

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LABOUR.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

WITH

APPENDICES,

TAKEN BEFORE

GROUP "B."

TRANSPORT AND AGRICULTURE

(The term "Transport" including Railways,
Shipping, Canals, Docks, and Tramways),

OF THE

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LABOUR.

(Volume II.)

TRANSPORT BY WATER (DOCKS, WHARVES, SHIPPING AND
CANALS), AND TRANSPORT BY LAND (TRAMWAYS,
OMNIBUSES, AND CABS).

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.
June 1892.



LONDON:

PRINTED FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE,
PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE, EAST HARDING STREET, FLEET STREET, E.C., and
32, ABINGDON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.; or
JOHN MENZIES & Co., 12, HANOVER STREET, EDINBURGH, and
90, WEST NILE STREET, GLASGOW; or
HODGES, FIGGIS, & Co. LIMITED, 104, GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

1892.

[G. 793.-v.] Price 3s. 6d.

CONTENTS.

ROYAL WARRANT	Page. iii
TERMS OF REFERENCE	v
LIST OF WITNESSES	vi
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE	1
LIST OF DOCUMENTS	378
APPENDIX	383

ROYAL WARRANT APPOINTING THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON
LABOUR.

VICTORIA, R.

Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith.

To Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Spencer Compton Cavendish, commonly called Marquess of Hartington; Our right trusty and right well-beloved Cousin and Councillor Edward Henry, Earl of Derby, Knight of Our Most Noble Order of the Garter; Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, Baronet, President of the Board of Trade; Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Anthony John Mundella; Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Henry Hartley Fowler; Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Leonard Henry Courtney; Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Sir John Eldon Gorst, Knight, one of Our Counsel learned in the Law, one of the Under Secretaries of State to Our Principal Secretary of State for India; Our trusty and well-beloved Sir Frederick Pollock, Baronet, Master of Arts, Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence in Our University of Oxford; Our trusty and well-beloved Sir Edward James Harland, Baronet; Our trusty and well-beloved Sir William Thomas Lewis, Knight; Our trusty and well-beloved Alfred Marshall, Esquire, Master of Arts, Professor of Political Economy in Our University of Cambridge; Our trusty and well-beloved William Abraham, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved Michael Austin, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved Gerald William Balfour, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved Joseph Cheney Bolton, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved Thomas Burt, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved Jesse Collings, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved David Dale, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved Alfred Hewlett, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved Thomas Henry Ismay, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved George Livesey, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved Tom Mann, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved James Mawdsley, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved Samuel Plimsoll, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved Henry Tait, Esquire; Our trusty and well-beloved Edward Trow, Esquire; and Our trusty and well-beloved William Tunstall, Esquire, greeting.

Whereas We have deemed it expedient that a Commission should forthwith issue to inquire into the questions affecting the relations between employer and employed; the combinations of employers and of employed; and the conditions of labour which have been raised during the recent trade disputes in the United Kingdom; and to report whether legislation can with advantage be directed to the remedy of any evils that may be disclosed, and, if so, in what manner.

Now know ye, that We, reposing great trust and confidence in your knowledge and ability, have nominated, constituted, and appointed, and do by these presents nominate, constitute, and appoint you, the said Spencer Compton Cavendish, commonly

called Marquess of Hartington; Edward Henry, Earl of Derby; Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach; Anthony John Mundella; Henry Hartley Fowler; Leonard Henry Courtney; Sir John Eldon Gorst; Sir Frederick Pollock; Sir Edward James Harland; Sir William Thomas Lewis; Alfred Marshall; William Abraham; Michael Austin; Gerald William Balfour; Joseph Cheney Bolton; Thomas Burt; Jesse Collings; David Dale; Alfred Hewlett; Thomas Henry Ismay; George Livesey; Tom Mann; James Mawdsley; Samuel Plimsoll; Henry Tait; Edward Trow; and William Tunstall; to be Our Commissioners for the purposes of the said inquiry.

And for the better effecting the purposes of this Our Commission, We do by these presents give and grant unto you, or any nine or more of you, full power to call before you such persons as you shall judge likely to afford you any information upon the subject of this Our Commission; and also to call for, have access to, and examine all such books, documents, registers, and records as may afford you the fullest information on the subject; and to inquire of and concerning the premises by all other lawful ways and means whatsoever.

And We do further by these presents authorise and empower you, or any nine or more of you, to visit and inquire at such places as you may deem it expedient so to visit and inquire at, for the more effectual carrying out of the purposes aforesaid; and to employ such persons as you may think fit to assist you in conducting any inquiry which you may hold.

And We do further by these Our presents will and ordain that this Our Commission shall continue in full force and virtue; and that you, Our said Commissioners, or any nine or more of you, may proceed in the execution thereof, and of every matter and thing therein contained, although the same be not continued from time to time by adjournment.

And We do further ordain that you, or any nine or more of you, have liberty to report your proceedings under this Our Commission from time to time, if you shall judge it expedient so to do.

And Our further will and pleasure is that you do, with as little delay as possible, report to Us under your hands and seals, or under the hands and seals of any nine or more of you, your opinion upon the matters herein submitted for your consideration.

Given at Our Court at St. James's, the twenty-first day of April, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one, in the fifty-fourth year of Our Reign.

By Her Majesty's Command,
(Signed) HENRY MATTHEWS.

REFERENCE.

A Royal Commission to inquire into the questions affecting the relations between employer and employed; the combinations of employers and of employed; and the conditions of labour which have been raised during the recent trade disputes in the United Kingdom; and to report whether legislation can with advantage be directed to the remedy of any evils that may be disclosed, and, if so, in what manner.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LABOUR.

GROUP B.

TRANSPORT AND AGRICULTURE.

(The term "Transport" including Railways, Shipping, Canals, Docks, and Tramways.)

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Name.	Interests represented.	Nos. of Questions in Evidence. (Vol. II., Group B.)	Days on which Evidence was given. (Vol. II., Group B.)	Page in Digest. (Vol. II., Group B.)	
				Analysis.	Précis.
Mr. Samuel Plimsoll -	British seamen - - - -	11,244-11,868	21st	147	25
„ Charles Booth -	Dock and waterside labour - - -	11,364-11,392	„	147	8
„ Isnac Allman -	Riverside Labour and Tyne Co-operative Stevedore Company.	11,393-11,523	„	147	11
„ John Morrison -	Tyne and Blyth District Committee of the Shipping Federation.	11,524-11,541	„	147	27
„ John Heron Wilson -	Shipping Federation (Cardiff) - -	11,542-11,662	„	148	29
„ James Cormack -	Shipping Federation (Leith) and Leith Ship-owners.	11,663-11,857	22nd	148	32
„ Robert Robinson -	Tyneside National Labour Union (Quayside Workers).	11,858-11,937	„	149	12
„ William King -	Sunderland and North-east Coast River, Dock, and Wharf Labour Union.	11,938-11,998	„	150	13
„ Thomas Frank Parr -	Liverpool Cotton and General Warehouse Porters' Society.	11,999-12,102	„	150	14
„ William Speed -	Upper Mersey Watermen and Porters' Association, and canal boatmen.	12,103-12,158	„	150	56
„ Thomas Morgan -	Southampton Free Labour Association, and firm of timber merchants.	12,159-12,272 and 12,459-12,468	23rd	151	14 and 18
„ Thomas MacCarthy -	Dock, Wharf, Riverside, and General Labourers' Union (Southampton).	12,273-12,458	„	151	16
„ Alexander Henry Varnier -	Plymouth and District Free Labour Association.	12,469-12,548	„	152	18
„ George Frederick Treleven -	Plymouth and District Free Labour Association.	12,549-12,620	„	152	19
„ George Creech -	Coal-porters (Plymouth) - - -	12,621-12,661	„	153	20
„ George Monro -	Free labour in Glasgow (Stevedores) - -	12,662-12,762	24th	153	20
„ James Smith Park -	Glasgow Shipowners' Association, and Allan Line.	12,763-12,940	„	153	35
„ Samuel Fisher -	Cardiff, Penarth, and Barry Coal Trimmers' Association.	12,941-13,010	„	154	21
Rev. John William Lewis -	Dock labour - - - -	13,011-13,188	„	154	21
„ Marmaduke Hare -	Dock labour - - - -	13,189-13,252	„	155	22
Captain Edward Brailey Hatfield.	British seamen, and proposed establishment of a National Insurance and Provident Fund.	13,253-13,411	25th	155	37
Mr. William Hannay Raeburn -	Clyde District Committee of the Shipping Federation and British seamen.	13,412-13,543	„	156	38
„ Edward Montagu Shepherd	Dock Labourers' Union (Barrow-in-Furness)	13,544-13,572	„	156	29

LIST OF WITNESSES—continued.

Name.	Interests represented.	Nos. of Questions in Evidence. (Vol. II., Group B.)	Days on which Evidence was given. (Vol. II., Group B.)	Page in Digest. (Vol. II., Group B.)	
				Analysis.	Précis.
Mr. James Sexton	Dock Labourers' Union (Liverpool)	13,578-13,580	25th	157	23
" Albert Anlaby Bird	Lightermen and Watermen's Union of the River Humber.	13,681-13,741	26th	157	56
Captain Ralph Pomeroy	Bute Docks, and proposed Joint Association of Employers and Employed.	13,742-13,805	"	158	41
Mr. James Benjamin Butcher	Hull Seaman and Firemen's Association	13,806-13,891	"	159	42
" James Tookey	United Bargemen and Watermen's Protection Society.	13,892-13,948	"	159	58
" James Hill	Plymouth firm of steamship owners and coal merchants in favour of unionism.	13,949-13,986	"	160	43
" Matthew Carroll	Corn-porters, and the contract system at the Surrey Commercial Docks.	13,987-14,014	"	160	24
" Henry Webb	Thames Steamship Workers' Union	14,015-14,080	"	161	54
" Thomas Scrutton	Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom	14,081-14,198	27th	161	48
" William James Brett	South Side Labour Protection League	14,199-14,334	"	161	24
" Louis Stephen White	Watermen and Lightermen's Hall	14,335-14,344	"	162	55
" James Stanbury	Ship Riggers and their Associations in London, Glasgow, Greenock, Liverpool, Belfast, and Londonderry.	14,345-14,474	"	162	45
" Edward Newman	Free labour as opposed to the Shipping Federation.	14,475-14,570	"	162	46
" George Milne	Firm of George Milne & Co. in refutation of statements by Mr. J. Havelock Wilson with regard to the cases of the "Donegal" and the "Rowena."	14,571-14,597	28th	163	46
" Wilson Mills Roche	Firm of Botterill and Roche in refutation of statements by Mr. J. Havelock Wilson with regard to the Shipping Federation.	14,598-14,668	"	163	47
" George Jerome Hornsby	National Independent Seamen and Firemen's Association in refutation of personal statements by Mr. J. Havelock Wilson.	14,669-14,697	"	163	48
" Arthur Richard Abbott	The International Federation of Stewards, Seamen, and Firemen in refutation of personal statements by Mr. J. Havelock Wilson.	14,698-14,720	"	164	49
" Paul Brown Sutcliffe	Shipping Federation, and British seamen in connection with the Seamen's Union.	14,721-14,750	"	164	49
" Cuthbert Laws	Shipping Federation in refutation of statements by Mr. Clem. Edwards and by Mr. J. Havelock Wilson.	14,751-14,756	"	164	49
Sir Henry George Calcraft, K.C.B.	Shipping Department of the Board of Trade in refutation of statements by Mr. J. Havelock Wilson and by Mr. G. A. Laws.	14,757-14,900	29th	164	51
Mr. George Day	Lightermen's Society	14,901-14,985	"	165	60
" Thomas Fawcett	Amalgamated Society of Lightermen and Watermen of the River Humber, and river and canal boatmen.	14,986-15,080	"	166	60
" William Hewson	Canal boatmen	15,081-15,136	"	166	61
" Ellis Gatley	Upper Mersey Watermen and Porters' Association, and canal boatmen.	15,137-15,338	30th	166	61
" Joseph Billam	Piccadilly (Manchester) Branch of the Upper Mersey Watermen and Porters' Association, and canal boatmen.	15,329-15,462	"	167	62
" William Turner	Burscough Branch of the Upper Mersey Watermen and Porters' Association, and canal boatmen.	15,463-15,583	"	167	62
" William Hough	Weaver Watermen's Association, and bargemen.	15,584-15,670	"	168	63

LIST OF WITNESSES—*continued.*

Name.	Interests represented.	Nos. of Questions in Evidence. (Vol. II., Group B.)	Days on which Evidence was given (Vol. II., Group B.)	Page in Digest, (Vol. II., Group B.)	
				Analysis.	Précis.
Mr. William Chadwick	- Mersey Flatmen's Association, and river boatmen.	15,671-15,742	30th	168	63
„ Thomas Sutherst	- - Tram and 'Bus Men - - - -	15,743-16,197	31st	168	64
„ Henry Bowbrick	- - Amalgamated Omnibus and Tram Workers' Union.	16,198-16,453	„	169	67
„ John Atkinson	- - Amalgamated Omnibus and Tram Workers' Union.	16,454-16,594	32nd	170	68
„ Edwin Dyke	- - Hyde Park Co-operative Cab Company, and Amalgamated Cab Drivers' Society.	16,595-16,732	„	171	70

ERRATA.

On page 419, "Appendix CVII, Table O." should read "Appendix CVII, Table N.";
and "Appendix CVIII, Table P." should read "Appendix CVIII, Table O,"
to accord with the references on pages 275 and 278 (Questions 14,787 and 14,819,
Minutes of Evidence), and on page 382 (List of Documents).—G.D.

LABOUR COMMISSION.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE THE

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LABOUR.

GROUP B.

Transport and Agriculture (the term "Transport" including Railways, Shipping, Canals, Docks, and Tramways).

TWENTY-FIRST DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Tuesday, 26th January 1892.

PRESENT:

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE.

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF DERBY, K.G. (CHAIRMAN).

The Right Hon. SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH,
Bart., M.P.
Mr. J. C. BOLTON, M.P.
Mr. SAMUEL PLIMSOLL

Mr. HENRY TAIT.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, M.P. (Group A.), Sir
FREDERICK POLLOCK, Bart., and Mr. GEORGE
LIVSEY (Group C.) also attended.

Mr. GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Mr. SAMUEL PLIMSOLL, a member of the Commission, examined.

Earl of Derby.

11,244. We understand that you wish to give evidence on the subject of employment in the British mercantile marine?—On the conditions of the seamen's life, yes.

11,245. You have been good enough to give us a summary of your evidence, and I see that the first subject which you wish to touch upon is that of deck-loading?—That is so.

11,246. Can you tell us how does the loss of life in the British mercantile marine compare with that of all other nations?—It is a fraction over four times as much. Whereas, taking Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, and Italy, they lose on the average one man per annum out of 271 employed, we lose one in 66.

11,247. Can you give us your authority for that statement?—That statement was made by the Right Honourable Joseph Chamberlain, when he was President of the Board of Trade, in a speech in the House of Commons.

11,248. How long ago?—It was during the time when he was President of the Board of Trade; it is some few years ago, but I apprehend there is not much difference since, and I thought it was better to give his authority than my own.

11,249. Now can you supply any further particulars?—The particulars which he gave in that speech were these, that the German fleet lost one life per annum for every 123 men, in the Netherlands the loss was one in 232, in Norway one in 277, and in Italy one in 454. In

Earl of Derby—continued.

Italy the skippers are mostly part owners. The average of those figures is 271, whereas the loss in the English navy is one in 66.

11,250. Are you aware of any facts that may throw light on the disparity which you have called our attention to?—Yes; I think that this loss, as to the greater part of it, can be very distinctly traced, and admits of being obviated without any hardship to the shipping interest.

11,251. We will take the history of the question; when was deck-loading first made the subject of an Act of Parliament?—In 1839, in consequence of the report of a committee of inquiry appointed that year. The state of things was such that an Act was passed at once that same session for one year.

11,252. Was it continued?—It was found that 200 lives had been saved during the year, and in the following session the Act was re-enacted for two years with very slight modifications, that is to say, they included Honduras in the Act, and they excluded coasting voyages in America, leaving it applicable to transatlantic voyages only.

11,253. And you say the immediate result of the Act was the saving of 200 lives in the year?—200 lives in one year.

11,254. Then another Act was passed not long afterwards?—In the following year it was re-enacted for two years.

11,255. And at the end of those two years what happened?—At the end of two years they

26 January 1892.]

Mr. S. PLIMSOLL.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

had had a period of three years of the operation of the Act, and a careful investigation was made and it was found that the loss of life during the three years that the practice had been prohibited was 318, whereas in the three years preceding the Act of 1839 the loss was 918, showing that nearly two-thirds of the loss of life had been saved by this legislation.

11,256. We understand that a committee for the second time was held upon the subject in 1843; is that not so?—That is so.

11,257. What is the substance of the report?—*Inter alia* they showed the great diminution in the loss of life and recommended that the Act of Parliament should be re-enacted for three years.

11,258. The Act was made perpetual in 1845; is that not so?—The Act in 1845 was made perpetual.

11,259. Is it now in force or was it repealed?—It is not in force; it was repealed in 1862 without a word of explanation to Parliament; so that neither Parliament, the Press, nor the public knew anything at all about it. But it was well known in some quarters, because deck-loading was immediately resumed with greater license than ever.

11,260. Was there no debate on the subject in Parliament?—I have gone through the journals of the House, both in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords, traced every single sitting, and no word of what was being done appeared, except two or three words by Mr. Milner Gibson in asking for leave to bring in the Bill, but on the first reading, the second, in Committee, report, on the third reading, and then right through the stages in the House of Lords not a syllable was said.

11,261. So that there was no discussion upon it?—None whatever. I do not see how there could be discussion upon it. If you will allow me to give you this (*handing in print of Act*),* that will show that there was not a letter in the Act to explain it. Those figures in the repealing schedule were all that ever repealed all that beneficial legislation—four separate Acts of Parliament accompanied by two committees of inquiry, and all swept out of the statute book by answering those three figures in that schedule. It took me months to find that out.

11,262. The effect of that was that all legislation against deck-loading was repealed?—That is so.

11,263. Was there not a committee appointed to investigate the operation of the repeal?—There was. The Board of Trade wrote to Lloyd's Committee and asked them to investigate the subject. They put it in the hands of two of their most experienced members, and they made an elaborate report upon it after some considerable time; they examined 6,000 voyages.

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,264. Are you prepared to show that the repeal of this legislation had the immediate effect of increasing the number of deaths?—After the legislation had been repealed 10 years the committee to which your Lordship has just referred was appointed. They examined into every single voyage for 10 years whilst it was prohibited, and for 10 years after it was allowed or not interfered with. They ascertained the particulars in nearly 7,000 voyages, with the exception of two, and in their report they say (among other things): "Our inquiry therefore now covers the autumn voyages of a period of 20 years in all, namely, from 1850 to 1859 inclusive, and from 1863 to 1872 inclusive. We find that during the former period 3,774 ships sailed from Quebec for, this country with timber cargoes; after the 1st of September and during the latter period, 3,068. Every one of these 6,842 voyages has been examined, and, except in two cases, all their results traced out." Then further on they say: "We find that the deck-loading period was marked by a loss of life nearly four times as great as the 10 years"—it is a long time, 10 years—"during which no deck-loads were allowed. This contract is made still more manifest by limiting the comparison of lives lost on board of missing vessels only." They point out how that during the latter period, when the greater number were lost, the circumstances of the trade, owing to the greater number of ships *en route*, would have tended at any rate so far to a less loss.

11,265. What was the ultimate result after that committee; deck-loading was not absolutely prohibited, was it?—There was nothing done in consequence of that report; it seems strange, but nothing was done. After many years of effort I succeeded in 1876 in passing in the House of Commons a clause in the Act of that year again prohibiting the practice. The case was so clear that I carried it against the shipowners and the Government. That was sent up to the House of Lords on the 22nd May 1876, and—it is my business to give facts and not to impute motives—it was not brought back to the House of Commons until the day before the prorogation, and then this clause had been struck out and another clause inserted allowing deck-loading to the extent of 3 feet.

11,266. That is to say, deck-loading instead of being absolutely prohibited was only limited to a very considerable extent?—On paper, yes; but when you give 3 feet you give up the whole subject.

11,267. How is that?—Because the shipowners sometimes translate three into thirteen. I have seen ships with 18 feet of deck-loading upon them. The prohibition was intelligible because there was none to be allowed, but when some was to be allowed, then—

11,268. Do you mean to say that it is impossible to know whether a ship is loaded to the extent of 3 feet above the deck, or of 18?—No, not at all impossible, but there is a wonderful difference in the legislation of 40 years ago and

* Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act, 1862, with Schedule repealing Sections 170, 171, and 172 of the Customs Consolidation Act, 1853. (See also Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Deck Loading Act, 1845.)—G.D.

26 January 1892.]

Mr. S. PLIMSOLL.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

now. In those four Acts of Parliament that I have submitted to you the issue of clearance papers is made contingent upon the Custom House officer having satisfied himself that the vessel was loaded according to law; now instead of that we have a wretched arrangement of penalties which are never enforced.

11,269. Then your objection to the 3 feet of deck-loading is not so much to the thing in itself as to the liability to evasion?—I think that there ought to be no deck-loading whatever across the Atlantic in winter, and that opinion is held by a large number of respectable shipowners.

11,270. And you say the Act is not sufficiently enforced?—The present Board of Trade have been working in that way. I believe until Sir Michael Hicks-Beach was President nobody was fined, but since then prosecutions have been entered into and fines inflicted; but indeed I have only seen one case in which more than 5*l.* has been inflicted for a penalty, although the infraction of the law has probably brought the shipowner from 50*l.* to 100*l.* more freight, so that it does not operate at all.

11,271. I see you mention certain peculiar features of a distressing character, as you say, which distinguish accidents happening to timber-laden vessels, and the loss of life in consequence. Will you explain that statement?—It is an extract from the report that was made in 1839, and I apprehend there is nothing to warrant us, I am sorry to say, in drawing a different conclusion now. The last days of a ship at sea waterlogged and the experience of the crew will be very much now what it was then, I suppose. There was a case of a ship coming into Weymouth in November with 23 men who had been on a waterlogged ship for five days without any food, and they had only had a wineglass of water per day, and if they had been left a little longer they would have perished as those others perished. Do you wish me to give those terrible instances that are reported in the report of 1839?

11,272. I think we had better not go into very great detail. I understand your point to be this: that apart from the actual loss of life there are circumstances of peculiar suffering attending the loss of life in the case of timber-laden ships?—Most horrible sufferings; they are all in that report of 1839, and what was singular in the diminished loss of life which ensued upon the prohibition of deck-loading, the committee of 1843 reported that there are no cases in the latter period of those terrible sufferings. When there is a load upon the deck you see it gets shifted and covers up the hatches and they cannot get down below for food or anything.

11,273. To come to the present; have you any recommendation to offer to the Commission as to what ought to be done?—I think that deck-loading in winter on the Atlantic ought to be peremptorily put an end to.

11,274. Deck-loading in winter and on the Atlantic?—Just so.

11,275. Then you do not apply that to all seas?—No.

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,276. Or to all times of the year?—No. In those four Acts of Parliament there were amendments made in the direction that they exempted the coasting trade of America from the operation.

11,277. Then you would confine the abolition of deck-loading to certain seas and to certain times of the year?—That is so.

11,278. Have you any reason to think that that would have an unfavourable effect upon the shipping trade?—The report of Wakefield and Janson, to which I have referred, states that a large number of shipowners are in favour of its being prohibited, and they say that it would not prejudicially affect the trade. It will be struggled against, I have no doubt, by Canada, but then the way to meet that, I submit, would be to leave Canada to legislate for herself, excepting of course if her vessels come into our ports, and then they ought to be subject to our laws, just as our ships are in their ports. But they have a peculiar class of vessel for carrying timber that has only one single deck. It is about 10 feet from the keel; the bulwarks are 7 or 8 feet high and sometimes more. I was speaking with a Canadian shipper of timber myself in Ottawa last year, when he stated that a vessel of his with the deck 10 feet above the keel had 18 feet of cargo upon that, which would be at least two-thirds of the whole; that is done on some question of dues, I believe. Timber loaded upon deck is not subject to certain dues.

11,279. Of course we have no control over foreign shipping?—In our own ports most certainly we have. They administer their laws and make our shipping subject to their laws in all the ports of the world. Even Canada takes the loading of grain ships out of our hands and employs her own officers to see that they are properly provided.

11,280. Then you would place English shipping and foreign shipping on the same footing?—Entirely. I think it would be highly injudicious to handicap our own people unfairly as against others. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, I may tell your Lordship, has recently prosecuted the owners of several foreign ships for sending deck-loads, but then the penalty inflicted is so trifling that I almost wonder at his perseverance in going on with it—5*l.* and 2*l.* 10*s.* and costs, and so on. I have only seen one penalty more than 5*l.*

11,281. Then I understand your complaint is not so much of the state of the law as of the insufficiency of the penalties; is that so?—Oh, no; I say that it is a very lame proceeding to inflict penalties at all. Why not do as they did in 1839, 1842, and 1845—make the issue of the clearance papers contingent upon the fact of the vessel having been loaded in accordance with the requirements of the law; that was what they did then and it answered perfectly. I would not have any penalties. Punishment is not what I seek; I want to seek the greater safety of the men. The Board of Trade were good enough to give me a special manuscript

26 January 1892.]

Mr. S. PLIMSOLL.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

report to illustrate this subject, which is here (*handing in same*). I have shown you that the prohibition of deck-loading reduced the loss of life from 918 to 318, that is two-thirds. I have shown that the removal of that prohibition sent it up again to four times. Now here is this report, which was sent me by the favour of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, which shows that when the 3-foot regulation came in in 1876 it only reduced the loss of life by one-fourth—not to one-fourth.

11,282. Do you conceive that shipowners as a body would be willing to have the trade farther restricted in the manner you propose?—I really do not know, and I do not think that we ought to concern ourselves much about that. Here is a state of the law that acted admirably, which was swept away in a manner that nobody can justify, and I ask for it to be restored to the statute book. The Act of 1890 prescribed the load-line; the people that break the law are fined if they are prosecuted. I suggested that that could be immensely strengthened and amended by any of the provisions that were inserted in 1839, 1843, or 1845, which makes the issue of clearance papers contingent upon the Custom House officer being satisfied that the ship is loaded in accordance with the law. I cannot conceive any objection to that. It would save the Board of Trade all this trouble of prosecuting in individual cases, and would secure the object we aim at of course.

11,283. Have you anything else to tell us on the subject of deck-loads?—I do not know that I have.

11,284. Now as to the legislation affecting the construction of vessels and their division by watertight compartments; that I believe is enacted in three separate Acts of Parliament; is that not so?—It was not enacted in 1839. It is the repeal I was dealing with. There were three preliminary inquiries and then there were three Acts of Parliament tentatively, and then watertight bulkheads were insisted upon with the most beneficial results in a great number of cases. May I give you one or two cases where the vessel was saved by the existence of these things?

11,285. Certainly?—When the "Sultan" collided with the "Cimbria" her bulkhead saved her from going down. The "Arizona" ran upon an iceberg; her bulkhead saved her. The "Elizabeth" collided with the "British Queen," and was saved from sinking by her bulkheads too. It would require a very long list indeed to give anything like an exhaustive return of the vessels which have been saved by bulkheads.

11,286. Is the legislation of which you speak still in force?—No; it was swept away in the same manner as the other was. This figure 300 was just inserted in that repealing clause, and all this legislation—three inquiries and three Acts of Parliament—were all swept out of the statute book.

11,287. What date was this?—The repeal was in 1862.

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,288. What were the reasons assigned for the repeal of these Acts?—Absolutely no reasons whatever, and no reference whatever to the subject. The figure 300 was just put in the repealing schedule of an Act of Parliament, and that legislation ceased to be. Sir John Pakington expressed his great astonishment and indignation to find that this legislation had been repealed.

11,289. And no notice was taken of it in Parliament; is that so?—No reasons whatever were given from first to last, either by the promoters of the Bill repealing this legislation, or by anybody else. Legislation based upon the inquiries of three Parliamentary committees, which brought in no less than three Acts of Parliament, the one amending the other, was entirely swept away by the insertion of the numeral 300, which you will see in the schedule of an Act of Parliament, copies of which I have placed before the Commissioners.

11,290. Have you anything more to say upon the subject of watertight compartments?—Nothing more than this. I understand that the Board of Trade have made an inquiry into the subject quite recently, and that they have reported in favour of certain legislation. I should like that the report should be legislated upon, because at present the shipowner may make a ship without any single bulkhead from bow to stern—so far as the law is concerned. Lloyd's interfere where the ship is offered to them for survey; their requirements are very sensible.

11,291. I will only ask on that, is it not very distinctly the interest of the shipowner himself to make his ship as safe against danger of loss as he can?—If he carries passengers, yes; because if a man loses many ships carrying passengers his business would be lost, but it would by no means follow that it is to the interest of the shipowner in other cases.

11,292. It cannot be to his advantage, unless in case of fraudulent insurance, to lose his cargo?—In case of over-insurance. I heard of three cases last week where vessels were over-insured. One was for 16,000*l.* She was lost, and it can be proved that she was only worth 7,000*l.*, and they are collecting the 16,000*l.* There are two other cases like that. At a time when shipping goes down in value very rapidly, it is the best thing for an owner that he should lose his ship unless he is in the passenger trade.

11,293. Then your argument is, as I understand it, that an owner cannot be trusted to wish to make his ship safe, because it may be more to his advantage to lose her than to keep her—that is the point?—Certainly. I think they are not to be trusted in the matter.

11,294. And therefore that the State should interpose to ensure the safety of the vessel as far as that could be done by law—that is your point?—I think so.

11,295. Now you have something to tell us as to the provisions supplied to seamen?—Yes; I have here specifications and forms of tender from workhouses and gaols and asylums, and from the

26 January 1892.]

Mr. S. PLIMSOLL.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

army and navy, all specifying the nature of the provisions, and that they are to be examined before they are supplied on being tendered, and then that they may be rejected (*handing in documents*). This is the case with the workhouses, asylums, gaols, the army and the navy, and also, singular to say, the merchant ships which carry emigrants, because Parliament legislated for the examination of the food of the emigrants, and could not very well leave out the seamen on board those ships, and so the food is examined there, but nowhere else. A singular instance occurred to myself in my own experience as to the operation of the law. There is no examination of the food for seamen, but there is a great improvement in the quality, owing to the action that Lord George Hamilton took a year ago. I was on board a ship where they were landing a cargo of between 20,000 and 30,000 sheep from abroad. There was a gentleman there examining. No single sheep was landed without being subject to his inspection. If they were off-colour or defective in any way, he had them condemned and put aside. At the same moment, standing in the same place, I saw them taking provisions on board the ship for the seamen, not a single bit of which had ever been examined at all. As to the need of examination in the two cases, common sense speaks for it, but there was no examination in case of the sailors' food, and the most careful examination with regard to the food that was being landed for sale amongst the public, who could go to another shop next week.

11,296. Is it the case that provisions supplied on board ships carrying passengers and emigrants are carefully examined before being put on board, and that there is no similar examination in the case of cargo-carrying vessels?—There is no examination at all in the case of the cargo-carrying vessels, and here is the Act of Parliament with the passage that prescribes it in the case of ships carrying emigrants. The water is examined also. "In addition to the allowance of pure water," &c., &c. (reads down to), "all such water, provisions, and stores shall be provided and properly stowed away in accordance with the requirements of the Act," and so on. Now a very little thing would put it right as regards seamen. Your Lordship will see that if all these other markets are so carefully watched, so that inferior food or bad food is excluded by inspectors, the tendency of that food to gravitate to a market which is unwatched, is greater by reason of the cure that is taken elsewhere, and the consequence is that a great deal of inferior—well, I need not waste your time by talking of the consequences. The Act I have quoted from is the 18th and 19th Victoria, chapter 119, and if this was simply applied to all cargo-carrying vessels, I think that we should then secure at least that what is rejected in other markets is not salted for the sailors.

11,297. As a matter of fact, can you tell us of any undesirable consequences which have resulted from this omission to examine sailors' provisions?—Yes; from a Blue Book on "Health of Crews" there is a report of the most harrow-

Earl of Derby—continued.

ing kind, showing how the men have died in great numbers and have had their gums swollen so that the teeth were in a hollow, and the roofs of their mouths were black. There were four or five ships which landed at San Francisco, which I read the accounts of myself a few years ago, where nearly half the men had died and had been thrown overboard one by one, and the others were so bad that they had to take them all to the hospital. They all recovered with the exception of one. I have made a few extracts from the Blue Book on the "Health of Crews." Here is one. Dr. Spooner, reporting to the Board of Trade, states that "Sailors as a rule are fed on worse than workhouse or prison fare." That is the deliberate opinion of an expert.

11,298. Have you any reason to suppose that there is any general inclination among sailors to complain of provisions supplied to them?—They avow to themselves that they will complain whilst they are at sea, but when they came to the end of a tedious voyage they want to relax and enjoy themselves, and so it is a very rare thing for a seaman to keep his wrath warm enough to take legal proceedings, and then the worry of it is so great. I wish I had marked two or three of the passages—I ought to have done. Here is another extract. "Dr. Walford, port medical officer at King's Lynn, informs me that when he examined J—D—s, A.B., the gums were immensely swelled, had a baggy feel, and were nearly as thick as two fingers, protruded the cheeks, and the teeth were quite sunk in them." I have quoted those instances from that report and had them printed on a separate sheet, but I think I have got it far too long to quote it all here. If I had marked just two or three of the passages it would have been much better.

11,299. Do you think that taking the merchant service through there is generally reason to complain of the character of the provisions supplied?—That is certain. If the provisions of this Act of the 18th and 19th Victoria, which does extend to the crews of ships which carry emigrants, were extended to all cargo-carrying ships—and I do not imagine that shipowners would object to it—they might lose some bargains in food, you know; where they get it at 1d. a pound now they might have to give a trifle more. This is a return (*producing Return*)* which was moved for by myself in the House of Commons, and which shows what became of the naval stores. You will see the price runs from 1d. to 1½d. a lb., but the singular part of it is that not a bit of it is sold for consumption ashore; it is all bought up by ships' husbands and people like that who buy it for ships. At Plymouth it is all bought for Plymouth; that is also done at Greenwich, and so on. There is one man who bought an immense lot of it, and I

* "Return (August 1876) of all sales of provisions, being naval stores, by or for the Admiralty, for the two years ending 31st December 1875, showing when each parcel was bought, of what it consisted, whether beef, pork, or biscuit, and the price paid for it; also the date of its sale, the prices for which it was sold, and the name of the purchaser." (No. 445 of 1876.)

26 January 1892.]

Mr. S. PLIMSOLL.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

know of a certain shipowner whose ships he supplied who landed with their crews in a frightful condition out at San Francisco. I have furnished to each Commissioner a copy of this return, and they will be able to see it for themselves. You cannot get good meat you know for 1d. or 1½d. or 1¾d. a lb.; it is not possible.

Mr. Tait.

11,300. Per pound of what?—Per pound weight.

11,301. Yes, but what class of food?—Pork and beef. It is taken out of the barrels in which it was salted, and the principal store-keeper down at Deptford told me himself that on one occasion they had unheaded a barrel which had had beef in it twenty years, and frequently when they unhead these barrels the men have to pinch their noses and go to a distance, and, notwithstanding that, it sells, and they will give 1d. a lb. for it or 1½d. per lb. These people will come to these ports, ships' husbands and chandlers; and that it is bought to be used as food is self-evident, because they pay far too much money for it otherwise; if they bought it for manure they could not give that money for it. The Corporation of London sell all their condemned meat for manure at 7 lbs. for 1d. or something like that, so that these people could not buy it for manure; it is bought for the ships and put on board ships and poisons and kills the men by scores and hundreds. There is, as I say, a Blue Book called "Health of Crews' Return" giving most deplorable instances of suffering and death.

11,302. If a shipowner supplies his crew with food which is distinctly unwholesome and sickness follows, is he not liable to punishment?—I suppose he might be if there were anybody sufficiently interested and who had the capital and means to lodge a complaint against him, but it would be an offence extremely difficult to prove. These people who buy the meat at Deptford take it piece by piece from the barrel, scrape it, where scraping is sufficient, and if not, they pare it, and they put it into new casks with fresh brine and label it "best navy stores." Well, the shipowner might very well say "I took it for best navy stores." I do not suppose shipowners are particularly anxious to be supplied with carrion, but they go to the cheapest market for their provisions, and if they are assured that the provisions are all right, some of them buy them with very little inquiry. But I should mislead your Lordship if I wanted you to suppose that that is in existence now. Lord George Hamilton has at length taken this resolution, and a minute of the Board has been adopted to the effect that no condemned stores shall in future be sold before they have been treated with a chemical bath which will render it impossible that they should be used as food. So that there is a great reform there, and now I want to shut out from the ships the rejected meat from other markets. My case is that if the inspection is

Mr. Tait—continued.

good and efficient at all these places I have mentioned—asylums, gaols, workhouses, and for the army and the navy and the public, surely sailors do not less require but rather more require that their food should be examined, and I do not imagine for a moment that the shipowners would object to it.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

11,303. Does your desire for inspection of food extend beyond ocean-going ships; would you apply that to every little coaster?—No, I think not; I would simply have you do all that you do there in that Act.

11,304. But you would apply it to purely ocean-going ships?—Yes, just so. I do not want to give annoyance.

Earl of Derby.

11,305. I think we understand what you want done in this matter of stores. You wish that they should be always examined in the same manner that they are in the case of passenger and emigrant ships?—Yes, that is all.

Mr. Livesey.

11,306. Perhaps it would be as well if you were to give at this point the date of this return from which you have just quoted. I see it is 1876, is it not?—Yes.

Earl of Derby.

11,307. Now, I will ask you about the sleeping accommodation provided for seamen; what have you to say upon that point?—I have gone on board a great number of ships both in Liverpool and in London and in Sunderland, and up the north too, and I find the accommodation provided for seamen varies very considerably. In a large number of vessels there is nothing left to be desired; the shipowners and the builders have taken every care to make the men as reasonably comfortable as they can be; they cannot expect to have everything on board ship that they can have on shore. But in many vessels I find that the accommodation is simply not fit for dogs. The accommodation would be in the peak, that is the fore end of the vessel, and there would be what they call a bulkhead, that is a sort of vertical diaphragm dividing it; the firemen and engineers will be on one side and the seamen on the other. From any of the beds you can reach with your hand as you lie and touch this partition. In the narrow part, where there is no room for men to lie at all, you will find that they keep the stores of oils and paints and things like that, which create a most disgusting odour. The whole place can only be reached from the deck by a narrow alley-way about 2 feet 6 inches wide, and sometimes 10 feet or 12 feet long, and there is no through draught at all. Further, besides having the oils and paints in the fore-peak sweltering about with the motion of the vessel, there will be a chain locker underneath, where you take up a flap, and it takes up the whole width of the floor, and so the men are disturbed while at their rest. In many cases also the roof over their faces leaks badly, and the bedding is never

26 January 1892.]

Mr. S. PLIMSOLL.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

dry from setting out to coming back in certain voyages. Then the access of the privies is from the sides of these narrow alley-ways. Altogether the atmosphere in the forecables of some ships is simply unendurable, and it was the more remarkable on coming from that ship and going on board of a foreign ship that I found the stores for paints and oils opened upon the deck, clean outside, away from it altogether. I think that the sanitary authorities who look after ships should look to this. Ships are defined as houses by certain Acts of Parliament, so that there are authorities on shore who have the right to go on board and examine these things, and I think that there ought to be a more general care of the seamen. I do not very well see how we could get it for ourselves; the necessities of men with wives and families are so great that they put up with just what they find.

11,308. Do you think that it would be possible to insure the sailors' sleeping accommodation being at any rate not so bad as to be injurious to health?—I think so. The port sanitary authorities, I am glad to say, are moving a little in the matter, but they want quickening; whether they want additional power I do not know.

11,309. Is there no interference in any case, however bad, on the part of the Board of Trade or of any other official body?—I have not heard of any.

11,310. I understand you wish also to tell us of certain complaints as to the administration of justice in seaport towns?—Yes. This is a return which Mr. Fenwick moved for for me, showing the constitution of the local marine boards, and of the magistrates too (*handing in Return*).^{*} The business of the boards is to hear complaints—very often against seamen. Out of 184 members of the local marine boards in all the ports round the coast, no less than 143 of them are shipowners. It is quite vain for a sailor to expect justice, either from the local marine boards or from the local magistrates. That is a large statement to make, but it is the fact. Where a shipowner breaks the law he is brought before a bench of shipowners, and they fine him 5*l.* or 2*l.* 10*s.* for breaking the law, whereas the freight that he gets from breaking the law is 50*l.* perhaps. You cannot expect justice under such circumstances as those, and when the local magistrates and local marine boards consist almost exclusively of shipowners you cannot be surprised to find that the laws against seamen are administered with Draconian severity.

11,311. What is your remedy for that complaint?—Well, you do not allow a game-preserving squire to sit on a poaching case now—at least, if he is not disqualified by law, public opinion will not allow him to sit and hear a case; and I submit that a sailor is quite as respectable a man as a poacher, and quite as

Earl of Derby—continued.

useful a man to the community, and therefore that his case should be heard by a stipendiary magistrate, or if you cannot have stipendiary magistrates in all the ports, then that the case should be heard at the nearest town where there were magistrates who were not shipowners. I am only saying that shipowners are like ordinary men; I am not making any great charge against them. I am only saying that you cannot expect justice under these circumstances.

11,312. What you object to is that you say that as marine boards are composed the shipowners are often judges in their own case?—Always, not often. I was down at Goole a little while ago; there were 11 magistrates, every one of them shipowners. Let a man be brought for desertion or for refusing to go to sea before any one of them, why he would have no chance in the world.

11,313. Is complaint made of the constitution of the bench of magistrates as well as of the constitution of the marine boards?—Yes, forasmuch as sailors, when they get ashore generally spend their time in enjoying themselves as they call it, or going about; they forget all their grievances as soon as they land. That is no reason, you know, why they should be poisoned at sea, and trampled upon when they come ashore.

11,314. And what you say is that cases where sailors are concerned should as far as possible be tried by persons who are not in any way parties interested?—Certainly, and also shipowners, because the President of the Board of Trade will tell your Lordship I have no doubt—at any rate he will confirm me—that although the Board of Trade have been unusually diligent in prosecuting shipowners who have broken the law as to overloading and deck-loading lately,—more prosecutions have been ordered than ever before that I know of—still that the tribunal is so unsatisfactory that with one exception they fine them 2*l.* 10*s.* and costs 5*l.*, and this thing and the other like that, because a shipowner breaks the law and a shipowner inflicts the penalty. I only know of one case where more than 5*l.* has been inflicted.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

11,315. I know of more than one?—I am very glad. Might I repeat an answer while Sir Michael is here that I gave to you earlier in the meeting. I was pointing out, Sir Michael, the characteristic of the legislation of 1839, 1840, 1842, and 1845; that there they would not allow clearance papers to be issued until the man who issued them was satisfied that the ship had been loaded according to the law. Now would it not save you a wonderful deal of trouble in your Department if you were to enact that now, and to say: "See that the vessels do not overload;" would not that be a great deal better than hunting up a few bad cases here and there and fining them? You would make sure then that no vessel could go to sea overloaded.

^{*} "Return by the Board of Trade (August 1890) of the names and descriptions of the members of all the Local Marine Boards (for each Port separately), distinguishing, as far as possible, those members who do not own ships, or shares in ships, from the others." (No. 372 of 1890.)

26 January 1892.]

Mr. S. PLIMSOLL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton.

11,316. Amongst the remedies which you have suggested for the improper state of matters which exist, you propose that the granting of clearance papers should be made contingent on the ship being properly loaded?—That is so.

11,317. You could apply that to foreign ships in England as well as to English ships, could you not?—If they were loaded in England certainly.

11,318. If they were loaded in England?—Yes.

11,319. But how could you apply it to foreign ships abroad?—Foreign ships abroad?—I do not see how that concerns us.

11,320. Does it not concern us in this manner, that foreign ships compete with our own ships in bringing cargoes to this country?—If they bring cargoes to our country I would subject them to our law certainly.

11,321. But how would you subject them to our law in respect of loading seeing that they clear from a foreign port?—Sir Michael has put the law in operation against several owners of foreign ships during the last 12 months, and has recovered penalties. I suppose that you cannot superintend the loading of a foreign ship in a foreign port, but you can superintend the loading of British ships in the North American ports. Where the law is broken, instead of leaving it to the magistrate to fine him 2l. 10s. or 5l., I would confiscate every stick of timber that he brought in excess of what he ought to bring.

11,322. Is there power at present given to the Board of Trade to fine a foreign ship which arrives here overloaded?—Certainly.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

No, not to the Board of Trade. If I may just interpose, the law applies both to foreign ships and to English ships in English ports, only of course it is enforced by the court; the Board of Trade prosecute, they do not fine.

Mr. Bolton.

11,323. My question is, how would you provide for foreign ships coming to this country overloaded being placed on the same terms as British ships?—Sir Michael has just told you.

11,324. I think not?—I think so. Lay an information and prosecute them, and then they are fined. All I object to is that the fine is too small.

11,325. I may be mistaken, but I think there is no power in this country to fine a foreign ship which arrives in this country overloaded?—Yes, they can be fined if they come here with too much.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

11,326. Mr. Bolton wishes to put to you the case of a foreign ship leaving a foreign port and arriving in England overloaded?—Then the owner can be cited before the magistrates and fined for doing it because it is in contravention of our law; and the Board of Trade have fined some foreign shipowners to my knowledge.

Mr. Bolton.

11,327. I am doubtful of its being correct, but under those circumstances it involves this:

Mr. Bolton—continued.

that all foreigners of whatever nation must be acquainted with the laws of England?—They do not ask our seamen in Hamburg, for instance, whether they are acquainted with the law there. They simply administer the law.

11,328. But take, for example, a vessel loading sugar, we will say, in Chili—a foreign ship—and coming to this country, and when she arrives in this country it is found that she is overloaded in respect of the provisions of our law; could you fine that ship?—I am not so sure about that as for deck-loading. Overloading I am not so sure about.

11,329. I am not on deck-loading at present?—I know. I do not see how you could very well, but it would be easy to strengthen the law.

11,330. Under those circumstances do you feel that it would be easy to strengthen the law in that respect and impose upon all foreign vessels the obligation to know the English law as respects loading?—Yes, I certainly think so. They ought to.

11,331. With regard to those watertight bulkheads to which you have alluded, would you make those applicable to wooden ships as well as to iron ships?—I think they were only applied to iron vessels.

11,332. You would only make it applicable to iron vessels?—I think I must ask you not to ask me such a technical question as that. A committee has been appointed by the Board of Trade which has investigated that subject and made recommendations. The committee consisted of experts; all I ask is that the report shall be legislated upon, not that certain provisions shall be put in the Act. Experts necessarily know more than a layman of that, and as they have advised and reported I think that that indicates the direction in which we ought to move.

11,333. With respect to provisions, and the examination of provisions, the law at present, I think, imposes an obligation on those disposing of provisions that they shall be fit for human food; is it not so?—I do not know I am sure. As a matter of fact we know that a very great deal of inferior food is put on board a ship.

11,334. No, no; I am not speaking of aboard ship; I am speaking generally of the sale of provisions in this country. I think the law imposes upon those who undertake the sale of provisions to see that the provisions they offer are fit for human food?—They are liable under the Adulteration Act to be punished if they offer that which is unfit for food.

11,335. But you do not think that that is sufficient?—Oh dear, no; neither does the Government in the case of emigrant ships. They insist upon having one cask in ten unheaded and examined. They do not depend upon the law, but they want to depend upon actual observation.

11,336. With respect to your observation of the sleeping accommodation on board ships, would you say that the deficient accommodation

26 January 1892.]

Mr. S. PLIMSOLL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

is more prevalent in any particular class of ship than in another?—I really cannot say. I think the smaller ships are the worst. I do not know that. I did not examine or take note with sufficient observation to answer your question.

11,337. But your recommendation I think is that no ship should be allowed to go to sea unless her accommodation is sufficient?—I think that if the port sanitary authorities were just imperatively ordered to see that the accommodation was good that would be sufficient.

Mr. Tait.

11,338. Your complaint regarding legislation in this country is, that legislation which prohibited deck-loading at one time was only of a tentative character?—It was passed in 1839, and it lasted till 1862, and in that interval the loss of life was one-third of what it had been, previously to 1839, and one-fourth of what it subsequently became when the prohibition was removed.

11,339. And your contention is, therefore, that if the Acts which were repealed previous to that period were again put into operation, there would be a considerable saving of life at sea?—I think there can be no sort of doubt of it. Why in 1876, as I have explained, there was in the House of Lords a clause inserted allowing it at 3 feet instead of what had been before. Well, that brought down the loss of life something—one-fourth—it brought it down from 119 to 85, whereas if deck-loading had been prohibited it would not be a violent presumption that, judging from precedent, it would be reduced to one-fourth instead of by one-fourth.

11,340. Have you consulted with any of the large shipowners or shipping companies as to the desirability of having again legislation on this subject?—No, I cannot say that I have.

11,341. In answer to Mr. Bolton about the fining for British or foreign ships in this country by proceedings instituted by the Board of Trade, are we to infer that when such shipowners were fined they had been deck-loading in excess of 3 feet?—In excess of 3 feet of course, because the law allows 3 feet just now.

11,342. The law allows 3 feet just now?—Yes, but it was greatly in excess of that. Each of the Commissioners I furnished with a photograph of a deck-loaded ship that came in. You will see what 3 feet grows to if you like to look at that.

11,343. Do you think the references which you made to food apply at the present time?—Yes; I have stated the case as it is now. The food of every single class is not inspected.

11,344. That is, notwithstanding you got a return in 1876, which you have given copies of to the Commissioners, the food in no way has been altered to the satisfaction or to the benefit of the men?—Oh, yes; just allow me to explain. The Government supplied the great bulk of the putrid meat which was eaten on board the commercial marine until a few years ago. Then I found this out and made it so uncomfortable that greater care was taken, and they examined

Mr. Tait—continued.

it before it was sold, and sold a lot for soap and for candles and stencilled on the head of the barrels, "Sold as unfit for human food." Then I pointed out to Lord George Hamilton and the chief storekeeper that that was not sufficient; they might sell it with that on, but they would not prevent this being used for food afterwards; and Lord George Hamilton found that the gain of selling any of it otherwise than as for soap and for candles was so trifling that he decided (and a minute was passed to that effect) that it should all be subjected to a chemical bath which would make it unfit, as it is, to sell for food. But then that does not apply to the shambles food. It is the supplies from the shambles and so on to ships that I want to put right now. All that was sold by the Government is stopped, and the cases of scurvy have diminished and have almost disappeared, as Mr. Bolton will tell you, I daresay. But still the men are badly served; bad meat gravitates to that market as there is no inspector, and I want to have them protected against the landmen who sell the bad food.

11,345. To my knowledge you have come greatly in contact with the seafaring class of this country within the last six or eight years. Have they to you, acting as you have done in their interests, made any complaints as to the bad food during that time?—The complaints are incessant. There was one man—you see I do not want to attack individuals because that takes off attention from the general subject; it is not punishment I want but prevention—but I can tell you of men who have bought this carrion at the Government stores year after year and year after year. I can tell you whom they have sold it to, and then I can show you their ships in this record of the "Health of Crews," with men dying and having their gums in all conditions, and teeth coming out, and so on, but it is not desirable to divert the attention of the Commission from the general question to the individuals.

11,346. But some complaints have been made by the men to you regarding the sleeping accommodation?—They have indeed. I have been asked to go on board and see some of the accommodation. I am sure that if a respectable shipowner were to see it he would be astonished; he would begin to find out that there were shipowners and shipowners.

11,347. Have you seen the Bill which was placed before this Commission by Mr. Wilson regarding sleeping accommodation?—No, I have not. I have been laid up until just quite recently.

11,348. Have you seen the proposals which are made there regarding deck-loading and provisions and accommodation?—I am sorry to say I have not. I have been so busy in getting my own share of the subject ready, and have been laid up so much, that I have not done so.

11,349. It is your opinion that if legislation was enacted in this country to prevent deck loading altogether it would not interfere with the interests of the British shipowner?—I think not

26 January 1892.]

Mr. S. PLIMSOLL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Livesey.

11,350. Can you give the Commission any idea of the extent to which these complaints apply; that is, do they apply to a majority or to only a small minority of shipowners?—I should say a minority.

11,351. You have just now said that there are shipowners and shipowners?—That is it.

11,352. Well, that being so, have you ever approached them at any time?—No. One of the members of this Commission has offered to go with me to see one or two respectable shipowners, and I shall be delighted to avail myself of his offer now that I am well enough to do so, and see how far we can get on by mutual accommodation, you know.

Earl of Derby.

11,353. Is there anything you wish to add to your evidence. If not I think we need not trouble you further?—Nothing occurs to me at present. I have referred to the report of Messrs. Janson and Wakefield in 1843, which showed that the loss of life had increased to four times as great as it was before. One of the writers of that report, Mr. Janson, is alive and would be willing to give evidence; it would not occupy very much time if you think it right to hear him. It would have reference to the wonderful increase in the loss of life when all that legislation was swept out of the statute book.

11,354. That is 30 years ago?—But it continued to operate till 1876, and it is only partially remedied by that clause of 3 feet.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

11,355. I should just like to ask you one question about that 3 feet. The law with regard to deck-loading is the same in Canada as it is in England, is it not?—Yes. That clause was put in in the House of Lords so as not to have it different from what it is in Canada.

11,356. I think you are aware that the Dominion Government and Parliament are strongly averse to any repeal of that 3 feet limit?—I daresay they are. You were not in when I was referring to this earlier on. They have certain vessels there for carrying wood only—timber—which have only one deck in them, and it is within 10 feet of the keel; it is down where we put the orlop deck or the 'tween decks, as you know, and low down; the bulwarks are 7 or 8 feet above. One shipowner himself told me that in a vessel he filled the holds up to this deck, that is the main deck, which is the deck—there is no other—and then they put 18-feet of wood upon the deck—sometimes more, and consequently much the greater part

The witness withdrew.

Mr. CHARLES BOOTH called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

11,364. You have given a good deal of time and attention as we know to the conditions of labour in London?—Yes.

11,365. And I believe you are making an inquiry into the conditions of the dock and waterside labour; is that so?—Yes.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

is above deck. It is done because of some questions of dues or other. I suppose that that which is on deck does not pay harbour dues or dock dues or something.

11,357. Do you think that is as dangerous as 3 feet on an ordinary ship?—You know a prohibition of 3 feet there would seem to them very unfair. The proper remedy would be to let them go their own way and to legislate for themselves, taking care of course that if they came into our ports they would be subject to our laws or would put in another deck, a proper deck say 3 or 4 feet below the bulwarks, so that they could look over it. They are altogether monster things, these ships—not in size.

11,358. Would it not be a very difficult position if a Canadian ship could load with a deck-load in Canada in accordance with the law there, and yet on arriving in England with the same load were fined for doing so under our law?—No; that is so now. The coasting trade from Canadian ports down to the West Indian Islands and to American ports was expressly exempted by us from the operation of the Acts or 1840, 1842, and 1845.

11,359. That trade does not come to our ports?—I know, but then, there they are under one set of regulations coastwise, and when they cross the Atlantic they are under another.

11,360. Do you not see a difficulty in the Canadian law on the subject conflicting with our own?—No, I cannot say that I do. If they come into our ports they must be subject to our laws, but I should scarcely imagine that any of these things do cross the Atlantic; I do not know.

11,361. You have inquired into this matter in Canada, have you not?—Yes, I have.

11,362. Was the result of your inquiry that ships with 3-feet deck-loads under the Canadian law do not cross the Atlantic?—They do, but they put in a great deal more than 3 feet, and, as you are aware, there has been no limit made to check anybody until quite recently. I give you the credit for nearly all of it. There has been an attempt to administer the law, and you appear to have administered it. I think you are mistaken in saying you have not fined foreign shipowners; I am almost certain that you have.

11,363. I did not at all mean to say that foreign shipowners had not been fined. What I doubt is whether foreign shipowners have been fined for arriving overladen?—I think they have.

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,366. And in the course of that work have you obtained information as to the numbers for whom employment has been found day by day over a period of 12 months at each dock?—I have obtained it so far for a period of eight or nine months. April was chosen as the beginning

26 January 1892.]

Mr. C. BOOTH.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

of the time at Mr. Hubbard's suggestion, because at that time a change was made in the system. A part of the labour that had been under his charge passed to the ship owners so that it was afterwards a more uniform arrangement than if we began before April.

11,367. We have very often been told in this room, and we have heard outside of it, that employment of this kind is in its nature irregular; is that your opinion also?—Yes.

11,368. And can you show to what extent it is so?—Yes; so far as the actual employment by the docks are concerned. I have not got the complete information with regard to the similar labour employed in the wharves, and by the shipowners. I have got some information, but not complete. With regard to the employment by the docks, it is here complete from April to November, and expressed in curves and figures which certainly show a great irregularity (*producing chart*). The last sheet at the bottom, on to which those are pinned, contains the entire labour under the Joint Committee. The top faint brown line includes the Tilbury Docks which, being so far away, I have thought better to show separately. The darker line is the employment by the Joint Committee, excluding the Tilbury Docks. It will be seen from the curve of the dark line on the large sheet how great the irregularity is, and especially it will show that in July and August it falls away very much.

11,369. I see that from 6,500 at one time it falls down to about 4,000?—That is so. I have some figures here that I should be very happy to put in, if you think it desirable, but I had thought it might be desirable to wait until I had the figures for a whole year.

11,370. When would that be?—It would be the 1st of April; but I could put in the figures as far as they go. From these figures about 4,000 men might find—it is not that they have—found absolutely permanent employment, and another 500, I think it is, or nearly so, up to about 200 days out of 206. There were 206 possible days work in the period, and 4,000 men have had work every day, and a few—between 500 and 1,000 more—might have had it nearly every day. Then after that it falls away very rapidly.

11,371. I see according to this chart, 500 more on 171 days?—Yes.

11,372. And 500 more on 112 days?—It is the 500th man. The total is divided into the various branches of their business so as to show which branches are the regular ones. Your Lordship has the chart which includes Tilbury. This chart (*producing another chart*) excludes Tilbury. On this the various branches are divided, each being stated separately, because it does not follow that the men would be absolutely exchangeable.

11,373. As I understand what you want to suggest is that the irregularity of the employment might be very considerably diminished by an understanding between the different employers?—Yes, if the men would fall in with the same arrangement.

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,374. What do you mean if the men "would fall in"?—If they would be willing to go a little distance to find their work, if asked to.

11,375. If they would go from one dock to another, you mean?—If they could be told where they were wanted, and were willing to go there.

11,376. And the result of that would be, I presume, that there would not be such a flocking of casual labourers for the chance of getting employment?—I think so.

11,377. Those actually employed would be more regularly employed, and those who are not regularly employed would know that they could not get employment there?—Exactly so.

11,378. And would look for it elsewhere?—Yes.

11,379. Have you considered that at all in detail; I mean as to how it could be done?—Very little. I am waiting until I have more complete figures, but those figures point to some such possibility.

11,380. What I understand you to mean is this, that very often there may be work at one dock when there is not work at another, or that there may be no work of one kind when there is work of a different kind in the same dock?—Precisely.

11,381. And what you desire is that labour should be more interchangeable?—Yes.

11,382. And the men should not be so much fixed in one groove?—Precisely so.

11,383. Have you consulted at all with the managers of the various docks on the point?—No, only so far as we consulted previous to the work being done. These curves are only just completed; the managers have been very kind in assisting me to do it. I have here the curves for the Surrey Commercial and the Millwall also. May I point out another use which possibly may be found in these curves, and that is to show when the time of slack work occurs. In this instance it appears to occur at harvest time; whether that points to the possibility of country work for the same men I cannot say.

11,384. Will you put in the table of figures which you have with you?—Yes, if you will allow me to have them properly made out. This chart (*producing chart*) is for the Surrey Commercial and Millwall combined; the nature of their business is similar, and it is combined on the chart in two ways. The two docks are given separately and added together in one, and below the two principal branches of their business, the grain and timber are separately stated and jointly stated as to the two docks. They represent two divisions of the same total amount of labour. One of them is only taken by the week; the nature of the employment is such that we could not express it by the day. To make them complete two things are needed: first, to prolong the time until the complete year, so as to show every season; and, secondly, if possible to include the employment offered by shipowners which used to be a portion of the dock work, but which is now in private hands. I

26 January 1892.]

Mr. C. BOOTH.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

have obtained information on that head from six principal shipowners, but have not yet got it all, and it is a little difficult to get it all because there are so many of them; but I shall endeavour to get as many as I can of them. In addition there is the employment offered by wharf-owners, which may take the same men. It is different from that offered by ship-owners, as it has always been under different management, but I suppose the labour is interchangeable. Before myself attempting to deduce from this I should like to complete the work as much as possible, but if I would do it with as little delay as possible, I may perhaps show you one more curve. That is a curve to express the degree of the regularity of the labour; so far as it is straight it is possibly permanent for a certain number of men, which is given at the bottom; and the downward curves represent the decreasing amount of labour that is offered for the residue of the men. Each of these colours represents a department, into which the whole of this is divided. The perpendicular line ends the permanent in each case; the sloping line indicates how much is left for the irregular, and in the case of the wool it is shown that it is almost all irregular.

11,385. On the other hand, at the London and India Docks four-fifths apparently are permanent?—Yes, but they are only potentially. That is another point which requires inquiry into, to what extent the men voluntarily take irregular work.

Mr. Livesey.

11,386. Have you reason to suppose that these irregularities are tolerably constant from year to year. I suppose you hardly know that?—I hardly know it. Evidence on that subject would be better taken from the dock managers.

Duke of Devonshire.

11,387. With regard to the figures which you have put in, what would they be?—*This* curve is the incompleting curve of the shipowner, the six shipowners out of a good many, and *these* figures are the detailed figures from Mr. Hubbard's books, and show, amongst other things, the extent to which the men who might have had work with him on any particular day did not take it. It is a very interesting paper.

11,388. The figures show the number of men who might have had work, but who did not avail themselves of it?—They really are Mr.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. ISAAC ALLMAN called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

11,393. You came here, I understand, as an independent witness?—Yes.

11,394. You come from Newcastle?—Yes, it is so.

11,395. You have had some experience of riverside labour?—Yes; I have worked on the

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

Hubbard's figures, and I suppose I am at liberty to use them here. He has a list; it is very interesting as bearing upon the question of how labour could be organised, and, as I think you know, that list is lettered according to the preference which is given to the men for employment. *This* table shows the number of men on the list on each day who therefore had the preference, and afterwards we see how many of those who had the preference did, as a matter of fact, take work on that day. As the men who had the preference did not turn up, others were put on in their place.

11,389. None of those charts would show those figures, would they?—No; I should have to ask Mr. Hubbard's leave, I think, to put those figures in.

11,390. Do the figures show a considerable number of men who might have had work, but who did not take it?—They do not absolutely show that the men did not have work. The men may have got work elsewhere; but the figures show that they did not take work at that place.

11,391. They may have been temporarily disabled?—They may have been temporarily disabled. Any number of reasons might have operated. The reason need not be laziness at all, but as a matter of fact out of, we will say, 1,100 men who were on the list, possibly only 800 did come to take the work which was offered to them.

Mr. Bolton.

11,392. They may have been employed elsewhere?—They may have been employed elsewhere.

Earl of Derby informed the witness that the

Committee considered that before examining him in detail it would be better to have the charts printed and circulated amongst the members of the Commission, and asked the witness whether he would be able to come up again for further examination after the charts had been printed.*

The Witness stated that he would be very happy to do so, and asked whether, in sending a circular round to the small employers, he might state that the information he was seeking was of interest to the Commission.

Earl of Derby stated that he would be quite authorised to say that.

* The charts and documents here referred to and since prepared or amended, were handed in by the witness on his recall in August, and are therefore printed in the Appendix contained in Vol. III., Evidence, Group B.—G. D.

Earl of Derby—continued.

river Tyne for the last 12 years, that is about 10 years before the formation of the National Labour Union. During that time we worked independently; we made the best bargains we could. Of course, we were all free labourers at that time, and we made our own bargains, and

26 January 1892.]

Mr. I. ALLMAN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

we carried on the work at the best prices we could get.

11,396. And when the National Labour Union was formed did you join it?—I became a member of it on the 13th July 1889. I took an active part in the organisation of it in the former part of the time that I was connected with it, but owing to my mooted a co-operative system to another gentleman who put the thing into practice, I was expelled from the Union on the 5th March 1890, or about then.

11,397. You had been vice-president and treasurer of the first branch of the Union; is that so?—The first riverside branch that was formed. That was the 31st branch, it was formed on the 29th of June 1889, and I was elected vice-president and treasurer of that branch.

11,398. About what time was that?—That would be on the 29th June 1889.

11,399. Then you say you were expelled from the Union; was that done by a resolution passed at a branch meeting?—That was done by a resolution passed by a few of the members without me ever being summoned there to defend myself.

11,400. You were not heard?—I was not heard. I was not expelled from the Union for breaking any of its rules, or for encroaching upon any of its rights, but merely for corresponding and conversing with a gentleman who was connected with this co-operative scheme. I was told by one of the officials that I must abandon this man entirely, that I must not speak to him, correspond with him, or transact any business whatever with him, and if I had any shares in the co-operative concern I had to relinquish them, or otherwise they would eject me, which they did.

11,401. On what ground was that, was the co-operative scheme formed in opposition to the Union?—Decidedly not. Some time after I became a member of the society, I thought I had discovered a measure that would be far more beneficial to our class as river workmen than the Union was, and I mooted this co-operative scheme to a gentleman of considerable ability, a Bachelor of Arts and Professor of Mathematics, who took the thing in hand and put it into form. It was incorporated and it was ready for work. To our first meeting that we called connected with this scheme, we invited all workmen and all middlemen, or the men that took the work from the merchant and let it to us. We invited the whole of them there, and our idea was to thresh the thing out, as to whether it was advisable to form it, or whether it was not. At that meeting there were certain stevedores attended there, and they brought with them some of the men in a state of intoxication that upset the meeting and kicked up a great noise there. In fact there was no business done until after they left when a resolution was taken by the remaining members and they were unanimously in favour of it. If your Lordship would like to see one of the prospectuses I have some of them here.

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,402. Yes, certainly?—I will hand in prints. It was paraded by the general secretary of the National Labour Union as a bogus company. He opposed it at all his meetings, on all occasions. I think this will decide whether it was a genuine attempt to benefit the working class or whether it was not. This also is accompanied by the Union's price list, the Master Stevedores' price list, and the Company's price list (*binding in documents*).

Duke of Devonshire.

11,403. What company are you speaking of?—The Tyne Co-operative Stevedore Company; and this was the cause of my expulsion from the Union.

Earl of Derby.

11,404. The object of this company was, I suppose, as in all co-operative concerns, to make the men in a certain sense their own employers?—Yes, that was it.

11,405. And what was the objection taken to it by the Union?—That is rather a difficult question. Prior to the formation of this stevedore company, such a thing as a masters stevedore's association did not exist upon the Tyne; but after this was mooted, and it had made some progress, the master stevedores of the river associated themselves together to combat it, and one means of their combating it was by, I was going to say, employing the general secretary of the Union, but I do not know whether they employed him or not, it looked very suspicious, for he opposed it tooth and nail upon all occasions, and succeeded in poisoning the men's minds against it. It was left open to working men of the Tyne exclusively for 16 weeks to join the concern and take up what number of shares they thought fit in it. In that 16 weeks I think there was about 10 of the working men took shares in it. Some of them were persecuted for doing so; and then it was open to the public, but the Union succeeded in crushing it eventually.

11,406. The Union considered it as hostile to their interests. You can hardly explain how?—Yes, they considered that. I might read a remark that the general secretary of the National Labour Union made at the last annual meeting of delegates but one on the 9th of August 1890: "In reply to a question by the Leeds delegate, Mr. Stanley said that our Tyneside branch had refused to pay the extra halfpenny because of the agitation of two of its members who were connected with Mr. Dynes' Stevedore Society. Mr. Dynes had sought to build up his own society by doing work at rates lower than those adopted by the Labour Union. War raged between the two societies for some time, and in the end the two members he had alluded to lost 5l. they had foolishly invested in the blacklegging combination, and then actuated by a spirit of revenge they inspired the members of their branch not to pay the increased contributions. With respect to the executive they had founded their action on the almost unanimous approval of the branches." This is very

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. ALLMAN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

incorrect. At the time that this speech was made before the annual meeting of delegates, this company practically did not exist. It was not incorporated, and it was only in process of formation. There had been no quotations from it to shipowners or employers; that is so far as the work went there had been no quotations for any work given up to that time.

11,407. I gather that the Union considered that in some way or another your co-operative society would tend to prevent wages being raised?—They might have imagined that. The fact of the matter is, if this co-operative stevedore company had found its way successfully on to the river Tyne, amongst the men, Trades Unionism would have been no longer of any use to the men, insomuch that this was a Union of itself. It was a profit-sharing Union, and a more beneficial one than the one that they were then members of.

11,408. If the interests of the employers and of the men became identical by their being fused together in a co-operative system, there would be no room for the special work of the Union?—Decidedly not.

11,409. The Union succeeded in breaking up this scheme, you say, and it has ceased to exist?—It ceases to exist now.

11,410. Now you have something to tell us about a steamer which has been blocked by the Union?—That was the "Fernando," belonging to Scott Brothers. In reference to the first work that the Union got the manager of the Company told me that he had agreed verbally to work that steamer for 7½d. per ton for the copper or sulphur ore which was in her, and 10½d. per ton for what precipitate was in her. Whether that was correct or not I do not know, but the manager told me that. He further told me that one of the Union men had tendered to do the work for less than that, and that he had accepted it at the Union rate of wages, or what the Union men had proposed to do it for. Anyhow that ship was worked by the Company, and it was worked successfully and in tolerably quick time. The ship that followed that was this "Fernando." She came in on the Monday. I am not certain of the date, but she came in about the 12th or 13th April 1891. On the Saturday previous to that a member of the National Labour Union went into Scott Brothers office—in fact took a written tender and proposed to do this for them for 6d. a ton. That was 1d. a ton below what they termed the Union rate of wages at the time. The manager of the Company rather than have the thing taken out of his hands in that manner proposed to do her at the same price, and as soon as ever he did that the Union set up a cry of "blackleg" against him, picketed the railway stations, the different gangways and other sources on the river where men might be got from, and successfully prevented us from finishing the ship.

11,411. They considered, I suppose, that the competition between the two bodies tended to lower the wages?—I suppose that would be their conception of the matter. Before the Union

Earl of Derby—continued.

existed I suffered reductions. In about four years, from 1880 to 1885, I suffered three reductions, always at the hands of the middleman, never at the hands of the shipowner, to my knowledge. This middleman took the work from the shipowner, and he employed us men to do it, and on three different occasions our wages were reduced one halfpenny per ton. After we had put in from 1,500 to 2,000 tons of cargo we found that our wages were reduced one halfpenny per ton after the work was done—not informed of it before I imagined that if this middleman could be displaced by a co-operative scheme which would bring the men in direct contact with the employer, it would be more beneficial to the man and to the master too from the fact that he would pay the labourer more wages, and that the labourer would do the work cheaper for the owner.

11,412. After this business of the steamer which was blocked, did you, as a former member of the co-operative company suffer any ill-usage, from the Union officials?—After the "Fernando" was stopped and the Company ceased working, it was no use my attempting to look for work upon the quay side, and for months before that I could not obtain any work on the quay side. From our first meeting, held in connexion with this co-operative concern, the master stevedores or the middleman passed a resolution to the effect that I had not to be employed upon the river Tyne by any of them, and from that day to the present I never did any work for them. What work I did on the riverside after that I did for the Newcastle Grain and General Warehousing Company, so that after the Company had failed to complete the last contract that they had it was no use me looking for work upon the quay. I went further afield. I got a job to remove the plant of a guano factory for a gentleman of the name of Morris, at a place called Pottery Bank, Newcastle. As soon as the Union officials found out that I had obtained employment there they sent a man up to see whether it was a fact whether I was there or not. This man found out in the dinner hour that I was there. That night, after we had finished work, one of the officials visited the foreman, with the result that I was discharged on Saturday. On Saturday I was paid off clear of the job altogether. On the Monday I went and saw Mr. Morris about it. He said it was very arbitrary, and he certainly should have resented it to the full extent of his power were it not for the conditions that he was under. He had notice from the North-Eastern Railway Company to quit the property. The North-Eastern had bought it, and he only had a certain time allowed him to remove the whole of his plant, and rather than be brought into conflict with the Union he discharged me.

11,413. As I understand, the work that you were engaged upon was quite a different kind of work from that with which the Union was concerned?—Yes.

11,414. So that their objection is not merely to your being employed in their line of business

26 January 1892.]

Mr. I. ALLMAN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

but to your being employed at all?—To my being employed at all.

11,415. Have you any instances of other men who have suffered similar treatment?—I visited Newcastle Union last Friday. I went to see a man who had been persecuted something after the same fashion as myself. I saw a man of the name of Thomas Acom, and from a statement that he made I wrote the following:—He said, "I have worked for the Tyne Steam-ship Company 17 years. I joined the Union about six months after its formation, and remained a member until my expulsion about the 15th June 1891, after which I was not allowed to follow the employment that I had previously made my living by, and not being able to obtain other employment I had to go with my family, six in all, into the workhouse. I was afraid to go to the quay owing to the threats of the Union men who threatened to throw me into the river." That man is in the workhouse now with four children and his wife.

11,416. I think you say that you have something to propose or to suggest as a means of avoiding strikes, what is it?—That is co-operation in labour. That is the only thing that I should propose, which would almost obviate the possibility of a strike in so much that it would furnish a board of arbitrators to settle disputes between man and master. I believe that co-operation is the best system that could possibly be adopted by the working class.

11,417. But, as a matter of fact, I think there have been disputes, have there not, between the co-operative societies and the men employed by them?—There is a great number of men employed by co-operative societies who are not members of the co-operative firm.

11,418. You mean that with regard to them the principle of co-operation is not adopted, and therefore the disputes continue as in other cases?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton.

11,419. What action did the Union take in Newcastle to prevent your getting employment on the quay?—They passed a resolution in their branches to the effect that no member of the Union was to work with me, so that if I made application for work at any vessel along the quay, or on the river, and the employer thought fit to employ me, the minute he employed me the whole of them left, and it left him with his ships and me.

11,420. Is all or the great bulk of the work on the Tyne done by Union men?—It has been up to the present, but it seems to me to be just upon its last legs now on the quay side. I know for a fact that there are scores of men on the quay now who were members, but who are not members now.

11,421. Have they not been persecuted in the same way as you say you were?—The fact of the matter is now they are working one among the other. I can scarcely find out who is a member and who is not. For instance, the

Mr. Bolton—continued.

Union recognises that they have a right in some cases to work with Non-Union men, and in other cases that they have no right to work with them. For instance, in the Tyne Steam Shipping Company men work there for 7*d.* an hour, in the morning up to dinner time they may work there for 7*d.* an hour; in the afternoon they go to the next door, and they work for 6*d.* an hour at the same class of work, and it is recognised by the Union. The following day they can go and carry bricks and mortar for 5*d.* an hour, and the next day after that accept a job at 3½*d.* an hour in the factory, and still it is all recognised as Union wages, so it is difficult to understand what they consider Union wages. Then there is another thing; in all foreign boats coming into the Tyne, all bag stuff is carried on piece; it is carried at the rate of 5*s.* per 100 bags. It does not matter whether they are 10 stone or whether they are 20 stone, they carry them for 5*s.* a hundred; and all bulk stuff that arrives there, that is filled into sacks, they carry for 5*d.* a last. At the Hamburg boat, or at the Antwerp boat, or the Rotterdam boat, or the London boat, or the Leith boat, or the Hull boat, or the Dundee boat, or the Aberdeen boat, they do just the same work for 7*d.* an hour for which they demand 5*s.* a hundred, and 5*d.* a last in the other case of foreign boats. Four men are employed to carry this stuff through by time, which means 2*s.* 4*d.* an hour; it takes three men to carry it on piece. These three men work for from 12*s.* to 14*s.* a day on an average at that work, and the other men who are carrying it on time—the four—work for 7*s.* a day. The four time men will carry as much stuff as three piece men, and therefore it costs 28*s.* a day for the four men, where it costs from 36*s.* to 40*s.* for the three men.

11,422. Per day?—Per day. That is imposed upon the foreign vessels.

11,423. You mean then that the regulations of the Union are very diverse?—Very indeed.

11,424. You spoke of having a job from Mr. Morris, and you said that you had to leave it in consequence of some action of the Union; what was the influence which the Union had with those workers: were they members of the Tyneside Union?—The men who were working with me for Mr. Morris did, some of them—I think two of them—belong to the Tyneside Union, and some of them did not. But anyhow the men were contented to work with me; they never said anything to me, never molested me at all until one of the officials came up there.

11,425. Excuse me, I want to know what influence the Tyneside Union had with those men who were not members of their Union?—I do not know that it has any influence at all with a Non-Union member.

11,426. But you said, I think, that unless you had been discharged the work would at once have stopped in consequence of the action of the Tyneside Union?—That was in reference to the river work.

26 January 1892.]

Mr. I. ALLMAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

11,427. No, in reference to Mr. Morris' work; the job you had from Mr. Morris?—It was at a factory that I worked for Mr. Morris.

11,428. Quite so, and you had undertaken with others to clear out his factory in order to leave the ground vacant for the purposes of the North-Eastern Railway?—Yes.

11,429. And owing to the action of the Tyneside Union you were dismissed on a Saturday night. Now, my question was, what influence had the Tyneside Union on your co-workers who were not members of the Tyneside Union?—They never consulted the men that I was working with at all—they consulted the employer—they saw a man of the name of May, who was the foreman of the job, and had charge of it. I believe he belonged to the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. They saw him, and told him that if he did not dismiss me they would bring the other men out. This man did not know whether they were members of the Society or not until afterwards. When I called back on the Monday morning I told him that the men I had been working with did not belong to the Union; he said he did not know anything about that, but he said the job was very urgent, and both he and Mr. Morris thought it advisable to discharge me rather than to delay the work.

Mr. Tait.

11,430. Can you tell us the rate of wages that you received when you first took work on the Tyne; the average wages?—The wages were then as they are now. They varied on different parts of the river; 6d. an hour was paid upon the quay for instance. There was a large grain warehousing company where there was only 3s. 6d. a day paid; anywhere up or down the river upon the water 6s. a day was paid, for tonnage work 7½d. was paid for general cargo, and 6d. was paid for discharging minerals, and 7½d. a ton was paid for stowing general cargo.

11,431. What I want to get at is, whether any advance came to the workers on the river side after the institution of the branch of the National Labourers Union?—Yes.

11,432. Therefore, in that respect, the Union has done some good?—It increased the wages.

11,433. Can you tell me whether the increase which it was the means of obtaining for its members still maintains?—Yes, it still maintains. I am the father of the price list that I gave you accompanying the prospectus (see question 11,402). That price list is a Union production, but I drew it up. It was perfectly satisfactory both to members and to employers, until there was a second price list introduced.

11,434. I am not going into that price list with you; what I was just wanting to know was—which you now have admitted—whether the institution of the Union on the riverside was the means of getting advanced wages to the workmen?—Yes.

11,435. Now you have made a complaint as to your being expelled from your Union; had you no right of appealing after your branch

Mr. Tait—continued.

took that step?—The only appeal that I made was to the general secretary. I appealed to him in the first place. He told me that he could not make any better of it, it was so, and that he could not help it. It had been done by the branch.

11,436. I take you to be a very intelligent person, and you will have read the constitution of your Union?—Yes.

11,437. Was the constitution of your Union so as to admit of your appealing to your executive committee, or district committee against the decision of your branch?—Yes, decidedly. I might have made that appeal. I might have appealed.

11,438. But did you?—I did not.

11,439. You did not?—No. I might have gone further than that, I might have taken it to the annual delegate meeting which is—

11,440. The supreme governing body?—Yes; but I did not take it that far.

11,441. Therefore I may take it that you, not having put into operation the constitutional means at your disposal for placing your case before the members of your Union, your expulsion is not the fault of the Union as a Union, so much as its being a branch of the Union with which you did not desire to have any further connexion?—It was two branches that I was expelled by. A copy of the resolution passed at the 25th branch was carried up to No. 40 branch, which was the branch I was a member of then, and it was passed there by them. The only appeal that ever I made against it was to the general secretary and to the officials of those branches.

11,442. Just so, but you did not put into operation the constitutional means you had at your disposal?—I did not take the steps that I might have taken.

11,443. Just so. Now you have referred to to your being persecuted. I take it from your statement that the reason you could not get employment upon the riverside was owing to the stevedores having passed a resolution—those stevedores who employed the labourers?—Yes.

11,444. They passed a resolution that owing to your taking some little interest in this particular co-operative company, they thought you were assailing their interests, and consequently decided not to employ you?—Yes.

11,445. Therefore it could not be the Union of which you were a member, which prevented you from getting employment on the riverside?—Decidedly it was, because the Union endorsed the very action that the stevedores had taken by passing a similar resolution amongst themselves.

11,446. But then you did not, they having done so, put into operation the necessary rules at your disposal in order to appeal against whatever that branch did?—If the Union had done its duty to me as a member, it would have rescinded the action taken by the middlemen when they deprived me of my only means of living that I had at that time, and the means that I had had for more than 20 years.

26 January 1892.]

Mr. I. ALLMAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

11,447. Might I ask you this question: was it before the stevedores passed their resolution or after they passed their resolution that you were expelled from your Union?—After the stevedores passed the resolution.

11,448. After the stevedores passed the resolution?—Yes. I remained a member of the society something like five months after they passed that resolution. I paid my contributions regularly, and still the society never interfered in my case at all. They allowed me to be boycotted, and to walk about the town in idleness week after week without making me any recompense.

11,449. Am I to understand that the branch having expelled you, for five months afterwards accepted your contributions?—I did not say that.

11,450. You say you paid your contributions for five months after?—For five months after I was expelled by the stevedores, not by the branch.

11,451. I beg your pardon. Now might I ask you whether the prospectus of this society was submitted to any meetings of the riverside workmen before being published?—It was to a number of meetings. When this thing was first mooted it was mooted by me to the gentleman that I spoke of before in the National Labour Union Office and the General Secretary who has so busily opposed it since, actually on the first list of members wrote his own name down, the general secretary himself, and I forget now how many shares he proposed to take in the Company.

11,452. Can you give us any other reason for your expulsion, then your simply as a member of the Union taking an interest in the formation of this Company?—I cannot give any other reason, that is the only reason that was given to me.

11,453. May I ask who was the secretary of this proposed Company; was Mr. John Dynes the secretary?—Yes, he was secretary *pro tem*.

11,454. Had he at any time made himself obnoxious to any member of the Union?—Never to my knowledge.

11,455. What was he?—The fact of the matter is that it was that same gentleman who built up the National Union, it was that same gentleman who put them into the way of carrying on their business, and I think that the thing would have been a grand success compared with what it is if they had followed his directions.

11,456. I see that you offered the shares of this concern to others other than the riverside workers?—Decidedly, it was open.

11,457. Might I ask if it had ever come within your knowledge that the workmen thought it was more of a joint stock concern than of a co-operative concern?—Well, I could not say that. They could not possibly have thought that in the first place because it was open to *bona fide* working men only for 16 weeks after its first formation.

11,458. At its formation was there any preference stock put forward?—No preference stock.

Mr. Tait—continued.

11,459. I see there is 1,000*l.* preference stock in the prospectus you have put in?—That might be, but there was not in the first one any preference stock.

11,460. You yourself spoke of a co-operative scheme, is it leased upon these lines that you spoke of or would you have the worker to be the co-operators?—The worker to be the co-operator if possible. But after a considerable amount of money had been spent in pressing this thing to the front, and the manager found that the working man could not possibly be induced to interest himself in it, then he opened it to the public.

Mr. Livesey.

11,461. You did not tell Mr. Tait why you did not appeal to the executive against your expulsion?—One reason that I did not appeal was that I was spurned and scorned by every man that I had formerly been acquainted with, and in fact it was anything but pleasant to be in the company of them. They looked upon me as an enemy to the labouring man; they looked upon me as a man who was trying to ruin them. I was trying to do nothing of the sort, I never committed an action in my life that I know of which I had any idea of being detrimental to the interest of my class. I know working men as a rule do not get more wages than they have use for. Some of them have big families and some of them have small ones; but big or small they in general have use for more than they can get. But they looked upon me as a man who was trying to build up a fortune for myself at their expense, which was not the case. This prospectus made it impossible for me to do anything for myself, except they thought fit to do it for me. I could not elect myself into any good office as they seemed to think I wanted to do.

11,462. They were suspicious?—They were suspicious; that is all it was; it was merely suspicion.

11,463. In reply to his Lordship asking what you recommended for avoiding strikes you said co-operation. In looking through your prospectus I think you mean something more than ordinary co-operation. I see the words "profit-sharing" are mentioned once or twice, and you mentioned it here, I think?—Yes.

11,464. By the co-operation that you speak of do you mean co-operation that shall unite the interests of the worker and of the employer?—That is what I mean by co-operation.

11,465. Co-operation of the worker and the employer?—Yes.

11,466. Not co-operation of the workers only?—Of course, it is co-operation of the workers and the employers; it must be when a co-operative company of working men is formed; they do the work for their employer a fraction cheaper than has been done heretofore, and pay the same wages to their *employés*, and still have a dividend on the profits of their employment quarterly or half yearly, as the case may be.

26 January 1892.]

Mr. I. ALLMAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Livesey—continued.

11,467. So your object is to make the interests of the worker and of the employer identical?—Yes.

11,468. And that was regarded by the Trades Unionists as antagonistic to them?—Decidedly so, it was treated so anyhow.

11,469. I suppose if you had succeeded in making the interests of the worker and of the employer identical there would have been a room for the Trades Union?—There would have been no room on the river; so far as the co-operation extended, it would have been a Union of itself.

Duke of Devonshire.

11,470. In what capacity were you employed before the Union was established?—Before the Union?

11,471. Yes. You spoke of your experience of riverside labour before the establishment of the Union?—I worked for all the stevedores on the river Tyne.

11,472. As what?—As a stevedore to stow or break out cargo; to load it or discharge it; all classes of goods.

11,473. You worked as an ordinary labourer, not as a master or middleman?—Decidedly not; as an ordinary labourer.

11,474. I think you said you joined the Union when it was established?—I joined the Union shortly after it was incorporated.

11,475. Did you hold any office in it?—The Saturday evening that I joined the Union I was elected as vice-president of that branch, it was the 25th branch at that time, afterwards altered to the 31st.

11,476. Did you have any differences with that Union or with the officials of the Union before your attempt to establish this co-operative society?—Never.

11,477. You got on well with the Union?—I got on very well indeed.

11,478. What were the objects the Union had in view at that time?—I do not know what their object could be in crushing this affair.

11,479. I am not referring to that—I mean while you were connected with it?—The objects of the Union of course were to look after the interests of its members so far as wages went, to raise them where they thought it was necessary, and to maintain them as they were in other cases, although they did not carry that policy out. There is a certain amount of sugar brought weekly into the Tyne and discharged by the London boats, sometimes by the Antwerp or the Hamburg boats, and this sugar was lifted before the Union sprung up at 6d. a ton. I have known men to go there at half past eight in the morning, and by 3 o'clock in the afternoon they have worked for 18s. apiece at 6d. a ton lifting sugar, but when the Union came in power it dictated to those men that they were not to lift this sugar for 6d. a ton, they were to demand 8d., with the result that they lost the work altogether, and it is now done by Mutter, Howie, and Company, and Carver & Co.

11,480. Had you a difference of opinion with the Union on this subject?—My opinion of

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

matters was that where men were paid and where they were perfectly satisfied with the pay that they were getting themselves no one had any right to interfere with it further.

11,481. Did that lead to any difference of opinion between you and the Union?—No, I cannot say that we ever fell out upon those matters; and I expressed myself in those terms many a time.

11,482. You maintain that you know of no difference of opinion between you and the Union or the Union officials before you interested yourself in the formation of this society?—That is so.

11,483. I did not quite understand whether the formation of this company was opposed in the first instance by the master or the middleman, or by the men?—In the first instance it was opposed by the middlemen, and after the opposition of those, to carry favour, a few of their leading men opposed it too and succeeded in persuading the men who worked with them to oppose it.

11,484. Did any of the other working men in your own position join in promoting this Company?—Yes, there was a man of the name of ———— I could not tell you all the names.

11,485. Never mind the name?—There were about eight of us altogether, and there is one out of the eight only who is working on the quay. This man worked on the first ship that we worked at. He is now secretary of one of the branches of the Union, and he works on the quay. Another man who worked side by side with him on the same ship is in the workhouse for doing the same thing.

11,486. For doing what?—For doing the same thing; for working on the same ship.

11,487. Is that an answer? I asked you whether any of the other labourers joined you in promoting this Company?—Yes.

11,488. And were they all boycotted for doing so?—They were all driven away from the river and the quay. There is only one working there now out of eight that I know of, and that man is secretary of a branch of the Union now at the present time. I was in his company last Sunday.

11,489. Was not the formation of this Company at all discussed between you and the other workmen?—It never was very much discussed. The fact of the matter is that they would not meet us in discussion. We sought it not only on their own ground, but in the office of the Trades Council, where we were refused admittance. The secretary of the Labour Union was allowed to stand there and browbeat, and run the thing down for a whole hour, and we were not permitted in there for one minute to defend ourselves.

11,490. When did you come to know that it was an unpopular thing with the Union, as soon as it was started, or when?—After it began to work. I did not realise it for a fact until then.

11,491. To what extent did it ever come into operation?—Not to a great extent. It never worked but one ship successfully, and part of

26 January 1892.]

Mr. I. ALLMAN.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

another one. I think we discharged about 1,500 tons out of the last ship, and near about 2,000 tons out of the first.

11,492. Was any of this capital ever raised?—Yes, some of it; not all of it. That was one of the principal features of this failure.

11,493. You say it was first opposed by the stevedores?—Yes, by the master stevedores it was first opposed.

11,494. And it was not until four or five months after that that it was opposed by the Union, was it?—Yes, it was opposed by the leaders of the Union from the very week after the stevedores opposed it. As soon as they formed themselves into an association it was opposed by the leaders of the Union.

11,495. Who formed themselves into an association?—The stevedores.

11,496. I think you said you remained a member of the Union for five months after the master stevedores had opposed your Company?—Yes, for five months, better than five months, after the stevedores had passed the resolution not to employ me I was a member of the society.

11,497. Was your new Company working all that time?—Decidedly not; it had not begun to work then. It had not done anything at all then up to that time.

11,498. When did it begin?—It commenced its first work about the 9th April 1891.

11,499. And when was the resolution passed by the stevedores of which you spoke?—This was in course of formation before it did any work very nearly two years, and it was at the early part of that when the stevedores passed the resolution condemning it.

11,500. Two years before the 8th April 1891?—It would be as near two years as I can judge.

11,501. When did you state that this thing was first started; when did you take it up?—I think it would be about September or October.

11,502. The prospectus you have put in is not the first prospectus which was brought out?—No, that was the second one. It would be about September 1889 when this thing was first mooted.

11,503. When you took a part in it?—Yes, when we called the first meeting, when we invited the men and the masters there to discuss this thing among themselves.

11,504. That would be September?—It would be about September 1889.

11,505. When did the master stevedores pass the resolution against you?—Shortly after that.

11,506. Early in 1890?—No; it would be in 1889.

11,507. Then what took place; did the Company go on?—The Company made what headway it could until it got sufficient capital to commence work; and then it started work, with the result that it only worked one ship and a half.

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

11,508. When did it start work?—It started work on April 9th, 1891.

11,509. And when were you expelled from your Union?—I was expelled from the Union about March 5th, 1890.

11,510. Before your Company had ever got to work?—Before it had ever got to work.

11,511. A few months after the resolution had been passed by the master stevedores, was it?—That the Company started?

11,512. No. You were expelled from the Union a few months after the resolution was passed against you by the stevedores?—Yes; as near as I can judge it would be about five months.

11,513. And you do not know for what reason except that you supposed the men thought this would be prejudicial to their interests?—The sole reason that was given to me was for having anything to do with the formation of the Co-operative Stevedore Company. That was the reason that was given to me by them.

11,514. And they never discussed it with you?—They never discussed the thing with me at all.

11,515. And it was brought into operation in the case of one ship you say?—Yes. We worked the "Colonus," finished her, and we partly finished the "Fernando."

11,516. And for what reason did it never come into any further operation? Want of money?—I think want of money was the reason, the finances of the Company did not warrant carrying it any further at the time.

11,517. Or did the men refuse to join or work for you?—Of course the Union refused to work for it, but it was possible to get other men than Union men if they had tried, but they did not try. Since the "Fernando" failed they did not bother their heads about looking for any further work.

11,518. I think you said your work on the "Fernando" was forcibly impeded, was it?—Forcibly impeded, yes.

11,519. Men were prevented working?—Men were beaten for coming down to the gangway to come off to the ship.

11,520. You gave us the case of a man of Newcastle who had been boycotted by the Union in the same way as yourself, did you not?—Yes.

11,521. On what ground was that done?—That was T. Acom; that was for working for this Company.

11,522. For that same Company you have spoken of?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton.

11,523. With respect to these other men, the eight men, I think you said they were expelled from the Union, as well as yourself; have they appealed to the executive?—In no case.

The witness withdrew.

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Mr. JOHN MORRISON called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

11,524. You are secretary of the Tyne and Blyth District Committee of the Shipping Federation, I think. Is that so?—I am.

11,525. Will you tell us, in the first place, what is the district under your supervision?—The district under the supervision of the Tyne Committee extends from the Tweed to the Tyne, embracing the ports of Berwick, Amble, Blyth, North and South Shields, and Newcastle.

11,526. Can you tell us the number of shipowners in the district, and the tonnage of the vessels?—The number of firms and shipowners we put down as 135, and the total tonnage of the vessels as 816,043. These are mainly composed of steam vessels, I may say.

11,527. Can you tell us the number of men employed?—The number of men employed averaged something like 20,000 in the year. The number of men that have been supplied through the Shipping Federation for one year was 11,699 seamen of all grades.

11,528. Now, perhaps you could tell us what the action of your association has been and is in regard to wages, hours of labour, and general conditions of service?—I may explain that the position of the Shipping Federation relative to the wages, hours of labour, and general conditions of service of seamen is that, as an association the Federation disclaims any interference in the wages question. It does not seek to lower wages, nor, on the other hand, can it be said that any action of the Federation will be taken to increase the rates of current wages. Strictly and briefly speaking, the wages question is left severely alone, and the members of the Federation agree to pay what may be called the full market price of seafaring labour.

11,529. You do not interfere with the rate of wages?—Not at all. What are called the current rates of wages vary considerably in the different parts, but the district to which I belong has the credit of paying the highest wages. The members of the Federation and the affiliated members in my district cheerfully pay these rates, with the result that there has never been any difficulty in procuring supplies of seamen for all the vessels for which there is a demand.

11,530. When labour is deficient at one port you supply it from another—is not that the case?—That is so.

11,531. I believe you wish to tell us something about the Federation Benefit Fund now in existence?—Yes. The Federation have now established a benefit fund for the purpose of recouping men for accidents or loss of life while on board their vessels. This fund is entirely found by the Shipping Federation, and the seaman does not pay any portion whatever to any fund towards it. The scale for a master who shall lose his life or be totally incapacitated by accident from following his employment is 100*l.*; a chief officer, surgeon, and purser, 75*l.*; for a second officer, a second engineer, and uncertificated masters of sailing vessels, 50*l.*; any

Earl of Derby—continued.

other certificated officers in the ship would have 40*l.*; petty officers, 35*l.*; sailors and firemen an all other members of the crew would have 25*l.* There is also provision for Asiatic seamen in Federation vessels. In that case these men would be paid 12*l.* 10*s.*, being one-half what we pay to European or rather to British seamen. I may say, with regard to the hours of labour in ships, the hours vary to some extent so far as firemen are concerned in opposition to seamen. Firemen may be taken as being employed for four hours and then having eight hours rest thus practically having an eight hours day. In some cases, however, in smaller vessels, the rule is four hours on and four hours off duty. Seamen in all cases, I believe, have four hour watches through the day.

11,532. How about overtime? Is there any payment for that?—Yes; overtime is paid in all ports. Last year I made application to several of the largest ports in the kingdom, and procured information in respect to that. I had a list printed—a copy of which I have here, and shall be glad to hand in (*see Appendix 72*). This list shows that in British ships after 5 p.m. and before 6 a.m., 9*d.* per hour would be paid, and after 1 p.m. on Saturdays; and on Sundays 1*s.* per hour would be paid as overtime. This return is from the Tyne, Cardiff, Clyde, Dundee, the Humber, the Forth, the Mersey, and the Thames. It gives the rating of seamen and their wages paid both weekly and monthly. There is also a table with a list of engineers' wages at the same ports. The masters and officers I did not get, as it is a matter of contract between the owners and these officers. I may say that in looking over this table it will be found that the Tyne and the Bristol Channel districts stand about level at the top of the pole for wages. I cannot understand why the wages are not the same all through, but the Union say they fix the wages. I think that is not so because I think the wages are more in accordance with local circumstances than with any fixed, despotic rule.

11,533. They vary at different places?—They vary at different places very considerably. As to the conditions of labour, probably one of the best known facts in connection with shipping is that shipowners are known to act more charitably, and, I may add, munificently, towards any of their servants who may be injured than are employers in other industries. Instead of its being difficult to find one instance of a shipowner spontaneously assisting an injured workman, as has been asserted here, or his relatives, my difficulty has been of a contrary character. I cannot find instances of a genuine case in the Tyne district arising from injury or loss of life at sea in which something has not been done to relieve the relatives or the man himself. I have a mass of documentary evidence here relating to cases during the last few years, a portion of which I will, with your permission, read and hand in as evidence. At

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

questions, Nos. 10,022, 10,023, and 10,024 Mr. Wilson said he could not remember one case where a seaman or fireman had received any compensation from the owners as a matter of grace, nor could he give one instance of a seaman's relatives being relieved in cases of shipwreck and loss of life. I have here a mass of evidence which shows that very large sums have been paid, and with your permission I should like to read some of it. This is a letter which I received from Messrs. Henry Clapham and Co., Newcastle-on-Tyne: "Dear Sir,—We are in due receipt of your circular letter of 8th inst., but think J. H. Wilson's absurd statements scarcely need refutation; however, we can state that our SS. 'Ethel' was lost on Lundy Island with all hands, excepting the first mate, in February 1877. We gave the mate a master's berth, and distributed 300*l.* to the wives and families of the men. Our SS. 'Filly' met with bad weather in January 1886, and the master, in the prosecution of his duties in navigating the steamer, badly damaged, was knocked down and broke his leg, which was amputated, rendering him unfit for sea service. We made him a donation of 250*l.*, which enabled him to take a business on shore. We have for many years given an annual subscription of 3*s.* per man for all the crews in our employ to the Shipwrecked Mariners and Fisherman's Society, thereby enabling the men or their families to obtain double the usual allowances in cases of casualties. This subscription, to be effective, requires the seaman to take his ticket, also costing 3*s.* per annum, and our trouble is to get him to do this. We also subscribe a fixed sum per annum and per steamer to the Tyne Seamen's Widows and Orphans' Fund—the Royal Alfred Institution for Seamen's Orphans. We believe that you will find that most shipowning firms are doing the same, or better than ourselves." Here is a letter from Messrs. Chapman and Miller, of Newcastle-on-Tyne.—"Replying to yours of date in the case of the loss of the 'Carlton,' where the crew had a very trying and perilous time. We paid each of the crew a half month's wages more than they were entitled to, and have contributed in a small way to other similar cases." There was a case where there was no loss of life, but in consequence of the arduous work that the men had undergone, the owners paid them half a month's wages in addition to their usual pay. This is from Mr. Henry Adamson, of Newcastle: "In reply to your letter of yesterday, I have to state that in 1877 my late firm lost the steamship 'Cerdes' with all of her crew. A subscription was raised amongst her owners and the list was headed by my firm with 100*l.* The sum realised was 388*l.* The 'Boadicea' was lost on this coast after being out of the Tyne some 24 hours, but all of her crew were saved. My firm paid to her crew for the owners of the vessel 142*l.* 1*0s.* The 'Algithea' under my management was lost

Earl of Derby—continued.

"with all of her crew in 1887. I paid to the relatives of the crew 130*l.*, and have since paid many other sums, besides getting several of the children placed in orphanages, in fact, "I am busy with one to-day for the Snaresbrook Institute." I may mention that Mr. Adamson has succeeded in getting about 40 children into the Snaresbrook schools, and he has paid the cost, averaging something like 15*l.* to get them into that institution. Messrs. Ridley, Son and Tully, of Newcastle, say:—"In reply to yours of the 8th instant, we beg to state that in the case of our steamship 'Zampa,' lost in the Bay of Biscay on or about the 30th of September 1876, with all hands, we paid over to the families of the men one month's pay, which amounted to 159*l.* 'Storm Queen,' steamship, lost in the Bay on the 22nd December 1888, a similar allowance was made which amounted in all to about 150*l.* We think you will have little difficulty in refuting a great many of Wilson's statements, which if allowed to gain currency, will do harm." Messrs. Thomson and Sons, of Dundee, say:—"We are in receipt of your favour of 9th instant, and in reply thereto beg to state that our steamship 'Carmona' left Barrow on 23rd February 1887 for New York, and was not afterwards heard of, and that wages were paid by us to near representatives up to 17th March, being fully 10 days after ship ought to have arrived at New York. Besides this, exhaustive enquiry was made into the circumstances of the crew, and in consequence a relief fund was got up and contributed to by owners of 'Carmona,' without any outside assistance. Out of this fund we have disbursed 327*l.* to date, and send you a separate list herewith showing particulars of each case, and what has been, and is still being done." In addition to these letters I have others. Messrs. Adam Brothers, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, had a ship "Caramatta" lost, and they paid to the representatives of the crew 378*l.* odd. Messrs. William Milburn and Co., Newcastle-on-Tyne, paid in the case of the loss of their steamship "Carriston," 195*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* In the case of the "Fernwood," 144*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* In the case of the "Colliston," 220*l.* 5*s.* In the case of the "Cape Clear," they paid 265*l.* In addition to these sums these gentlemen contributed about 150*l.* per annum to different charities connected with the relief of seamen in the locality. Messrs. Walter Runciman and Co., of South Shields, say:—"When our steamship 'Levant' was lost in March 1888, 84*l.* 10*s.* was divided among the relatives of the 15 hands. In November 1890 the mate of our steamship 'Marstonmoor' was drowned at Blyth, and we handed 60*l.* to his widow." Messrs. Fisher, Renwick, and Co., of Newcastle, sent me a list, which I have here, showing the larger amounts which have been paid to the men who have got injured owing to injuries that have happened to them while on service on board their ships (*handing in letter*) There was a man lost by the sinking of the

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

"Wetherall," off Dover, owing to collision. 15*l.* 11*s.* was paid to his widow and family. Another man, James Shanley, a fireman, was drowned in Swansea Dock whilst attempting to board a ship, and 8*l.* 15*s.* was given to his wife and family. Another fireman in September 1888 lost his life in an attempt to board the steamship "Lady Bertha," at Bordeyri, Iceland; there was 38*l.* 18*s.* 4*d.* paid to his widow and family. The second mate's family on the same occasion had 31*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*, and the steward's widow had 18*l.*

Duke of Devonshire.

11,534. Is this in contradiction of any evidence given?—This is in contradiction of the assertion made by Mr. Wilson that there was no case which had ever come to his knowledge where shipowners had spontaneously given any remuneration or any gratuity or bounty to any of the relatives of their crews who had been lost. In the case of Joseph Purvis, fireman, lost in the attempt to board the steamship "Kate Forster" at Bilbao; his wife was left with five children, and the owners contributed 43*l.* to her relief. Evan Jones, a master, found drowned at Swansea Dock, and who was supposed to have been attempting to join his ship, the steamship "Denia," was unmarried, and they were at the expense of 5*l.* to pay the funeral expenses. Thomas Evans, A.B., who was injured whilst following his employment on board the steamship "Newark" received 12*l.* 16*s.*, which was paid for a horse and cart for him. He was injured so that he could not follow his employment, and he came to the office and said there was a horse and cart for sale and he thought he would be able to earn a livelihood with that, and the owners purchased those things for him. Francis Chalmers, a master, died at Gibraltar, and 32*l.* was paid to his widow. W. I. Cook, mate, was lost in October 1890 owing to the capsizing of the "Troutbeck's" life-boat near the island of North Hofton, in the Baltic, and 15*l.* was given to his widow; and in the cases of John Hill, A.B., and Thomas Gray, second engineer, who lost their lives at the same time, 13*l.* 4*s.* and 10*l.* respectively was given to their representatives. Then G. D. McKay, master, on March 1891 was found dead in the cabin of the steamship "Lodore" at Dunkirk; he left a widow and eight children, and the owners undertook to get some of the children into the Snarebrook Asylum, which cost them something like 20*l.* In addition to the above there are many other sums. Messrs. G. W. Allen and Co., of South Shields, write on the 10th December: "We have your circular letter of 8th instant *re* the Royal Commission on Labour, and in reply beg to say that we have never had a loss of a steamer nor been consequently called upon to contribute anything in a special way to the widows or families of the seamen so lost. We, however, have had two cases, one where a man got hurt (not a member of the crew) while the S.S. 'Isaac Pennock' was loading

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

cargo of timber or deals in the Baltic some three years ago, in which case we voluntarily contributed to his relief the sum of 12*l.*; and in the second case at Constantinople, where the boatswain of the S.S. 'Warrior' fell down the hold of the ship and was killed, we gave his widow 20*l.* We believe the amounts mentioned in both cases are correct, but we have parted with both vessels more than 12 months ago, and closed and stowed away all their accounts, and it would take some time and trouble to trace the amounts precisely, but if the actual amounts are required we can get the dates and the amounts contributed in each case.—Yours truly, G. W. Allen and Co." Then Messrs. Macintyre Bros. write on the 15th of December: "Referring to your circular of 8th instant and in reply thereto, we have to inform you that in the case of the 'Strathairly,' lost on 23rd March last, wages were paid to date of such loss, the balance amounting to 734*l.* 5*s.* 10*d.*, to which sum the owners added a gratuity or bonus of 119*l.* We may add that we are subscribers to the funds of the Shipwrecked Fishermen and Mariners' Royal Benevolent Society, and also to the Society for the Relief of Widows and Orphans of Shipwrecked Mariners, from which societies grants were made to the relatives, and that in virtue of an annual contribution to a special fund of the former society many of the relatives of the deceased received supplemental allowances over and above the ordinary grants.—Yours faithfully, Macintyre Bros. and Co." The next is a letter from Messrs. Hunting and Son, Newcastle-on-Tyne, dated 8th December: "Replying to your circular letter of yesterday's date, we beg to say that in the case of our S.S. 'Joseph Ferens,' lost in November 1879, we distributed amongst the relatives of those lost the sum of 193*l.* 7*s.* 1*d.* in various sums and payments during the period ending March 1884; and in the case of 'Saxmundham,' which foundered 4th November 1888, we have given to the relatives 184*l.* 19*s.* 3*d.* up to date, apportioned as follows:—

"Second mate's family -	£	s.	d.
	-	20	0 0
	£	s.	d.
"Carpenter's -	-	34	0 0
"Expenses electing child into orphanage -	-	15	7 3
		49	7 3
"Cook -	-	5	0 0
"2 A.B.'s, 11 <i>l.</i> 2 <i>s.</i> and 15 <i>l.</i> -	-	26	2 0
"Engineer—1st, 35 <i>l.</i> ; and 4th, 31 <i>l.</i> 10 <i>s.</i> -	-	66	10 0
"Firemen, 13 <i>l.</i> and 5 <i>l.</i> -	-	18	0 0
		184	19 3

"Sorry we cannot give you the particulars of apportionment in the case of the 'Joseph Ferens,' as it would take too long, and entail too much labour.—Yours truly, Hunting and Son." Messrs. Hugh Roberts

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

and Son, of Newcastle, write as follows: "During the period we have owned vessels we have only lost three, and in no case was there any loss of life. We may mention, however, that when our S.S. 'North Gwalia' was at Venice on her first voyage in January 1889, an A.B. named John Jones through his own negligence fell down the fore hold, which necessitated him leaving the vessel and going into the hospital. After he was sufficiently recovered and had arrived home, we sent him cheque for 30*l.*, 15*l.* of which we ourselves subscribed, and the remaining 15*l.* we collected. We have seen the above seaman several times since; the last time we saw him he was then mate of a schooner trading on the coast.—Yours truly, Hugh Roberts and Son." Messrs. Cairns, Young, and Noble write on the 9th of December: "Replying to your letter re Royal Commission on Labour, we have never had any loss of life in our vessels so far. We may, however, mention that such a case as you refer to came prominently before us at the time of the loss of the S.S. 'Carmona,' belonging to our principals in Dundee, Messrs. William Thomson and Sons. We know for a fact that that firm and their co-owners put their hands deeply into their pockets on behalf of the crew of that ill-fated vessel. No doubt you will have sent a circular to them upon the subject, and the information will be forthcoming.—Yours faithfully, Cairns, Young, and Noble."

Earl of Derby.

11,535. Have you any more cases of the same kind?—There are three or four, but I think I have amply shown that shipowners are not heartless in the treatment of their servants, as has been alleged. I have here a copy of the report of the Society for the Relief of Widows and Orphans of Shipwrecked Mariners. This society was founded in Newcastle in 1831, and amalgamated with the Widows and Orphans' Fund, March 1873. The total subscriptions for last year amounted to 760*l.* 3*s.* 9*d.*, and the total amount paid by shipowners was 538*l.* 3*s.* 11*d.* So that nearly the whole of the subscriptions for those two societies were contributed by shipowners.

11,536. Are there any other cases of compensation which you wish to bring before us?—There are many others, my Lord, but I think those will be sufficient.

11,537. I think we may take it that those you have given us are samples of the rest?—Quite so. Then I should like to say something as to the employment of foreigners. The Shipping Federation has made a point of restricting the employment of foreigners in the English mercantile marine, as far as possible, since its formation. Probably the chief reason for this policy is a spirit of patriotism. British shipowners are not only anxious to encourage the employment of British-born subjects in their vessels, but they are also desirous of supporting

Earl of Derby—continued.

to the utmost of their power the Naval Reserve of this country, which of course consists entirely of British subjects. As a remarkable instance of the privileges which the Federation offer to Naval Reserve men of the first class, I may recall your attention to the handbills which I have handed in on the benefit fund (*see Appendix 73*). It will be there noted that whilst every seaman must show six months' service in Federation vessels before being entitled to a benefit certificate, an exception is made in favour of men of the first class in the Naval Reserve. These are allowed a benefit certificate immediately they become registered with the Federation, which to my mind is conclusive evidence that the Federation is anxious to encourage the strengthening of the Naval Reserve. On the other hand, foreigners receive very little attention at the hands of Federation officials. The latter have strict instructions not to register foreigners unless they can speak and thoroughly understand English, or can produce four years' discharges from British vessels. At the beginning of December last a foreigner who could speak very little English applied at the Newcastle office for a Federation ticket. He had come over from Hamburg, and could not produce one English discharge, although he had several from foreign ships. When asked if he was in the Union, he replied, as well as he could make himself understood, that he had paid half a sovereign to join the English Union at Hamburg, but that he had not received a card. Upon being further questioned he took off a black sateen cap that he was wearing, which had three white buttons in a row, and said that was a proof of his being a member of the Union, as those caps were only supplied through the Union officials. I give you that man's statement (his name, Charles Martins) for what it is worth, and the two following reports from Captain Oxley, of North Shields, is a further proof that we do not encourage foreigners into the Federation even after they have been introduced into the mercantile marine through the auspices of the Seamen's Union. "Mr. Morrison. Dear Sir,— "Karl Broden (A.B.) German, joined the "S. and F. U. at Hamburg last week, and "paid 5*s.*, and shipped into the S.S. 'Rio "Tinto'; could only show one discharge; re- "fused him a ticket. The man could speak "very little English." "Mickal Rasmussen " (A.B.), Swede. Similar case to above; paid "7*s.* to join S. and F. U. at Hamburg. He "said he paid the money to M. Gustaggen, the "master of the Sailors' Home there, and joined "the S.S. 'Rio Tinto'; only seven months in "British ships; refused him a ticket." You will notice from this, my Lord, that the Shipping Federation officials use discrimination in giving the tickets to men. When it is considered they are not fit to be in British vessels they are refused tickets, so that it is very hard to get employment in British vessels. I should like to speak now as to the refusal of unionists to work with non-unionists. This is so well-known a custom that instances can be procured every

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

day, but as a rule the practice is only indulged in when unionists are of opinion that they can "rule the roost," so to speak, or have matters entirely their own way. Personally, I do not so much object to unionists refusing to work with non-unionists as I do to the well-known methods of intimidation which union men resort to in order to prevent non-union men from working. Non-unionists are not noted for preventing their fellow workmen who are in Unions from following up their work. That sort of work is more congenial to the unionists, and I propose now to give some instances of these men not only refusing work, but also doing their level best to deter others from following the bent of their inclinations by accepting employment. On the 13th of October, that was one week after my appointment, Captain Davidson, who acted as local superintendent for the Federation, made the following report to me in connexion with the S.S. "S-rica." He had accompanied part of the crew of that vessel to Middlesbrough, and as it was a Federation vessel the Union attempted to prevent it from getting a crew. "Upon arrival in Middlesbrough I found a large crowd of roughs with Union delegates at the railway station, but the police, having been informed of my coming, were present in force. All the way to the Mercantile Marine Office the police had to clear the way to make a free passage. The language used to the men and myself by the Union roughs was most brutal, and as they remained round the Mercantile Marine Office whilst the men were signing articles, the police had to clear the road so as to allow the men to proceed to the ship. After I had succeeded in getting the men on board, the delegates being about the quay threatening to take the men out of the ship again, and using such threatening language towards myself that I sought and obtained police protection whilst in the town." The same officer, Captain Davidson, also gave me the following report, dated the 3rd of November 1890, in reference to the S.S. "Bakium": "I accompanied a first and second engineer to West Hartlepool for the S.S. 'Bakium.' The Union delegates were in force on my arrival, and one threatened that if I returned he would send me back in my coffin. This delegate, a man named Jones, was brought before the magistrates and bound over to keep the peace. The engineers were taken by a private way to the dock, under an escort of police, and I went in a cab to escape violence. On coming back it was necessary for me to walk with the police, and to remain under their protection whilst in the town." As a further illustration of the obstructive tactics indulged in by the National Amalgamated Seamen's Union at that time towards the Federation, I will now mention the case of the S.S. "Linda." On Friday the 14th of November 1890, a crew for this vessel was signed on at North Shields, and on the following day a Union official was seen on board talking to the men. He was ordered off the

Earl of Derby—continued.

ship, upon which he became very abusive, and said he was determined to get at the crew. On the Sunday morning, when the vessel was about to sail, no less than seven of the crew were found to have deserted, entailing upon the owners the expense and trouble of securing substitutes. I found out afterwards that some of these men of the S.S. "Linda" had been on a voyage from America with cattle, and that some of these men had been taken away to give evidence before the inquiry into the cattle trade. Note Monsell's evidence that he had strict instructions from Mr. J. H. Wilson to get two of the crew out at any price—the donkeyman and another—that he succeeded, and that the Union paid them 35s. per week each, for long enough. The following extract from Captain Anderson, of South Shields, letter to me on January 25th last year, explains something very like a disgraceful riot over the shipping of a crew for the S.S. "Cervin." When the crew went down first, Cowie called out, "Here are the Federation men coming; line up, lads." The doors of the shipping office were blocked, and the men hustled until they had to run. "It appears that after the first crowd came up to our office after the captain and engineers, and the officials of the Union had got the crew intended for the S.S. 'Cervin' out of the way, Cowie went to the shipping office and boasted that he had taken a certain number of men from the Federation, and given them 15s. each to desert. This can be proved. Shortly after this, Cowie went back to the shipping office and shouted for a hundred men to go to the Federation office and to watch the ferry, and in a very short time there were about 200 men in front of our office, and for some time the road was blocked."

Mr. Tait.

11,538. Was this at Newcastle?—This was at South Shields. "Mr. Moorhouse"—that is the local superintendent of police—when he was asked about the matter, "was of opinion that they intended to make a raid upon our office, but they found a large force of police when they got there. I may just say that all this trouble was caused through the captain and engineers picking their men outside instead of selecting them at our office in the usual way. If they had done so, I would have sent the men to the shipping office quietly, the same as we have done with other steamers, and there would have been no trouble with her, but her captain went about his business in a different manner.—Yours respectfully, (Signed) J. Anderson." I beg now to produce the statement of Richard Doyle, a Federation seaman, who was grossly assaulted when on his way to join a Federation vessel. The statement is copied from Doyle's deposition on oath before the South Shields magistrates, and although the case was sent to the sessions, it was ultimately

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

dismissed on the ground that there was no felonious intent on the part of the accused in taking Doyle's property. Richard Doyle, on his oath, saith: "I am a seaman, and reside at Mr. Sloan's boarding-house, East Holborn, at South Shields. On Saturday night, the 14th February instant, about 10 o'clock, I proceeded with Mr. Sloan and four other seamen to the South Shields railway station. I carried my bag, and a boy carried my bed. When we got to Station Road some men came up to me from the opposite side of the road. A man named Cowie spoke to me, and I replied. At that time I did not see prisoner. Cowie stepped back, and a number of other men surrounded me. I endeavoured to get along, but the prisoner and other men came up. Prisoner called me a scab. I endeavoured to go along. Prisoner struck me in the back. I was carrying my bag on my shoulder. My bag fell over my head, and fell to the ground. I turned round, and saw the prisoner. He cursed me. I picked my bag up and put it on my shoulder. Prisoner struck me twice after this, and my bag fell each time to the ground. For the third time I endeavoured to get my bag, when prisoner got hold of it and walked away with it. I was surrounded by five or six men, acting in concert with the prisoner, and they prevented me recovering my property. I was left without my property. I have known prisoner 18 months. I gave information to the police. The contents of the bag was four pairs of pants, one waistcoat, three jackets, oilskin suit, three pairs boots, three or four pairs stockings, towels and blankets, and number of other things. It is of the value of 15*l*. My bed was also lost, but I do not know that the prisoner took it. On being cross-examined, he said there were a crowd of men about the Shipowners' Federation office, and the prisoner with five or six men came and surrounded me. I did not see him actually strike me but he was nearest to me. There were no other men where he was and where I received the blows. It was as near 10 o'clock as I can say. I am certain the prisoner is the man who took my bag. I now identify the bag as my property. I was going to join the 'Bavaria.' It was in consequence of my going to join a non-union ship that the scuffle took place and I lost my bag." I may mention, my Lord, that this case was taken up to the Sessions at Durham and it was dismissed on the ground that there was no felonious intent on the part of this union man in taking his bag. At the same time I think it was a great hardship upon the poor man who lost his property for the time being was prevented getting his employment and was put to a very great deal of trouble and expense, and did not get any satisfaction at all.

11,539. What was the charge against the man?—The charge against the man was of robbing this man of his bag, for intimidation—preventing him seeking his employment.

11,540. Was the intimidation proved?—The intimidation was not gone into. They thought

Mr. Tait—continued.

the case was not sufficiently strong for that so they simply went against him for a robbery of the bag. I have read Mr. Wilson's evidence before this Commission and cannot agree to a great part of it to which I would like to refer at length. Confining myself to such portions of his evidence as relates to the district over which I act as secretary for the Shipping Federation I am prepared to put in proofs of the following statement. Mr. Wilson said that a steamer trading from Blyth frequently struck the bar going out, was never docked, nor inspected, and finally going out in a gale of wind in October 1886, foundered with all hands. I have made careful inquiries into that alleged case, and beg to put written evidence from a pilot in Blyth, copies of the Board of Trade official records into losses of steamers, &c., all of which go to show that no such case occurred. Mr. Wilson insisted upon the accuracy of this case on two separate occasions, whilst giving evidence before this Commission, I therefore trust that I may be allowed to read the pilot's statement in reference to the only case which bears even a remote resemblance to that which was cited by Mr. Wilson, "2nd December 1891, Blyth. SS. 'John Liddell.' I, Isaac Tate, of Blyth, Northumberland, pilot, state that I have been a pilot in this port since February 1886, and that during that year the only steamer sailing from Blyth that was lost, was named the 'John Liddell' of London. She sailed on the 11th December, and I piloted her out. The sea was very calm, and weather fine when she sailed. She did not touch on the bar when going out. Stormy weather came on after she sailed, and she was reported as being sunk on the Burkum Reefs, near the entrance of the River Elbe, by a vessel belonging to Messrs. Pyman and Bell, of Newcastle." A Board of Trade inquiry was held at North Shields respecting the loss of the vessel, at which I gave evidence. The finding of the Court was, "that the vessel was good, and in seaworthy condition, and that no blame rested on the owners in respect to the loss." I have here a copy of the Board of Trade inquiries into all the ships which have been lost since 1st January 1886 which I will hand in so that it can be seen. These are the official records of the courts of inquiry into the loss of every ship since January 1886.

Earl of Derby.

11,541. Is there anything else you wish to bring before this Commission?—At questions 9227 and 9228, Mr. Wilson said that in 1886 the Union (North of England) that he was then connected with, issued invitations to shipowners to attend a conference in Sunderland at the Central Coffee Tavern, High Street, in order to discuss the "wages question," and employment of foreigners. He further said the invitations to shipowners were scattered broadcast, but only one solitary shipowner, Mr. Dent, of Newcastle, attended. It is perhaps a pity to deprive Mr. Wilson of that only comfort, but

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

my instructions from Mr. Dent, which I now produce, are that he did not attend any such gathering in Sunderland. Mr. Wilson was also very precise upon that matter on two different occasions, which is my reason for mentioning the circumstances. "John Morrison, Esq., King Street. Dear Sir,—I have your favour of 5th and 8th instant, and in reply beg to inform you that Mr. J. H. Wilson is mistaken in saying that I ever attended a meeting of his Union delegates in Sunderland. The meeting he refers to is no doubt the one held here in Lockhart's Cocoa Rooms, Side, when I was the only one present. My firm has always subscribed to the Widows and Orphans' Fund for each steamer as well as ourselves, and thereby ensured the grants being made to any dependents of men lost in our employ; but where these not eligible according to the rules, help has been given to tide over the loss. Last was paid to widow of Captain O'Leary, 25th on 31st August 1889. Yours truly (signed) John Dent." Then, at question 9232, it is here asserted that Mr. Matthew Cay, a well-known shipowner, was a member of the Committee of a Seaman's Union in 1886. From the following letter of that gentleman to me, it will be seen that such is not the case. Mr. Cay, however, in 1886, advocated the policy which the Federation is now pursuing, namely, to give a preference of employment to British sailors, providing they faithfully perform their work. This is Mr. Cay's letter. "Shipping Federation, King Street, Newcastle. Dear Sir,—I was never on the Committee, to my knowledge, of any Sailors or Fireman's Union. In 1886, I took some interest in the English sailors and took the chair at a meeting and advocated that English sailors should be employed provided they kept sober and did their duty. Yours truly (signed), Mathew Cay." Mr. Cay has also personally informed me that he never had anything to do with any Seamen's Union, and that, so far as he remembered, there is not the slightest truth in what Mr. Wilson alleged about that. Mr. Wilson, in his evidence, said on several occasions that there was no force or coercion used. See 9313, 9314. About 18 months ago there were numerous instances of captains of ships being compelled at various ports to join the Seamen's Union, or run the risk of sailing short-handed by members of the crew backing out. I believe there were many cases of this sort never reported to the owners, as the ship's officers did not think it worth while to enlarge upon a grievance which they could get over by paying. At the same time, those coercive tactics carried on generally, would no doubt go a long way towards swelling the income from entrance fees towards membership in the Seaman's Union. The Shipmaster's Union, of which Mr. Wilson acted as a sort of manager, also succeeded in raising its fund by the brotherly co-operation of the Seamen and Firemen's Union, as the following matter, which was related to me by Captain John James, of the steamship "Trinidad," and who resides at

Earl of Derby—continued.

Morden Road, Newport (Mon.), will show. Captain James said that just before the Cardiff strike last year, to prevent his ship from being stopped, he was forced to join the Seamen's Union, which meant the paying of blackmail to the extent of about thirty shillings. At that time Captain James was master of the "Sestos," but he is now commanding the "Trinidad." The chief officer, too, of the latter vessel was compelled to pay 26s. towards the Shipmasters' Union, of which I have spoken, whilst acting under Captain James on the "Sestos." This was at Newport last year, and the name of that officer is Alfred George Harlow, of 34, Lowdown Square, Cardiff. I could multiply these instances, if necessary, by a little research, but have not had time to hunt up details. In speaking of the Cardiff strike, Mr. Wilson said that anybody at all in the shape of a man that could be rigged up in a pair of blue trousers and a fireman's cap would be shipped, and that tramps sweeps, navvies, &c., were supplied. I examined the discharges of all men supplied from the Tyne District, and can testify to the fact that every man had sufficient service at sea to warrant his being employed either as sailor or fireman. One noteworthy feature of this strike was (so far as it related to the Tyne district) that about 20 of the men sent to Cardiff, fell into the hands of the Union, and of course did not ship. I had a list of the men's names, and singularly enough the very men whom the Union captured, were those who most loudly protested to me, that if they were only sent away to join any vessel, so eager were they for employment, that they would gladly snap at the chance. The Union did not give them employment, of course, but it would supply them with a small portion of the hard-earned contributions of its members, which was perhaps all that these gentlemen desired. I would like at this stage to correct some mis-statements of Mr. Wilson in reference to 51 men who were sent in a batch to Cardiff during the dispute, or rather during the time that Mr. Plimsoll's Union endeavoured unsuccessfully to block the trade of that port. Mr. Wilson says that on arrival in Cardiff the 51 men marched in a body to the Colonial Hall, as they had been led to believe that they were intended for London. The facts of this case are that upwards of 50 men were sent to Cardiff in charge of Captain Davidson, and that upon arrival there 28 of the men shipped in vessels that were being blocked. The other 23 men threw themselves, I suppose, upon the funds of the Union, stating they had been brought there under false pretences, when, as I have already explained, they assured me they were prepared to take employment anywhere. The Union tried to recover damages for those men, but as there could not be any evidence produced to show that the men had been misled, they were of course non-suited. Yet Mr. Wilson stated here that the men had been sent to Cardiff in ignorance of the fact that there was a dispute pending in that port. Further, not only was it exten-

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

REPORT [Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

sively and widely-known that a strike was in progress at Cardiff, but Mr. Wilson himself made a speech at Cardiff, which was reported in the North of England newspapers, that the Federation was smashed on the Tyne just two days before I sent these men off, thus giving, I think, a very practical and effective reply, and showing the vitality of the Federation in the district.

(The witness then put in the following statement, and it was arranged that he should appear for cross-examination thereon if required.)

I am, however, reluctantly compelled to believe that, though Mr. Wilson endeavoured hard to persuade this Commission that no genuine seamen were shipped during the Cardiff dispute, he was at the time well enough aware of the fact that I had supplied good men from North Shields, and could have supplied an almost indefinite number, if required.

My reason for making this statement is found in a speech which Mr. Wilson delivered to sailors at North Shields on the 8th of this present month, and an extract from which, with your permission, I will quote, as it appeared in the 'Newcastle Evening Chronicle' of the 9th inst. :—

"The Union had met with considerable opposition from the shipowning community, and he was sorry to say that some of their men, on the first eve of battle, had behaved in a not very creditable manner. (Hear, hear.) Some of them had been only too ready, on the formation of that Shipping Federation, to say, 'Well, the Federation is started now, it is not necessary to belong to the Union; I will wait and see which is the strongest.' Now, there were men in North Shields who had said that. There were men in North Shields who had been cowardly enough to allow themselves to be taken from North Shields and shipped to Cardiff and other places in the place of men who had been on strike. Now, he said it was not creditable to men who must know that they had improved their condition by combination, that on the eve of battle they should neglect their contributions, and go over to the side of the enemy. Some, on the other hand, had sat on the dyke waiting to see on which side they were going to jump. That was plain speaking. He did not want to offend any of his fellow-workmen, but he wanted his shots to go home, and strike in the right place. (Applause.) Why should they support or believe in the Shipping Federation, which boasted of having about 80,000,000*l.* of capital? That was a deliberate falsehood; and, if they had that amount of capital, he should say they had robbed it from the toilers. (Applause.)"

The rest of the speech contains denunciations of local marine boards, &c., which I do not ask to read, but am content to hand the paper in (*handing in same*).

"Question 9331."

"EVIDENCE showing that FEDERATION AGENTS do not connive at CRIMPING."

Mr. Wilson stated here that boarding masters go to the agents of the Federation, and offer

Earl of Derby—continued.

them 5*s.* per head for each man that is shipped. In the Tyne district I am able to give to this allegation the most emphatic denial. Nor can I for one moment believe that there is any truth in such a statement as being applicable to the Shipping Federation and its system of carrying on its work.

Seamen out of employment, union and free, without difference, assemble freely in our waiting rooms, where captains and other ships officers call to select their crews.

The choosing of the men is left entirely in the hands of the ships officers, and our agents simply see that the men are provided with Federation tickets.

Boarding masters are never sent for, but when large demands for men have suddenly come in, it has sometimes been found necessary to send an official to the boarding-houses to acquaint the men of that fact.

On busy occasions it has also been found necessary to hunt up seamen from their private home addresses, and as a matter of fact the men who are forthcoming first, are invariably the first that are engaged, quite irrespective of whether they are in any union or boarding-house, or simply living at their own homes."

"Questions 9336-7-8-9, 9340."

"ALL TRADE UNIONISTS do not claim a MONOPOLY OF WORK to the disadvantage of NON-UNIONISTS."

Mr. Wilson puts forward the extraordinary claim, that only union men should be employed on board ship, and gives as a reason that the amalgamated engineers in the majority of the engine works throughout the country will not work with a non-union man. The Boiler-makers, the Darpenters, and the Shipwrights' societies are also said by Mr. Wilson to decline to work with non-unionists. This Commission will probably have evidence on this point from members of those unions, but personally I am aware that unionists and non-unionists are working together in many places amicably.

During the last 12 months Mr. John Burns, who is connected with the amalgamated engineers, has said frequently that the amalgamated society was 70,000 strong, but that there were fully 200,000 men employed in the engineering trade. In the face of that declaration, it sounds rather absurd to say that the Engineers' Union could put forward such a pretentious claim.

The "Newcastle Daily Chronicle" of the 12th instant gives the following report in reference to the Engineers' Secretaryship. "A meeting of engineers was held yesterday at the Three Crowns Hotel, Sunderland, in connection with Mr. Tom Mann's candidature for the vacant secretaryship of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. There was a large attendance. Mr. Mann, in the course of his speech, referred to trades unionism in the country, and pointed out the brilliant future there was before workmen if they would

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

“organise sufficiently. He regretted there was only a fourth of the adult male workers of the country organised out of a possible eight millions. By banding themselves together and by acting judiciously he believed they could make such changes as to practically wipe out poverty from the land. Trade Unionism, he thought, would vastly contribute to that very desirable end. With regard to their own societies, there was room for improvement, for out of 250,000 skilled workmen employed in the engineering trade, only 65,000 had been enrolled as members of trade societies. He also thought wages ought to be higher in their trade, remarking that, though the Enfield engineers were in receipt of 40s. a week, yet in some places as low a rate as 22s. was paid. He did not complain of the rate paid in Sunderland. With regard to the overtime question, he said, he was altogether opposed to systematic overtime. Overtime was bad except in cases of emergency. If they put a stop to it thousands of workmen would be enabled to do the work which was now being done by those who were at present working under that pernicious system. The speaker proceeded to advocate the establishment of a uniform 48 hours a week, and an eight hours' day. In Sunderland, he was reminded that already in one shop the eight hours' day had become an accomplished fact. He was glad to know that that was so, and was also glad to know that that result had been brought about by a sensible overtone being made by an employer to the workmen. The employers, as a rule, refused to seriously consider the bearing of the improved conditions of the workers upon the welfare of the capitalist. The chances of the capitalist were, in fact, improved by the betterment of the working classes. He then appealed for their support, and said that the candidate who received the most votes on the north-east coast district would, he thought, win the election. A vote of thanks to the chairman brought the meeting to a close. Mr. Mann continued his campaign in the evening, when he addressed another meeting in the Central Coffee Tavern. With regard to the boiler-makers, whilst it was true that there was a majority of Unionists in the Tyne district it should be remembered that on the Clyde, where a larger body of men were employed, the Non-Unionists were in a much more striking majority.

Here is an official record of their progress.

“THE BOILERMAKERS' SOCIETY.

“From an official statement just published regarding the progress the United Boiler-makers and Iron Shipbuilders' Society has made in Scotland during the past five years, the Scottish district committee consider the state of affairs very satisfactory. The following was the position of the society at the end of each of these years :—

Earl of Derby—continued.

Year.	Branches.	Members.	Balance.
1887	37	3,712	£ 1,910
1888	37	4,752	7,173
1889	41	6,894	15,961
1890	41	7,417	22,925
1891	44	7,751	28,277

“The committee express their belief that at the end of 1892 a more prosperous state of affairs will have to be recorded.”

That official statement shows a very satisfactory increase of membership in Scotland, but a still more satisfactory increase of funds in the hands of Scottish boilermakers. Will the Royal Commission be surprised to hear that there has been no coercion on the part of Scotch Unionist boilermakers in order to attain this desirable position.

That at all events is what I have been assured of, and the matter can, of course, be officially ascertained, when, if my information is correct, I will go as far as to say that the Boilermakers' Union in Scotland has done very creditably indeed. The Carpenters' and Joiners' Unions have shown a good deal more of fighting propensities towards one another than to the exclusion of Non-Unionist labour, and I am acquainted with men on the Tyne following those occupations who are not connected with any union or trade society.

A body of men calling themselves shipwrights have lately adopted the seamen's paper, “Seafaring,” as their official organ, and probably this section of workers may adopt Mr. Wilson's ideas about working with Union men only.

I can, however, state that in our registry offices we never have any difficulty in procuring plenty of good and competent shipwrights to go to sea as ship carpenters, and that I take to be evidence of the fact that there is no considerable section of shipwrights who object to work with Non-Unionists. Yet Mr. Wilson, after citing the foregoing instances, avows that it is the principle of his Union to prevent Non-Unionists going to sea, and the principle is put into force wherever the Union is strong enough. (Questions 10,092-93-94.)

With further reference to the statement of Mr. Wilson, that his members never blocked the entrances of the shipping offices so as to prevent seamen signing articles, the almost every-day experience of the agents in my district is opposed to this. I am speaking now of the time from the formation of the Federation until the beginning of March last, when the members of the Seamen's Union generally accepted the Federation ticket. Indeed, so riotous and disorderly was the conduct of the Seamen's Union delegates at South Shields outside of the shipping offices when free seamen approached for the purpose of signing articles, that our officials had invariably to call in police assistance. The usual practice was for delegates of the Seamen's Union to post themselves as near as possible to the shipping office and commence to

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

harangue those present. Then when a crew of free seamen appeared in charge of our officials they were jostled and abused, and frequently driven back until reinforced by a body of police.

It was practically useless proceeding against these men for obstruction, inasmuch as the fines in such cases were so insignificant. Although I was well aware that we could successfully establish charges of intimidation against the Union officials on several occasions, the Federation was anxious to give these misguided men all the forbearance and toleration that was possible.

Some instances, however, were too gross to overlook, and the following report from Captain Davidson is a case in point:—

"On 24th November 1890 I accompanied some men to the Newcastle shipping office to sign articles.

"Outside the door there was a crowd of Unionists, amongst whom the local secretary of the Seamen's Union was conspicuous. One man named Macdonald made a savage assault upon me, for which he was arrested and sentenced to one month's imprisonment. At the police court this man had the assistance of the local solicitor for the Seamen's Union, and the advice of the Seamen's secretary."

"Questions 10,092, 10,093, 10,094."

"EVIDENCE to show that NON-UNIONISTS were blocked at the SHIPPING OFFICES."

In the above questions, Mr. Wilson strongly denied that Non-Unionists were blocked. My experience all goes in opposition to that statement. From the first opening of the registry offices on the Tyne, virulent obstruction was offered by the Union delegates to seamen being shipped under the auspices of the Shipping Federation in that district, unless they held cards of membership in the Union. I can give several instances of intimidation and coercion practised upon free seamen, not by ignorant members of the Union alone, but by high officials.

As a typical case I beg to call your attention to a statement of the witnesses who gave evidence in the police court proceedings against a delegate of the Union, named Cowie, who threatened a fireman (Thomas Kennedy) after the latter had signed articles at South Shields in the SS. "Fortescue."

During the progress of the proceedings Cowie was supposed to have finished his connexion with the Seamen's Union, having resigned the post of delegate, and this circumstance had, no doubt, a material bearing upon the magistrates who tried the case, Cowie getting off with a small fine.

No sooner had the case been settled, however, than Mr. Cowie again appears as a liveried delegate of Mr. Plimsoll's Union, and he is now stationed in Blyth, where he offers as much obstruction to our agents in the discharge of their duties as he possibly can.

Earl of Derby—continued.

"KENNEDY v. COWIE."

"30th January. Summons issued under section 6 of Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1875.

"For that he, Cowie, did, on the 24th January, for the purpose of compelling Thomas Kennedy to abstain from joining the steamship "Fortescue" after he had signed articles to serve thereon as fireman, which he had a legal right to do, did unlawfully, wrongfully, and without legal authority, intimidate the said Thomas Kennedy."

"Thomas Kennedy, 16, East Holborn, South Shields, states:—I am 35 years of age, and a fireman. I am a registered member of the Federation: I joined on 23rd January last. I used to be a member of the Seamen and Firemen's Union at Cardiff on the 11th June. At the time I joined the Federation I was still a member of the Union, but a month in arrears with subscriptions. I had not withdrawn from it. On Saturday, the 24th January, I was standing at the Federation office door when the captain of the SS. "Fortescue" asked me to ship in his steamer, and asked me to go down to the South Shields shipping office with him at once. I went down with him and signed on at the South Shields shipping office at 4*l.* 15*s.* per month, half month's advance. I had to join at 4 o'clock that afternoon for a Mediterranean voyage. I came out of the shipping office at 2 o'clock. I had received the advance note, 2*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* I was alone. The master had left me a few minutes before that. When I got outside the door I was met by Mr. Cowie. I know him very well. There were five or six men with him; I do not know whom they were. Cowie accosted me and asked, 'Did you ship in that boat?' I said 'Yes.' He said, 'Where is your book?' I said, 'It is in my pocket.' He said, 'Give it to me.' I refused. I then commenced to walk away, he followed me and said, 'Do not be in a hurry, I am not going to hit you.' He said, 'You should not have shipped in that boat; she was going through the Federation.' I said, 'What am I going to do; I may be put out of the boarding-house, and then I am on the streets. I have no money.' I then commenced to walk home, and he followed me. He said, 'Do not run away; cannot a man speak to you?' I said, 'Come with me to the boarding-house master, and what he says I am satisfied.' We went to the boarding master. I then handed the boarding master the advance note, and said to the boarding master, in Mr. Cowie's presence, 'I shipped in that boat, and he (Cowie) won't let me go in that boat.' Cowie immediately said to me, 'If you go in that boat you will be marked, and you are not sure of your life. I will give you 12*s.* 6*d.* a week as long as you are ashore until you are shipped through the old Union.' I said, 'Whatever the board master says I will do.' The boarding master, who had said nothing up to this time, and had been reading the advance

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued

Earl of Derby—continued.

note, said to me, 'Well, you had better not go; they might mark you or hurt you.' When he said this I was afraid to go. I was afraid he would use means to have me badly treated. It was not the offer of 12s. 6d. a week ashore that induced me not to go in the ship. Cowie then said to me, 'Come up to the office.' I then left with him and we went to the Union office about 12.15, and Cowie said to the secretary, D. Clement, 'There is a man I have taken out of a Federation boat after signing. I have promised him 12s. 6d. a week.' Clement said, 'All right, be here on Monday morning.' I saw a boy write my name down in a book. I had handed my last discharge to the boy at his request and he copied my name from it. Nothing more passed and I went away. I went back on Monday morning, 26th January, 10 a.m. My name was called out in the office with several other names. Clement then addressed the whole of us, and said, 'I cannot give you anything until the meeting is over to-night.' I went away. I then went back next morning and saw Clement. He then said, 'There is nothing for you; you are out of the Union, and there is nothing for you. You were put out of the Union by the meeting last night.' I did not say anything in reply, and went away immediately. I have received no money, and have heard nothing more from them since.

"George Hughes, 16, East Holborn, South Shields, says:—I am a seamen's boarding-house keeper, and carry on business at the above address. I remember the 24th January last. It was a Saturday. Thomas Kennedy was boarding with me at that time; he was then considerably indebted to me for board and lodgings. At about 2 o'clock that afternoon Kennedy and Mr. Cowie came to me at my house door. Kennedy brought Cowie into the kitchen. Kennedy handed me an advance note and said at the same time, 'I have shipped in that boat, and he don't want me to go in her.' I said to Cowie, 'Why is that?' and Cowie said, 'Because he is going through the Federation, being a Union man,' and added, 'It will be the worse for him if he goes in the ship, as he will be a marked man.' I am not sure if the words 'You are not sure of your life' were made use of. As near as I can remember he spoke of Kennedy in the third person. Cowie also added, 'I will give him 12s. 6d. a week and assist him in getting a ship.' I then said to Kennedy, in Cowie's presence, 'You had better not go in the ship, for fear something might happen to you.' They then went away. I then kept the advance note.

"Questions 9480, 9485, 9928."

Mr. Wilson says, "Our men have suffered and I believe they will suffer more, if the Federation ticket continues to live, &c. Thousands of married men and single men who reside with their parents, will have long spells of unemployment, whilst men in boarding-houses and others who can afford to tip Federation officials will have preference."

Earl of Derby—continued.

That statement is a gross libel. O registry offices at North and South Shields, well as Blyth and Newcastle, are waiting rooms for unemployed seamen of all grad irrespective of whether they are in any Uni or not.

The ships' officers in want of men for Federation vessels call at those waiting rooms, a select of their own free will, seamen who ha registered themselves for employment, and ha taken the Federation ticket.

The Federation ticket simply means that t holder of it will sail and do his work proper with other members of the crew, whether th are in any Union or not.

Should it be found that the holder of Federation ticket sets up the preposterous cla that he will not sail with anyone unless th are members of his particular Union, t Federation is justified in suspending that ma ticket until he becomes more reasonable.

Such would-be dictators as these are n required inside the waiting-rooms of the Fed eration, and my experience is that there s sufficient seamen in the mercantile marine this country to man all the ships afloat, witho the assistance of men holding such exclusi ideas.

With that single justifiable obligation (vi that all seamen must hold the Federati ticket) our waiting-rooms are free to all class of sailors alike, and whether a seaman lives i boarding-house or at home, he has equally t same chance for employment.

Mr. Wilson gives a case where a chi engineer brought a fireman to the South Shiel office for a Federation ticket. He said the m was refused a ticket, and the engineer wa co sequently compelled to take another man w was in the office at the time and was p forward by the Federation official. The fac are not as Mr. Wilson stated.

Our officials give tickets to all applican who can show the requisite sea service. The tickets are given out at all times of the da but when a ship's officer is present with l men, our staff, which is limited, is busi occupied in checking off the men who a engaged. The issuing of tickets is therfo necessarily suspended for a short time on su occasions. When the chief engineer that M Wilson speaks of arrived at the South Shiel office, our staff was engaged in checking off crew. A ticket was promised to the firem who had come to the office with the engineer the usual course, but the engineer, not caring wait a moment, at once, of his own accor turned round and engaged another fireman wl was present.

The latter of course at once made his wa to the Union office, and complained of tl tyranny of the Federation.

The production of such a solitary and pett instance as this of Federation officials attenptin to prevent members of the Seamen's Union fro going to sea, is surely a strong argument in favour of my contention that the Federati

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

treats Union and Non-Union men with impartiality.

Mr. Wilson must have been hard pressed for a case amongst his 40,000 members, when he had to introduce such an instance of Federation tyranny.

"Question 9679."

"ACTUAL NUMBER OF MEN SHIPPED in this DISTRICT in ONE MONTH—UNION and NON-UNION."

Mr. Wilson stated here, that there were certain ports where only Union men were shipped, and mentioned Blyth and North and South Shields as such places.

Apart from my personal knowledge that the Shipping Federation can not only get a constant supply of free seamen in these places to man all the ships, I beg to put in the number of men shipped during the month of November last at these three offices, together with the relative numbers of Union and Non-Union men.

Independent of this table of figures, I may mention that during part of November, one of Mr. Wilson's guerilla chiefs, a man named Sprow, visited West Hartlepool, and induced several crews not to sail with Non-Unionists. The result was that my district sent men to West Hartlepool. There would be about 80 men in all supplied in this way.

"NORTH SHIELDS OFFICE."

Number of men shipped in November 1891, 503; of these 366 were free men, and 137 Union.

"SOUTH SHIELDS OFFICE."

496 men shipped, 320 free, and 176 Union.

"BLYTH OFFICE."

118 men were shipped, and of these two-thirds were free men.

"Question 9827."

"The CHARACTER NOTE SYSTEM still in FORCE."

Mr. Wilson was asked about the private inquiry system into men's characters, and denied that it was enforced except in very small places where about three men and a boy were employed. He further said that there had been several strikes in the North of England against the system with the result that it was now entirely abolished.

I am not aware of any strike in the North of England against the system. There was a strike a few years ago at the Elswick Works, Newcastle, upon a question of the management of the factory—the men trying to strike out the manager, a Mr. Macdonald. During the progress of the strike, there was some talk about the abolition of the "character note" system, but when the strike collapsed, there was nothing more heard of it, and as a matter of fact the system is in full operation to-day. It occasion-

Earl of Derby—continued.

ally happens that men who have been to sea as firemen, &c., and have then found employment ashore, apply at the Federation offices for the ticket, owing to their anxiety to take up a seafaring life again. I have no other means of verifying their statements that they have been lawfully employed ashore than by the "character note" system, and I beg to hand in several instances of where I have made inquiries and found satisfactory answers. It will be observed here that one of the largest works in England adopt the plan, and it is therefore rather absurd for Mr. Wilson to say that it is abolished. I may just further add that in no single instance that I can call to mind has any firm declined to give a character to any of their *ex-employees*.

"Question 10,307."

"The CALL OFFICERS spoken of."

I would like now to refer to a document which Mr. Wilson put in to the Commission, tending to show that some six months ago he had endeavoured to meet the shipowners in a conciliatory manner by establishing call offices on the Tyne, where 20 or 30 seamen could always be found ready for sea at a few moments' notice by telephone call.

With a view to advertise this arrangement, Mr. Wilson says he sent out circulars to the shipowners, acquainting them of the fact, but that nothing was done in the matter.

With reference to that statement, I beg to offer the following observations:—

1st. After careful inquiries, I cannot find that any call offices such as described by Mr. Wilson have been opened on the Tyne.

2nd. The only places that the Seamen's Union possess in the Tyne district are simply and only Union offices, where delegates are in attendance to enrol members, receive subscriptions, &c., and generally carry on the business of the Union.

3rd. The only place that telephonic communication has been established at during the last six months is at the Tyne Dock office, and that also is the only place which has been opened day and night.

4th. At one other office of the Union on the Tyne there is a telephone, but the instrument has been there upwards of two years; and as the call office proposal was only made last spring or summer, according to Mr. Wilson, it cannot be said that the instrument was placed there for the purpose alleged.

5th. I am in pretty close touch with the majority of shipowners in the North, and I do not know any of them who have received circulars such as those spoken of.

6th. Speaking from a purely business point of view, and from my own experience, I would suggest that even if Mr. Wilson had submitted a *loud sile* scheme such as the foregoing to shipowners, very little reflection ought to have been sufficient to convince him that he was very much too late in the field with his nostrums. From the establishment of the Shipping Federa-

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.

Earl of Derby—continued.

tion on the Tyne, in October 1890 until now there has never been the slightest difficulty in procuring plenty of good and competent seamen.

As I have stated before, we have not only been able to supply our local wants with free seamen, but we have also sent large numbers of the same class of men to other ports when the Seamen's Union have been acting aggressively by striving to block vessels. So that Mr. Wilson's scheme given in evidence before this Commission was an entirely superfluous one, being at least six months too late in the field.

"The Shipping Federation, Limited.

"Tyne and Blyth District,

"Newcastle-on-Tyne.

The following resolution was adopted by the Tyne District Committee of the Shipping Federation at their meeting held on 8th September 1891:—

"That in view of the difficulties frequently occurring in the shipping of seamen, and in sending them to other ports where their services are required, the Board of Trade be requested to grant licences to supply seamen under section 146 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, to officers of the Shipping Federation, Limited, and also to amend the 147th section of the same Act by inserting the word "agent" in place of "servant" and omitting the words "In the constant employ," and that the local marine boards, shipowners' associations, and chambers of commerce in the Tyne ports be requested to take such steps as they may deem advisable to support the action of the Committee."

"SUGGESTIONS."

Crimping.—This is probably the greatest curse attached to seafaring life. I am conversant with what the law has done in order to checkmate the evil, but I am also aware that so far legislation has barely scotched, far less crushed the iniquitous system.

I believe that the plan adopted by the Shipping Federation of bringing ships' officers and men into mutual contact at their registry offices, is one that is well calculated to ultimately inflict a crushing blow upon the nefarious practice of crimping.

There are other roads for improvement too, in the matter of granting licences only to respectable people as boarding-house keepers.

What we find by daily experience is that all sorts of characters secure these licences, and no matter how scandalously they conduct their business the licences are never revoked. There are men now carrying on boarding houses who have been convicted over and over again for offences under the Merchant Shipping Act; and yet no action is taken by the authorities in saving sailors ashore from the clutches of such harpies.

From the "Newcastle Evening Chronicle" of December 16th last, I extract the following instance of a boarding-house keeper's cupidity, and it will be noted that the bench merely made

Earl of Derby—continued.

an order for the defendant to pay costs an deliver up plaintiff's clothing, when to all intent and purposes defendant was guilty of swindlin and crimping.

"*Evening Chronicle,*

"December 16, 1891.

"CHARGE AGAINST A BOARDING-HOUSE
KEEPER.

"To day at the South Shields police court before the mayor and other magistrates, Thomas Bell, boarding-house keeper, was charged with refusing to give up a quantity of clothin belonging to a sailor named George Rickson Mr. T. D. Marshall prosecuted. The defendant produced a statement in which he alleged that the complainant was owing him money for board and lodgings. Mr. Marshall said that he had glanced at the statement just sufficiently to show that it was the usual statement made in cases of that kind, where sailors were alleged to be owing money. He should be able to prove that the statement was entirely false. The defendant had belonging to the complainant a quantity of clothes valued at 2l. 10s. Six weeks ago the defendant signed on board a ship, and was met by the complainant, who persuaded him not to go on that vessel, but to go to his house and he would get him another ship for America. Complainant remained at the house two weeks, and received an advance note for the ship which he did not proceed in and which the defendant got cashed and only gave the complainant 10s. He had two weeks' board at the house, which at 15s. per week would make altogether with the advance, 2l. Complainant afterwards proceeded in another vessel, and got an advance note for the vessel for 2l. 7s. 6d. which the defendant also secured. He left a quantity of clothing at the house, and when he returned from the voyage he went to the house for his clothes and was told they had been pawned, and was further told that he owed the defendant nothing. His clothes, which were worth 2l. 10s., were in the possession of the defendant, who refused to give them up. The bench made an order for the clothes to be given up and defendant to pay costs."

The establishment of sailors' homes at many ports has not had the beneficial results that were largely expected.

The real fact is, and there is no use of blinking or disguising it, sailors' homes are formed on too severely formal lines to become popular with the major portion of seamen ashore, who, it is well-known, are rather boisterous and free and easy in their habits and manner of living as long as the money holds out.

It seems a step in the wrong direction to advocate a laxity of discipline, or a slackening of the bonds of authority in sailors' homes, especially when I know that numbers of the best conducted men in the merchant service make these places their head-quarters; yet if sailors' homes are to entirely supersede the lower class of boarding houses, where crimping

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

is unblushingly carried on, then the homes must be run on more popular lines.

One reform which I would strongly suggest would be that some method should be attempted to avoid the necessity of turning an impecunious or improvident seaman out of the homes when his cash is exhausted. If, instead of being turned destitute into the streets, as sailors' homes have done, and are doing, the improvident sailor was packed off in a ship, then the faith of such men in sailors' homes would be greatly strengthened.

I have spoken to such men as these (and there are unfortunately a great many good seamen of this kind) and asked them why they chose to go to the dens of crimps with their eyes wide open to the consequences, when they could have a respectable boarding house or a decent room in a sailors' home for a moderate figure.

The invariable reply in such cases has been that if they made a mistake ashore and got through all their cash, bad as the crimp was, he would not turn them out like a dog in the streets, but would maintain them until he had found a ship for them.

So that in the estimation of a good number of seamen the one redeeming feature in the character of the crimp is, that he finds sailors a berth in time of pressing need, and for that service they are content to hand over to the crimp large portions of their hard-earned money when coming from vessels, and the whole of their advance notes (frequently a month's wages) when joining vessels.

It should not be an impossible task for those having the management of sailors' homes to devise some method of seeing sailors provided for until they are shipped. It should never be forgotten that the crimp, who frequently cannot afford to employ any staff of assistants, finds time to know when ships will be ready for sailing, and has his men planted accordingly. One feature of the crimping business is to deter seamen who have already signed articles from joining their vessels, so that the men in charge of the crimp may be employed at the last moment as substitutes. This is what is called in seafaring language having a "pier-head" jump, and as long as that system prevails it will be found practically impossible to purge the mercantile marine of 'loafers' and incompetent men.

The crimps are frequently assisted by delegates of the Seamen's Union in persuading men to back out of vessels after they have signed articles.

Notwithstanding the denunciations of crimping uttered by Mr. Wilson when before this Commission, I find that even he is not above suspicion in aiding and abetting crimps. I have no wish to hurt that gentleman's feelings by quoting from a shipowners' paper, but the following extract taken from his own choice organ, "Seafaring," of Saturday, September 14th, 1889, will bear out what I have been saying.

U 72739.

Earl of Derby—continued.

"EXTRACT FROM 'SEAFARING.'"

"At the Sunderland Police Court, September 6, 1889.

"The CASE of Mr. WILSON.

"The case against the general secretary was then proceeded with.

"Mr. W. M. Roche appeared to prosecute in this case, and Mr. Strachan again defended. The charge was that of attempting to persuade Thos. Carfrae, an A.B., to desert from the steamer 'Edmondsley' on the same date and under similar circumstances to those of the above case. The first witness, called Sullivan, said that he attended the meeting on the 25th of April. In reply to Mr. Strachan, witness said that Mr. Wilson was not present. He was therefore ordered to stand down. Thomas Carfrae deposed that he signed articles on the 26th of April. As he was going on board the vessel on the 27th, Wilson came up and asked him if he was going with the vessel. He said he was, but offered to stay ashore if the Union would sign an agreement to pay him 1*l.* per week, and take all consequences. Wilson replied, 'Do you think I am a fool?' Defendant tried to persuade him to leave, but he refused, and Wilson said that when he came back he would stop him from earning his bread. Cross-examined: Wilson did not speak to him in the presence of a man named Gibson. Wilson Orwin, second mate of the 'Edmondsley,' said that he saw Wilson speaking to Carfrae as he was going on board the vessel. He heard Carfrae ask for the 1*l.* per week, and Wilson said you are a nice Union man, referring to Carfrae. Wilson told defendant he had no right to interfere with the men who had signed articles. Wilson replied that that was a matter of opinion. Cross-examined by Mr. Strachan, witness said he never heard Wilson say anything about stopping Carfrae's bread. Mr. Strachan submitted that there was no case, the evidence not being any stronger than in that of the preceding one. He also submitted that it had not as yet been proved that the 'Edmondsley' was a British ship. Mr. Roche said that had not been called into question, and added that the articles proved the vessel to be a British one. After some further remarks, Mr. Strachan withdrew the objection, saying at the same time that he was perfectly justified and within his right in raising it. Subject to the three witnesses mentioned in the previous case his defence was closed.

"Mr. Roche asked that if there was to be an adjournment the names of the witnesses should be given to the magistrates' clerk. He would also apply for leave to bring further witnesses for his side if necessary. Mr. Strachan then said he would leave his case as it was. The Bench retired to consider their decision, and after a short absence returned into court and fined the defendant 5*l.* with 2*l.* 2*s.* costs for each summons and 5*s.* for each witness. Mr. Roche: I do not propose to go into the other case. The proceedings then concluded for the present, but the

E

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

Union will, we hear, appeal against the decision in Mr. Wilson's case."

Whilst advocating that sailors' homes should be conducted on more popular lines, to suit the boisterous temperament of "Jack ashore," I do not pretend to say that that only would be sufficient to abolish crimping.

The only effectual method to stamp out the system of seamen deserting and failing to join their vessels after signing would be to impose penalties upon the men themselves. Crimping may be restricted to a large extent by a modification of the plan upon which sailors' homes are run, but the men themselves should be taught, by the discipline of salutary legislation, that they cannot break their contracts with impunity.

At the present moment in my district I could quickly find a large number of seamen (mostly belonging to the Union) who haunt the approaches of the shipping offices, ostensibly looking for employment, but in reality waiting for an opportunity of signing articles, so that they may get an advance note to cash, and then make themselves scarce for a few days when they reappear at another shipping office.

I think the law should be so framed that men like these should be brought to summary justice, without any vexatious proceeding causing detention to ships by masters prosecuting. "Failure to join" should, in short, become a misdemeanour punishable by fine or even imprisonment, and then there would be an end of such disgraceful proceedings as is recorded in the Board of Trade inquiry at Sunderland on the 4th of this month into the stranding of the ship "Dominion," where it will be noted the initial cause of the disaster was "failure to join" by three men.

This is the case I speak of as recorded in the Shipping Gazette of 7th January inst., but as it occupies several columns of that paper I shall only ask to be allowed to give some extracts from the evidence of one A.B., the questions submitted by the solicitor to the Board of Trade, and the finding of the court.

"Frank Bear, able seaman, said he was engaged at Liverpool to join the 'Dominion.' When he with the others arrived at Sunderland Station they were taken to have some refreshment. He had some rum hot. When he got to the dock he went on board, and he and the others went to the fore-castle, where it was found they were seven short. He did not then commence work, and they told the Board of Trade officer they did not want to go to sea short-handed. The mate came to them about three-quarters of an hour after they went on board and asked them to turn to, but they told him they could not turn to without their clothes. It was raining at the time. The pilot also came and asked them to go on duty, but they refused to do so because they were still short-handed. At that time they had got their clothes. They went back to the fore-castle; and subsequently the overlooker came again, but they would not

Earl of Derby—continued.

go. The overlooker said he would go ashore and get more hands, but they declined to do duty because they felt they could not trust his word to get more. They did not think there were sufficient to work the ship. When the captain came to them afterwards and said he would give them a written guarantee to get more men, they turned out. This was between half-past twelve and one o'clock. This was not the first time the captain told them he would get more hands, but they did not believe him until he offered to give them a written guarantee. They never got the written guarantee. All they got was the promise. Before the men went to duty, the overlooker and the pilot came to say that the vessel was on a lee shore, and that they must come out to keep her from going ashore. They promised Mr. Williams that if he would promise to get more men they would come out, as they did not want the ship to go ashore any more than he did. The expression 'To — with the ship; let her go ashore' was used by a man named M'Gilroy after the men had left the fore-castle. When they went on board they were all sober and fit for duty. He thought all the while that the mate appeared to be drunk, but he had been told that it was only his way. He now thought he was not drunk.

"The first thing witness did after going on duty was to begin to set the fore-sail. Breakfast came in that morning about 9 o'clock in the fore-castle, and they made complaint to the overlooker that there was nothing to eat their breakfast with. One man went to the galley to get his breakfast, but no things were sent to the fore-castle with which to eat the breakfast, but he did not complain to the captain. The reason he had no breakfast was because he had nothing to eat it with.

"Mr. Burton here intimated that this was all the evidence he had to offer to the court, and submitted the following questions upon which he said the Board of Trade desired the opinion of the court:—1. Why does it appear in the agreement that 25 hands all told are to be considered the ship's full complement when the master had authority from the owner to engage 30 hands? 2. What was the necessity for engaging 16 hands at Liverpool, and for sending them by the night train from that port to Sunderland? 3. Was the vessel in a fit state to proceed to sea when she left that port? 4. Was there any undue haste in despatching her, and, if so, what was the necessity for it? 5. Were the men shipped at Liverpool fit for their work when they boarded the vessel? 6. Were the master and the overlooker both, or either of them, justified in sending the vessel to sea from Sunderland with the crew she had on board at the time she left? 7. Whether, when the master and two hands subsequently boarded the vessel, the men who shipped at Liverpool were justified in refusing duty? 8. Was every possible effort then made by the master to obtain additional hands? 9. Were proper and

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

sufficient measures taken by the master and officers to prevent the stranding of the vessel? 10. What was the cause of the stranding of the vessel? 11. Whether the master and officers are, or either of them is, in default, and whether blame attaches to the owner and his overlooker, or either of them? It was added that in the opinion of the Board of Trade the certificate of William Meredith, the master, should be dealt with.

"Captain Meredith, recalled and examined by Mr. Dickinson, denied that the remark that the vessel must go to sea was ever made. The ship was fit and ready for sea. Had he let go the anchors when the vessel was drifting it would have been no good.

"By Mr. Burton: I do not agree with the statement made that had the tug 'Angler' come to the ship's assistance she would have been kept out of danger.

"By Mr. Boning: The mate was quite sober.

"Judgment was delivered yesterday. The court found that the stranding was caused by the refusal of the men to do duty when the vessel was in stays during a wind which was increasing to a gale, and which was backing the vessel more and more to the westward. The court did not find the master, William Meredith, the officers, or the overlooker in default, but they held that the seamen were not justified in refusing duty."

"PICKETING SHOULD BE MADE ILLEGAL."

I have read speeches of prominent Trades Union leaders advocating that picketing should be freely recognised, and that no police interference should be tolerated against men who are merely "persuading" their fellow workmen to join in a strike by refusing to work.

Personally I have no objection whatever to workmen persuading one another, but even a liberty of that description can, and as a matter of fact is abused. The liberty to persuade should be confined to public meetings and canvassing at workmen's homes.

When persuasion is conducted at the gates of a factory or the doors of shipping offices, it too often degenerates into intimidation of the worst possible kind.

It is perfectly idle for Trades Union leaders or others to claim immunity for pickets on the ground that they only "persuade" men to refrain from work. Were this so, it would be found that the pickets engaged in strikes would be the most eloquent men in the Union. Instead of that it is well known by even casual on-lookers that these men are invariably the biggest, roughest, and most ferocious members of the societies. Their only qualification (which is absolutely essential) is a capacity for kicking and maltreating the unfortunate Non-Unionists who fall into their clutches.

I submit that a strike of any description should not be accompanied by such semi-military characters as pickets. When men voluntarily leave their work on account of grievances (real

Earl of Derby—continued.

or fancied), they give up all claim upon that work. Other men have surely as much right to accept work offered as the first party has to reject such work, and that being so, the system of picketing should be condemned as lawless.

I know it will be said that it is practically an impossible task to discover men in the act of picketing. What I ask is that no men should be allowed by the authorities to loiter in the vicinity of works or of shipping offices where strikes are in progress. The police should have power to arrest and proceed against such parties summarily, and benches of magistrates should have no option, but pass terms of imprisonment upon all such clearly proved offenders.

It would not be difficult for innocent people to prove their disinterestedness in the strike, but men actually concerned in the dispute would have to show what grounds they had for hanging about a place where they had refused the employment offered.

There would be no hardship in this, for surely the laws of the country cannot recognise as just a policy of "dog in the manger," which is briefly that of picketing. The men decline to work themselves and, through their pickets, deter others who are willing to work.

I could give many instances of picketing in my district at the Federation registry offices, but they are all so much alike that a short account of the general plan may be best.

At the time the Seamen's Union was opposing the issue of Federation tickets to seamen, from 2 to 50 Union men were employed daily standing at the doors of the registry offices in North and South Shields.

Every seaman who approached was stopped, and if he persisted in running the blockade, a system of jostling began, which usually ended in a crowd of people gathering, the victim getting severely handled, and no assailant identified.

The utmost the police could do with these pickets in the present state of the law was done, and that was to keep the fellows moving about a little, or else charge them with obstructing the thoroughfare. It is needless for me to add that such powers as these are of little use in preventing intimidation, which is the life and soul of the picketing system.

In conversation with the master of the S.S. "Trinidad," on January 6th last, I found that last summer, so strong was the picketing plan carried on at Newport, Mon., that it was highly dangerous for a free seaman to even attempt to enter the shipping offices at that port, owing to the continual presence of a rowdy element of Unionists.

Unless a man first secured the necessary Union card or permit, he had absolutely no chance of offering his services to any captain requiring men, and this too at a Government shipping office.

It was not the interference of seamen going to sea regularly that caused this, but the active doings of well-paid delegates and pickets of the Seamen's Union.

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

I consider such a state of things intolerable, and in order to stamp it out effectually, I ask this Commission to support my suggestion by recommending that picketing should be declared illegal.

“RECORD OF THE LATEST STRIKE IN THE TYNE DISTRICT.”

As bearing strongly on the remarks I have made with regard to picketing, the latest strike on the Tyne deserves to be cited before this Commission.

On the 14th of this month, the quay labourers at Newcastle employed in loading and discharging Messrs. Jas. Currie and Co.'s fleet of steamers trading between Newcastle and Leith, came out on strike.

So far as the firm of Messrs. Currie and Co. were concerned, the only reason advanced by the labourers was that they would not work under the new stevedore appointed because he was not a local man, and they alleged (though they knew nothing about him) that he was tyrannical.

On Thursday, the 14th the men refused to work at the “*Britannia*,” with the result that during the day the services of the Federation were called in.

I, that evening, engaged nearly 30 men at North Shields to begin work at the vessel on the following morning. This was at the local registry office, and during the very moment that I was explaining the position of affairs to these men, a delegate of the Seamen's Union was seen crawling up the passage way and eavesdropping at the window.

You may well conjecture what the fate of a Federation or free labour man would be if detected under similar circumstances at a gathering of Union labourers.

As it was, this delegate, a man named Brown, got away with a whole skin, and he testified his gratitude by going amongst the men and persuading a number of them not to go to the work.

Almost every day since the 14th I have sent local men, that is to say, men belonging to the Tyne District, to these vessels, every one of whom has promised earnestly that he meant to work.

With only few exceptions they have failed to redeem their promise, and I think this Commission ought to know, that the cause of that failure is terrorism by the Union.

I may be asked to prove this terrorism, and I reply that it is to be seen in the menacing looks, the threatening gestures, and the scurrilous taunts of the men on strike.

These men, instead of looking for other work in place of that which they have forsaken, haunt the whole of Newcastle Quay and gather in a crowd at the wharf, where the Leith boats are delivered.

I have sent members of my staff along with men to this wharf, and I have also within the last few days accompanied men there myself, and the experience of all is identical.

Earl of Derby—continued.

Either at one place or another as the parties approach the wharf, some if not all of the labourers—hitherto brimful of confidence—suddenly halt, hesitate a moment, and then in many cases terror-stricken, declare they will go no further.

Sometimes the cause of this is a strong word from a burly picket, who appears to be backed up by a few rowdies; at other times the terror is caused by a voice shouting from a crowd in a significant tone “You——blacklegs had better go home, before you are carried there.”

In this strike there is no question of wages or hours involved. I suppose it is what is called a sympathetic strike, the object of sympathy being of course the discharged stevedores, who, as a matter of fact, has nothing at all in common with the men.

I may add that we have broken the back of this foolish strike by getting men from other districts to gladly accept the employment, and the vessels are now being loaded and discharged with the utmost regularity.

What I most particularly wish to draw the attention of this Commission to, is that terrorism, and not persuasion, is the sheet-anchor of picketing during strikes. It cannot be expected to recommend that it should be a legal offence to look at a man unkindly or harshly, or that even threatening gestures should be made criminal. I do not ask that.

I ask simply that men on strike be prohibited from patrolling in the vicinity of works, wharves, shipping offices, or other places where men who are willing to work may be employed.

It is not that I fear the persuasion used by these patrollers or pickets.

Their arguments are alike in all cases, in unjustifiable as well as in justifiable strikes.

The argument is a threat nine times in every ten, and where it is not a threat, it fails nine times in every ten.

Here is an instance of only last week's occurrence.

Mr. W. Stanley, General and Organising Secretary of the Tyneside and National Labour Union, was, on the 15th inst., doing duty as picket.

I take it that a man like Mr. Stanley, holding a responsible position, would have sense enough to carry on picket duty without overstepping the law.

Well, that is precisely what he did do, and his efforts in this instance were a complete failure.

A man named Charles Geddes was being escorted to the Leith Wharf by two of my staff.

He had been informed that there was a strike, and after getting the facts, had asked for employment.

Mr. Stanley met the man on the road, and in the presence of the Federation officials offered him as much money for lying idle as he could get by working.

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

When Geddes pressed to know how long Stanley would continue his payments, the latter replied "he would pay him as long and as well as the shipowners," and as if to convince Geddes, that he (Stanley) was a genuine paymaster, he rattled his loose cash, and described the Federation officials as "pirates."

In the meantime the party had reached the wharf, without further interference from pickets, the presence of Stanley, of course, acting as a sort of guarantee that all was well.

Arrived at the wharf, and under the protection of police, Geddes quietly said he had come for the purpose of working, and thereupon walked on board the ship.

I am glad to further report that Captain Nelson, who acted as overlooker of the work, states that Geddes was a thoroughly good man.

Now that is an instance of extravagant promises by the leading man of what is called a Trades Union, to a poor workman, asking him to abstain from work, having ended in smoke.

The persuasion of the most able man in the Union had less effect upon Geddes than would the ugly frown of one of the commonest of the pickets.

I feel thoroughly convinced that a cruel hardship is inflicted upon thousands of willing and deserving workmen in this country every year by the so-called "persuasive" tactics of organised pickets, and I see no better remedy for the evil than giving ample power to the police to summarily disperse all bodies of men congregated near where a dispute is, and to arrest those who either singly, or in concert with others, patrol the streets or docks, with the object of interfering with, or preventing, the supply of labour reaching the demand of employers.

"SUGGESTIONS for the COLLECTION of STATISTICAL INFORMATION RELATIVE to STRIKES."

Strikes are so far-reaching in their consequences and disastrous to the general interests of the community, that I quite endorse the policy of having a Government Department collecting and publishing trustworthy statistics relative to their origin, development and effects.

I am aware that Mr. Burnett, of the Labour Department, is doing his best to accumulate reliable information from Trades Unions on these points, and I produce an interesting schedule of questions which that gentleman addressed to the officials of Trades Unions on the subject of strikes in which they are engaged.

Upon this schedule I have added in pen and ink two additional questions, which, if answered, I think would enhance the value of the information so acquired.

The first question is "Give a brief and succinct account of the efforts (if any) that were put forth by the Union, to obviate or prevent strikes."

That information, if supplied, would go far on the way of saddling the right party with the responsibility of precipitating the strike.

Earl of Derby—continued.

The other question I would suggest to add is, "How many of the men affected actually voted "in favour of the strike, and was the vote taken "by ballot or otherwise?"

The need of accurate information in regard to this query in strikes upon land is self-evident, but in the shipping industry it is of even more significance.

As an instance, let me quote the late strike in Cardiff.

A steamer, say, arrives with a crew who have been absent from England for several months. On their way to the shipping office to be paid off, and in some cases resigned on articles, they are intercepted by pickets and delegates of the Union, who inform them that a strike is in progress, and that they will be "scabs," "black-legs," or some other flowery, unmentionable word, if they sign on articles again.

The men naturally enough ask the cause of the strike, and are informed by one picket that it is not a question of wages. Another picket says, that it is because the Federation wants to smash the Union, whilst a third one declares with more truth that it is owing to the Union being anxious to knock the Federation out of time.

There is still another picket who remarks that the whole strike is because of the Federation going to have Mr. Wilson locked up.

I have heard all these reasons myself for the Cardiff strike, and it is but natural that a crew coming from abroad should be amazed and confused by the stories told to them by the pickets.

The reproach of "scab" and "blackleg" very freely used by Unionists has usually all the desired effect, and "Jack ashore" generally finds that he cannot endure these epithets.

I would also suggest that a similar set of questions should be addressed to the employers who are concerned in trade disputes, so that both sides of the question should be fairly heard, and that the employers' answers should be published side by side with those of the men on strike.

It would be too much to expect that Mr. Burnett should be held responsible for this additional work, and I might throw out the suggestion that a coadjutor should be appointed at what would be a sort of Labour and Capital Department of a Government Office.

Finally, as these returns from employers and employed, when tabulated and published by Government, would be important statistical information well calculated to influence public opinion, I would recommend that it be made compulsory on the part of the Trade Union secretaries and employers to send in accurate information.

At present I understand Trade Union secretaries do not methodically and fully fill up the schedules that Mr. Burnett issues, whilst in some instances I have heard they make no reply whatever.

26 January 1892.]

Mr. J. MORRISON.

[Continued]

Earl of Derby—continued.

It would therefore be necessary to impose a penalty upon those who refuse the desired information, especially when a Government

Earl of Derby—continued.

Department undertook the work of publishing such returns for the good of the general community.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. JOHN HERON WILSON called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

11,542. You are a shipowner?—I am.

11,543. Do you represent the Shipping Federation of Cardiff?—I represent the Shipping Federation of Cardiff. I shall wish, my Lord, with your permission, before entering into details which I wish to enter into, to say something with regard to the sufferings and hardships and losses sustained by shipowners frequenting the port of Cardiff, during a part of 1890 and a part of 1891, in consequence of the peculiar tactics of Trades Unionism, and especially the actions of what is called the Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union of Great Britain and Ireland.

11,544. Are you chairman of the Cardiff Pilotage Board?—I am.

11,545. And also of the Cardiff Local Marine Board?—I am.

11,546. Have you long resided in Cardiff?—Thirty-four years. I have been a shipowner during all that time, and previous to that.

11,547. So that you may claim to be intimately acquainted with the local conditions of the shipping business?—I think so.

11,548. You wish to tell us something about the trouble arising out of the strike at Cardiff?—I may state that there was a good deal of trouble caused to employers of labour, not only at the railways coming into Cardiff, but at the docks in Cardiff, and to shipowners, by the united action of several Trades Unions. At that time, which was about the beginning of August 1890, a representation was made to the Cardiff Chamber of Commerce to consider whether a Board of Conciliation could not be formed, by which some of these matters might be arranged, and the great disorganisation which existed at that time in trade be remedied by that Board of Conciliation. This Board of Conciliation was duly appointed, and after about three months' negotiation with the different Trades Unions on the part of the employers of labour in the port of Cardiff, they found that it was utterly impossible to form a Board of Conciliation unless they would agree that that Board of Conciliation should be formed entirely of Unionists. The Trades Council of Cardiff, which represented the Trades Unions of the district, distinctly refused to take any part in the formation of a Board of Conciliation unless that board was formed of Unionists only. I may read a short letter which was sent by the committee to the Trades Council of Cardiff, representing Trades Unionism, asking them distinctly to state whether they would or not. It is dated 7th of November 1890: "Dear Sir, referring to the meeting on the 14th ultimo, wherein you

Earl of Derby—continued.

were good enough to promise that you would group the different trades with the view to assist my committee in their efforts to form a Board of Conciliation which would be satisfactory to all concerned, I shall feel obliged if you will let me have this at your earliest possible convenience, seeing that as little time as possible should be lost in such a cause. Yours faithfully, W. L. Hawkins. To Mr. T. Davies, Esq., Chairman, Trades Council." The following day Mr. Hawkins again wrote Mr. T. Davies: "Dear Sir, my letter of yesterday's date was this morning brought under the notice of the president of the Chamber of Commerce, and he points out that it is referred back to the Trades Council. The other question arose out of the determination of the Trades Council, which you communicated to my committee, to be no parties to the formation of a board unless all members were Trades Unionists, and elected by the Trades Council. My committee asked you to reconsider this matter, and it was arranged that the Trades Council should be called together on the following Thursday to decide whether they would agree to the election of the representatives by the various bodies of workmen, including Unionists affiliated to the Trades Council, other Unionists and Non-Unionists. Yours faithfully, W. L. Hawkins. Then the answer which the committee of the Chamber of Commerce received was this: "Cardiff Trades Council, 13, Mark Street, Cardiff, November 15, 1890. Dear Sir, I am desired to inform you that the Council, having fully considered the question of the formation of a Conciliation Board, have finally decided not to take any part in such a Board which would be composed of Unionists and Non-Unionists, as they feel they cannot condescend to that principle. I remain, yours faithfully, J. Richards, Secretary." So that all attempts on the part of the committee of the Cardiff Chamber of Commerce to form a Conciliatory Board were defeated by the Trades Unionists themselves through their Cardiff Trades Council. I only mention that as a reason why I think from that moment, a most determined attack was made by the Seamen and Firemen's Union, represented by Mr. Wilson, upon the shipowners which was really the first action that was taken against any large body of owners employing labour. On the 6th of August the Cardiff shipowners held a meeting. That was about the same time that this committee was formed of the Chamber of Commerce. They passed at that time the following resolution: "That thi

26 January 1892.]

Mr. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

" Association binds itself to use all legitimate means to preserve for employers the right of free labour. That the shipowners of the United Kingdom be requested to support this Association by keeping their vessels away from the port during disputes, and that the thanks of this Association be tendered to the directors of the local docks and railways for the firm stand they are making." That was in favour of the rights of labour. Immediately that resolution was passed it appeared in the newspapers, and the following day we received this telegram, dated August 7th: "Shipowners' Association, Cardiff. We take your threat, which appears in to-day's paper, as a declaration of war, and give you notice we will stop all Cardiff vessels from getting men in any port United Kingdom.—Wilson, Sailors' Union, Buckingham Street, Strand, London." That was the threat we received from the Seamen and Firemen's Union, through their agent, Mr. Wilson; in consequence of that resolution that we passed to support free labour. From that time we seriously considered the propriety of forming a federation of shipowners for self-protection and defence. The Shipping Federation was entirely formed for defence against the attacks made upon shipowners by Trade Unionism. It has been said in evidence here that the Seamen and Firemen's Union, and Mr. Wilson, the leader of that Union, and, I believe, the originator of that Union, never threatened sailors, and never blocked the shipping offices, nor prevented men from taking service on board ship, and that he had always failed to do so. I think the proper way will be to say cases of intimidation and blocking and assaults on the shipping offices became frequent immediately after this. Mr. Hawkins, the secretary of the Cardiff Branch of the Federation, sent the following letter to Mr. Turner, the secretary of the Local Marine Board, dated the 13th of January 1891:—"Dear Sir. I am given to understand from our out-door men that a good deal of intimidation on the part of Wilson's men goes on at Penarth. Two men who were to have sailed in the 'Crimea,' upon going to the shipping office to sign, were interfered with to such an extent that they went to the captain and asked him to return their discharges as they were afraid. I trust you will take the necessary steps to remedy this, and oblige, yours faithfully, W. L. Hawkins." Now I have here a list of cases which will show that not only was an attack made and intimidation practised, but that all means possible were used to prevent sailors in Cardiff from joining their ships or from signing articles to join ships. The consequences of all that was that we had to take some further action, which I shall recite in a minute. These cases I have had stated as shortly as possible, so as not to take up much time, and if you will allow me to read them over, I think they will very clearly show the course of action of the Seamen and Firemen's Union at that time.

Mr. Tait.

11,549. Are the facts you are going to state within your own knowledge?—They are facts derived from official information.

11,550. Not within your own knowledge?—Some of them are within my own knowledge.

11,551. Will you kindly detail those which are within your own knowledge?—I will detail those which I have from official sources first, and then I will detail those which have come within my own knowledge.

Mr. Bolton.

11,552. What do you mean by official sources?—I am chairman of the Local Marine Board, and I have received them from the Local Marine Board offices, and they are taken from their report book, and I can guarantee that proof confirmatory can be given. The first was on February 28th, 1890, and George Tucker was the delegate. At 10 a.m. stood at entrance to shipping office yard, and was preventing men (seamen and firemen) from entering, unless they could show Union cards; he was afterwards removed by dock police. April 3rd. George Tucker, delegate. Several times during the day calling all the men into the side entrance and lane, causing great obstruction. The dock police had great difficulty in keeping a thoroughfare. April 24th. George Tucker, delegate. Called all the men out of the yard because an engineer was there selecting some firemen. Lane and entrance to the shipping office greatly obstructed. May 19. George Tucker, delegate. Called all the Union men out of the yard, because the S.S. "Sarah Radcliff" was engaging Non-Unionists. He was also urging the men to mob some of the men who had signed; several were assaulted, and were eventually rescued by Sergeant Damm of the town police. May 20. George Tucker, delegate. Standing at the entrance to shipping office and preventing Non-Union men from entering, and threatening them with violence if they went in. He was arrested by town police, but chief constable refused to detain him. June 9. George Tucker and William Courtenay, delegates. Standing at the entrance to shipping office and preventing seamen and firemen from entering unless they could show their Union cards. June 12, 1890. William Courtenay and George Tucker, delegates. The chief mate of the S.S. "Brenner" complained that he was prevented from entering the yard of the shipping office before telling them all his business. A Mr. Williams (master) complained of being prevented from coming into the yard to seek employment. November 4. J. H. Wilson, secretary of Union. All the men called out from the yard into the lane to hear Mr. Wilson speak to them; the thoroughfare was completely blocked for some time. Wilson was ordered away by the town police. November 20. J. H. Wilson, secretary of Union. Mr. Wilson again speaking to the men; great obstruction; thoroughfare impassable. He was again ordered away by town police; over 100 persons there present. January 19, 1891. F. Hallock, delegate. A seaman named Hans Olsen was pre-

26 January 1892.]

Mr. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued

Mr. Bolton—continued.

vented from going into the yard, his Union card and Federation ticket were taken from him (from his pocket). January 19. William Courtenay, delegate. Took a Union card and Federation ticket from a seaman in the lane; great excitement and obstruction. The man had to run to escape violence from the mob. I may state that during two or three months the mob was continually, morning and evening, surrounding the shipping offices in Cardiff. On February 2nd. William Courtenay, delegate. Three men, Non-Unionists, prevented from coming into yard to sign articles in "The Linnet." January 26. William Courtenay, delegate. Called all the men out of the yard because the S.S. "White Jacket" was signing articles; great obstruction; entrance blocked. January 28. William Courtenay, delegate. Called all the men out of the yard because the S.S. "Portugalete" was taking Federation men; great disturbance and excitement; Superintendent Tamplin had to come from town to clear the entrance, and prevent violence; a crowd of about 300 or 400 persons present; police superintendent and staff hooted and threatened. February 2nd. William Courtenay, delegate. All men called out of yard because men were being selected to be taken on board to sign articles in the S.S. "Straits of Gibraltar;" lane greatly obstructed. February 3. William Courtenay, delegate. All men called out of the yard causing great obstruction in the lane and entrance to yard. February 10. John Gardner, delegate and secretary. Called all the men out of the yard and took them away with him. February 11. F. Hallock, delegate. Called all the men out of the yard, causing great obstruction in lane and entrance to yard. February 13. F. Hallock, delegate, and William Courtenay and Mr. Wilson, delegates and secretaries. The men were called out of the yard several times, causing great obstruction in the lane and entrance to the yard. This occurred whenever a vessel was going to sign articles, so that the officers would be compelled to go to the delegates for men. March 17. William Courtenay, delegate. Blew a whistle for all the men to come out of the yard to hear Mr. Wilson, who advised the men not to sign with Non-Unionists. The lane was greatly obstructed; over 100 persons present. April 1. J. H. Wilson, secretary, and F. Hallock, delegate. Called all the men out of the yard, causing the lane and entrance to yard to be completely blocked. August 11. F. Hallock, Union delegate. Called out to the men not to sign under 5*l*. per month, and to come to the gates and not to stand by the selecting counter, which they did, completely blocking the entrance. Then October 8. F. Hallock, Union delegate. Persuading the men not to sign articles in the S.S. "Fairfield;" a great number of Unionists watching all entrances, and the men, after signing articles, had to be escorted away by policemen. April 19th, 1890. John Gardner, secretary, and William Courtenay, delegate. A large crowd of Unionists outside the shipping

Mr. Bolton—continued.

office during the evening, waiting to molest the crew of the S.S. "Brankelow" who were coming from Liverpool, and to escape the mob, the men signed articles at the railway station, and were taken to Penarth pier in brakes, thence by tug boat to the vessel. Gardner tried to interfere with the men at the station, but was prevented by the master. Assaults. February. John Harrison, Union delegate. At Penarth police court for attempting to persuade crew to desert at sailing from Barry.—Acquitted. February 2. William Courtenay, Union delegate. Violently assaulting a steward named Thomas, knocking his teeth out, &c. as he was leaving the shipping office after signing articles in S.S. "Elsie" because he refused to join the Union; prosecutor proceeded to sea, could not proceed with case. That is frequent matter. These men who are attacked are on the point of going to sea with the ship and they cannot necessarily stay on shore to prosecute. April 16. William Courtenay, delegate. Arrested on a warrant for a violent assault on a seaman named H. Dunn, at the entrance to the shipping office yard. At Cardiff police court he was fined 2*l*. and costs. May 2. George Tucker, Union delegate. Arrested by town police for causing obstruction, and preventing seamen from entering mercantile marine offices yard; superintendent of police declined to detain him. May 28. William Courtenay, Union delegate. Causing obstruction, and preventing seamen from entering marine offices to seek employment. June 3. Ralph Goldin, Union delegate. Hindering and preventing seaman named Alexander Likus from entering Penarth mercantile marine offices to sign articles. The Board of Trade cautioned Mr. J. H. Wilson, secretary of the National Associated Seamen and Firemen's Union, that if his delegates did not discontinue the practice of interference at mercantile marine offices they would institute proceedings against them. June 3. J. Harrison, Union delegate. Adolphus Weierstrom was compelled by threats and intimidation to leave the S.S. "Hessle" in Penarth Dock, losing his clothes and 12*l*. Mr. Vache, solicitor, advised the Board of Trade that the evidence was not conclusive. June 16. J. Harrison, Union delegate. George Ward, fireman, complained in writing that he was prevented by Harrison from proceeding to sea on the steamer "Minerva" from Barry Dock. June 16. William Courtenay, Union delegate. Herman Antonio, fireman, made a statement complaining of having been threatened, intimidated, and assaulted, and prevented from joining the S.S. "Munroc," after signing articles and articles, by William Courtenay. September 2. William Courtenay, Union delegate. Threatening the master of the S.S. "Ivanhoe" that he would take all the crew out of the ship if he did not engage an engineer's steward. December 14. William Courtenay and J. Courtenay, Union delegates. Violently assaulting Captain Smith, overlooker, at Great Western Railway station, and preventing him taking a seaman on board ship. At Cardiff police court they were

26 January 1892.]

Mr. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

fined 5*l.* each, or in default one month's imprisonment. February 3. William Courtenay and J. Harrison, Union delegates. Causing obstruction at entrance to yard; served with summons, but not proceeded with. February 3. William Courtenay, Union delegate. For assault and intimidation at the Cardiff quarter sessions he was sentenced to nine days hard labour. Those are cases of assaults and intimidation, which I am obliged to you for having allowed me to read.

(The Duke of Devonshire here took the chair.)

Mr. Tait.

11,553. Are those cases which have come under your cognizance?—No. There are two or three special cases which will go perhaps more clearly to show the peculiar action of the Seamen and Firemen's Union in case of ships which they stop going to sea. In the case of "George A. Booth," S.S. This vessel was at Newport, July 12, 1890. She went under tip at 6 a.m. The tippers would not lower shoots owing to foreign crew being on board. I am reading this to show that at that time the Dockers' Union and the Sailors and Firemen's Union and other Trade Unions were combining to assist the Sailors and Firemen's Union in gaining their object by preventing shipowners taking any but Union men if possible. The tippers would not lower shoots owing to foreign crew being on board considered by Sailors and Firemen's Union to be blacklegs. She put a little coal in, and after numerous delays stopped on the 15th July after shipping about 490 tons in all. The whole of the dock men, shippers and trimmers, then refused work. Eventually the shipowner was compelled to pay off his crew, take a Union crew and pay higher wages to enable him to get his ship loaded and off to sea. This was in consequence of all the Unions connected with the labour of the place uniting and stopping work until the demands of the Seamen and Firemen's Union were complied with. This is a case in which I received evidence from the very people who were agents for the ship and the colliery, proprietors who engaged the men that stopped work, and I can vouch for the correctness of it, and can bring evidence forward if required to prove its truth. There was another peculiar case, a ship called the "Tasso" of London, February 1891, discharged at Antwerp and took cargo and shipped crew there for River Plate, intending to take bunker coals at Barry Docks. Left Antwerp for Barry, and, upon arriving at Barry went under a tip to receive 800 tons of bunker coal. After getting 200 tons on board, the tippers refused to tip any more as the crew were foreigners, and captain was required to pay them off, obtain a Unionist crew and sign on articles at a higher rate of wage than he had got his men at Antwerp. This the captain refused to do, and left Barry with the 200 tons on board. As he was expected to call at Falmouth for balance of bunkers, the agents of the Union

U 72739.

Mr. Tait—continued.

wired their agents there to block her, and eventually the "Tasso" proceeded to Las Palmas and bunkered there. Then another case is the "Rougemont's" case. She arrived at Newport, January 31st, 1891, and began and continued to discharge; on the 4th February work stopped, the labourers saying that the captain intended to ship Non-Union men. They remained idle till 10th February, when the labourers returned and finished discharging. The ship then having to move to Alexandra Dock, the foreman of the shifting gang said that his Union had ordered him not to touch her. They got another man to find hands for shifting, but when they approached they were pelted with stones and pieces of ore, and compelled to retreat. The captain, mate, overlooker, and owners' clerks, then took her to dock, but charterers said that the hoist men and trimmers refused to work at her. She was then manned by men from Cardiff, and taken there to load. She could not get her coals at all at Newport, on account of the amalgamation of the Unions. Then, my Lord, is the case called the "Glen Gelder" case, and this I am going to mention now. I mention it specially, because in Mr. Wilson's evidence he states, in answer to Question 10,126 of his evidence, that the old captain and the old crew remained by the "Glen Gelder." The "Glen Gelder's" case was this. She had a crew of six firemen, five A.B.s, and one ordinary seaman. She left Cardiff for Brazil and was run into and beached near Barry on 17th December 1890. On December 20th all the crew left or were discharged. The vessel was then taken to Cardiff for repairs, which were proceeded with during January 1891. A new captain joined the ship at Cardiff about the end of January 1891, and a new crew were engaged and signed articles at Cardiff on the 3rd February 1891, and went at once on board, and remained on board doing their duty till the ship finally sailed on 13th February 1891. (That ship was the beginning of the Cardiff strike, which seemed to flourish for about two or three days, and then collapsed very suddenly.) The tippers stopped the working of the ship's coals at 1 p.m. On the 3rd of February 1891 Mr. Orbel, of the Dockers' Union, came down and told the tippers to take up the shoots, that the crew on board were scabs, and they must not therefore touch her or do any work to her. All her crew were Non-Union men, and most, if not all, had Federation tickets. No officer of the Shipowners' Federation told the men they were to take the Federation ticket. On the 5th February 1891 a general strike of all the men at the docks took place. They followed the example of those men working on board the "Glen Gelder," and because Non-Unionists were at work on the "Glen Gelder" the whole of the Bute Docks were stopped working. The whole of the tippers and trimmers, and everyone else connected with the loading of the ships, stopped work, and a block of a very serious kind took place. The ships were detained for some days, and a great deal of loss was necessarily sustained by the owners,

F

26 January 1892.]

Mr. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

and a great deal of disorganisation took place. All this time while this strike was going on at the docks the Sailors and Firemen's Union held their procession daily through the streets of Cardiff, causing immense confusion and disorder in the town. I may as well state that the Bute Docks strike began at 6 o'clock on the morning of the 5th of February at all the tips, but in 14 days afterwards all the tips were at work again with free labour. The Dock Company acted very promptly. The merchants and shipowners and shipbrokers of the port volunteered their services. All the clerks expressed themselves as willing to work, but the Dock Company said, "Thank you, gentlemen; we do not require your assistance, because we think we shall be able to get free labour ourselves, and that the men who have been foolish enough to follow the advice of the Sailors and Firemen's Union will lose their situations." The Dock Company got men—free labour—and in the course of 14 days the docks were at full work again. The matter went on, but from the collapse of the dock strike a great change took place with regard to the action of the Sailors and Firemen's Union, and the shipowners began to get their crews more easily, and found that the obstruction was not so great at the dock office, and things began to tone down. I may state shortly—I will not enter into it fully—that during that time, or about that time, I think it was the 9th of March, Mr. Wilson requested an interview with the Shipping Federation, Cardiff branch. The Shipping Federation, Cardiff branch, said they would be very happy to see him. He called at the Federation office and had a very long interview, and said a good deal at that interview.

11,554. With whom was the interview?—With the Shipping Federation of Cardiff.

11,555. That is with the whole of the committee, or with the officers of the committee?—With the committee of the Shipping Federation in Cardiff; that is the Bristol Channel branch of the Federation. At that interview he said he had come to discuss matters, and the Federation said: "Well, what do you wish to discuss?" He replied: "I wish to see if we can come to some bargain with regard to cessation of hostilities." "Well," the Shipping Federation said, "we cannot enter into that subject at all with you, Mr. Wilson, unless you first withdraw your pickets and stop blocking the shipping offices at Cardiff. When you withdraw your pickets and your intimidation and your blocking of the shipping office, we can then talk about any other matter you wish to bring forward." "Well," Mr. Wilson said, "that will not do; we are not defeated yet, but we want to hoist the flag of truce if possible, but the flag of truce cannot be hoisted on one side; it must be hoisted on both sides; and if you will withdraw your Federation ticket, which we consider a degrading thing to take, we will withdraw our pickets and intimidation." Of course we could not do that, and we said we could not do

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

it. We did not intend to withdraw our Federation tickets, and we pointed out to Mr. Wilson as strongly as we could, that the Federation ticket, instead of being a badge of tyranny or slavery, as he termed it, was simply an undertaking by the man who took it that he would perform his duty, that he would go to sea in the ship on which he had signed articles, whether that ship contained Non-Unionists or Unionists; that there was nothing to prevent him being a Unionist, and that all he was required to do by taking the ticket was to give a promise that he would go to sea in the ship he signed articles with, and perform his duty according to the Merchant Shipping Act. We asked Mr. Wilson how he could consider that to be a badge of slavery. Well, he did not say much to that but the meeting was closed simply in that way. Mr. Wilson would do nothing, and the Federation would not withdraw their ticket. So that that meeting ended, no benefit accruing to anyone. From that time the men who held Union tickets began gradually to come in and ask for Federation tickets, and I may say that at the present moment large numbers of men are taking the Federation ticket (the paper ticket) who are also holders of the Unionist tickets. That I speak to as a fact from my own personal knowledge. We have now issued altogether in Cardiff about 10,000 Federation tickets—7,000 and odd paper tickets, and 3,000 and odd parchment tickets. The parchment tickets are different from the paper tickets. The paper tickets cost the sailor nothing. Anyone can get them who can show regular discharges, and show by those discharges that he is a competent sailor; having served a certain time at sea. That is all that the paper ticket shows, and it costs nothing. Any man can take it who shows his qualification, but he must present himself at the Federation office, and let his discharge be seen by the shipping master there. The parchment ticket is a different matter. A man must have served four years at sea in a British ship, show good discharges, and prove himself to be a competent sailor. Then he must pay 1s. for the parchment ticket, which is not like a mere piece of paper, but which costs something to manufacture. Then after he has held a parchment ticket for six months, showing good discharges, and doing his duty well, carrying out his articles, he has the advantage of being on the benefit fund, which is a fund giving him certain sums of money in case of accident, and in case of death a certain substantial sum. These tickets cost him nothing except just the shilling for registration. The shilling is not charged as an annual fee or as a weekly fee, but it is simply a charge for registering him as the holder of the parchment ticket. The ticket must be renewed every six months, according to the rules of the Federation, which simply means continuous discharge.

Mr. *Bolton*.

11,556. Is there any payment on renewal?—Sixpence is charged at every renewal of the

26 January 1892.]

Mr. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

registration. I should like, however, to speak to what is actually existing now in Cardiff because the inconvenience and loss to shipowners is still considerable. There is a case here I have called the "Syria" case. It is a case of a ship which I had myself, and that case, I think, shows the most arbitrary action on the part of the Sailors and Firemen's Union. This case occurred only on the 11th of December 1891. I wanted four men to fill up the crew of a ship that I had lying at Barry Dock. I got the men from the Shipping Federation office, and they sent them under the conduct of a man whom I personally knew to be a most respectable man. He is a foreigner, and his name is Andrew Macri. I sent four men to fill up under charge of Andrew Macri. The captain met them at the station and examined discharges, and proceeded to shipping office to sign articles. During the time the men were in the shipping office, two of Wilson's Union delegates (one named Morris with badge in cap) came and told Macri that he had no business to bring the men to Barry, the "Syria" being a Union steamer, and that if they did not join the Union, they should not be allowed to go on board the "Syria." I may state that the "Syria," instead of being a Unionist steamer, is really a Federation steamer, and the owners are subscribers and have their vessels entered in the Shipping Federation. Two of the men who had then signed articles came out of the shipping office, and were at once confronted by the delegates using all sorts of threats and asserting that unless they joined their Union they should not go to sea in the "Syria" or any other ship. The men being frightened and forced, then took the Union card and book of rules, and were compelled also to pay 5s. 6d. each man. The delegate said the subscription they ought to pay was 10s. 6d. They paid 5s. 6d. then and they were credited in the book with only 4s. 6d., the other shilling going, I believe, in the delegate's pocket. That at least was the common report. They only got credit for 4s. 6d., although they paid 5s. 6d. They got two tickets and two books given to them. Then Mr. Macri says, "I firmly believe they would have been used badly if they had refused to do so." I have here Mr. Macri's original deposition. Now, perhaps I shall be allowed to refer to some questions which I have got numbered here in the examination of Mr. Wilson, the secretary of the Sailors and Firemen's Union. I will refer first to Question 9313 in answer to which he says that their Union never assaulted seamen. Now, in reply to that, I may refer to the cases which I have already read to the Commission. In answer to Question 9983 he says, his Union has increased wages of sailors to the extent of 3,000,000l. since September 1887. Now, I emphatically deny that any action of the Sailors and Firemen's Union has increased wages. Wages in 1888, and not till then, began gradually to get up, in consequence of the great improvement in the shipping trade. 1888 and 1889 were two of the best years we have had for a very great period of

Mr. Bolton—continued.

time. Previous to that wages were low, but in 1888 they began to get up. I have here an official statement as to the wages paid during those years. First in 1885 the wages were very low. The wages for A.B.'s. from January to April 1885 were 3l. 10s., and for firemen 3l. 15s. In May 1885, the wages for A.B.'s were 3l. 10s., and for firemen 4l. From June to December 1885, wages of A.B.'s were 3l. 10s., and of firemen 3l. 15s. That was before Wilson's Union was formed. In 1886, also before Wilson's Union was formed, in January and February, the wages of A.B.'s were 3l. 10s., and of firemen 3l. 15s. From March to December of 1886 they fell a little. They were 3l. 5s. for A.B.'s, and 3l. 10s. for firemen. That was a very bad year especially the latter part of it. In 1887 they were 3l. 10s. for A.B.'s, and 3l. 15s. for firemen. In 1888 they began to improve slowly, and they were from January to November 1888, 3l. 10s. for A.B.'s, and 3l. 15s. for firemen. Then during November and December they were 4l. for A.B.'s, and 4l. 5s. for firemen. In 1889 the shipping trade began to be very good indeed. In fact it began to be very good in January 1888, but in 1889 it was still better, and the wages rose to 4l. 10s. for A.B.'s, and 4l. 15s. for firemen. In 1889 the wages were also 4l. 10s. for A.B.'s, and 4l. 15s. for firemen. Now, that is from an official record kept at the Local Marine Board, Cardiff, and for the authenticity of which I can vouch, or give proof if needed. The increase in wages may be attributed, I think, and can only be attributed, to the improvement in trade and to the natural fluctuation of supply and demand of the men. A large number of vessels came out in 1888 and 1889, and men were required, and wages rose, and freights were good. Then in answer to question 9923, Mr. Wilson answers in this way. He says, "Hundreds of Federation tickets have been given to men who never produced one discharge." I beg to state that that is not the case, and that in all cases before a Federation ticket is given, men's discharges are required except in the case of boys. If a boy is likely to make a good sailor he is given a paper ticket.

Duke of Devonshire.

11,557. Who is entitled to issue these tickets?—The secretaries of the different branches of Shipping Federation at different ports of the United Kingdom are authorised to give these tickets when applied to at the offices by sailors.

11,558. It would be the duty of such officer to see the discharge before he gave the tickets?—The secretaries are always assisted by practical captains who act as registrars.

11,559. And it would be their duty to see the man's discharge before he was given a ticket?—Just so. All care is taken upon that point. I say, in reply to Mr. Wilson on that matter, that no Federation tickets have been given to men unless they produce their discharges, and have been examined by the registrars. Then in answer to Questions 10,093 and 11,094 Mr. Wilson says, "Delegates never stopped Non-Unionists

26 January 1892.]

Mr. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

at shipping offices." I can only refer again to numerous cases I have mentioned—cases which clearly show that the delegates were continually stopping Non-Unionists at the shipping offices. Then there is rather an important matter which has touched the feelings of the shipowners in Cardiff, and I suppose in other parts of the United Kingdom, very much. In answer to Question 10,224 Mr. Wilson says, "Owners have never done anything for the families of crews 'drowned.'" Now I may say that, on the contrary, I never knew a case where the shipowners did not head the subscription lists to a very considerable extent for the benefit of the widows and orphan children of the men lost. They make a regular practice of it in Cardiff. Generally speaking, the shipowners head the subscription with from 200*l.* to 300*l.*, and they then get their friends or tradespeople and others who have been brought into contact with the ship and the shipowners to subscribe, and in that way they get an addition to what they give themselves. They generally, however, head the list with 200*l.* or 300*l.* In a recent case of a ship called the "Prince Soltykoff," which was a very disastrous case, as, I think, only one man was saved, the owners sent a list out. They gave 200*l.* themselves to head the list, and they got upwards of 1,000*l.* for the benefit of the widows and children of the crew of that ship. That sort of thing, I may say, is universally the case, and I may say I never heard of a case in which the owners and friends did not give largely to the widows and orphans of crews who were lost at sea. Perhaps you will allow me to mention one matter which I have omitted. I do not appear to have taken it in its proper sequence. That is a case in which the Federation in Cardiff—the Bristol Channel branch of the Federation—engaged a ship called the "Speedwell," to act as a depot ship in the roads for sailors. When the blocking of the shipping offices was carried out to such a large extent, and intimidation and threats were largely used and the sailors attending to sign on articles at the shipping offices could not absolutely get near the shipping offices, we decided in Cardiff to hire this steamship "Speedwell," a very good vessel, and we paid a very considerable sum of money for her, to go out into the roads and anchor there. She anchored in the Penarth Roads. We fitted her up as well as possible, with sleeping accommodation for about 150 men, I think, and with all the necessary requirements that sailors might wish to have, such as good food, books, newspapers, amusements, bagatelle, draughts, and all that sort of thing, to amuse the men while they were staying there, and we had an inspecting committee of retired captains to visit the men on board, and there was also a daily visit by Dr. Scott of Cardiff to see that the men were in a healthy condition and their comforts attended to. We had an inspection at short intervals by the Port Officer of Health, Dr. Walford I think his name is. Then we had two police officers on board the ship and we had Divine service on Sundays; so that we did all

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

we could to make the men comfortable. The men were well found in food and books and we guaranteed to each man that we took on board the ship that he should have a ship in six days, but that if he did not have a ship in six days after arriving on board the "Speedwell" we should pay 3*s.* per day till he had a ship. The first lot of men we had from Liverpool, and we had great difficulty, not to get the men, but to get them into Cardiff. The seamen and firemen delegates and pickets were at the Great Western station where the men were supposed to come, and we had to get the Great Western Company to give us a branch line, which they never used before, for the purpose of conveying these men down direct to the docks, to prevent their being seized upon by the pickets and intimidated. We got these men down by hook or by crook, to the ship "Speedwell," in the Penarth Roads, and when we had them there, any ship that wanted crews, instead of going to the shipping office for them, were sent out into the Penarth Roads, and there the captains went on board the "Speedwell" and signed articles on board the "Speedwell." The Local Marine Board granted us an officer there to see the men signed on, and to carry out the Merchant Shipping Act. That is the way we got our ships manned at Cardiff during that short but very acute period of time, when the Seamen and Firemen's Union were attacking the shipowners. When the men on the "Speedwell" were reduced to about 50 we got more men. We got them from different places—from Liverpool and Shields. The Local Marine Board placed an officer on board the ship to sign on, as I have said. It is hardly necessary to say it perhaps, but we had amongst them some men who were not sailors—not good men—and those men were sent back. They were paid their expenses on sending them back to the place from which they came and they had nothing to complain of. They were fed and they were paid their expenses, but we did not take them on board our ships when we found they were not fit and proper men. There is one other matter that I think ought to be brought before the notice of this Commission. I have here a copy of the rules of the Seamen and Firemen's Union of Great Britain and Ireland (see Appendix 63, Evidence, Vol. I., and Tabulated Rules), and I have here, too, a book which a poor foreign sailor handed in to the Federation Office a few days ago. The name of the man is J. Anderson, Stockholm, a foreign sailor, whom the Sailors and Firemen's Union usually say they do not encourage because they state they do not think foreign sailors ought to be encouraged at all, and they prefer the British sailor should be encouraged, and would blackball foreigners as much as they can; but, instead of blackballing the poor man Anderson—this is his book, and it has printed upon it the Bristol Branch meeting night 7.30. Ship, Radcliffe Hill; this book is dated 17th December 1890, and it is issued to J. Anderson, Stockholm, as a member of the Sailors and Firemen's Union of Great Britain and Ireland—

26 January 1892.]

MR. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

they have debited him in the book according to Rule 9, with the sum of 20*l.* as entry contribution, I take it, to the Seamens and Firemen's Union, and this 20*l.* he has to pay as best he can. Well, I need hardly say very few foreign sailors seeking a situation would have 20*l.* in their pockets, but this man scraped together two sums of 10*s.*, and he has paid 10*s.* on one date, and 10*s.* on another, as an instalment of his 20*l.*, but when he expected to get the other amount paid off and thereby come into the limited benefit of this book of rules, I leave the Commission to judge. The man, I may say, is now out of the Union, and I am not at all surprised. He paid two sums of 10*s.* each to the Union, but he is debited with 20*l.*, and he brought that book to the Shipping Federation office and said, "It will not do for a poor man like me to remain in that Union, because I simply cannot pay the money," and as for getting any benefit in future, I leave the Commission to judge what benefit he is ever likely to get. That is one case. Then there is another case which I can speak of personally because it is a case affecting my own ship. I have a letter from the captain of that ship. The name of the ship is the "Gabalva." She was in Cardiff at the first beginning of the dockers' strike, when the Sailors' and Firemen's Union were attacking the shipowners in the way I have already stated. When the captain came on shore I said to him, "I have always left the engaging of the crew and officers to yourself, and I do not intend to interfere with that, but under present circumstances I must tell you this: when you take men on to sign articles you must lay it down before them in this way:—Are you prepared to go to sea with me in this ship for which you have signed articles whether I have on board Union men or Non-Union men; that is, after you have signed articles, will you promise me to go with the vessel and carry out your articles whether I have Unionists or Non-Unionists on board?" Well, the men all agreed to this with the exception of the steward, whose name was Thomas Ashley. He said, "Well, sir, I cannot do that because I am a member of the Sailors and Firemen's Union, and I have been told by my Union officers that I must not sail with a Non-Unionist, and therefore, although I am very sorry to leave the ship, still I shall lose my benefits which I have under the rules of that Union—about 20*s.* a week strike pay—if I remain on board the ship. Therefore I must leave the ship and fall back upon the Union for my strike pay of 20*s.* a week." He therefore left the ship, and I lost a good man. I had had him some time. This man Ashley had been nine months on board the ship, and was a very decent, honest, straightforward fellow, and did his duty very well. Then the next man was William Gannon boatswain, who left me for the same reasons; that is that he was a member of the Sailors and Firemen's Union; and his instructions were not to sail with blacklegs, which was the elegant

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

name given by the Sailors and Firemen's Union to men who did not happen to be members of their Union. Therefore this poor fellow Gannon, the boatswain, left the ship for the same reason as the steward, but he found he could not get his strike pay; and when he found he could not get his strike pay according to these rules, and that he derived no benefit from these rules, he came back to the ship and gave up the Union altogether. He returned to his work, and has since remained on board the ship. That is a case which I can vouch for, and which I can get the captain's evidence to prove if required. Then I would like to say that Mr. Wilson has always professed that his great aim and object is conciliation, and he has been at our Federation offices within the last week, and has there interviewed the secretary and asked some questions as to refusing some of his men paper tickets. It is not the fact that they are refused, for we only refuse them when they do not come. We refuse no sailor a Federation paper ticket if he comes to the Federation office for it; but he must come to the Federation office to be examined by the registrar as to his capacity. Mr. Wilson came and saw the secretary, as I have said, of the Shipping Federation, and, after a long conversation with him, the secretary reported to me that Mr. Wilson expressed his great satisfaction with the interview he had had, and said he was perfectly satisfied with what the Federation was doing. On the same day that Mr. Wilson had this interview, I was going to my duties at the Local Marine Board shipping office of the mercantile marine, and saw one of Wilson's delegates walking about with a large bundle of pink bills in his hand, and I said, "Give me one of those bills, will you," and the man said, "Certainly," and he handed me this bill. This bill is from Mr. Wilson, and it is to this effect. I should like to read it because it shows that Mr. Wilson, after being very conciliatory and very agreeable at one moment with the secretary, then goes and issues a handbill of this kind:—
 "Our sailors on the sea. National Amalgamated Sailors' and Firemen's Union of Great Britain and Ireland. Notice. Come and hear your Champion Wilson, the Cardiff martyr, and the man who flogged Laws and the shipowners conspirators before the Labour Commission. He will explain the evil of Shipping Federation Sham Insurance Scheme. No collection. Non-Unionist men in arrears and members are cordially invited. Mr. Wilson will leave the shipping office at 4 o'clock; with the boys. Come and consider how to save the lives of toilers on the sea. Meeting at 4.30, Pelican Club, Custom House Street." At 4 o'clock I thought I would go down to the shipping office, and see Mr. Wilson and the boys. I went down to the shipping office where Mr. Wilson had to meet his boys, and found no boys and no Mr. Wilson there. I heard nothing; there was no procession through the streets. I had thought I should meet a crowd of people and find great excitement in the town; but I found no excitement whatever. The next morning I saw in

25 January 1892.]

Mr. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

the papers that Mr. Wilson had a meeting, the proceedings of which were duly reported, and that Mr. Wilson at that meeting had been extremely temperate; he had not shown up the shipowners at all; he had not smashed Laws in any way whatever, nor anyone else. He simply made a very moderate, and, I thought, a very proper sort of speech, the principal burden of his speech being that sailors must combine; that by combination everything would be obtained; but he was sorry to say they did not combine sufficiently, and that many of them were very lazy. I do not know whether he referred to their being lazy in attending meetings, or lazy in joining the ranks. However, his speech blamed them for being lazy, and so on, and hoped things would be better in the future. That was the whole of his remarks.

Mr. Bolton.

11,560. Was there a meeting, and was there a speech?—Yes; and it was duly published in the paper.

11,561. I thought you said there was no meeting?—There was not a meeting at 4 o'clock with "the boys" at the shipping office. I went there myself, expecting to see it. There was a meeting held at the Pelican Club, up in the town, which is a building Mr. Wilson has taken, I think, but the speech was a very moderate speech and a very moderate meeting.

Mr. Tait.

11,562. This handbill does not say there would be a meeting at the shipping office. It says, "Mr. Wilson will leave the shipping office at 4 o'clock with the boys, and that a meeting will be held at 4.30 at the Pelican Club"?—But he could not meet the boys at the shipping office without there being a meeting of the boys.

11,563. Do you mean a meeting which he was to address?—No; but he had to meet the boys at the shipping office at 4 o'clock.

11,564. I see this has not been issued by Mr. Wilson himself, as you stated?—I got it from one of Mr. Wilson's delegates.

11,565. That does not show it was issued by him?—I hope the Commission will ask Mr. Wilson if he knows anything about this bill.

11,566. You say this bill has been issued by Mr. Wilson, but I cannot see his name at the bottom of it?—It was issued and published on the streets of Cardiff by a delegate of his, that is all I know about it. I may say that in answer to a letter from the secretary of the Shipping Federation in Cardiff to Mr. Turner, superintendent of the Board of Trade in Cardiff, referring to certain matters, Mr. Turner states to him that he has reported the blocks of the shipping office on the 16th January, so that the Board of Trade, I have no doubt, will be fully aware of all that has been done. There is no doubt the blocking of the shipping office at Cardiff has been reported to the Board of Trade.

Duke of Devonshire.

11,567. Can you state what are the present relations between the shipowners and the men at Cardiff?—The relations between the shipowners and the sailors have never been at all of an unfriendly character. We have had no difficulty. I have never had any difficulty in getting crews, and I do not think any of the shipowners frequenting the port at Cardiff have ever made a rule of inquiring, until lately, whether the men belonged to any Union or not because really it does not matter to a shipowner whether his men are Unionists or Non-Unionists.

11,568. Is the strike entirely at an end?—Yes. The strike arose, as I think I have already stated, because the Seamen and Firemen's Union and the Dockers' Union joined together in one united action to stop the whole of the trade of the port simply because the shipowners, getting crews from Cardiff, would not take (as the Seamen and Firemen's Union desired them to do) their crews entirely from Union men. The shipowners would not be dictated to on that point, and, therefore Wilson sought to carry out his threat to block all Cardiff ships.

11,569. Does the Union still claim to forbid their men to sail with Non-Union men?—I do not know. I do not think they do so now. I do not know, but their action in that case of the "Syria," which I recited at Barry, would go to show that they are blocking Non-Union men.

11,570. At Cardiff is there at present any combination between the Unions for the purpose of preventing the employment of Non-Union men?—I believe that combination still exists, but is not showing an active front.

11,571. It is not effective?—It is not effective now, because it has not been brought forward.

11,572. As a matter of fact, do Unionists and Non-Unionists sail together now?—Yes, I think they do. In fact, I may say they do, because Unionists have taken the Federation tickets, and therefore Unionists now are to a large extent if not throwing up their Union still sailing under two flags. They are sailing under the Union flag and they are sailing under the Federation flag.

Mr. Bolton.

11,573. The attempts to form a Board of Conciliation failed I understood you to say?—Failed entirely.

11,574. Through the demand of the Unionists that the members of the Board of Conciliation should be exclusively composed of Unionists?—Just so. In other words, the question was put to them, "Will you join the Conciliation Board or send members to discuss the conciliation arrangement, and will you discuss it with men who are Non-Unionists?" and the Trade Unionists said "No, we will not do so. We will not join any conciliation board where there are Non-Unionists sitting with Unionists." And that really meant that they must all be Unionists.

26 January 1892.]

MR. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire.

11,575. I do not understand you to say that they refused to go on with a Conciliation Board with representatives of the masters, who, of course, would be non-unionists?—The Conciliation Board was intended to be formed of all representatives of the trade, both labourers and masters; and it was not intended that it should be composed of labourers only, but of all descriptions of labour.

11,576. I understand you to say their claim was that the representatives of labour should be entirely unionists?—Yes, that is what the Trade Unions required.

11,577. They did not say they would have no masters at the board?—No.

Mr. Bolton.

11,578. What proportion of unionists did they demand on the board?—The question of proportion was never gone into. The question was only asked them, "Will you sit with non-unionists."

11,579. They simply refused to consider the question along with non-unionists?—That was so.

11,580. Then you have no Board of Conciliation at all?—None at all.

11,581. In your opinion would a Board of Conciliation be effective in preventing disputes?—No; I do not think so. That is my own impression.

11,582. Have you had any experience of them?—No, I have not. I have read on the subject.

11,583. You have given us a number of instances in which intimidation was used?—Yes.

11,584. A number of these cases also were prosecuted before the magistrates?—A great number were prosecuted.

11,585. And some were fined?—Yes.

11,586. And a number of others were dismissed?—Yes.

11,587. Do you want any change in the law, or are you satisfied with the law at present in regard to intimidation?—I am not satisfied with the law at all. I do not think it is nearly severe enough in regard to intimidation; because we know sailors and workpeople, as a rule, are very easily scared.

11,588. What do you want more than fining?—I think if a man is assaulted in the street and distinctly intimidated from going and taking work for which he has signed and which he wishes to take, the person committing that crime should be sent to prison.

11,589. And if a person assaults another may he not be imprisoned?—I suppose he may for assault; but I am speaking more of intimidation.

11,590. In what way? Do you make a difference between intimidation by assault and intimidation by threats?—Threats are made sometimes to break heads.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

11,591. Have you not had cases of punishment for threats?—Yes, there have been cases I read out some cases of the sort just now.

11,592. Exactly. Then what change do you want in the law?—I do not know, except that I think it is hardly stern enough with regard to these cases of violent intimidation, and threats of doing injury to a man.

11,593. Can you define violent intimidation?—Yes. I mean to say that if a crowd of men come round three or four sailors who want to go to their work and say (using bad language all the time), "If you go on board the ship and sign articles on board the ship, we will pitch you into the dock or break your head."

11,594. That may be punished now?—I do not know.

11,595. I thought you gave us a case where a man was bound over for a certain time to keep the peace?—Yes; but I do not think that is sufficient.

11,596. Magistrates have power to imprison now, have they not?—Yes. Then you see there is another point. It is very difficult to get sailors to bring actions against people for intimidation, and you cannot bring an action unless the man is there—no one else can bring an action. The Board of Trade have had frequent cases of men who could be proved by others to have been guilty of intimidation, but they would not proceed in consequence of the men intimidated having gone to sea.

11,597. Who do you propose should proceed if not the men who are intimidated?—I think that may be remedied by some other procedure.

11,598. How?—Well, I have not really thought the matter out. I should think an alteration of the law might be made very beneficially if it was law that magistrates could convict if other witnesses could prove intimidation.

11,599. They are convicted now?—Not without the appearance of the man intimidated, I think.

11,600. You have given us several cases where men have been convicted?—Yes.

11,601. My question is how would you remedy the existing law?—Unless the man stops to prosecute, the magistrate will, I think always dismiss the case.

11,602. Can you suggest who should prosecute?—The Board of Trade should prosecute, because they can easily satisfy themselves by inquiries through their officers as to the truth or otherwise of the case. In this case of the Syria, for instance, I got the Superintendent to go down and inquire into the case, but the Board of Trade would not take the case up. The case was duly reported to the Board of Trade, but they refused to prosecute.

11,603. What is the difference between the men remaining to give evidence before the Board of Trade and the men remaining to give evidence before the magistrate?—No difference; but if a man is brought before the magistrates for committing this crime the case is dismissed

26 January 1892.]

MR. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

because the men who were assaulted or threatened had proceeded to sea and were not there to give evidence in the case.

11,604. With respect to the benefit fund to which you have alluded, I understand that the holders of parchment tickets contribute one shilling on the issue of the ticket?—They contribute one shilling for registration; and they also pay 6*d.* when they renew it—for every renewal of registration.

11,605. Are the funds so obtained sufficient for the ends of the benefit society?—No, they are not.

11,606. Then how are the rest of the funds contributed?—Out of the shipowners' pockets.

11,607. It is done voluntarily?—Yes.

11,608. In what way is it done?—Through their Federation.

11,609. And do they contribute per ton?—Yes, so much per ton of tonnage entered. I may state, while I am upon that, that the amount entered is a little over 7,000,000 of tons now in the Shipping Federation, and that the Shipping Federation are empowered to call up to the extent of 3*s.* per registered ton per annum.

11,610. For that special purpose?—For the Federation purposes.

11,611. Do you mean for the special purpose of the benefit fund?—No, for the special purposes of the Federation.

11,612. Including that?—Yes; one of the purposes is the benefit fund for sailors. I may tell you that the shipowners do tax themselves willingly in this way, because they feel that it is an important point for them to get good men, and also that is one of the best plans for having them under their own eyes, and also, if possible, to put a stop to these continual harassments of trade unionists.

11,613. I think you have said that the Federation does not interfere with the rate of wages in any way or shape?—Not in any shape or form. The wages are according to the rates of the day.

11,614. The paper ticket is given to every man who proves himself to be a sailor?—Yes, without any charge whatever.

11,615. And who is willing to abide by the rules of the Federation?—Yes.

11,616. As to sailing with non-unionists or unionists?—Yes—carry out his articles—that is really what it comes to.

11,617. No question is put to him as to whether or no he is a member of any Union?—None whatever.

Mr. Tait.

11,618. With regard to the Board of Conciliation you stated that the Trades' Council, and I believe you also said the Trade Union of Cardiff, refused to consider, along with the Chamber of Commerce, the propriety of having a joint board for the purpose of arranging or settling disputes which had occurred?—They were agreeable to join the Conciliation Board

Mr. Tait—continued.

on the footing that unionists only should be on that board.

11,619. When the Chamber of Commerce approached the Trades' Council, the Chamber of Commerce approached them as a responsible body making a communication to another responsible body?—Yes; the Trades' Council is the governing body of the Trade Unions of the district.

11,620. In the same way the Chamber of Commerce is a representative body?—Yes.

11,621. Do not you think it was a right thing and a logical thing for the Trade Unions to say that they could not sit alongside of a class of men over whom they had no control?—No, I do not think so.

11,622. Let me put it in the very opposite way. Suppose the Trades' Council had approached your Chamber of Commerce on the same lines as you approached them, do not you think you would have been fairly entitled to say that you were not able to speak for or have any control over any person who was not affiliated with you?—No, certainly not; because what the Chamber of Commerce intended to do was this: in the first instance to call the representatives of all labour that was then in a state of turmoil—dock labourers, sailors and firemen, trimmers, railway men—known representatives of these men, and known representatives of the Trades Unions, through the Trades' Council, such men as they pleased to appoint upon it. That body would then have discussed as a body the position, and would have decided what, if anything, could be done to allay these disturbances. There was no question of being affiliated to the Chamber of Commerce in any way whatever. The Chamber of Commerce was simply the instrument.

11,623. I am not questioning what was the intention of the Chamber of Commerce. What I am wishing to direct your attention to is this: If the Trades' Council, or to make it broader, if the Trade Unions had said that they would join with you under the condition that a certain section of men, who were a disorganised body, were not admitted to the board, would they not have been justified in doing so because they had no control whatever over a certain section which they would have to sit along with?—It was a very good job that they had no control. It would have been a very unfair thing if they had the control of all the other men who were free labourers, because then it would have been a very one-sided committee, and a very one-sided council; it would not have been a Board of Conciliation.

11,624. It has been given in evidence before this Commission by those who have charge and management of thousands of men that they have got on best, and had more peace with strong Trades Unions than when there was no Trade Union in existence in a particular trade?—I do not think Trade Unions have a sedative influence, but you must not understand me to be against the principle of the Trade Union at all. If a Trade Union keeps itself within certain lines, then I think Trades Unions are very good things

26 January 1892.]

Mr. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

to a certain extent. They may ameliorate the condition of their men, and they may by small payments from their members form sick funds and other funds of very great value to their members; besides, they would have a centre, who could represent the different bodies of men in trade disputes for wages. But when a Trade Union says that no man shall be employed in our line by any master unless he is a trade unionist in our particular Union, then I say the Trade Union becomes a despotism of a most objectionable kind.

11,625. While you deny the right of the men to take up that position, you claim the right to take it up for your own Federation by not allowing a man to work under your employ unless he has your Federation ticket?—I have already tried to explain what the nature of a Federation ticket is.

11,626. I wish you to answer me distinctly. While you deny to the workman the right of saying that he will not work alongside of another man who is not a member of a Union, you claim for yourself and your Federation to say, "We will only employ workmen who will accept our Federation ticket"?—Yes; but we do not keep that Federation ticket in the hands of free labourers only, we keep it in the hands of unionists, no matter what Union they belong to. We do not refuse it to anyone. The Federation ticket is simply a promise on the part of the man holding it that he will carry out his duty; if he signs an agreement to do a certain thing or to go on a certain ship that he will do his duty. It pays him for doing his duty by giving him a benefit fund which he cannot get under any other association.

11,627. I am not questioning the ulterior motive or object of the ticket. What I am trying to see is that you should claim for yourselves as a Federation what you are not prepared to give to a combination of workmen?—I do not see it at all in that light. I do not see what we are refusing to any combination of workmen. We are glad to have combinations of workmen, but a combination must act within certain fair, right, legal, and reasonable bounds, and wherever they overstep those bounds they are becoming a tyranny of a very serious character, and then it is time for the shipowners to look after themselves, and to protect their interests, which the Federation are attempting to do.

11,628. You have put in a table regarding the wages in the Bristol Channel (see Appendix 74). May I ask you if, it was within your knowledge as a shipowner that, unasked by either the seamen or the firemen in your employ, you spontaneously raised the wages of either of those two classes of labourers?—No. They rose owing to force of circumstances.

11,629. I wish an affirmative or a negative answer. Have you as a shipowner spontaneously, and without being asked by your men, given an advance of wages?—Yes, in this way. We have gone to the shipping office and we have asked the superintendent what the wages of the day were. We have been told so

Mr. Tait—continued.

much, and we have paid that wage; that is spontaneity.

11,630. How does the superintendent get to know the regulation wage?—He gets to know it by the daily work at the Mercantile Marine Office.

11,631. Who regulates it?—It is regulated by the supply and demand. Let me take a case like this. A captain goes to select a certain number of men as sailors; he goes to a legally appointed shipping master, or he goes to the Federation Office and says, "How many men have you got here?" He is told, "We have a hundred men in hand in the waiting room." "Well," the captain remarks, "I want so many hands." He goes in, and he says to these men, "Lads, I want half-a-dozen firemen," and the firemen say what their wages are. Then the captain, if the wages are the ordinary wages of the day, and are not excessive, says, "Very well," and if he finds that the men are suitable and good men he does not higgler over a matter of half-a-crown or 5s. a month; but he takes the men, picks out half-a-dozen tidy looking fellows and says, "Come along, I will sign you on," and they go. That is really the action that is taken.

11,632. Suppose the wages are 4l. 10s., and you have a lot of men in your waiting room, and the captain comes up or someone to engage a crew, and you only want to pay 4l. 5s. Suppose that the men who are in the room at that time are not willing to accept 4l. 5s., thinking it too low, what would be the position of your Federation with regard to filling up those places at 4l. 5s.?—The Federation have nothing to do with wages. It is a matter they never interfere with in the slightest. They do not know what the wages are. They know nothing about wages. They do not interfere in wages in any way whatever. It is beyond their duty. They never touch wages. It is a matter of contract between the master and his men, and they leave it so. They have never attempted to influence wages. It is outside their rules.

11,633. You said to-day that you denied that the Union, and I presume you referred to the Sailors and Firemen's Union, had raised wages?—I did say so.

11,634. You are still prepared to say that the Union in no way tends to increase wages—does not bring the rise question, for instance?—I do not think they are going the right way to do it.

11,635. Has it done so in your experience of the past?—No, I say it has not. I say the rise of wages is entirely owing to the ordinary law of supply and demand, and to no other law. I do not believe it is by the organisation of the Seamen and Firemen's Union. In the early stages of the Union for a short time it may perhaps have been the case that the Union caused certain captains to give more than they otherwise would—men who were pressed for crews—before they got this Federation organised. Before they got this Federation organised, in one or two instances it might have had the

26 January 1892.]

Mr. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

effect—naturally it would have had the effect, I should think. But it is the increase in shipping which has raised wages.

11,636. Before your Federation was in existence, were you approached in your district to raise the wages of the sailors and firemen by the Union, and did you do it?—No, I do not think so. I could not answer that question.

11,637. You do not know that you received an intimation, and that you did give the rise?—I do not think any intimation was made in the matter. I have no recollection of any intimation being made that wages were going to be raised. I know wages were rising in 1888, simply on account of the increase in freights. You see a great number of ships were rushing to sea, and they wanted and must have hands, and the consequence was that the law of supply and demand came into force, and as the demand was great, naturally wages rose.

11,638. I thought that you, being the chairman of the Marine Board in Cardiff, and also being in connection with the Federation and a shipowner, would have been ignorant of the fact that within these last three or four years many great strikes have taken place through the United Kingdom of the sailors, on the question of wages, and on that question alone, and that at a great number of those strikes, particularly on the East Coast and in London, there has been an advance which the Union at that time demanded?—I do not think so, and with regard to advances and demands of the Sailors and Firemen's Union, I do not think the sailors as a body of men themselves have had anything scarcely to do with the formation of these Unions. I think these Unions have been formed by certain leaders, as they call themselves, of men, but I cannot help thinking, and, I believe, most strongly, that these Unions formed in that way have done the men a great deal of harm. They have bred ill-feeling between the masters and the men to a large extent, and they cannot help breeding ill-feeling. Therefore, I think the men have not received benefit from the formation of these Unions, especially such Unions as the Sailors' and Firemen's.

11,639. You are not cognizant of any cases where the Union has raised the wages?—No, I am not.

11,640. At the Cardiff strike, the men that were sent from different parts of the country were what is known as Federation men?—No; they were not when they came to us. These men, who were got from Liverpool and the North of England, were not Federation men. They were men who were got from the boarding-houses there, and a good many of them were very poor men.

11,641. The previous witness stated that all the men that he sent from the North of England—from the Tyne and the Tees and the Blyth district, were perfectly competent men?—Yes, no doubt they were, but I believe the Liverpool men were not all competent men. We had to send 27 of those men back.

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

11,642. You told us of your scheme for benefits. Is it registered under the Friendly Societies Act?—No, it is a gift of the ship-owners. The Federation is not registered under the Trades Union Act. It is registered as a limited liability company, and the benefit scheme is a part and parcel of the Federation.

Mr. *Livesey*.

11,643. I think you heard Mr. Plimsoll's evidence?—I did.

11,644. I suppose you will admit that there are bad shipowners as well as good ones?—I will not admit as much as Mr. Plimsoll stated. I think Mr. Plimsoll's statements were very much exaggerated indeed.

11,645. I can quite understand that there are a great many good shipowners, who are anxious for the welfare of their men?—I think the great majority are. Naturally they must be.

11,646. Should you be willing to confer with a gentleman like Mr. Plimsoll, or anyone, with the object of remedying the abuses?—I had the pleasure of seeing Mr. Plimsoll and of conferring with him at the sittings of the Commission upon Unseaworthy Ships about 20 years ago. I was up from Cardiff, with two or three others, to give evidence before that Commission. Well, I will not say any more; but my impression—I cannot help saying it—of Mr. Plimsoll was not very favourable. I think Mr. Plimsoll exaggerates a good deal.

Mr. *Plimsoll*.

11,647. If you state that I have exaggerated to-day in giving my evidence, will you kindly instance a single statement in which I exaggerated?—I think the rotten pork statement was exaggerated.

Mr. *Livesey*.

11,648. My only object was to try and bring the shipowners and the friends of the sailors together?—The shipowners will be very glad to do all they can, but I am afraid it would be a hopeless task, from my experience.

Mr. *Plimsoll*.

11,649. Will you kindly specify any statement I have made to-day which you consider exaggerated?—You made the remark, I think, to-day that shipowners did not greatly consider the safety of the lives and the welfare of the crews, with regard to ships—not liners, but ordinary mercantile steamers. You said, though the question might be raised that it would naturally be to the interest of the shipowner to look after the safety of the crew, it was not necessarily in the interest of the shipowner.

11,650. I did say so, but I see no exaggeration in that?—That was one of the statements you made, and one I was very much struck with, because I thought it was a very unjust and unfair remark. I think shipowners as a class

26 January 1892.]

Mr. JOHN HERON WILSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. *Plimsoll*—continued.

have quite as much humanity as any other employers of labour.

11,651. I said that there were shipowners and shipowners, and, asked whether I thought those that were guilty of malpractice and careless of safety were in the majority, I stated I thought they were in the minority. Are you prepared to deny that there are shipowners who are careless of the safety and comfort of their men?—I would not deny that, but I will say they are a very small minority.

11,652. Oh, no, they are not?—I say they are.

11,653. I spoke of cases in which I had gone on board ships and found places where you would not put your dog—dreadful places?—I think the rotten pork question was one I should like to deny.

11,654. I put in a Return from the House of Commons (see Question 11,299), in which it was shown that hundreds of tons of meat had been sold at Deptford and had been bought by a man at Cardiff?—I think there was a good deal of exaggeration.

Duke of *Devonshire*.

11,655. You have mentioned sums which are frequently given by shipowners to the families of sailors who have been lost at sea?—Yes.

11,656. Would those sums include to any extent wages which were owing to the men?—Not at all. The question of wages would not come in at all. The wages of the crew are paid up to the moment of the loss; they are paid into the Board of Trade and the men get them in the ordinary way through application to the Board of Trade.

11,657. The sums which you mention as being frequently subscribed by owners are entirely

Duke of *Devonshire*—continued.

exclusive of wages?—Yes; they are free gifts simply by the owners and their friends. Some owners never ask their friends and simply give a sum themselves. I may say I never knew a case where a shipowner did not willingly give a large amount to the widows and orphans of the men lost in the ship; and, if he did not do so it would throw a very great stigma upon his character.

11,658. I did not quite understand in your evidence whether you stated that you attributed the troubles which you had in Cardiff to Unions directing their members who had signed articles not to sail with non-unionists. Did any cases come under your notice of that?—Yes, many cases. That case of the "Glen Gelder" was one very striking case in which they went down and stopped all work until the men came out and told their men not to go on board ship with "scabs." That is the title by which they called the "free labour" men.

11,659. Mr. Wilson, I think, stated that while admitting that they desired their members to refuse to sign with non-unionists, they never in any case called men out who had signed?—Yes.

11,660. That would not be correct according to you?—It would not be correct—certainly not. Many men were called out.

11,661. Who had actually signed?—Who had actually signed. The case of the "Syria" only last month is a very striking case. It is a small case, but it is very striking.

11,662. You know of your own knowledge of cases in which men have, through the action of a Union, refused to sail although they had signed articles?—I do.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

TWENTY-SECOND DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Wednesday, 27th January 1892.

PRESENT:

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE
THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF DERBY, K.G. (CHAIRMAN).

The Right Hon. Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH,
Bart., M.P.
Mr. J. C. BOLTON, M.P.
Mr. T. H. ISMAY.

Mr. SAMUEL PLIMSOLL.
Mr. HENRY TAIT.
Mr. E. TROW (Group A.), and Mr. M. AUSTIN
(Group C.) also attended.

Mr. GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Mr. JAMES CORMACK called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

11,663. You are a shipowner and merchant, I understand?—I am.

11,664. And you are engaged in the Russian trade?—Yes.

11,665. Have you been chairman of the Leith Chamber of Commerce?—Yes, I have.

11,666. And one of the directors of the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce?—I am at this time.

11,667. Are you a member of the Executive Council of the Shipping Federation?—I am.

11,668. Do you appear to give evidence on behalf of the Federation?—I do.

11,669. And on behalf of the Leith Shipowners' Society also?—Yes.

11,670. Now, can you tell us, in the first place, what is the extent and what are the principal features of the shipping trade of Leith?—With reference to the extent, I may just state in a word that within 12 months the number of ships entered in Leith, that is, arriving at Leith, has been close upon 5,000, actually 4,996 in one year, and that the tonnage is 1,369,031. If I include the Leith district, that is, the ports in the Forth in addition to Leith, the number of ships would be 10,471, and the entries inward 3,160,438 tons.

Mr. Ismay.

11,671. That is, foreign and coastwise?—Yes.

11,672. Both?—Yes. That shows that we have a pretty large trade in the Forth. With reference to the particular nature of the trade, I should say that it consists largely of regular steam lines engaged between Leith and the continental and Baltic ports. We have also a large coasting and general trade. Most of the steamers make voyages ranging in duration from a week to a month, so that the men are not long

Mr. Ismay—continued.

away from home, and return to their homes, which is always considered an advantage, of course. The employment is pretty regular. Except in the case of the Baltic steamers, which are occasionally laid up for a short time in winter, I should say the employment is regular and steady.

Earl of Derby.

11,673. Can you tell us the number of sailous and firemen employed?—The total number I find it rather difficult to state, but in the regular trading steamers I should say the number was about from 1,350 to 1,400 sailors and firemen. Of course there is a large number in addition to that in the general trading ships which I cannot state precisely.

11,674. Are there many foreigners among those whom you have mentioned?—There is a considerable number of foreigners—what proportion it is very difficult to state, but I know that there is a considerable number.

11,675. Is there any distinction made between foreigners and native seamen in regard to the wages, or in any other respect?—No, there is no distinction made in wages or otherwise between foreign and native seamen; they get the same wages, and otherwise are treated the same.

11,676. Can you tell us what were the relations between the shipowners and the men previous to the establishment of the union?—I can only say that the relations between the employers and the men were up to that time of an exceedingly cordial and amicable character. There were no disputes or difficulties but what were easily adjusted, and altogether there was a very general feeling of amity and cordiality.

11,677. When any disputes arose were they settled by arbitration, or how?—There was no

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

arbitration, they were simply adjusted by a little friendly conference. We met the men and discussed any little grievance that they had, and the matter was settled without any difficulty whatever.

11,678. We were told by the general secretary of the Union that previous to its establishment wages were low, and the men had cause for complaint; do you admit that?—No, I do not; as regards Leith at any rate.

11,679. Can you compare the wages now paid in Leith with what they were in previous years?—Yes, I can. I can go back to 1865, when the wages of sailors was 25s. a week, and of firemen 27s. 6d. In 1872 these were 27s. 6d. and 28s. per week respectively, in 1878 the same, in 1881 the same, in 1885 (that was during a year of great depression in shipping) they were 26s. and 26s. 6d., in 1888 they were 27s. 6d. and 28s., and in 1889 and at the present time 30s. and 30s., that is, the same for seamen and firemen.

11,680. There have been years of great depression in the shipping business during the last 10 years, is that not so?—There have been.

11,681. And you say the wages did not vary very much?—Not very much. These years of depression were from 1883, when the owners experienced great difficulty in keeping their ships going at all, because of the extremely depressed state of the freight market, and that continued until about 1887.

11,682. And from 1887 the improvement began?—Yes.

11,683. Was there any change made in the wages? You say they have risen from 26s. in the time of depression to 30s. now?—To 30s. now. During these years of depression the Leith owners were very unwilling indeed to reduce the wages, and in the middle of 1884 they found it necessary to give the men notice that if trade did not improve it would be necessary to reduce the wages, but still, unwilling to do so, they allowed a year to elapse before that took effect, and as things continued in the same state in July 1885 they then were obliged to reduce the wages to the figure that I stated—26s. and 26s. 6d.

11,684. In May 1889 were the shipowners asked for an advance of wages, and what did they do?—They were; but I should state that in the autumn of 1888, when some little improvement had taken place in the trade, wages were restored to their former figure, namely, 27s. 6d. and 28s. Then in May of the following year—that was in 1889—the Leith shipowners were approached by their men, and asked for an increase of wages to 30s. per week, both for seamen and firemen, and although many of the owners had contracts running, and though the state of trade did not warrant such an advance, yet to avoid any friction they consented to give the advance asked on the 30th June, when the then current six months' articles expired. I should say that this the men professed to consider quite satisfactory, and it was also

Earl of Derby—continued.

understood that the Union officials in Leith were of the same opinion.

11,685. That settlement was interfered with, was it not?—It was.

11,686. Will you describe what occurred?—Matters had, as I have stated, been satisfactorily arranged between the owners and the men, and there was considerable surprise occasioned when a few days later on, or about the 30th May 1889, a printed paper was issued by the secretary of the N. A. S. and F. U. (I use the contraction) from Sunderland, and dated the 27th of May. This paper was issued to the shipowners in Leith, requesting them to take notice that, "On and after the 3rd June the following wages will be paid out of all ports of the United Kingdom," and then followed the statement of "wages, which for Leith ships would have meant weekly 32s. 8d. I have a copy of that circular, which I can put in if desired. This circular winds up with the following clause:—"We trust you will see your way to adopt this scale of wages for the future, so as to prevent any inconveniences arising either to owners or men through the stoppage of work." This is the printed paper (see Appendix 75).

11,687. What did the owners do on receiving that notice?—The owners met and consulted over the matter, and they found that they could not afford to give the wages asked. I should say that this circular, which I have referred to, was a clear attempt to dictate to the shipowners of the United Kingdom what wages they must pay, or submit to stoppage of their work, and that also without ever consulting them.

11,688. What took place next?—On the 3rd June the men, without further notice, left their employment in obedience to the dictates of the Union, and in breach of the agreement previously come to with the owners.

11,689. What did the shipowners do to meet the difficulty?—This caused great inconvenience and loss to the owners, and the regular liners which had advertised sailing dates were put to great difficulties and delay, and many of these steamers had to be laid up. Endeavours were at once made to obtain non-unionist men, and the required number were gradually obtained, and the steamers got to sea.

11,690. Were there any attempts made by the men on strike to interfere with those who were willing to work?—Yes, there were. A considerable amount of intimidation was practised at that time. They were interfered with going to work, and it was necessary to put a depot steamer out in the roads in the estuary of the Forth, and to place the men who were obtained, the "free men," as we call them, on board this depot steamer, where they were drafted off to the respective vessels in the roads as required. The reason for that was the need of protecting the men from intimidation. In other cases steamers were navigated out to the roads by officers, and the crews put on board at certain ports in the Forth.

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,691. Because the men would have been intimidated if they had joined earlier?—Yes. If we had attempted to put them on board in the docks we should certainly have had to face a very serious amount of opposition.

11,692. Did any difficulty arise at the shipping office in getting men to sign?—It was extremely difficult to ship men there, because of the large crowds of men who surrounded the shipping offices, and it was necessary, in order to sign the men on board the ships, to pay extra fees in order to get the shipping office officials to sign the men on board.

11,693. Have you reckoned how many steamers were laid idle in consequence of the strike?—There were 22, I know.

11,694. And for how long on an average?—I should think an average of about a week, or from that to a fortnight, that is to say, the longest limit would be a fortnight, and the shortest, perhaps, three or four days.

11,695. Were there any cases, or were there many cases of men on strike wishing to return to their employment before the strike ended?—Yes, there were. Some of the men, who had been engaged for years in the regular employment of the liners, themselves came to the office and requested to be taken back, and tore up their Union books. In other cases some of the wives of the men came to the offices and begged that the men should be taken back, stating that the men were afraid to come themselves.

11,696. Were those men taken back?—Yes, I believe they were so far as there were places vacant.

11,697. Did the strike continue after the steamers were got to sea?—It did nominally; the strike was nominally continued longer, but it was practically then at an end, and the men still out then had to look for employment elsewhere. I should say that many of them had been years in the same employment up to that time, and having their homes and families in Leith it was a great disadvantage to them to be thrown out of employment.

11,698. Have you reckoned how many men were out on strike?—I believe from 500 to 600.

11,699. What do you estimate the loss in wages at?—I should say from 1,800*l.* to 2,000*l.*, not reckoning the loss incurred by those men who did not obtain situations when the strike finished.

11,700. What do you estimate the loss to the owners at?—It is very difficult to state that, but one firm who had ten steamers laid idle estimated their direct loss and expenses at 1,142*l.* 10*s.*, but that does not nearly represent the loss actually sustained.

11,701. Of course, besides actual money loss there would be a certain amount of confusion and disorganisation consequent upon the interruption of the traffic?—Very much.

11,702. Was there any attempt made on the part of the Union to get the dock labourers

Earl of Derby—continued.

out?—There was a very strong endeavour to get them out, but it was unsuccessful, I believe, chiefly because of the want of funds on the part of the Dock Labourers' Union.

11,703. Was there any attempt on the part of the Union to influence the Naval Reserve men?—Yes, there was. A resolution was passed by the Union branch in Leith, calling on the Naval Reserve men to resign their books, but I did not hear that they did it.

11,704. Can you quote any instances of intimidation and violence during the strike?—I believe there were some such cases. There is one especially that I remember, where a man was coming across the bridge over the Water of Leith, with his bag and things ready to join a ship, when he was set upon by a large number of men—the strikers—and his bag and clothes were flung into the water, and he himself was suspended over the bridge as if it was intended that he should follow them. He was then taken to the Union Hall, and after some time was set at liberty considerably injured. That is the report that was given in the papers at the time, and I believe it is substantially correct.

11,705. The Shipping Federation was established in September of that year, was it not?—In September 1890.

11,706. Are you of opinion that the Federation ticket, of which we have heard a good deal, was necessary?—I think it was quite necessary.

11,707. Did the Union order the strike against the ticket, or did the ticket follow upon the strike?—The Union ordered a general strike against the ticket in March 1891.

11,708. And did the strike follow?—The Leith branch of the Union met to consider this matter, and finding that the real character of the ticket had been thoroughly misrepresented to them by their officials, and remembering the disastrous strike into which they had been led in 1889, refused to come out, and sent a deputation of their number to wait upon the Leith Shipowners' Society, and informed them of their resolution not to come out. I should like to put in a report of that meeting which I think is a very instructive matter indeed. These are some copies of the report (*handing in prints*). The following is the resolution which the men passed at that meeting: "That we, the members of the "Leith branch of the above Union, seeing the "harmonious and amicable relations that have "existed between us and the local shipowners "since the formation of the branch, and that we "have already and are still prepared to sail with "non-union sailors, take no action in the proposed general strike." It is to be noticed here that the branch of the Union recognised the "harmonious and amicable relations," and the fair way in which the owners had treated them. They also expressed great regret for their conduct during the strike.

11,709. You were present at that meeting?—I was.

11,710. And you have put in a printed report of it?—I have.

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,711. Which we presume is accurate?—Yes. I may state that we were very well pleased that the men should thus recognise and give their testimony to the fair and honourable way in which the shipowners had treated them, and to their expression of regret at their having been led into striking; and other matters.

11,712. After what you have said, it is hardly necessary to ask you what is your opinion as to the influence of the Union upon the relations between the shipowners and the men?—I can only say from our experience that that influence has been decidedly adverse. I have already shown what were the relations with the men previous to its institution. Any difficulties that have arisen have been in consequence of the interference—outside interference, I should call it—on the part of the Union, and the organ of the Union, "Seafaring," has been unceasing in publishing the most virulent and scurrilous abuse in regard to shipowners, doing the utmost to inflame the minds of the men with opposition to their employers.

11,713. Then I understand you to say that nothing in the nature of conciliatory action was taken by the Union?—I am entirely unaware of any conciliatory action, but quite the opposite.

11,714. Now I think you have to tell us something as to the Union having interfered with the shipowners in the conduct of their business?—Yes.

11,715. Will you state what you have to say on that point?—I shall give, with your permission, two or three illustrations of the attacks made by the Union upon the liberty of the owners and of the coercive tactics put in practice by it (*handing in correspondence*). The first case is that of the "Britannia," a Leith coasting steamer trading between Leith and Newcastle. I may just briefly state the facts. When this strike took place, which I have referred to already, of course it was necessary to put crews on board, where we could get them, and many of these (although some of the Union men had returned), were non-union men; and then there was a clear determination on the part of the Union to block and stop steamers in which there were one or more of the crew free men or non-union men. The "Britannia" shipped her crew in Leith under six months' articles and proceeded on her voyage to Newcastle, and while there the following letter was handed to the captain, signed by J. Mansell, Secretary of the Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union of Great Britain and Ireland. "Sir, unless the whole of the crew of your vessel belong to the above Union, I shall be obliged to stop your vessel. On Monday next, December 9th, 1889, the labourers will be paid by the above Union to refuse working the cargo you bring here until the wages of the Tyne are paid, and all Union men on board. Yours truly, J. Mansell, Secretary." That letter I will hand to your secretary (*handing in letter*). I should state that the owners did not yield to that intimidation, and under great difficulties they maintained their position and had their vessel

Earl of Derby—continued.

discharged. But the most persistent efforts were made by the Union to obstruct and prevent the work being done. I should say that that was a clear incitement to breach of engagement, because these men had been shipped in Leith, and were in the middle of a voyage when it was attempted to interfere with them. The next case, or cases rather, I may say, I am more particularly acquainted with, because the vessels happened to be those principally owned and managed by myself. They are engaged in the Russian trade, trading between the Forth and Tay and Russian ports. I am afraid to trespass too much upon your time, but I should like to state the facts of these cases a little fully, because they seem to illustrate better than anything I could say the peculiar tactics of the Union and the objects.

11,716. Do so?—Early in August in 1890, my steamer, "Moravia," had re-engaged her crew under six months' articles, and had proceeded to Bo'ness to load for Russia, and while there I received two telegrams from my agent, stating, "'Moravia' berthed ready, cargo along-side; secretary Sailors' Union threatens stop loading unless steward joins Union; all Union men here." I wired them to do the best they could, and try and get over the difficulty. However, they telegraphed again, "Secretary demands steward's dismissal, or join Union. We recommend steward joining, but he refuses. Unless either alternative, loading certainly stopped. Wire quickly." I have here also a letter from the secretary of the Union, addressed to the captain at Bo'ness, in which he says, "I am informed your steward is not enrolled as a member of the 'Seamen's Union.' Will you please use your influence to bear upon the steward to join the said Union, as 'per above,' or leave the ship, to save further trouble. An early reply will oblige" (*handing in the original letter and telegrams*). I proceeded to Bo'ness, and saw the steward. I may say that I had never made any distinction whatever between union and non-union men. I had never asked the question what they were when they joined the ships. But I went then to Bo'ness and I saw the steward, and he told me that he had made up his mind that he would not join the Union, and I did not see that I would be doing my duty to force him to leave the ship, and I found it was useless to attempt to compel him to join. He was a Dutchman, and being a sober and steady man, who had been with me for a number of years, I did not wish to lose his services. I found, as I have already stated, that he declined to join. I told the captain that I would not compel him. Meantime, all the crew gave in their notice to leave, at the instigation of the union secretary, of course, and that although they had just signed articles for the voyage, knowing very well (because some of them had been in the ship for years) that this steward was a non-union man, and intended to remain so. I saw the captain, and told him to give the men to understand that if they left the ship, I should at once institute prosecution

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

against them. This caused them to withdraw their notice next morning. Attempts were made to stop the loading, but these were only partially successful, and the ship at length, after some delay, sailed. When she returned to Dundee with her cargo—part cargo for Dundee and part for Leith—the ship was boarded by the union secretary there, who urged the steward again to join the Union, and he refused, when the threat was made by the secretary that if he did not do so before the ship came back, the discharge would be stopped. The ship then came on to Leith with the rest of her cargo, and began to discharge at six in the morning. At 12 o'clock, or about that, the Leith secretary came on board, and told the captain again there that if the steward did not join at once he would stop the discharge. The captain, knowing my mind, refused to discharge him, and accordingly the secretary of the Sailors' Union at once arranged matters with the dockers, agreed to pay them to stop work, and accordingly at dinner-time every man refused to touch the cargo, and we were brought entirely to a standstill. I then gave the captain orders to move the ship into another dock, where the union labourers were less strong, but on giving the men the orders to assist in moving the ship, they refused everyone to do it, although they were on the articles, and in the pay of the ship. Then their next move was everyone to give notice, and to leave the next morning. It was extremely difficult to get free labourers to work the cargo, and it was a day or two before we managed to get any. At last we did get some, and the discharge was proceeded with, but slowly and under police protection all the time. However, we succeeded in getting the cargo discharged and shipping another crew of non-union men, and proceeded to Bo'ness to load. The Leith secretary of the Union at once proceeded to Bo'ness by train, and prevailed upon the dock labourers there to refuse to load the ship. Here was the ship lying alongside in her berth, cargo alongside waiting, and not a man could be got to touch the cargo. I was asked then by the manager of the railway and the dock contractors to bring up men from Leith to trim it, and they would get it to put on board. I had men on board that night, although every attempt was made to obstruct and interfere with them. However, we persisted, started loading under great difficulty, and at length, having occupied a week in what should have been done in two or three days, the ship was loaded and sailed. The same thing had to be gone through on her return at Dundee, although the dock labourers there had agreed—given me an assurance—that the ship would not be interfered with. The same fight had to be gone through there, and I had to take men from Leith to discharge the cargo. Another of my steamers, which arrived in Leith about the same time, was also interfered with, although she had not a single non-union man on board, simply to bring additional pressure to bear upon me. I am glad to say that in every case that intimidation and coercion was entirely unsuccessful.

Earl of Derby—continued.

So that in Leith, in Bo'ness, and in Dundee we had this fight to go through, and I should say that there was not the slightest cause for it, excepting that the whole matter was instigated by the Union for the purpose which I have named.

11,717. The object, as I understand, being that no man should be employed who was not a member of the Union?—Quite so, and that any owner who refused to give effect to that dictum of the Union should be, if necessary, ruined in his business, because that was the outcome of it.

11,718. As I understand, the objection to this steward on board the "Moravia" was solely that he was a non-unionist?—That was it.

11,719. There was no other complaint made against him?—No complaint that would really stand examination. It was stated afterwards that he had used some bad language towards the Union. Well, any of us who are acquainted with seafaring men know that sometimes they do use strong language, and I have very little doubt, that this man being annoyed, and worried, and threatened with expulsion from earning his bread, may have used some stronger language than he would otherwise have done, but I think he was fairly justified—at least I cannot blame him very strongly.

11,720. Did any of these incidents that you have described come before a court of law?—Yes, the conduct of the Leith secretary was brought before the court in Edinburgh, and he was tried for intimidation by a Sheriff and a jury, and found guilty. That, I believe, was under the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act.

11,721. Before this quarrel with the Union had you ever been in the habit of making any distinction between union and non-union men?—None whatever.

11,722. Did the Shipping Federation assist you in this difficulty?—This difficulty broke out just three days, I think, after the Shipping Federation had been established. They gave me any assistance they could; still it was very small compared with what they would be able to now, because they were not organised then.

11,723. You say that the Shipping Federation gave you assistance, but not to the extent to which they would have been able to assist you later?—That is so.

11,724. Did the union officials make any complaint of that, or did they make any attack upon you in consequence?—No, I do not think that that had anything to do with it, but they tried to make it appear to the public that this was an attempt to, as they call it, "Smash the Union," the fact being entirely the reverse.

11,725. Now there is another case about which you wish to tell us something, I think; the case of the "Iona"?—Yes, that is a case which occurred during the recent strike at the Hermitage Wharf, where there was a distinct attempt to induce the men on board this steamer—men who had been shipped in Leith, and were under engagement accordingly—to break their engagement and leave the ship.

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

Fortunately the attempt failed, because the engineer hearing in time that the Union delegate had been on board, went into the forecabin and he found six firemen with their bags and beds packed ready to leave the ship, and he succeeded in preventing them. I put in the letter from the engineer stating the facts of the case, which, I think, perhaps, are sufficient for you (*handing in letters*).

11,726. In that case were the men prepared to disregard their arrangements made in their engagement with the owners?—I think in all cases where the supposed interests of the Union conflicted with the men's engagements with the owners these engagements were disregarded and treated as being of no consequence.

11,727. Have you had any trouble with the Dock Labourers' Union at Leith, besides what you have mentioned?—Yes, we had a great deal of trouble constantly with vessels being stopped—discharging being interfered with or loading—on the most trivial pretences. The fact of a free carter or labourer being employed, if it was noticed, was at once made a cause for interfering and interrupting the work.

11,728. And in consequence of some action of this kind, was there a notice issued on the 17th March of last year by the stevedores of Leith?—Yes, there was, and I have a copy of that notice here. It runs as follows: "Notice. To all whom it may concern. We, the undersigned stevedores of Leith hereby give notice that on and after 23rd instant, we hold ourselves free to engage for employment any men whom we consider suitable for our work, whether they are members of any Union or not, and all men engaging with us shall be bound to do their work as directed, notwithstanding that other men in our employment or on board the ships may or may not be members of any Union. We also reserve to ourselves the right to engage as many men as we think necessary; and any man molesting or interfering in any way with other workmen shall be debarred from further employment by us"; and then it is signed by the stevedores. I put in a copy of that notice (*handing in print*).

11,729. How was this notice taken by the men?—It was taken very quietly. I think it has had a very good effect. Since then matters have gone on quietly, the Union men and free men working together to the mutual advantage of both, and to the benefit of the port.

11,730. It has been stated by the secretary of the Union and by others, that the shipowners have done nothing to show interest in the men or to assist them; can you contradict that statement as regards your district?—I can, most emphatically. The fact is, that the shipowners have always taken the lead in almost every benevolent scheme for the benefit of the seamen frequenting the port.

11,731. Were the shipowners contributories to the Maritime Disasters Fund?—They were much the largest contributors. I should say there have been several funds raised from time

Earl of Derby—continued.

to time, but in March 1883, a fund was formed, and called the Leith Maritime Disasters' Fund, which has assumed a more permanent form. I put in a statement of that fund up to the 2nd July 1891, showing the amount subscribed and expended (*handing in statement*). I should say that that fund has been administered chiefly the shipowners, and that the utmost care has been taken in its administration, each case being considered specially on its merits and dealt with accordingly. In some cases pecuniary assistance was given, weekly or periodical alms were given, there was payment of rents, and besides that 10 children have been placed in various institutions for education; employment was found for 20 women by training them as nurses, getting them into situations, and setting them up in business. I think that that shows that the Leith shipowners have not earned the opinion which has been expressed, that they have been negligent of the interests of their men.

11,732. Have they set up a sailors' home, is that what you were speaking of?—Yes, they did; a very handsome and excellent home was built and equipped in Leith at a cost of about 12,000*l*. I should say that much the greater part of this money was subscribed by the shipowners and their friends, and that we have in Leith now one of the best and most efficient homes of the kind in the kingdom. I am glad to say that it is practically free of debt. This is a statement of the cost and of the tariff (*handing in print of Sixth Annual Report*).

11,733. We need not go into details; all these things to which you have referred for the benefit of the sailors were done before the Union was established?—Yes.

11,734. Have the Shipping Federation established a benefit fund?—Yes, they have, and that scheme came into operation upon the 1st of this month. I do not know whether your Lordship would like me to state the benefits which the Shipping Federation has provided for its men, but I am ready to do so if you require me.

11,735. Yes, if you can state them briefly; but not in detail?—The fund provides on death or total disablement, for the payment, in case of a master, of 100*l*.; chief officer, chief engineer, surgeon, and purser, 75*l*.; second officer and second engineer, 50*l*.; other certificated officers, 40*l*.; petty officers, 35*l*.; sailors and firemen and all other members of the crew, 25*l*.; and Asiatic seamen, 12*l*. 10*s*., or alternately allowance in case of accident for 13 weeks, to the master, of 40*s*. a week; to the chief officer, chief engineer, surgeon, and purser, 30*s*.; second officer and second engineer, 20*s*.; other certificated officers, 16*s*.; petty officers and others, 14*s*.; sailors and fireman, 10*s*.; Asiatic seamen, 5*s*. each per week.

11,736. Is there any system in connexion with your Shipowners' Society providing for conciliation, arbitration, or any other means of arranging disputes?—No, there is no system in connexion with our Society for that purpose.

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

As I have already stated previous to the intervention of the Union, the shipowners had no difficulty in arranging matters; they were always ready to meet with the men, and to confer with them as desired, and there was good feeling.

11,737. What is the feeling in your district respecting arbitration or the establishment of boards of conciliation?—I cannot say that there is a very favourable opinion of arbitration or of boards of conciliation, one reason for this distrust being that while the decisions would be binding and enforceable against owners, they would not be so on the other side: at all events, there would be no such security to that end. Perhaps you will permit me to say, before leaving this question, that we believe more in the spread of more intelligent views among the men, and in the frank discussion of differences between the owners and the men. I say the men, rather than the Union officials, because I think that the more the men come to realize that their interest is bound up with the interest of the owners, and that the success of the one means the success of the other, the better; views of that nature are more likely to be effectual in preventing these disputes.

11,738. You have told us in a paper which I hold in my hand, that you think there are certain statistics which it would be desirable to have collected and published by Government; what are they?—I think that it would be very desirable that statistics should be got to show how far trade has been driven from our ports, especially London, by the labour troubles, to the benefit of such ports as Antwerp, Rotterdam, and Hamburg. Also the Government might collect and publish statistics regarding the so-called "on principle" strikes, or sympathetic strikes, or whatever the term used may be.

11,739. Have you anything to say as to picketing, or the legal punishment of intimidation?—Picketing, which is really synonymous with intimidation, should be made illegal, and the penalties for intimidation increased.

11,740. It is punishable at present, is it not?—It is punishable under the 7th section of the Conspiracy Act, but that Act is not very efficient, at all events. I shall explain how that Act does not meet the case exactly.

11,741. Will you kindly explain now?—Section 7 of that Act reads: "Every person who, with a view to compel any other person to abstain from doing, or to do any act which such other person has a legal right to do, or abstain from doing, wrongfully and without legal authority—1. Uses violence to, or intimidates such other person or his wife or children, or injures his property; or, 2. Persistently follows such other person about from place to place; or, 3. Hides any tools, clothes, or other property owned or used by such other person, or deprives him of, or hinders him in the use thereof; or, 4. Watches or besets the house or other place where such other person resides, or works, or carries on business, or happens to be, or the approach to such

Earl of Derby—continued.

house or place; or, 5. Follows such other person, with two or more other persons in a disorderly manner in or through any street or road." These are all very good as they stand, but there is a clause at the end of that section which practically nullifies numbers 2 and 4, because it says, "Attending at or near the house or place where a person resides, or works, or carries on business, or happens to be, or the approach to such house or place, in order merely to obtain or communicate information, shall not be deemed a watching or besetting within the meaning of this section." Now, it entirely depends upon the nature of the communication or information that is made, and undoubtedly there has been very many cases where large numbers of men (in our own case, for instance, in Leith) have practised this kind of intimidation with impunity. Of course, the kind of communication meant by those who framed this Act was respecting the merits of the dispute; but we know very well that the kind of information or communication has, in many cases, been very different from that. A communication that "If you go and take employment with So-and-so you will suffer for it personally; you may get your head broken," or whatever the particular threat may be. That is information; but it is not the kind of information which was intended.

11,742. Have there been many prosecutions under this Act in Scotland?—No; I believe that of the Leith Secretary of the Union was the first under this Act—so far as I know.

11,743. You have told us that you wish to strengthen the Act in this respect, and that certain acts which are really intimidation escape, because they are not treated as such by the law?—Yes.

11,744. We were told in evidence yesterday that the loss of life in British ships is over four times that in ships belonging to other European countries; have you any evidence to give upon that point?—I do not think that I have anything to say upon that point, further than that I believe that to be a wholly erroneous and wholly misleading statement.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

11,745. You told us that the Leith Secretary of the Union was prosecuted for intimidation, I think, and found guilty, did you not?—I did.

11,746. What was the punishment inflicted?—A fine of 10*l.*, or seven days' imprisonment. I need not say that the fine was paid at once.

11,747. Was it owing to that conviction that the proceedings, which you detailed with regard to your steamers in 1890, were stopped?—No; this prosecution took place a good deal later than that—the prosecution did not come on, or rather the case was not tried, till January of 1891.

11,748. What was it put an end to the attempts at interfering with the conduct of your steamers?—Simply that we succeeded in showing that we could do without those men, and

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

by the strengthening of our hands through the Shipping Federation.

11,749. Was not the secretary of the Dockers' Union at Dundee also prosecuted for intimidation?—He was. On the Dundee dockers refusing and stopping my work, I succeeded in getting a free-labour stevedore to undertake it, and he was continually molested, and threats were used against him chiefly by the secretary of the Dockers' Union in Dundee. Complaint was lodged, this secretary was brought before the sheriff, but the sheriff curiously enough took this view of the case: that because the man had not actually ceased work, there was no intimidation. The public prosecutor then applied to the Court of Session as against this judgment of the sheriff, and the judges of the Court of Session unanimously held that the sheriff was wrong; that there was intimidation when the threats were used, and sent it back for trial. But when the case was sent back for trial it was found that the secretary had absconded, it is said, with the funds, or with certain funds of the Union, so that the case was really not tried.

11,750. I did not quite understand whether you made any definite proposal for altering the law upon this subject?—The only proposal that I have to make is, that the last clause of section 7—that explanatory clause—should be removed, or in some way altered, so as to meet the case, because I know that there have been cases where the judges have held that they could not interfere although we knew perfectly that there was intimidation, still that the peculiar phraseology of this clause made it very difficult for them to convict.

11,751. Would not any kind of threat be punishable now?—It is very difficult to get evidence, because while there are generally a good number of intimidators, they generally select the time when there is perhaps only one or a very few persons to be intimidated, and we know that in many cases men, after having lodged a complaint of intimidation, have been induced by other influences to withdraw it, perhaps for monetary considerations or otherwise—I do not know.

11,752. Do you want to punish a man for informing another of the existence of a strike?—Certainly not.

11,753. Or for trying to persuade another man not to work for another employer?—I certainly do not, but I would punish a man for intimidating either by threats or numbers, and for preventing men from doing what they have a right to do—to seek employment or to take employment.

11,754. And you are of opinion that that is not punishable now by law?—Well, it is extremely difficult to punish. I hold that it should be illegal for men in numbers to beset the approaches of places where work is to be had, and by their presence, and by their words, and by their looks—because there may be as much intimidation in a look as in a word—to prevent men from seeking or taking employment. But

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

I have nothing to suggest further than that that explanatory clause of the Act should be removed.

Mr. Plimsoll.

11,755. You stated a little while ago that you considered the statement which was made yesterday as to the comparative loss of life in the English mercantile marine, and in that of other nations, to be wholly illusory and misleading?—Yes.

11,756. Have you heard of such a man as the Right Honourable Joseph Chamberlain?—Yes, I have.

11,757. Do you know that he was President of the Board of Trade at one time?—Quite well.

11,758. Do you know that the Presidents of the Board of Trade, when they are about to make statements in Parliament, are supplied with the most trustworthy information by the heads of the Department?—I should believe they were.

11,759. Well then, would you be surprised to hear that the statement which you take upon yourself to say is wholly misleading and illusory was made by the Right Honourable Joseph Chamberlain in the House of Commons in his capacity as President of the Board of Trade?—I am quite aware of the fact, but I am also aware of the fact that Mr. Chamberlain took very great and special care upon that occasion to warn Parliament that these figures could not be relied upon; that the returns from foreign countries were not of a kind which would compare with ours—that is the sense of what he said—and that accordingly he stated this with great reserve. I am not using the actual words, I have not got them with me, but certainly that is the sense of what he said.

11,760. And do you think that any source of possible error which he indicated in what he said on that occasion would tend to explain away this enormous disparity?—It is so enormous that it is absurd and incredible in the last degree.

11,761. Did you hear, or are you aware, that by means of a schedule of an Act of Parliament—what is called a repealing schedule—legislation was swept away by Mr. Milner Gibson in 1862, which was distinctly afterwards proved to have resulted in an increase of loss of life on timber ships by four times; that is to say, that the removal effected in the Statute Book resulted in multiplying the loss of life four times?—I know that that has been stated, but I have seen no proof of the fact—no proof of the statement.

11,762. Are you aware that the statement was made by gentlemen who were appointed by the Lloyd's Committee at the instance of the Board of Trade to investigate such things?—No, I should be very much surprised to hear that.

11,763. Well, take it from me that it was so?—I should be very glad to see the statement in the report.

11,764. This is the report in question (*producing report*) which was made in 1874 by two gentle-

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued

Mr. Plimsoll—continued.

men appointed by Lloyd's, and they say that they have examined 6,842 voyages, being all the autumn voyages from the North American ports in the 10 years preceding 1862, and the 10 years following 1862, and they say, "We find that the "deck-loading period was marked by a loss of "life nearly four times as great as the 10 years "during which no deck-loads were allowed." Have you anything to say to impugn that statement?—I have to state—

11,765. That you do not believe it?—That that applies, in the first place, to a period nearly 30 years ago; and, in the next place, if you will allow me, that that applies to one particular trade only, whereas the statement was made to appear to apply to the whole shipping of the United Kingdom.

11,766. No doubt the statement upon which you give your opinion does apply to the whole, but I was wanting to show how in one particular instance it is literally true—?—I do not think it is so.

11,767. That the loss is owing to legislation?—Am I to understand that you say that that is true now?

11,768. This?—Yes.

11,769. That I cannot say. I trust that the Board of Trade will obtain an extension of this report and inquiry by Messrs. Janson and Wakefield; that was the object which I had in view?—I should just like to say in reference to that that Parliament has been legislating for many years past—

11,770. No doubt things are better?—And there is no trade in the country which has been so harassed by legislation as the shipping trade. We have had Acts at the rate of sometimes three and four in a year, so that we scarcely know where we are, and yet we are told that this is the result. I, for one, do not believe that it is the result. But we can only say there is one of two things must be true; either that the legislation has done more harm than good, or that the statement is void of foundation. While I hold that some of the legislation has not only failed in its purpose, but been positively harmful, yet we know that there has been enormous improvement in the safety of ships at sea, and that British shipowners have always taken the lead in improving the quality of their ships, and the means of securing safety of life and property at sea. I could give you no better test of that—at all events, it is a very important test which occurs to me—than the rates at which underwriters now write ships and cargo, which, in many cases, are a mere fraction of what they were.

Mr. Tait.

11,771. Would you further explain your meaning when you say that picketing is synonymous with intimidation?—I have endeavoured to explain that as well as I can. We know that it is so, and we know that the effect is very much the same, and as it has been

Mr. Tait—continued.

practised, we know that that has been the effect.

11,772. Have you never known a strike where there was no intimidation?—I presume that there is more or less intimidation at every strike. I cannot say that I know of any where there was no intimidation, but I say intimidation is wrong.

11,773. But the fact of your not knowing that there had not been a strike where there was no intimidation, would scarcely warrant you in stating that picketing is synonymous with intimidation, simply because you do not know?—I know that it has been so in our case.

11,774. It may have been. I am not denying that it has been so in some instances?—I should say in the generality of cases.

11,775. Now your position in reference to section 7 of the Act is, that the workmen who may be on strike shall, in effect, not have the same privileges as the owners or employers whom they may be striking against?—No, I do not think so. May I ask you to explain?

11,776. Supposing that there was a strike at your dock, say in Leith, do you want to prevent the *employé* going up to a man who may be coming ashore from a voyage, and saying that on the ship "Arabia" there is a strike going on, and you might take care and not take employment in that ship?—No, I do not think that that would be a punishable offence.

11,777. What would you say that the workmen should be prevented from doing, what they are presently allowed under the law now?—The workmen ought to be prevented from making threats, or giving any man to understand either by word or look, that if he took employment on board that ship, or in that shop or warehouse, he would suffer for it.

11,778. Under the Act just now, there is plenty of provision for punishing men for doing those things, with the exception of looking?—Yes, but it is not punished; that is what I say, it is not punished.

11,779. Supposing you had an alteration of the Act, how would you get them any more punished than they are just now?—They are not punished at all just now; that is what I object to.

11,780. By the insertion of what provision would you get the punishment?—I think I have already stated that I am not prepared to make any proposal upon that point, excepting the alteration of that explanatory clause at the end of section 7.

11,781. Yes, but while you say that that should be taken away, and the privileges of the exceptions not maintained, you are not prepared to say what you would substitute for it?—I would leave the Act as it is without that. Let the clauses of the Act speak for themselves without that explanatory clause.

11,782. In answer to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach you stated that the Leith case was the only case where prosecutions had resulted when cases of intimidation had occurred?—I think I stated—it was my intention to state, at least—

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

that I believed that was the only case that had been tried in Scotland for intimidation.

11,783. Are you aware that the secretary of one of the largest Unions in Scotland, for violating the same provision of the Act which you have read, was sentenced to a term of two months' imprisonment?—May I ask when that was?

11,784. I should think about two years ago, or two years and a half ago?—No, I am not aware of that.

11,785. Will you accept it from me that that is the case?—Certainly.

11,786. It was tried in the Court of Justiciary in Edinburgh?—I should state that the judge, in giving judgment in the case of the secretary to whom I referred, stated that this was the first case which had been tried in Scotland. I, perhaps, was wrong in taking his statement for a fact, but he did make that statement.

11,787. The case I referred to was tried in Edinburgh about two years ago. I was just mentioning this case to show to you that where cases of intimidation have been clearly proven to the court, the court has sufficient power under the present Act to prevent any such intimidation?—Yes. I can state, however, with regard to that, that there has been a great remissness on the part of the legal authorities in Scotland in giving effect to the provisions of this Act. A private individual cannot prosecute under this Act; it remains with the procurators fiscal, and they in most cases have been extremely slow to move in that direction.

11,788. Of course, like all other people, the procurator fiscal would be desirous of assuring himself that he had a good case to take to the court before taking it there. Like every other person, he does not like to go to the court and lose?—Naturally; and perhaps there may be something in the way of saving themselves trouble.

11,789. Now your experience in having communications with Trades Unions has not been very lengthy; only since the formation of the Sailors and Firemen's Union or the Dockers' Union in Leith?—Well, I may say so; yes.

11,790. And you have expressed your opinion to-day that you think one method of diminishing any strained relations between employers and workmen would be to confer together, but you qualified that by stating that you meant by meeting them, to meet the men who would be actually in your employment?—Or representatives.

11,791. But you do not want to deny, then, the right to send a representative to you?—Certainly not, provided that they are *bona fide* working men in the actual employment—doing the actual work.

11,792. Just so; but assume for a moment that in your district one of the sailors who is personally in your employment was elected by the men to act as their secretary, and they would pay him for doing their work the same as you would pay your manager for doing yours,

Mr. Tait—continued.

would you deny that secretary who had been taken from the ranks of the working men the opportunity of vindicating, as far as possible, the cause of the men?—Certainly not; but I would say that if he came to see me upon any business connected with the employment of my men that he should be accompanied by men who are actually doing the work.

11,793. I agree with that myself to some extent. I was going to point out that evidence which has been led here by some of the dock directors of London has pointed out that they are desirous of meeting rather with representatives of the men, as being the best means of settling any strained relations which may exist?—With the qualification that I have already stated, I have no objections to that.

11,794. Now, can you give us any information of what, during these last 15 or 16 years, has been the lowest wage that you have paid to seamen? I was not in at the commencement of your evidence. I only got it from 1885, when you stated that it was 26s. Have you any statistics before that?—I have statistics obtained from the Mercantile Marine Office in Leith, which I think you may take as correct. In 1865 25s. per week was paid to sailors, and 27s. 6d. per week to firemen.

11,795. Just give me 1875?—I am sorry to say I have not 1875. I can give you 1872, when they were 27s. 6d. and 28s. respectively.

11,796. Do the wages which you were giving us just now solely pertain to ocean steamers?—No, to coasting steamers too.

11,797. Have you any monthly boats in Leith?—Yes.

11,798. Are the wages of those less than those stipulated here?—No. At present they are 4l. 10s. for sailors, and 4l. 15s. for firemen, and found, of course.

11,799. Because there have been statements made here that during these last 14 or 15 years, at some periods of that time, sailors were working for 2l. 10s. or 2l. 15s. per month, or had been?—I should say that such a thing is quite unknown to me, and that since 1865—and I have this schedule before me—there has been nothing of that kind.

11,800. Referring to the advance of wages which you gave in June, namely, from 27s. 6d. to 30s. per week, was the advance requested by the Union?—It was requested by the men—not the Union, but by the men. I have no doubt the Union was behind them.

11,801. The Union was in existence at that time?—Yes.

11,802. And you had a pretty strong branch in Leith, I believe?—Yes.

11,803. Before that there was no system of regulating wages?—Before that the system was just that the men and the owners arranged the wages; that is to say, that there was freedom of contract; they contracted according to their freedom.

11,804. Yes, but under that system it would be possible for one shipowner competing in the

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued.]

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

same market as another to get men at a lower rate of wage than another?—No.

11,805. Not owing to the nature of the system?—No, the men would not take it; we never could do that.

11,806. Such a case as that has never occurred to your knowledge?—Not to my knowledge.

Mr. *Bolton*.

11,807. It has been stated here that certain ports in the kingdom are called union ports, because all the sailors sailing therefrom are members of the Union. Is that the case in Leith?—Do you ask me whether all the sailors in Leith are connected with the Union?

11,808. Yes?—No, certainly not.

11,809. Is a large proportion of them connected with, and under the control of, the Union?—I am unable to say what the proportion under control is now at present, but at one time there was, I should say, a large proportion—I am unable to say what—connected with the Union—previous to that strike that I have referred to.

11,810. Have you reason to suppose that that proportion is reduced?—I have; very decidedly.

11,811. Considerably reduced?—Yes.

11,812. I think you have expressed an opinion adverse to boards of conciliation and boards of arbitration?—Not adverse exactly, at least I hope not, but, generally speaking, we have not much reason to feel confident that they would be either efficient or effective in preventing or arranging disputes.

11,813. Would you be prepared to support proposals for the establishment of boards of arbitration and conciliation by Act of Parliament?—It depends entirely what the provisions and powers of these boards are or might be.

11,814. I presume that the powers of a board of conciliation would merely be to endeavour to effect settlements between the disputants?—If the effect of the work of such boards was to elicit a true statement of the facts of the case, and to make plain to the men as well as to the public, the true nature of the dispute, I should personally have no objection to them.

11,815. Do you imagine that much benefit would be derived from them?—I find it extremely difficult to say. I am clear that there should be the widest possible knowledge of the facts of the case in all disputes, because I think that if these were fully and fairly stated, they would, in many cases, prevent these labour disputes, but I cannot say.

11,816. Who should be the possessors of that knowledge?—The men engaged in the dispute; the men who have reason, or think they have reason, to complain; and also the public, because public opinion is a very important factor in all such cases.

11,817. You do not think it is sufficient that the masters and the men should be possessors of that knowledge?—I have no objection. I think

Mr. *Bolton*—continued.

it is, perhaps, as well in such cases that the public should have the facts also, but that is immaterial.

11,818. Then, as to the board of arbitration. What benefit would you anticipate from that?—By a board of arbitration I conceive you mean a board which would have the right to adjudicate upon a dispute.

11,819. I do so?—I am not prepared to say that our Leith shipowners are quite prepared to give their adhesion to that proposal. I rather think not, at the present time.

11,820. For reasons?—For reasons which I have no doubt are satisfactory to them. I have no authority to enter into details or reasons, but I should think myself that they would require to be assured of the ability of the judges in the first instance, and to see exactly what their powers were, and the terms of the submission.

11,821. And would they not require powers of enforcing their decision?—I should think they would; if you give them the power compulsorily to intervene in disputes I should think they would require that. I should think it would be a necessary provision that a Trades Union, in such a case, should require to lay down a certain sum of money as a guarantee for the fulfilment of the obligations.

11,822. Why do you bring in the Trades Union?—Because I presume that you were speaking from the Trades Union point of view.

11,823. I was desirous of eliciting your opinion on the point merely?—Call it a Union. I do not care, but unless you have an organised body—

11,824. Assume a dispute between a shipowner and a ship's crew as to the rates of wages, or as to serving, we will say, with non-union men, or something of that kind?—As to the rate of wages, that is a matter that there has never been any difficulty in adjusting, and as to serving with a non-union crew, that is a point that shipowners will not submit to any arbitration upon. They will uphold the freedom of contract, and that is a condition precedent to any negotiation whatever.

11,825. Then, would you exclude from this board of arbitration any revision of wages?—I am not prepared to say that I would exclude that, but I would exclude the right of freedom of contract, which we will uphold at any cost.

11,826. I think you expressed an opinion, favourable rather than the reverse, to the presence of union leaders in the settlement of disputes between owners and the men?—I would have no objection to the leaders of Unions being present in the case of any conference; but I would most strongly maintain that there ought always to be at such conferences a large representation of the men themselves who are actually engaged in the work.

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

11,827. Then what purposes would the presence of the union leaders serve?—That is for them to say; it is not I who am contending for their presence. I merely say that I would not object to their presence.

11,828. I think you suggest that the Government should obtain statistics as to the trade being driven from English ports to foreign ports?—Yes.

11,829. How would you arrive at the result which you aim at? How would you determine the cause of a particular trade being withdrawn from the port of London to the port of Antwerp or Rotterdam?—I think that could be very easily ascertained. I do not think there could be any doubt or difficulty about that if it were gone about in earnest.

11,830. To whom would you leave the decision that a certain trade had left this port of London and gone to Antwerp, in consequence of trade disputes, say?—I would leave it to any impartial parties.

11,831. Would you leave it to the Board of Trade?—Yes, I should have no objection to that. I should say that in consequence of the unsatisfactory state of matters in the port of London, many owners will not send their ships here at all, and I myself have a strong feeling in the same direction—the delays and expense are so great.

11,832. You were asked by Mr. Tait whether prior to the establishment of the Union there was any system of regulating wages in force; is there a system regulating wages now?—There is no system really, but there is the right of contract between the men and the owners. The men of course get the best wages they can, and they are very well able to make their own bargain.

11,833. And the owners, of course, engage the men at the lowest rate of wages that they can?—I think I have given sufficient evidence to show that the owners have not acted upon that principle.

11,834. Do you think they pay more than they are required to do?—I am not prepared to say that they pay more, but they have always given a fair rate of wages, and I have shown that in times of great depression, when ship-owners were making nothing and losing heavily, they did not reduce wages until they were actually forced to do it after a lengthened period of loss, and then only to a small extent, and as soon as things began to mend, the wages were again restored to their former figure.

11,835. By the action of the Union?—No.

11,836. By the action of what?—By the owners.

11,837. Are you of opinion that Trades Unions, as a whole, are able to force up wages?—Probably, if they had the power they would do so. I have not the slightest doubt that they would.

11,838. But as matters stand?—In Leith I do not think they have the power.

Mr. Ismay.

11,839. You told the Commission that you thought there was a considerable reduction in the loss of life at sea, or rather an increased safety at sea in ships?—Yes, I do think so.

11,840. And you referred to the premium of insurance as having gone down. Can you give the Commission any instances of it?—Yes, I can. I must do so from memory, because I have not the facts by me at the moment. I remember many years ago when I was engaged, as I am still engaged, in carrying cargoes from Archangel, in the north of Russia, to this country, we used to pay 20s. per cent. premium on the cargo, and now we can do the same thing at 7s. 6d.

11,841. And I suppose risk indicates premium?—Certainly; one is a very good indication of the other. In the Baltic the reduction is even greater than that.

11,842. Do the foreign vessels in the same trade insure cheaper than British vessels?—I am not aware that they do. I should think not.

11,843. If the safety is so much greater, as we have been told, they would insure cheaper, would they not?—I am not prepared to say. I am not quite sure that I understand your question.

11,844. Can the cargo carried by foreign vessels engaged in the same trade be insured at a lower rate of premium than the cargo carried by British ships?—No; I do not believe so.

11,845. You do not believe it?—No.

11,846. It has not come under your notice that such is the case?—No; in fact I do not believe there is any difference; from my knowledge I should say there is no difference.

11,847. No difference?—No.

11,848. As regards the loss of trade in London have you any knowledge of it yourself?—Yes. I know in a general way that in consequence of the delays and expense—the delays caused by the trouble and the state of matters in the labour market—many owners, as I have already said, have given their foreign agents instructions not to charter for London. I know that. I have the same feeling myself, and act upon it as far as I can. I also know that there are sundry lines in London which used to come here and ship large quantities of cargo which now go to the Continental ports to the loss, of course, of the British trade.

11,849. Is not that a natural diversion of trade to the Continent?—I think not. It was begun during the time—well, not begun, but it was greatly intensified, if not begun, during the time when the dockers' strike and its subsequent effects were felt in London.

11,850. To what countries do you chiefly refer; to what parts?—Belgium, Germany, and Holland.

11,851. Trading where?—Trading with the East, with India, with South America.

11,852. With the Australian colonies?—Yes.

11,853. Do you think that the Port of London has lost considerably?—I do think so.

27 January 1892.]

Mr. J. CORMACK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ismay—continued.

11,854. I believe the tonnage of the port has not fallen off?—That may be, but a very cursory examination and inquiry will show that a very considerable number of those large ships, which used to come to London for cargoes, now go to these ports, and I believe that that is largely due to the difficulty, delay, and expense here.

11,855. And the vexatious disputes?—Yes.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

11,856. You expressed a wish for the collec-

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

tion and publication of statistics with regard to strikes on principle, and strikes of sympathy?—Yes.

11,857. Are you acquainted with the Annual Report on Strikes, which is prepared and published by the Statistical Department of the Board of Trade?—Well, I have not seen it, I must say. If that report contains the information that I have expressed a desire to see, then I should be exceedingly glad to find it there.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. ROBERT ROBINSON called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

11,858. We understand that you represent the Tyneside National Labour Union?—Yes.

11,859. Have you been desired by the officials of your Union to attend here as a witness?—I am desired to represent the Quayside workers.

11,860. Your Union, as I understand, represents the unskilled labourers of the Newcastle district?—Yes.

11,861. Are they about 1,400 in number?—The Quayside men are 1,400 in number; they are generally what are called "dockers."

11,862. I think we need not ask you as to the facts which you have already given us in the printed statement from your Union, but, perhaps you will tell us what is the special point to which you wish to call the attention of the Commission?—The special point is that the overflow of labour is smaller than the demand for work, and that the wages received are so little that they necessarily compel those men who follow this occupation to live in a very unsanitary condition of life—in an overcrowded and unsanitary condition; in fact, they have to live in hovels which are not fit for human habitation. On the other hand, there are some classes of them—small numbers of them—who have a permanent job, who are not casual, and who have to work extraordinary long hours at a stretch, and we think by the national introduction or the national adoption of an eight hours day, it would considerably reduce the numbers of the unemployed.

11,863. You complain of low wages and long hours?—Yes.

11,864. What are the average wages weekly; I do not think you have given that yet?—We cannot get an average wage; it is only with certain sections. The body which I represent are casual labourers; they are only paid by the hour with time-work, or if it is piece-work, by the ton, but the work is that little that you cannot strike any other average than merely a few hours each week—generally on the Sunday nights and the Fridays, which is the only time there is any demand for casual labour.

11,865. Sevenpence per hour, I understand, is the ordinary price, and 9d. per hour for overtime?—That is so.

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,866. Now, do you complain of the irregularity of labour?—Yes.

11,867. Do you complain that the employment is irregular?—Very irregular indeed.

11,868. That, I suppose, is in consequence of the fluctuations of trade?—Fluctuations in the market and seasonable causes likewise.

11,869. As to that, I presume you have no suggestion to offer?—No.

11,870. That is an inevitable inconvenience. Are there many foreigners employed in the kind of work that you do?—None.

11,871. Has there been any considerable introduction of labour-saving machinery?—There have been a good deal of facilities, but not of labour-reducing machinery, because cranes and those things are all that they can do in that line, but they have introduced of late years facilities, since the Union has commenced, which were not introduced before, by which a sharper man as a worker will lift more bulk at a time, and such appliances as those.

11,872. Then you complain of very long hours?—Very long hours with some classes who are employed weekly. I have known as a general thing 24 hours, but I have known them in some cases 48 hours and upwards.

11,873. You do not mean 48 hours of consecutive work?—Consecutive work, with only a cessation for meal hours. That is the strongest point we have. We think that if the nation, the Government, would curtail the hours to eight per day, it would make those men, when they have worked eight hours go home, and let other men step into their places and get their work.

11,874. But, if the work were limited to eight hours per day compulsorily, do you not think the wages would fall in proportion?—No. I do not think they would fall in proportion—not in our line. I would not like to be sure that I could say positively that it would not reduce the wages in any other place, but I cannot see why it should.

11,875. Do you think, as a whole, that the men whom you represent would wish to be compelled by law not to work above eight hours?—Yes; they would wish to be compelled by law

27 January 1892.]

Mr. R. ROBINSON.

[Continued.

Earl of Derby—continued.

—they would wish every man to get eight hours if possible, no more; quite willing to drop off work after eight hours for that day.

11,876. No overtime?—No overtime; they want to stop the overtime if possible.

11,877. The same amount of work could be distributed among a larger number of men?—Yes.

11,878. Do you not think, that being the case, that employers would continue to pay the same total amount as before, and therefore pay each man less?—I think they would pay the same as they paid before, but there would be a more equal division of it, it would stop the ranks of the unemployed swelling so much.

11,879. Have you had much trouble in the way of strikes?—Not a great deal; I have had two or three cases.

11,880. Is there any rule or custom in your Union which prevents working with non-unionists?—Yes.

11,881. You refuse to work with them?—We refuse to work with non-unionists.

11,882. Therefore when you speak of a larger number of persons being employed in this work, you mean that they should be all members of the Union?—Must be trades unionists; we recognise only trades unionists.

11,883. You would confine the kind of work that you do, entirely to members of the Union?—Just so, we would.

11,884. Is there anything else that your Union wishes to recommend besides the compulsory eight hours day?—Yes; we beg to recommend that the masters give not so much confidence to the middleman, and look more to the man. We think it would be the means of bringing capital and labour more together if they would allow the men to work on a co-operative or profit-sharing principle; that would be the means, we consider, of doing away with the middleman, and would bring direct communication between capital and labour.

11,885. What prevents you from undertaking work on the co-operative system; that has been done to a great extent without any help from the law, has it not?—It has not been done in our neighbourhood yet. One attempt was made by some non-unionists to work on the co-operative principle, but as they were reducing, or trying to reduce, the wages on the river it was disastrous, and the trades unionists would not work for them.

11,886. The only attempt at co-operation that was made in your district was opposed by the Union, I understand?—Yes, they were non-unionists.

11,887. Then, I think, if I may sum it up, what you have to recommend is this: that no work of the kind which you have to deal with should be done except by unionists, and that no one shall make more than eight hours a day?—That is it.

Mr. Tait.

11,888. In the summary here, you state that there are 1,400 members, and that the average

U 7272a.

Mr. Tait—continued.

earnings are only 9s. 9d. per week?—That is right.

11,889. Would you inform us how you have arrived at these figures?—I have arrived at that figure by, in the first place, getting the numbers of men employed at this branch of industry from our books of the various branches, and likewise by being out night and day attending to them, getting to them, seeing the exact time they commence work and when they finish, and getting the men themselves to say exactly what they worked for.

11,890. Have you ever attempted to get the number of casuals that on a given day come seeking work upon the Tyneside?—We are all casuals, union or non-union; but the number 1,400, embraces the members of our Union only. There are a good few men over and above that who seek work, but do not get it if there are trades unionists to be had.

11,891. But there should be a number of permanent men in this 1,400?—There are not over 150 permanent men in it.

11,892. You suggested to the Commission that you want an eight hours' day, and that you want Government to interfere; how did you get the opinion of your men, was it by vote?—By vote.

11,893. By ballot?—No, by vote; by a show of hands.

11,894. At a committee?—Yes; at a series of meetings.

11,895. In reference to your suggestion that the middleman should be done away with, do you wish a system of co-operation instituted similar to that which exists in the distribution of grocery and other goods on the same basis?—On the same basis as the co-operative or profit-sharing system.

11,896. What is the reason that your Union opposed a system of co-operation which was led in evidence here yesterday? Do you know Mr. Allman?—Yes.

11,897. What was the reason that your Union opposed that attempt?—They opposed it on the principles of trade unionists, that they were not paying the rate of wages to the men on the one-half; and, on the other half, that they were working too low for the stevedores—that they were bringing the prices of the employers down, and that they were also bringing the prices of the *employés* down.

11,898. Was it the fact that your Union expelled a few of its members?—Yes.

11,899. Who were interested in that co-operative system, was it simply because they were interested in that?—Well, yes; they expelled one or two of the members from the Society who had connection with this stevedore company, and who refused to knock off and desist work when asked to do so.

11,900. But what were the reasons why you asked them to desist work?—Because they were materially pulling the prices down; they were working directly in opposition to the Union.

11,901. Then it was for some other reason than just simply being in connexion with this

27 January 1892.]

Mr. R. ROBINSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

co-operative system that you expelled them?—That was all; and the black-legging propensities that they were exhibiting at the time.

11,902. Have you had any accidents in your district from having bad tools or gear about your ships?—Very slight accidents, very temporary; they are nothing serious.

11,903. I see here you are not satisfied?—Not satisfied with the majority of them. The large firms have a pretty good sample of material to work with, but the small men have not.

11,904. And you suggest here that a practical inspector be appointed?—Yes.

11,905. Whose jurisdiction would you have the inspector to be under?—I would have a Government inspector—a working-man Government inspector. You mentioned the gentleman's name who was here yesterday—a gentleman who was giving evidence yesterday. He was one of the pioneers of our Society, and he has been a disappointed man, I suppose, in not getting into office, or into a fair office, in the Society; he changed his tactics and he left it.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

11,906. Supposing you had your Act of Parliament punishing working for more than eight hours, would you punish the men who worked?—Yes, most undoubtedly. It would have to be as binding on the one side as on the other.

11,907. You would have to punish the employer and the workman?—Most undoubtedly, without it was some special case, such as an accident, or a fire, or anything of that kind which was taking place to cause this extra work, damage to a ship, a collision, or anything of that kind which could not avoidably be helped. In such cases as those we would be prepared to give way, but as an ordinary course of things we would not allow them to work any longer.

11,908. Yes, but are the men whom you represent here willing that the law should send them to prison or fine them for working more than eight hours in the day?—Yes.

11,909. That has been put to them?—That has been put to them, taking into consideration that it would be allowed on cases of emergency only—on very special cases. They are quite willing to abide by the eight hours pure and simple, and make it penal.

Mr. Trow.

11,910. With respect to the dismissal of representative delegates, you state here that you have had a few dismissals, but that you have settled them by trades union efforts?—Yes.

11,911. How have you settled them?—Those are cases of men being dismissed for speaking as delegates. They have been dismissed, and we have got them back again at a meeting of the masters with a deputation of our men. We

Mr. Trow—continued.

never had strikes of any consequence on that head.

11,912. Did you get them back on the threat of a stoppage unless they were put back?—Not a threat; but on showing the masters that it was necessary for some of the men to take an active part on behalf of the others.

11,913. Were there no strong expressions, such as that there would be a stop unless they came back?—Yes, undoubtedly there was a little pressure brought to bear on it, but it was necessary for some of the members to take this active part—

11,914. How long has your Union been in existence?—Three years.

11,915. And you refused to work with the non-unionists?—Yes.

11,916. Did ever any unionists object to your working before you formed the Union?—I never worked with any other trade that had not a Union.

11,917. Do you think it is in accordance with the trade union principle for you to refuse to allow the employer to dismiss a man, and to refuse yourselves to allow a man to exercise his own judgment whether he will belong to you or not, and if he refuses, to try to prevent him getting bread?—No; I do not think it is out of place our refusing to work with them or preventing non-unionists working.

11,918. Do you not think it is as much tyranny upon your part as it is upon the part of the employers?—No, I do not see it in that light.

11,919. Supposing a man belonging to another Union comes amongst your men, would you compel him to leave his own and join yours?—No, as long as it is a Trades Union.

11,920. Now, as to your eight hours, is the Commission to understand that 9s. 9d. per week is the average earning under the present conditions of your men?—Yes.

11,921. That is about 12 hours for six days work?—9s. 9d. per week is the average, but I cannot say for six days' work, taking into consideration that generally most of the work in Newcastle is on a Sunday night.

11,922. It is continued right through the night for 24 or 48 hours, is it not?—Yes.

11,923. If you reduce the 12 down to eight hours, must not you increase that 1,400 men to 2,100?—I should do so.

11,924. And if you increase the 1,400 to 2,100, would it not reduce the wages down to 6s. 6d., taking off 3s. 3d., the third of it?—I cannot see that.

11,925. Where, then, are you going to find the money from to meet the increase in the number of men?—We do not wish to increase the number of men any more than the 1,400—there is no work for those 1,400 except for a few hours a week. We contend that if the men who are employed had their time shortened that would necessarily reduce the 1,400 itself, and not increase it; it would reduce the numbers of the unemployed.

27 January 1892.]

Mr. R. ROBINSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Trow—continued.

11,926. But you say that the labour is so uncertain and irregular?—It is uncertain and irregular.

11,927. If it is uncertain and irregular, how would it reduce the men if you worked eight-hour shifts?—Suppose we got a ship which takes 18 hours working, we will say, we contend that if two men divide that 18 hours—

11,928. Then you will increase the number of men?—Yes; but still, the same number of men are not employed now; the men are not employed, they are just walking about.

11,929. But I cannot understand how you overcome the difficulty; you say that now you are compelled to work for from 24 hours to 48 hours at a stretch?—That is it.

11,930. If you divide the 24 hours into three-eighths, you will have three men to do the work of one?—That is just in certain gangs or sections, and I allude to that under the head of task work. I say there are sections, or gangs, of men in this trading district who are working for one firm, and who work under the following agreement: to discharge and re-load two steamers, for 54 hours per week, at 32s. per week per man, and, after the 54 hours of work, overtime is to be paid at the rate of 7½d. per hour. That is their agreement. There is a second lot of them, who have to discharge and load two steamers per week in 68 hours, after the 68 hours, overtime to be paid at the same rate as the other—7½d. Now, these steamers are not in port two or three days of the week, and that necessarily compels them to commence work on Friday morning, as the ship is there on Saturday, or late on Saturday night. It compels them to begin very early on the Friday morning, to

The witness withdrew.

Mr. WILLIAM KING called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

11,938. I understand that you represent the Sunderland and North East Coast River, Dock, and Wharf Labour Union; is that so?—Yes.

11,939. And have you been deputed by your Union to attend here as a witness?—Yes.

11,940. Your Society mainly represents Sunderland, I understand?—Yes.

11,941. How many casual labourers are there employed at the docks, river, and wharves in Sunderland?—It would be about 650.

11,942. How many of them are members of the Union?—About 560 odd, I should think.

11,943. I gather from that, that no objection is made by your Union to unionists working together with non-unionists?—Yes; where a unionist is out of employment, the majority of unionists generally look for that man to be employed before a non-unionist.

11,944. But they do not object to work with a non-unionist?—Not if there is abundance of work, and the unionists are employed.

11,945. You do not exclude non-unionists, but you give a preference to those who belong to the Union?—Yes.

Mr. Trow—continued.

work right through till the ship sails, and they always work 24 hours, and in many cases up to 48 and over if the cargoes are large. We contend that that is too long for any man to work, and that if it was made compulsory, that man should not work longer than eight hours; some of these men would have to retire and allow other men to get a day's work.

11,931. You can never judge to an hour how long you may be wanted, can you?—No.

11,932. Suppose, at the end of three sets of eight hours, there was half-an-hour's work to do, would you imprison a set of men for doing it?—I should think you would not draw the line so tight.

11,933. You said you would put a man in prison, or the employer, for it?—Yes.

11,934. Just one question on this co-operation, will you tell us who were the movers in that movement?—The Stevedore Co-operative Company, do you mean?

11,935. Yes?—The movers I do not know exactly, but the manager was Mr. Dynes. When they commenced to start, this company laid their prospectus before our Society, and I believe, if they had allowed the Society to go on with it, it would have been a success, but they changed their tactics, and went dead against our trades union efforts altogether.

11,936. Had Laird anything to do with it?—I believe he had.

11,937. Had Harris, the secretary to the Trades' Council?—I do not think Harris had anything to do with it, but I could not say, in fact. I never saw Harris at any of the meetings which were got up.

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,946. I think, of those 650 labourers, some are boys?—Yes; there are a few boys.

11,947. Now, in the paper put before us, you say there are about 100 boys employed where men should be?—Yes.

11,948. Why do you say that the men should be employed in their place?—Formerly, men used to be employed on this work. Generally they work among pit timber—pit props. When the timber began to be imported, already cut in lengths for use, the boys were introduced then, but, formerly, the timber used to come in in full lengths, and be cut in this country.

11,949. Then when you say boys are now employed where men should be, you rather mean where men used to be?—Yes.

11,950. Because boys can do the work?—They can, but it is very severe on them; it is too hard work for them.

11,951. You have told us that wages ranged from 3s. 6d. to 6s. a day, is that so?—Yes.

11,952. What are the hours of labour?—Generally 9½.

27 January 1892.]

Mr. W. KING.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,953. And for overtime you receive how much?—9d. per hour.

11,954. And the overtime is reckoned after how long—after eight hours?—After 5 o'clock.

11,955. There is a part of the year, I understand, during which you can get very little to do?—Very little.

11,956. That is after the timber season is done, and the Baltic ports are closed?—Yes.

11,957. That, I understand, is about four months in the year?—Yes.

11,958. Are there many foreigners employed in the industry which you represent?—They cannot actually be counted as casual labourers, but I venture to say that there are at least 200 ships' cargoes of timber imported every year into a small place like Sunderland, and they are wholly discharged by foreigners.

11,959. Discharged, I suppose, by the crews of the ships who bring the timber?—By the crews of the ships, yes—steamers excepted.

11,960. I suppose you do not object to the crews of the ships which bring the timber being employed in discharging it, do you?—Yes, we do object.

11,961. Do you mean that while the crew are standing idle, with nothing to do, other men should be called in to do the work of discharging?—I mean to say that while a ship is in harbour the crew have sufficient to do in getting the ship ready for sea again, without interfering with the labourers' work.

11,962. But would you endeavour to prevent it, to make it illegal, or to forbid the employment of the crews in discharging?—I would suggest that the dock companies undertake to discharge all cargoes imported into such ports, because, as a rule, foreigners are working cargo during the day, and then they are sent to do ship's duty at night.

11,963. I think you put it simply on the ground that if the ships' crews were forbidden to do this work, there would be more work and more pay given to your men?—Yes.

11,964. Presumably, the shipowners would not see the advantage of paying two sets of men to do the same work?—Well, we look at it from this point of view, that the British shipowner has to employ two different classes of men to do the different classes of work.

11,965. I think I understood you to say that your Union did object to the employment of non-unionists, but not so much so as absolutely to forbid it?—Not absolutely forbidding it.

11,966. Have you had many strikes or labour disputes?—We have had two or three disputes.

11,967. What were the causes of them?—Attempts to reduce wages without due notice.

11,968. What do you call due notice?—Say they pay a man his money at 5 o'clock in the evening and tell him that he must be out to work in the morning, and when he turns out he is told then that he could commence his work at a reduced rate of pay.

11,969. We understand there is one case where the employers sent to Scotland for men?—Yes.

Earl of Derby—continued.

11,970. I see it is stated here that your Union had to send them back; what do you mean by sending them back; you could not send them back against their will?—Those men that were brought from Scotland were brought under false pretences, and when they saw the way they were duped by the employers who sent for them, they applied to the employers to fulfil the conditions on which they were brought, and they would not, and the men were left on a lee shore, and of course we, through an act of humanity, sent the men home.

11,971. Then there is a dispute in consequence of piece-work being introduced?—Yes.

11,972. What is the objection of your Union to piece-work?—The principal objection is that when a ship, say, brings a cargo of timber or whatever it might be, the stevedore goes on board, and puts a price in to discharge that cargo, and he pays each individual man a fair day's wages, which we must admit we generally are paid. Some person will come behind him and offer his services at a less price, and he could not do that if he had not a number of men behind him to go in by the piece. He has not capital sufficient to undertake the discharging the vessel on his own responsibility. The consequence is, all hands, as it is commonly called, go in by the lump, but if the employer was compelled to be a man who had capital, the labourers would certainly be more sure of receiving their pay. There are several instances where men have undertaken to discharge ships, and they have run away with the price of discharging after the ship was done, and the men of course, had no alternative but to grin and bear it.

11,973. Your objection, as I understand it, to piece-work is that it increases the competition between man and man?—Yes.

11,974. And obliges the men to work harder?—Yes. There is one case now of the grain department, it is left to six or seven men, and there are nine men now doing the work that it used to take 21 to do. There are six or seven men, I daresay they are getting from 5*l.* to 6*l.* a week out of the sweat of the other men. They are working stevedores themselves, of course. Each of those is sent to work with two or three men who are paid by the day, he works naturally as hard as he can as he is on piece, and of course of necessity the man who is on time has to keep up with him, and the piece man has the benefit of the time man's work.

11,975. I think I understand, the man who works by piece and is paid in proportion to the work does work as hard as he can?—Yes, and of course he is working alongside of men who are working by time, and they have as a necessity to keep in turn with him.

11,976. And they do not work so hard?—They must do.

11,977. If they are to keep up with him, you mean?—Yes.

27 January 1892]

Mr. W. KING.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

11,978. What wages do the boys earn who are employed in the way you say?—From 2s. to 2s. 6d. a day.

11,979. At what age do they begin work?—At 13 or 14 years of age.

11,980. How do you define a boy, up to 16 years of age?—I consider he is a boy till he is 17 or 18.

11,981. Do you wish to prohibit the employment of everybody under 18?—No, I do not. That is, at such laborious work as carrying timber.

11,982. I mean at that work. Do you wish that the law should forbid that?—Yes.

11,983. Whatever the size of the timber?—No. To define the different sizes, of course, would be very difficult, because a ship brings so many different sizes that she might be discharging what a boy could easily manage, say one hour, and the next hour she might be discharging stuff that would take a pretty good man to deal with.

11,984. But there are cases in which the stuff that is discharged could perfectly well be managed by boys?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton.

11,985. Is your objection to the employment of boys simply that they are put to work for which they are unfitted?—Yes.

11,986. Nothing more?—Yes.

11,987. Do you want the men to do that work for the same wage?—No.

11,988. What wage would the men get—you say the boys get from 2s. to 2s. 6d.?—The general wage the men would get would be 4s. a day.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. THOMAS FRANK PARR called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

11,999. You represent, as I understand, the Liverpool Cotton and General Warehouse Porters' Society; is that so?—Yes.

12,000. How are you connected with that body; you are a member of it, of course?—I am the secretary.

12,001. How many men does it include?—About 2,700.

12,002. In that branch of industry how many men in all are employed in your district?—About 10,000 in the winter time, and about 6,000 in the summer.

12,003. What are the average wages?—4s. 6d. per day.

12,004. Payments weekly?—Yes.

12,005. And the hours of labour?—Nine and a half the first five days and 7½ on Saturdays.

12,006. I presume that the employment is not of a very regular character?—Very irregular.

12,007. It depends upon the amount of exports and imports, and the state of trade?—Yes, the winter time is principally the busiest season.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

11,989. Would the boys get 2s. a day?—Yes.

11,990. Then you double the price?—Yes.

11,991. What size timber is it that these boys usually carry?—Props 7 feet long and 4½ inches or 5 inches across.

11,992. Pit props 7 feet long by 5 inches thick?—Five inches across.

11,993. Is that the usual size of pit props in your neighbourhood?—There are 7 feet pit props.

11,994. And the size is 5 inches across?—Yes, 4½ inches and 5 inches.

11,995. It would be a little less, I think?—You can get 3 inches across.

11,996. Would you not think 3 inches and 3½ inches would be nearer the mark?—I would not.

Mr. Tait.

11,997. Might I just ask if your Union is federated with any of the other Dockers' Unions?—No.

Mr. Austin.

11,998. Has the employment of foreigners produced any friction in your Union?—The foreigners are not actually employed here. The foreigners are actually employed whenever they sign articles on board the ship, but what we consider is, that foreigners, as British seamen are, should be confined to the work of the ship, and should not do the work of dock labourers.

Earl of Derby—continued.

12,008. Now, what is it that you have come here to represent; what grievance have you?—One grievance is caused by men coming into the city from various parts of the country.

12,009. They come into Liverpool from various parts of the country?—Yes, it gets worse every year, and what makes it more felt by Liverpool men is the fact that warehousemen, or foremen, or middlemen, whatever you like to call them, employ their relatives and others, and give them preferential work.

12,010. I quite understand your Society disliking the competition of people from other places, but I presume you do not propose to confine the employment to men born in Liverpool or resident there for a number of years; do you?—No.

12,011. Therefore, while you speak of this as an unsatisfactory state of things, you are not prepared to ask us to recommend any remedy for it?—No. We have already asked the employers of Liverpool, and we have no doubt, well, we shall have an opportunity of seeing in

27 January 1892.]

Mr. T. F. PARR.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

the course of next summer whether their remedy will have the desired effect.

12,012. What you want is that a preference should be given to men resident in the district?—Yes.

12,013. But of course there is no question of refusing to work with men who come from greater distances?—No; and there is no question of wages either; they are all paid the same.

12,014. Have you anything to complain of in regard to the danger of your occupation?—Yes; our warehouses are not inspected in any shape or form, and the hoisting machinery, and the sanitary arrangements, and, in some cases, the light and the floors are bad through not being inspected. On Saturday last we had a man knocked to pieces through machinery not being properly protected.

12,015. Do many accidents occur?—No, not a great many.

12,016. It is not generally regarded as a dangerous occupation, is it?—Yes.

12,017. Is it?—Yes.

12,018. You have no question of excluding non-unionists?—No.

12,019. You work indifferently with unionist or non-unionists?—Yes.

12,020. And you have no difficulty, I understand, with the employers?—No.

12,021. Has there been any strike of late years?—No, not for the last 20 years.

12,022. You have suffered indirectly from the strikes in other industries?—Yes; very severely.

12,023. But there has been none in yours?—No.

12,024. Is there anything special that you wish to bring before us?—We should like the warehouses inspected. I think that most of our grievances can be met by our meeting our employers. We should also like the State to recognise boards of conciliation and arbitration, as our men fully believe that that is the only means of settling labour disputes.

12,025. Do you mean by that that the board of conciliation or arbitration should be empowered to fix a rate of wages?—No.

12,026. Or only to recommend?—I would recommend the board of arbitration to settle differences that may arise between employers and employed.

12,027. Yes; but do you mean that both parties shall be bound to accept its award, or only that it should advise?—I would advise that the State should recognise such boards, so that the boards can be formed in the first instance. After that I think that the rules and the men who would sit on those boards would bring about all the rest themselves.

12,028. What I ask is, do you wish that such a board should have the compulsory power of saying that such and such a decision shall be adhered to by both sides, or only that it should recommend something which either side should be free to accept or to reject?—I would have it

Earl of Derby—continued.

that it should be compulsory on both sides to accept the decision of the board.

12,029. Then, if a question of wages arose, and if the board decided that a claim to an increase of wages could not be sustained, you would not object to the men being compelled to work for a lower rate of wages?—No.

12,030. But, as I understand, you have no definite grievance, except that you think that the occupation is sometimes dangerous, and that warehouses should be inspected?—Yes. All the smaller grievances that we have could be settled by the board of arbitration.

Mr. Ismay.

12,031. Have you worked as a cotton porter?—Yes.

12,032. How long?—Eleven years previous to being secretary of the Society.

12,033. Will you tell the Commission in what way you regard the employment as being particularly dangerous, or as being dangerous?—In many ways.

12,034. Tell the Commission in what way?—In the first place, cotton is stowed to a great height, and the men fall from the piles and are killed.

12,035. Need they necessarily fall from the piles?—It is accident, of course.

12,036. What are the number of bales of cotton which are handled in Liverpool in the course of a year, do you know?—No, I could not tell you.

12,037. Roughly speaking?—Well, I should think about 500,000 bales.

12,038. You are a long way out of it; you know the cotton crop is about from 7,000,000 to 8,000,000, and the bulk of it comes to Liverpool?—I am not interested in the amount that comes.

12,039. Of course, all employment is more or less dangerous in its character, but having regard to the amount of work done, there are not many accidents?—No, I suppose there are not more accidents than in other trades, although we have had a good many lately—slight accidents and others. There have been three men killed within the last six months.

12,040. Do you remember from what cause?—One man, as I have just stated, was killed by machinery catching him and knocking him to pieces. Another man was killed by the fall of two bales from a pile of cotton which was about 20 feet high, and another man was killed by falling from a pile of cotton which was about 15 feet high.

12,041. Did the men fall from the cotton, or did the cotton fall upon them?—In one instance the cotton fell upon the man, and in the other, the man fell from the top of the cotton to the warehouse floor.

12,042. Still it is an occupation that is much sought after, is it not?—Yes, there are all sorts and conditions of men who work at it.

12,043. How are the men taken on?—They are employed by the warehousemen. They are

27 January 1892.]

Mr. T. F. PARR.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ismay—continued.

employed by the half day or the day, as the case may be.

12,044. Are there any permanent hands?—There are no permanent men, but at the same time there are men who are in regular employment. They are not considered permanent men; they are liable to dismissal at any time.

12,045. You do not seem to have any grievance but what you think may be fairly got over by a meeting with your employers?—That is so.

Mr. Bolton.

12,046. Of the three instances you have given us of the danger of this occupation, one accident was due to machinery I think you said?—Yes.

12,047. How did this man meet with his death?—It was in the top room of a six-storey warehouse, the shafting running through three warehouses for hoisting purposes. The man was on the top of a pile of cotton, which came very close to this machinery. The machinery was not protected, and it caught him by his short jacket here (*describing*) and knocked him to pieces.

12,048. Is that the only case of accident from machinery which has occurred in your experience?—That is the only fatal accident that I remember.

12,049. The others were from falling from bales, or from bales falling on them?—Yes.

12,050. And you suggest as a means of avoiding these accidents that there should be inspection?—Yes.

12,051. How would the inspector prevent the falling of bales, or of men falling off bales?—He could not prevent the man falling off the bales, but he could prevent the bales from falling.

12,052. How?—By seeing that they were properly stowed.

12,053. Do you want a resident inspector then?—Yes.

12,054. A man at every warehouse?—No, we do not want one at every warehouse, we want one for Liverpool.

12,055. But he could not be present daily at every warehouse in the town?—But in the course of his rounds he could see how the work was done. The work is done very often by inexperienced men, and not half done, and consequently the accidents occur.

12,056. You are in favour of a board of conciliation and a board of arbitration?—Our Society is, along with other Trades Unions of Liverpool.

12,057. Do you look upon the two as synonymous—conciliation and arbitration?—Yes.

12,058. Would you give them compulsory powers?—Yes.

12,059. And practically they would fix the rate of wages?—The board would be composed of an equal number of employers and employed, and if that board comes to a conclusion, that conclusion should be binding on both sides.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

12,060. And would you compel the men to work at these wages?—Yes.

12,061. Under what penalties?—I have not considered that point. I do not know what to say about the penalty.

12,062. Supposing a man said, "I prefer to become something else,"—a cabdriver, for instance; would you prevent him from becoming a cabdriver?—No.

12,063. Then you could not compel him?—We could compel him either to work for the wages, or to work at some other occupation.

12,064. Then would you not allow the master to make his choice of men too. Suppose that you are getting a wage which somebody else desires to obtain, would you say, "No" in that case, or would you allow the master to take that man at a cheaper rate?—He has always done that.

12,065. But under the rule of a board of arbitration?—We would allow a master to employ any man he should think fit, provided he receive the wages which the board had settled.

12,066. But yet although people were desirous of working for less, you would not allow him to employ them at a less rate?—No.

12,067. You could not compel the men to take these wages provided they could get something better elsewhere?—We would not compel anything, only that the man must not work for a rate of wages less than that fixed by the board of arbitration.

12,068. But you will not compel him to work at that rate of wages?—No.

12,069. But you will compel the master to pay that rate of wages?—If possible.

12,070. That would hardly be fair, would it, as between the two?—I do not exactly understand the drift of your question. I take it that an equal number of employers and employed agree to form a board of arbitration. Well, in the first place, those that are agreed to form that board of arbitration must be guided and abide by its decision.

12,071. All the men?—All the men and the masters too.

12,072. But then when the decision is known, some of the men may disagree with it; that is to say, they may think the rate of wages fixed too low?—They will have to be ruled by the majority.

12,073. But would you compel them to remain in that employment?—I would compel them to receive the same rate of wages as was fixed by the board.

12,074. If they work at it, would you compel them to remain?—We cannot do that.

Mr. Tait.

12,075. When you talk of insufficient protection to machinery, do you simply confine yourself to the hoisting machinery in your warehouses?—Yes.

12,076. Have you any other machinery?—We have no other machinery.

12,077. And when you state that warehouses do not come under the Act, have we to infer

27 January 1892.]

Mr. T. F. PARR.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

that it is the Factory Act that you refer to?—Yes.

12,078. You wish, therefore, that warehouses should be put under the jurisdiction of the Factory Act, the same as workshops?—Yes, that would cover the whole thing.

12,079. When you state that you object to the influx of country people to work in Liverpool, do you do it for any other reason than just simply that they are supplanting the Liverpool men?—It is not their coming, it is the way it is done. They are brought there by Liverpool people for a special purpose; for a pecuniary gain.

12,080. What is the special purpose?—They are brought there by people in a position to find them work, and the Liverpool man suffers in consequence.

12,081. Would you explain to us what your Society is doing at the present time to bring employers and employed closer together, as stated in your reply to the general questions?—We have already met the Liverpool Cotton Association and the Liverpool Corn Association on questions affecting the men. We have been received by both with cordiality, and we have no doubt that the result of the last interview or the next interview will do us some material good.

12,082. Were you there at that conference?—Yes.

12,083. Do you work as a cotton porter?—No.

12,084. You are now the general secretary of the Union?—Yes.

12,085. Was any exception taken to you by any of the gentlemen present?—Not the slightest.

12,086. And any correspondence that is necessary between your Association and the various associations which you have named, you conduct in the name of your members?—Yes.

12,087. What are the extra benefits that you have paid out of the benefit and trade funds which you wish to direct the attention of the Commission to?—We pay 20*l.* on death by accident, 10*l.* on death from natural causes, 5*l.* at the end of six months, and 10*s.* a week in case of accident. We also pay a superannuation after 15 years' membership.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. WILLIAM SPEED called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

12,103. We understand that you represent the Upper Mersey Watermen and Porters' Association, is that so?—Yes.

12,104. Can you tell us whether that is a numerous body; how many members have you?—1,035.

12,105. And that, I presume, does not include, by any means, all the persons employed in that business within your district?—We have two or three districts.

Mr. Tait—continued.

12,088. What do you give at the end of 15 years' membership?—5*s.* per week.

12,089. For life?—Yes.

12,090. In the case of strike what do you pay?—We pay according to what we think fit from the trade fund.

12,091. According to the condition of the fund?—Yes.

12,092. It may be that you would pay 10*s.*, and if you thought fit, if you had the funds, you would pay 1*l.* a week to your men who may be on strike?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton.

12,093. You have had no strikes, have you?—No.

Mr. Tait.

12,094. But you have a provision in your rules for strikes?—Yes.

12,095. Has your Association, as an Association, ever had the question of reduced hours in front of them with a view to asking Parliament to do anything for them?—It has been spoken about by the members of the Society, and they seem to think that a Saturday half-holiday would be far preferable to them than eight hours a day.

12,096. The usual 9½ hours for five days in the week?—They would work the same number of hours in the week providing they could get the Saturday half-holiday.

12,097. Do I infer from that, that you would start earlier on the Saturday morning to complete your 7½ hours?—No, it would be extended over the week.

12,098. Would it be extended over the week by an additional half hour per day or so?—Yes.

12,099. Might I ask whether you have taken a vote of your Society on this question?—No.

12,100. Therefore you are just, as it were, stating the opinion of a few members who have spoken to you either privately or at any meetings which you have held?—And also the opinion of the committee.

12,101. Have you any branches of your Society?—No.

12,102. Just the one central office?—Yes.

Earl of Derby—continued.

12,106. I will put it in another way, do you represent only the members of your Association, or are there many other persons employed in the same business, and in the same district who are not members?—Do I represent the members of the Association and the work that they are engaged in? There is none outside the pale of unionism.

12,107. As a matter of fact, are there many non-unionists doing the same kind of work?—

27 January 1892.]

Mr. W. SPERD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

There are non-unionists in another district altogether, but not in the sphere of labour we are engaged in.

12,108. Then the whole of the business of the watermen and porters within this district is done by members of the Union, is that so?—Yes.

12,109. Now you complain, as I understand, of the number of hours that you have to work?—Yes. We work 100 hours per week on an average; sometimes we are called upon to work from 24, 30, 48, up to 70 hours at one stretch, without any interval of rest.

12,110. When you say you have to work, you do not mean that you are actually employed without any interval of rest for 70 hours, do you?—Actually on duty.

12,111. And when you say the average time of work is 100 hours a week, do you extend that over the whole of the year?—Taking the whole year's average round it runs 100 hours per week; sometimes we make 120 and up to 137 in one week, but taking the whole year round it averages 100 hours per week.

12,112. Then I understand you complain of the danger of your occupation, and of the boats and flats not being furnished with any appliance for saving life; is that so?—Yes, we are not supplied on the River Mersey with either life belts, or life buoys, or boats for saving human life. There are upwards of 400 craft which are trading on the River Mersey, and we are not supplied with anything to save life except a rope, and if a man gets overboard we have nothing to assist him with, and we have to stand by and watch him drown in cases where a man cannot swim. We have had cases which have occurred to us in connexion with this, and they do not come under the Employers' Liability Act.

12,113. Does it often happen that men fall overboard?—We have not had so many cases, but we have had two or three within these last four or five years.

12,114. Should you say that a man could not very well fall overboard, except by carelessness on his own part?—In stress of weather a man cannot assist himself, because we have nothing to keep us on board when we are amidships the flat—we have neither rails nor man-ropes in some of the craft; there is only the bare decks.

12,115. There is an Act relating to canal boats, and including registration clauses, is there not?—Yes.

12,116. I understand you complain that that Act is not observed?—No, it is openly violated. We have it in the Act, and in our registration papers, that a cabin shall be the residence of three persons, and it gives the age and sex that they shall be. We find in, I may say, lots of instances, that there are the father, and the mother, and four and five, and up to six children occupying the one cabin where there only ought to be sleeping and living accommodation for three persons. We have these cases brought under our eyes every day. An instance I could give you which occurred last Saturday, no longer

U 13729.

Earl of Derby—continued.

since, in Runcorn district, where there was a woman and four young children, and the father besides, connected with the boat, and the inspector passed by and never took any notice of them. I cannot say whether he saw, but I consider that if an inspector is doing his duty he ought to see cases of that description.

12,117. Then you say that the inspection is not sufficient?—There is either an insufficient number of inspectors, or there is a laxity in regard to the inspectors doing their duty. There are boats connected with us which have never been inspected in the Runcorn district for three years, and these boats may pass through the districts where the inspection is more rigorous, and sometimes they pass through in the night, and where there is an overcrowding of a family they send their children overland to avoid the inspector seeing them, or they distribute them over other boats which have no families in them. That happens very frequently in Preston Brook, over the Preston Brook tunnels.

12,118. I suppose it is very difficult for any inspector to detect evasions of that kind, unless they are very frequent?—He must be a man who is well acquainted with the life of the boatmen, and acquainted with their ways, or he cannot get every case; but I believe that there are cases which could be got if they were looked up by the present inspectors.

12,119. Then, in addition to a stricter enforcement of the present Act, you wish, as I understand, to extend it so as to prohibit women and children living on board?—Yes. There are firms which pay sufficient money to enable the men to work their crafts, but these parties work them with their wives and families, so that they can satisfy their own cravings for drink, in scores of instances, and we find the men leave the women and children actually to navigate their craft, whereas their employers pay sufficient wages to permit them to employ men to do the work; but they let it off to the man, and he supplies the crew to the boat, and the crew is his own family. There are other instances where they really cannot pay two men; the wages are so low that under the present circumstances the man has to take his wife and family to eke out an existence, but that is not so in all cases.

12,120. Would you say that in no case should a man be allowed to have, say, a young son on board to help him?—We do not object to that; what we object to is the female labour.

12,121. I presume you object to it on the ground that if it were got rid of there would be more men employed?—Because we consider that, in the interests of humanity, it is not work that a female ought to be engaged in.

12,122. Do you think that is the opinion of the women themselves?—In a great many instances.

12,123. And would you altogether object to the women and children being taken on board these boats?—Yes; we have in some instances women who have charge of craft.

12,124. Women who have charge of craft?—Yes, actually captains of them; and we find

K

27 January 1892.]

Mr. W. SPEED.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

when we are brought into contact with these in the dark at night, that it is very dangerous to life in some cases. A short time ago, outside in the River Mersey, with a woman on board of a craft, one of our own men had to get overboard from his craft to save her life, and to save the craft itself.

12,125. Then, in point of fact, you want to prohibit by law women from helping in the working of canal boats; is that not so?—Yes, that is our desire, but the greatest desire is for the young children—to save the rising generation of our country from being brought up in the state that they are at the present time. They avoid the Education Act, and we find that the laxity on the part of the inspectors does not bring them to justice, and they are brought up in total ignorance at the present time, the same as they were in the past.

12,126. And they do not attend any schools?—No.

12,127. I do not quite understand what you propose with regard to the women who are presumably the wives of the men who work these boats; do you say they should not be allowed to sleep on board the boats?—Yes. I have been married 22 years, and I have never had my wife on board only once in my life.

12,128. And the children also?—Never had the children on board at all.

12,129. And you wish to make that a rule to be enforced by law?—Yes.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,130. You told us that your hours of work were sometimes more than 130 in the course of the week?—Yes.

12,131. What sort of work is it?—We have to handle all our own cargoes, and then after we have handled the cargoes we have to travel a certain distance. We are not always actually working hard laborious work, but we are travelling the distance.

12,132. You mean that you are navigating the boat?—Yes.

12,133. Are they sailing boats?—No.

12,134. Are they towed?—They are worked by steam.

12,135. Then you have charge of the helm?—Yes.

12,136. One person would have charge of the helm, and the other would simply be sitting in the boat?—Yes, in some instances; but in lots of cases when we get down for, say, half-an-hour, we are called out again. We never have to undress ourselves. We may get an hour sometimes, or sometimes an hour and a half; but that is the fullest extent.

12,137. But a good deal of that time must be spent in doing comparatively little except watching the boat?—I will give you an instance last week. I commenced to work at 7 o'clock on the Wednesday morning. That was the time I turned out. We were at the graving dock. We worked there till half-past five at night. Then we had to go down to the warehouse, and

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

we commenced to load at a quarter to seven. We finished loading at a little after half-past eleven. It was half-past twelve before we got down the two locks; and at one o'clock the ebb of the tide came, and we went down to Liverpool and discharged cargo the next day.

12,138. What time did you get to Liverpool?—At seven in the morning.

12,139. How many hours would that be?—From Runcorn to Liverpool $3\frac{1}{2}$ hours at high-water. The hours are longer now they are making the ship canal. It was nine when we got alongside. I had to go out to the office, then, to look after the boats to discharge cargo. At 3 o'clock we were discharged at Alexandria Dock. We had to come back from there to Cornstone, and we commenced to load again at a quarter to seven at night, and we finished at half-past two in the morning, and at about a quarter to three we were going back again to Runcorn. We had to navigate to Runcorn and it was 7 o'clock on Friday night when we finished work. That was from Wednesday morning.

12,140. You could not get any sleep all that time?—I had not any sleep. And we have instances of men coming from Manchester direct with their flats at Liverpool, discharging, and working back into Yorkshire before they have any rest.

12,141. What do you ask to be done with regard to that?—We have asked our employers to grant us a six hours' rest after we have worked 36 hours. Some of the employers of labour have granted it. In some instances, if a flat travels from Manchester to Liverpool, and back again to Manchester, he gets six hours' rest in Manchester, but he has to work about 56 hours for that. If he works from Liverpool to Manchester, and *vice versa* from Manchester to Liverpool, he would get no rest, which is the same district, only in another place, under the same firm too. Then there are other firms that will not grant any anywhere.

12,142. What do you ask us to do with regard to it?—We ask you to make it compulsory after a man has worked 36 hours, that he is entitled to six or 12 hours' rest. We are not trying for the eight hours' system; but we consider after a man has worked from 24 to 36 hours he ought to have either six or 12 hours' rest.

Mr. Plimsoll.

12,143. Where the hours extend over so very long a period, I suppose some of the time is spent in travel, and the men would, I imagine, have some opportunity of resting during a long journey?—You may get an hour once, but that is the fullest extent. You see when a craft gets into Manchester you have no steam to take you, and going to Rochdale you have 42 locks to go through; and if you go further on to Todmorden and Sowerby, you have about 92; and there is plenty of work for three men all the way.

27 January 1892.]

Mr. W. SPEED.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait.

12,144. Who appoints the inspectors who look after your flats?—The Government.

12,145. Have you reported to the Government any neglect on their part?—We have brought those before the notice of the inspectors.

12,146. Not before the department of the Government which has jurisdiction over them?—No.

12,147. Did you ever approach your employers with regard to a reduction of hours from the very long stretches you have named?—Yes, we have on three different occasions.

12,148. And what has been the reply?—We have got a six hours' concession in Manchester. We have none in Liverpool and at any of the other stations. We have a six hours' system in Preston, but one man has to be out the whole of the time; that is only three hours each.

12,149. Have you ever approached them to give you what may be called a 10 or a 12 hours' nominal day?—We have approached them for a 16 hours' day.

12,150. What is the reply to that?—The reply is, that we are engaged for seven days to the week, and seven nights.

12,151. In fact, that you are engaged for 365 days in the year?—Yes.

12,152. And the fact of you being all Union men in the district which you have named, there being no non-union labour, have you ever attempted to force any of your demands by

Mr. Tait—continued.

strike?—Since we formed the Association we have not in the district we are in.

12,153. But before that were there strikes?—Yes, one.

12,154. How did it end?—In 1884 they reduced us 4s. a week.

12,155. Did you strike against a reduction of pay?—Yes. We were not asking for an increase; but they reduced us 4s. per week at one drop, and we struck against it; but we had not formed any Association at that time.

12,156. When you ask the Commission to interfere, or rather to put into force the present Act, with special reference to families occupying the boats, you do so from the fact that it has come within your knowledge that there has been gross immortality as the result of the present system?—Yes. We had a case last August or September, I could not say which now, of a man having another woman on board and getting her drowned in the Mersey.

Mr. Bolton.

12,157. You want additional inspectors, you say?—Yes. We consider the present inspectors are not acquainted with the life of the boatmen, and they do not go among them enough.

12,158. You want inspectors to inspect the present inspectors?—Or to inspect the boats in a proper manner.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

TWENTY-THIRD DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Thursday, 28th January 1892.

PRESENT :

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE EARL OF DERBY, K.G. (CHAIRMAN).

The Right Hon. Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH,
Bart., M.P.
Mr. J. C. BOLTON, M.P.
Mr. T. H. ISMAY.
Mr. TOM MANN.
Mr. SAMUEL PLIMSOLL.

Mr. HENRY TAIT.
Mr. E. TROW (Group A.); The Right Hon.
LEONARD COURTNEY, M.P., Mr. GEORGE
LIVSEY, and Mr. M. AUSTIN (Group C.) also
attended.

Mr. GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Mr. THOMAS MORGAN called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

12,159. We understand that you are the vice-president of the Southampton Chamber of Commerce?—Yes.

12,160. And honorary secretary to the Southampton Free Labour Association?—Yes.

12,161. You are also managing director of an important firm of timber merchants?—Yes.

12,162. Now, will you tell us, if you please, what were the circumstances under which this Free Labour Association was formed?—In September 1890, there was a general strike of the dock labourers in the port of Southampton. That arose by the men being called out by a man called William Sprow, who was then acting as agent of the Dock, Waterside, and General Labourers' Union of Great Britain and Ireland. There was no notice whatever given, nor was there any question at that time between the employers and the men about which a strike ought to have been properly declared. So far from that the facts were these, that on the 26th of August in that year, that is to say, some fortnight or more before the strike had occurred, the dock company had raised their rate of wages for casual men by 1d. per hour, the new wages being fixed at 5d. per hour for day work, and 6d. per hour for night work. Some considerable time before that there had been also a rise in wages by the night work being paid 1d. per hour higher than the day work. At the same time that that was done the rate of pay for permanent men (I have already been speaking of the casual men) was raised 3s. per week, namely, from 18s. to 21s. per week, and the hours were reduced from 11 to 10 hours per day. There was, and had been for some little time, considerable activity on the part of the agents of what we may call the Docker's Union—I think that term will be understood—and a very considerable number of

Earl of Derby—continued.

men had joined that Union. But the employers generally throughout Southampton preferred to deal with their own men, they did not desire to have the interference of any of the leaders of the Union between them and their men. The only question about which it was possible to call a strike at that time was the question as to whether the Union should be recognised by the employers.

12,163. What do you mean by "recognised"?—I use a term which the agents of the Union at that time brought prominently before the public. They said "the Union must be recognised." I presume recognition of the Union means this, that whenever any dispute occurs as to wages, or terms, or conditions of labour, the agents of the Union will be called in, as it were, to speak on behalf of the men. Now, Southampton is in a peculiar position. It is a very important port, the most important port on the south coast, but it has behind it no great manufactories, no great mines, or any industries producing large exporting material. The result of that is that more or less it is a port on sufferance; we get what we can. We have, of course, large imports and also large exports, but Southampton may be said to be a port which is not backed up by anything immediately behind it, but which gathers all its trade from all round the country. That being so, we are obliged to be very careful that the work of the port is carried on with the utmost regularity, and without any hindrances. Those being the circumstances, notwithstanding there was no question of wages nor any question of conditions of labour—upon this very narrow basis of the question of the recognition of the Union—a strike, without any notice or any warning of any kind was declared on Monday morning, the 8th September. I do not know whether I need go

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

into the particulars of the strike, but the strike practically collapsed during the same week. In the meantime there had been a great suspension of work. The boats of the South-Western Company running to the Channel Islands, were able to get off, but practically the work of the port was suspended during that week. At the end of the week it was found that the Dockers' Union, or at any rate the agent of the Dockers' Union, who had called the strike, had gone beyond his instructions. There was, as we were informed, no money forthcoming to pay the men who were out on strike, and the strike collapsed. Of course, the employers met from time to time under this very serious state of affairs, aggravated by a very considerable amount of disorder in the streets, and particularly aggravated by an attempt to stop the mail trains with Her Majesty's mails to the Channel Islands, which was, of course a very serious matter for the Post Office, and for all concerned. In considering these matters, two prominent facts, we thought, were established; first, that work was suspended for a wholly inadequate cause by an officer of the executive of the Dockers' Union, and, secondly, that the men obeying the mandate received no monetary support from the Union. I would like to qualify that in this way—of course, I am not speaking now entirely from my own knowledge—there was, I believe, a certain amount of money distributed amongst the men, which money had been collected by themselves, that is to say, it was their own contributions to the Union, and it was understood that there was no contribution by the head-quarters of the Union; in fact, the head-quarters of the Union distinctly stated that the strike was called without authority. The men, therefore, were deceived, the trade of the port was seriously menaced, and all the time there was never any real difference between the employers and the workmen, because the question of wages had already been settled amicably between them. Under these circumstances, the employers took the initiative in forming an Association which, it was hoped, would form a ready way of preventing such a state of things recurring. A mass meeting of all interested in the matter was held on the 20th of October in that year, 1890, when the proposal was most warmly received by a large meeting of the men, some 1,000 or 1,200 men being present, and the constitution and rules were settled and adopted. That is, roughly speaking, the history of the circumstances under which the Association was formed.

12,164. Now, will you tell us what the constitution of the Association is?—I had better perhaps hand in a copy of the rules (see Appendix 76). The constitution of the Association is that it is "An Association of workmen and employers in the port of Southampton, for their mutual benefit, and for maintaining and promoting the trade of the port." The Association includes the unskilled labour connected with the docks and

Earl of Derby—continued.

shipping, such as general dock labourers, stevedores, coal, timber, and corn porters, and all waterside industries comprised under the general term transport. The operations are confined to Southampton, and embrace not only the docks but also the town quay, and all the waterside industries on both sides of the town. There are 44 employers and firms who are members of the Association, and the number of workmen enrolled up to the present time is about 2,200. The constitution and benefits of the Association are found fully set out in the print of rules which I have handed in; the mode of election of committees and council is as follows:—The Association is divided into two sections, the employers section and the workmen's section; each has its separate committee and representatives on the council. The workmen's section is further divided into sub-sections, with a view to obtaining a representative on the committee of men employed by the Dock Company in its various departments, by the large steamship companies, and by the wharf owners, and also men undertaking any special branches of labour, such as corn porters, coal porters, and so on. Each sub-section has a separate meeting to elect representatives on the committee. These meetings are called in January and February, by special notice. The workmen are left entirely free to elect whom they please to represent them, without any suggestion from the employers. That, I think, is an important point to be borne in mind. At the elections sometimes one set of men are supplanted by another, in some cases spirited competition arises between the various candidates, but the election is left entirely in the hands of the various sections of the workmen. The members of the council are nominated at these sub-sectional meetings, but the right of election is vested in the annual general meeting of the Association. The workmen's committee, thus organised and formed, meets regularly for the conduct of business, unfettered by the presence of any employer or representative of any employer, and can hold meetings whenever it pleases. The usual custom is for them to meet every month. No employer or representative of an employer attends any workmen's committee meeting, except by a special request from that committee. Any sub-section can, if it desire, use the office of the Association for a private meeting at any time, and without any interference on the part of the employers. With regard to the employers' section of the committee, that is called whenever it is found necessary, the whole scope and intention of the Association being that, if any question should arise of any kind, first of all, the men, having this matter upon their minds, should be able to see their own employers, and see whether any satisfactory accommodation can be arrived at; if that is not successful, they can then ask the committee of this Association to assist them, and the workmen's committee discuss the matter, and, if they consider it important, they make a representation upon it to the employers. If

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

that is unsuccessful, they are then entitled to call upon the committee of the employers to meet them to discuss the matter with a view to its settlement. It will be seen by the rules that the first object of the Association is to secure freedom of agreement between workmen and employers, also freedom of communication between them without the intervention of outsiders, for the mutual consideration and settlement of all differences which may arise. The Council is a sort of second Chamber, and in case the committees do not agree upon any point, then it is possible to bring in a fresh set of minds to the discussion of the subject, and get a fresh opinion. The Association, by its committees and council, acts as a board of arbitration in the event of the workmen and employers being unable to come to terms of agreement in the settlement of any dispute, and, in one sense, it is a board of arbitration constantly sitting. The manner in which the Association acts is as follows—A body of workmen having a grievance upon which the employer does not give them a satisfactory remedy, would instruct their representative upon the workmen's committee to bring the matter before the next committee meeting for discussion. If the workmen's committee considers the grievance a legitimate one, the question will be again placed before the employer in the name of the committee, as representing the whole of the working members of the Association. Failing the satisfactory solution of the difficulty, the workmen's committee is entitled to ask for a joint conference with the employers' committee, when the matter will be discussed from both points of view, and a decision arrived at. As I have already explained, a final court of appeal is provided in the council, consisting of 20 members, in equal numbers of workmen and employers.

12,165. When you say that, do you mean that the Association collectively decides upon questions which may arise between employers and men, and that that decision is binding upon both parties, or is it only in the nature of advice?—Of course, it is not binding legally. We have no form of contract, and there is no form of contract between employers and workmen by which you could in any way bring the pains and penalties of the law to bear. The intention is to promote harmony and good feeling between masters and workpeople. Your Lordship will easily understand that, in dealing with a very large body of men, it is very often the case that any particular man is, to some extent, apprehensive of making complaints, and the fact of his feeling that he has his fellow men behind him is an advantage. On the other hand, there may be cases where a man may wish to have certain matters altered for his own benefit, and it might be that the alteration might affect other men prejudicially; therefore, it is best for the working men themselves to discuss whether any suggested alterations should be carried out, or not. When you take a whole body of men in different employments, although they are all

Earl of Derby—continued.

working in the docks, or on the town quay, or on the shipping, still, there are various interests more or less conflicting sometimes, and it is well to have the matter thought out thoroughly well by intelligent men before any action is taken. The important points to be borne in mind are the presence of the workmen on the committees and council, that workmen and employers deal directly with each other, and that the working men representatives are selected from among those actually at work in their various kinds of labour, and by the men employed in each department from among themselves. Therefore, whatever the question which may arise, those that have the actual experience of the conditions of work have the duty of placing the matter before the employer, and discussing it with him, with the assistance of men engaged in similar occupations; in other words, it is not necessary to bring in experts, but the men who actually do the work, and know all about it, are the men who discuss the matter. The decision does not depend solely upon the opinion of one employer, it is considered by a body of employers, equal in number to the workmen's delegates, engaged in various though similar classes of trade. The Association provides an easy means of arbitration in settlement of disputes in which every member by his membership is directly interested, and whereby workmen and employers are brought together to calmly discuss differences before a disastrous strike is entered upon, and not after the bitter struggle has done its best to ruin both parties and make bad blood.

12,166. May I ask if the majority of employers in Southampton have joined this Association?—Yes, practically the whole of them.

12,167. Now, as to the working men, what proportion of them have joined?—I may say, practically, the whole of them; at any rate a very large number. I do not desire from that for it to be understood that there are no men in Southampton who are not still members of the Dockers Union, because I presume there are some, but when our membership reaches 2,200, although we have not any actual statistics of the number of men employed in Southampton—it is rather difficult to get that—it will be seen that it is practically a very large proportion of the men who belong to this Association.

12,168. Do you consider that, upon the whole, this Association has established its position, in affording a means of communication between masters and men, and so tending to prevent strikes?—Yes, certainly; because there have been many small matters that have been adjusted by means of the Association, although, perhaps, it is going a long way to say they would have been the cause of a strike; still, the Association has already shown great usefulness in promoting harmony, and adjusting small matters that ought to have been adjusted.

12,169. Was any considerable opposition made to the establishment of this Association?—No; I think there was no considerable opposition.

26 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

12,170. Now, is part of the work of the Association to supply a list of men out of work?—Yes.

12,171. And to send it to employers?—We have an office and a clerk in constant attendance, and any men out of work give in their names and also intimate the kind of work they want. Every month we publish a list—I see that I have not got here the most recent list, but I have several—of those men who want work, and of the kind of work they want to do. We have found this list very useful, and we send it out to all the employers every month. In addition to that we are on the telephone, and we take every means we can to ask all the employers and others in Southampton to let us, know whenever they want men, when the clerk at once puts up a notice and is enabled to engage the men, or to send the men to the place where they will be engaged. Of course we cannot do a very great deal, but we do something towards helping the men to get work who are out of work.

12,172. And subordinate to your main objects you have an accident fund, a sick fund, and a savings bank?—Yes, and the rules are attached to the print which I have already put in (*see Appendix 77*). I might just say, with regard to the accident fund, that one of the chief difficulties, in our opinion, of casual labour is the fact that a casual man is nobody's man in particular, but works for different employers at different times. The result of that is, that when he meets with an accident he is not like a man in constant employment, towards whom his employers feel a certain amount of sympathy, and to whom the employer wishes to give some help, but the man is nobody's man. Under those circumstances, in case of accident, he has nobody to look to to help him, unless he happens to be a member of some sick club, or something of that kind. Accordingly, we thought that it would be a very excellent plan to start this accident fund, which is started on a very simple basis. The men pay 1d. per week, and they take a ticket for that penny, which insures them for a week. If it happens that work is very slack, and a man cannot get any work during the week, why then, he need not pay his penny. Thinking, probably, that the penny a week would not meet the claims upon the fund, we have a guarantee fund amongst the employers amounting to a little over a thousand pounds. I am very glad to say that up to now, although we have drawn upon that fund, practically the penny a week has come very near towards meeting the claims upon the fund. If we could induce all the men in Southampton to join that fund, I think it is very likely that those pennies per week would absolutely meet the claims, except, perhaps, in cases of any special disaster, where a number of men might be injured at one time. The benefits arising from that accident fund are, that for total disablement the men are paid 10s. per week for 10 weeks, and for partial disablement, where men are only able to earn a very small part of their money, they get 5s. a

Earl of Derby—continued.

week, and in case of fatal accident, the member's family is entitled to receive 8l. I may also say that that accident fund is entirely administered by a committee consisting of six members, three employers, and three workmen, chosen, of course, from the General Committees of the Association. Then, in addition to that, may I mention the savings bank?

12,173. Certainly?—There is a great diversity of occupation in Southampton in the different months of the year; in the summer months there being a great amount of work, in the winter months naturally less, and, therefore, we thought it would be a good plan to give the men the opportunity when work was very plentiful of putting by something for the time when work was slack. And so we, in connexion with the Post Office, have opened a savings bank in which there have been a considerable number of deposits, but that also, is a branch of our Association which is in its infancy, and which we hope may grow. Then, finally, we have a sick fund for the sea-going section of the Association. We have not got a sick fund for the general labourers, because we do not wish to interfere with the sick clubs and benefit societies in the town, but the sea-going men have not the same opportunities of keeping up their payments, and therefore, this is especially arranged for them in order that men going away and coming home perhaps ill, or getting ill when they are ashore, may have the benefit of sick-pay during those periods.

12,174. Is there anything else that you have to tell us about the Association before we go to other matters?—I think I have pretty fully explained generally the objects and intention of the Association. I do not think at the moment of anything that I can usefully add.

12,175. You have told us that there is a good deal of irregularity in the employment of labour at Southampton, and that it is much greater at one time of the year than at another; is that, in your opinion, capable of remedy, or is it inevitable?—I think it is, at present, inevitable. I have prepared a list which, if you will allow me, I will hand in (*see Appendix 78*), although I am afraid it is not quite so plain at first sight as it might be. By the kindness of the Dock Company which furnished the information to me, I have taken there the first six working days of each month from November to October. I might, perhaps, explain that this was prepared for the Commission in November, and that that is the reason why it is not up to December—but, of course, it is practically the same thing. Taking the first six days and the first six nights in each month as being a fair average, we find that the number of hirings—I think that will be the best way to put it—the number of men taken on shows a very wonderful alteration in the different months. The last column is the average number of men taken on during the 24 hours. The minimum number occurs in April, 248 men; the maximum number occurs in July, 948 men. It will be seen that there are about three months in the year when the average

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

number is about 400. There is one month—well, you may say there are two months—when the average is very much over that; and in the rest of the months of the year the number is from 250 up to 350. Now, there is a very striking difference there; and the facts arise entirely from the very heavy business that is done in Southampton in the summer months, particularly in June and July, in connexion with the trade from the continent and the Channel Islands; in potatoes and produce of that kind, coming also at a time when other trade is very busy. I presume that the same state of affairs obtains all along the coast at the different ports, and that in the summer months the employment is very high as compared with the other months in the year. That appears to me to answer your question “inevitable,” because the goods which have to be dealt with then are goods which are the result of the growth of the earth, and they are ripe, and they have to be handled and distributed without delay all over the United Kingdom.

12,176. Now, I understand that, partly in consequence of that necessary irregularity of employment, you object to any legislative interference with the number of hours worked?—Yes, and for two or three reasons. I think these statistics show that such a thing would be utterly impracticable. I do not propose to hand it in, but I have here a rough statement of the hours worked during this very heavy month, and I find in some weeks that, at the docks, they are actually at work every hour of the 24; they have to begin at 6 in the morning, and they have to go on till 6 o'clock the next morning. Of course, they have different gangs of men for the night work and the day work, but it is absolutely necessary that that should be done. The ships come, arriving in one after the other, very quickly. This produce has to be dealt with very quickly, it has to be sent off to catch trains all over the kingdom in order to catch all the different markets, and supply the tables of the whole population.

12,177. But let me understand you; you say the work is going on the whole of the 24 hours?—Yes.

12,178. That does not mean that the same men are at work the whole of the 24 hours?—No, it does not, but just during those particular months, we may say, practically, the months of June and July, there is a great amount of work to be done. Now, if we had a legislative eight hours' day, where should we get the men to do it? I did not point out that this list that I put in refers only to the casual men; of course, the Dock Company have a number of permanent men in addition. But, with regard to the casual men, the statistics show that 300 or 400 casual men may expect to get fairly regular employment, but, in those months of June and July, we want, as it shows here, the maximum number of 900. If we had a legislative eight hours' day, we should have to get not 900 men, I suppose, but three times 900 men; and what are those men going to do in the other months of the year,

Earl of Derby—continued.

when work is very slack? Already there is always danger in Southampton of our being overcrowded with men in the slack months, and we always consider ourselves very fortunate if we get through the winter without any special distress. I am glad to say that this winter we have done so. There has been no very great distress in Southampton. But if we were to have a legislative eight hours' day, I submit that the effect would be to bring a great many more men into the town in the summer months, many of whom would, perhaps, remain there, and be a burden and a distress to the regular occupants of the town, who, even now, in the winter months, find it difficult to get sufficient employment. So that, in that way, a legislative eight hours' day at Southampton would undoubtedly lead to a congestion of the labour market in the winter months, which would be very serious. Then, in addition to that, I would suggest that it is altogether an unnecessary interference with the freedom of the men to make a little money when they can. I have already pointed out that the wages in the day are at the rate of 5*d.* an hour, and at night 6*d.* an hour. These men at this very busy season of the year will, many of them, work from 6 o'clock at night till 6 o'clock in the morning, in that way earning 6*s.* a day. That enables them, no doubt, if they earn 36*s.* per week, as some of them can, to make a little provision for the future; and anything like a legislative interference with that sort of freedom which the men now have, I think, would be a great misfortune, and to some extent, no doubt, a sapping of that independence which is so valuable.

12,179. That, of course, is all matter of general argument?—Of course.

12,180. But as applied to the circumstances of this particular case, you say that the effect of trying to limit the amount of work done by one man in summer would only be to bring a large number of workmen into the town, who would probably be paupers in the winter?—That would be, I think, the ordinary result of it, but at the same time, there would be another effect as a practical matter, and that would be this, that probably we should not get the men, and therefore that the work of the port would stand still; and, therefore, as a practical matter, that would be more disastrous than any possible harm that may arise from the present system. I should just like to explain, if I may be allowed, because it might perhaps be asked how it is we get so many extra men at that time; but there is no doubt that there are a good many men who come into the town just for that month or two. It is a well understood fact, that there is a large number of men required, and also I am given to understand that there is a considerable number of men who will leave their ordinary occupation just for a month or two in order to do this night work.

12,181. To get better paid work?—Just so.

12,182. Is there anything else that you wish to tell us?—There is one matter, if I might be allowed, I would like to mention, which arose

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

partly out of one of the matters which the committees I have already described took in hand; and that is the question of night work. It was represented to the committee that there was at one time no proper recognised period for refreshment, and that was at once taken up and put right, and, by agreement amongst all the companies concerned, it was settled that there should be a regular proper time for refreshment in the middle of the night in case of night work. But we were met with a difficulty with regard to that refreshment which, although it perhaps hardly comes under your purview, I think might be mentioned in case there should be any way of rectifying it. We found that we were in this difficulty that although we arranged with everybody that they should stop for half an hour, from 4 till half-past 4 for refreshment, the refreshment house in the dock could not be opened under the excise laws. Now considering that the area of the Dock Company is within the Custom House regulations, and that there are Custom House officers always on the watch during the working of the ships, it does seem to us that there ought to be some method by which a refreshment house for a particular purpose in a particular area could be allowed to be opened at a particular hour like that. This is a matter connected with the conditions of labour; it is essential that men hard at work should have fair opportunities for refreshment, and an opportunity of getting it. This is a matter a little bit outside the question of wages or strikes, but I wish, if it is possible, to draw the attention of the Commission to it, with a view to seeing whether it would be possible, in special circumstances, that we should have some special permission to open a refreshment house of that kind, although under the general law we have not, and cannot open one.

Mr. Ismay.

12,183. I suppose, on the whole, you regard Southampton as very favourably situated for labour?—Yes, I think so.

12,184. There are not the fluctuations at Southampton that there are at other ports?—Well, I cannot say that, not having a sufficient knowledge of the fluctuations at other ports; but I think that Southampton is a place where the labourers can live fairly cheaply, and where, on the whole, with the exception I have already spoken of in June and July, the work is pretty constant.

12,185. When the men work the overtime that you referred to, do they change after 12 hours, or what is the system?—They are taken on when they are wanted. When a ship arrives, of course a certain number of men are taken on, and you cannot tell whether that will be at 12 o'clock or at 2 o'clock, but the men are taken on when they are wanted, and they are kept going for a certain time. There is no recognised system as to how many hours the man shall work before he is discharged and another man taken on in his place, because

Mr. Ismay—continued.

sometimes if a job will take, say, 8 or 10 hours to work a ship out, the men prefer to finish it rather than to be knocked off and a fresh gang to be taken on. Besides that, it is not always possible to take on a fresh gang. There is therefore a good deal of latitude allowed with regard to that. No man is kept at work longer than he cares to stop, but I think that is about the point at which the fresh gang comes on.

12,186. The men themselves seek to obtain a little overtime, do they not?—They seek to obtain overtime, certainly. I think I may say without hesitation, the men as a rule like to work overtime to a reasonable extent. They do not desire to rob other men of the work, but it is very natural that if a man sees there is another couple of hours' work to do, and that it will put a shilling in his pocket, then he prefers to earn the shilling rather than not.

12,187. Are they the same men who load and unload ships?—There are export and import gangs. Of course the casual men will sometimes be employed in both; but generally speaking, and roughly speaking, the men keep to their own particular work. The import men, that is the men who receive the goods from the ship, are generally the same set of men from day to day, and the export men are just the same.

12,188. And they change?—They do not change over from one to the other much, but, of course, they can if they like.

12,189. Then, on the whole, you have found the rules and regulations which you have told us of so fully working well in Southampton?—Yes.

12,190. Bringing the employers and employed into touch with each other?—Yes, and producing a good feeling of the real community of interest between them. We desire very earnestly, and I think it should be the desire of everybody, to get rid of the feeling that there is any hostility of interest between employers and employed; and our association certainly has the tendency to get rid of that, to show the men that their interest in the port is just the same as the interest of the employers.

12,191. And therefore you prefer your system to the Union?—I do.

12,192. Do the men?—Yes, I should say so, certainly. Upon one occasion one of the men said publicly at one of our annual meetings, that he thought a union of men and masters must be better than a union of men only, because it is a union where you have not only the men with you but the masters as well; in one sense it is a double union.

12,193. You think you have arrived at that?—Yes, I think we have.

Mr. Tom Mann.

12,194. First, with regard to the origin of the strike that you alluded to; I understood you to say that there were no difficulties existing at the time?—Yes.

12,195. As wages had already been advanced?—Yes.

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tom Mann—continued.

12,196. And that, practically, there was a settlement of the difficulties, but that this strike took place without notice?—Yes.

12,197. Do you remember why the wages were advanced, and when?—The wages were advanced upon the 26th August 1890.

12,198. Do you remember how the advance came about?—I believe there was a meeting called of the men who were at work at the docks, and that at that meeting the officials of the docks met the men and arranged the advance.

12,199. Do I understand it to have been a voluntary arrangement on the part of the employers?—Certainly.

12,200. Do you know whether it was a request made by Union men or not?—No doubt; but as I have already explained the Union had been in operation for some time and sought to be recognised by the employers. The employers said: "We cannot recognise the Union, but we are willing to meet our own men." I do not suggest for a moment but that the Union had been urging that there should be a rise of wages, but the employers as a body never met the Union officials; they met their own men. They said to their own men: "It is proposed that there should be a rise in wages; what is it you want?" And at that meeting, then and there, it was settled that there should be a rise of a penny per hour, and, I think, 3s. per week.

12,201. So that the overtures made by the Union men to the employers resulted in the advance of wages?—Well, I think it would be more correct to say there was a general tendency to advance the wages of labourers throughout the country, and Southampton very naturally followed suit.

12,202. In consequence of the bearing this has upon the evidence that you have given, I should like to ask you, do you know whether or not this advance was brought about directly as the result of the overtures made by the Union men to the employers?—I should say certainly not.

12,203. Then will you please give us the reason how did it come about, if it did not come about in that manner?—Some months, many months previously to the strike, the Dock Companies had raised the wages of their men for night work by one penny per hour, and upon the 26th of August they further raised those wages again by one penny per hour.

12,204. That was the result of those overtures, was it not?—No. I say not. I should say it was as a result of wages throughout the country generally being upon the rise, and the Dock Company and the other employers of labour recognising that fact.

12,205. Would you say distinctly that it was not as a result of the overtures?—Of course you must take all the causes that may together produce any effect. I do not suggest at all that the agitation by the Union at Southampton had nothing whatever to do with the rise of wages, because of course it would be one of the many causes.

Mr. Tom Mann—continued.

12,206. Did the rise of wages precede or follow the overtures made by the Union men to the employers?—I should think that they came very much together, but I have not any dates of any communications that may have been sent from the Dockers' Union to the employers.

12,207. You stated that a member of the executive of the Dockers' Union called the men out on strike?—Yes.

12,208. To whom did you refer?—I referred to William Sprow.

12,209. Why did you say he was a member of the executive of the Dockers' Union?—Did I say he was a member of the executive?

12,210. Yes, I understood you to say so?—I thought I used the words "an officer of the Dockers' Union."

12,211. Perhaps you had intended to?—I am quite willing to take from you any correction with regard to that. I do not wish of course to mislead the Commission at all about that.

12,212. You do not know that he was a member?—I do not know that he was a member of the executive of the Dockers' Union, but I understood that he was an authorised agent of the Dockers' Union; at any rate, he held himself out to be so, and there is no doubt whatever that he called the strike in the name of the Dockers' Union.

12,213. At a subsequent stage in your evidence you said that it was known that this man who had called the men out on strike had exceeded his duties?—Yes.

12,214. Why did you say that—exceeded his duties from what point of view?—I have here an extract from the "Southampton Times" of July 11th, 1891, of an "Interview with Mr. Tom Mann," I think I took it from that. "A deputation came to the executive and I presided at the meeting." This is what you are reported to have said to the "Southampton Times" interviewer: "We finally gave definite instructions that under no circumstances whatever was a strike to be declared. Mr. Edwards was sent down and the very definite instructions previously given to the deputation were again given to the meeting, and endorsed by the men. Reports came from time to time from Sprow which caused us to feel uneasy respecting his behaviour, and he was written to and charged to be careful, otherwise we feared he might precipitate a strike" (*handing in extract*). Considering that that appeared, and has not, as far as I know, been contradicted, I think I am quite justified in saying that he must have called the strike without proper authority.

12,215. So that as regards the authorities in the Dockers' Union you understand that they did not declare the strike, and did not authorise the strike in any way?—Of course I cannot give evidence as to what occurs at the executive of the Dockers' Union, but I should take it that Sprow, as agent of the Dockers' Union, called this strike, and that the strike failed. The executive of the Dockers' Union then tell us that they never authorised it, and that it was altogether a

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tom Mann—continued.

mistake. Supposing the strike had succeeded, it is possible that the Dockers' Union executive might have taken a different view of it.

12,216. If I remember correctly, you stated in your evidence in chief just now that before the week was out, while the strike was still pending, it was found that there would be no strike pay for those men, and that the man who had declared the strike exceeded his duties. You did not gather that information from the interview, I understand, because that is on a subsequent date. You gathered the information you gave in your evidence just now from something that had taken place during the week of the strike?—Yes.

12,217. And prior to the men becoming entitled to strike pay, even if a strike had been authorised by the Union?—Yes.

12,218. Therefore that would rather clash with the suggestion you have just made, would it not?—No, I do not think so. Of course my own men went out on strike; were called out, and went out at the same time.

12,219. By your own men, whom are we to understand?—I am the managing director of Tagart, Morgan, and Coles, timber merchants.

12,220. No connexion with the Dock Company?—No. Therefore, of course, I am in possession of facts regarding my own men that I can speak to without hesitation.

12,221. The point I want cleared up is this: whether you have any justification for making that suggestion you have just made, that the probabilities are that had the strike terminated successfully, the Union would then have said, "We authorised it, and have supported it. Does that fit with your previous statement in your evidence in chief, wherein you stated that before the week was out, that is, during the week of the strike, it was found that the man who had declared the strike had exceeded his duties. If you make the one statement, can you consistently make the other?—In addition to what I have already read of this interview with yourself, I would read this: "The only interpretation that I can put upon it"; is your answer to one question "was that Sprow was "most anxious to score a success, and rightly" so, feeling that perhaps if he won we would "endorse his action, and therefore he took the "risk." I say at once that that is exactly my own feeling about it. I believe that Sprow called the strike, and that it was just a toss up as to whether it would be recognised by the Union or not.

12,222. Do you believe that the Union executive were dealing in a double-faced way with the matter?—No, I do not say so at all.

12,223. Then do you believe that the Union executive authorised the strike?—I do not say that, for it is not within my knowledge either way. What I say is—

12,224. Then what do you mean, please. What had you in your mind when you said that it was found that this man had exceeded his duties?—Why, that was in relation to the question as to the origin of our Association.

Mr. Tom Mann—continued.

There is no doubt whatever that the men at Southampton were very much upset and disgusted with what had taken place.

12,225. I thought it was in relation to the declaration of the strike, the calling of the men out on strike?—Yes.

12,226. I understood it to mean that. Now then, I would like it very clearly as to whether we are to take it from you that you believe the Union executive dealt in a double way with the business or kept in the background with a view to endorsing it or not according as the result might turn out unsuccessful or otherwise; or whether you believe that the Union executive took up one attitude and remained firm, but that the man who declared the strike did not act in accordance with his instructions?—Well, you see it would be rather hard to ask me what I believe when I have really no evidence to go upon with regard to what the Union executive did except what has been stated by Mr. Burns and by yourself, and by others. What I do believe from what I can gather of all the facts is that Sprow called this strike on his own authority and that if it had been successful it is possible, I say that because I have no reason not to say it—it is possible that it might have been endorsed by the executive of the Dockers' Union. I do not wish to suggest for a moment that the Dockers' Union executive were behaving in a double-faced manner, but I am perfectly certain, I feel perfectly sure in my own mind, that Sprow called out the strike in the hope that it would be successful.

12,227. Right?—It was not successful. The executive of the Dockers' Union, I understood, did not send down strike pay because the strike, they stated, was against their instructions; and the whole result of that was the collapse of the strike. I can speak from my own knowledge, because one of my own men told me: "I am going to the committee-room to get "a straight answer to a straight question." The straight question, no doubt was are we going to be paid strike pay; and when they found that they were not, those men at once came back to work. Therefore, I say that our Association was formed because the men were so very much upset with the way in which they had been, as they thought, sold by the Union; whether or not they thought correctly is a question for further explanation.

12,228. With regard to the comparatively peaceful attitude of the men generally, and of the surprise with which the Dock Company were taken when the strike took place, I think you led the Commission to understand that there were really no difficulties existing, or no negotiations taking place. Do you remember the date of this strike, and the day of the week?—It was on a Monday, and the date of the strike was the 8th of September.

12,229. Do you remember whether any negotiations were going on at all at that time between the men and the Dock Company?—I have already stated that on the 26th of August the wages were raised as the result of a meeting.

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tom Mann—continued.

12,230. I mean subsequent negotiations to those? I mean at the very time; the day preceding even. This strike took place on the Monday; were any negotiations taking place, or had they been taking place on the Sunday?—Between whom?

12,231. The Dock Company and their *employés*?—Well, I am not quite certain about that. I knew that there was a meeting on a Sunday afternoon, but whether it was the Sunday before the strike or not I do not remember.

12,232. Do you remember by whom it was called?—I suppose by one of the officials of the Dock Company.

12,233. A meeting of the men called where?—At the docks.

12,234. On a Sunday?—Yes.

12,235. Does that not indicate that some negotiations had been taking place, and that some uneasiness existed?—Well, perhaps it might; but I do not know. There was no question of wages, and there was no question of the ordinary conditions; in fact, there was no question whatever as to anything excepting what is called the recognition of the Union.

12,236. In any case these negotiations were going on. It is not a common thing, is it, for the Dock Company to hold meetings of the men on Sunday in the docks?—No, certainly not.

12,237. Most exceptional, is it not?—I should think so.

12,238. And therefore we may reasonably surmise that considerable activity existed there with regard to the negotiations which had been attempted or were taking place, and that things were not in that peaceful state that you would have led us to understand?—Well, you might very easily, by your question, mislead the Commission in the other direction. On the 26th August the wages were raised, notwithstanding which this agitation to recognise the Union still continued. Well, you imply by your question that the Dock Company might know there was trouble in store for them; but, as I have already stated in evidence, there was no question of any kind about which trouble could arise, except this one question of the recognition of the Union.

12,239. If the Union had been recognised by the employers, do you imagine any difficulty would have resulted?—Yes, I imagine considerable difficulty would have resulted.

12,240. What difficulty do you imagine?—I think that difficulties would have arisen, perhaps in the way of the Union trying to make their Union a close corporation, and dictating who should be taken on and who should not.

12,241. Do you remember that the corn men obtained an advance of wages?—I cannot say that I remember the details of that.

12,242. There was a general advance in wages about that time?—Yes, there was, all through the country.

12,243. And that was the result of the negotiations between the Dock Company and the Union men?—I cannot say that. I can say generally that the Dock Company have never

Mr. Tom Mann—continued.

entered into communications with the Dockers' Union as a Dockers' Union.

12,244. Did I understand you to say that in your Free Labour Association you have over 2,000 men?—Yes.

12,245. How many men are there employed in the port?—Well, I am sorry to say that I cannot tell you that with real accuracy.

12,246. You mentioned the maximum of 948. By whom are they employed?—Those are casual men employed by the Dock Company.

12,247. And as to what number of permanent men do they employ?—About 250. Those would be exclusive of the works department or anything of the kind, the engineers department, for instance. The ordinary labourers would be about 250.

12,248. With reference to your remarks concerning a legislative eight hours' day, you said that would interfere with the trade of the port generally, and also with the liberty of the subject, and what not?—Yes.

12,249. Does this Association afford an opportunity for any demands being made or negotiations taking place to obtain improved conditions for the men?—Certainly.

12,250. If they thought fit, irrespective of legislation, independent of legislation, to make application for an eight hours' day, would it be entertained by this Association?—The discussion of it would be entertained certainly.

12,251. With a view to bringing it about, if a majority of the men desired it?—Any question would be entertained having to do with the conditions of labour or the rate of wages.

12,252. Has any application for improved conditions been made by the men since this Association was established?—I mentioned the question of the proper time for refreshment at night, and there were many other little matters, but nothing of any very great importance—very many little matters.

12,253. Any with regard to the working hours or advances of wages?—No.

Mr. Livesey.

12,254. I should like to ask you whether you would define what you mean by a "recognition of the Union"?—I suppose "recognition of the Union" means that the officials of the Union, either locally or at the head office, should be the persons to negotiate with the employers any change in the conditions of labour or of wages.

12,255. At that time there was no demand that you should employ only Union men, I suppose, included in the term "recognition of the Union"?—I am obliged to answer that question not very directly. The Union was never recognised, and none of the employers ever entered into any negotiations with the Union officials. Therefore I cannot say that the Union ever made any demands or did not make them, but amongst the men I can say from my own knowledge, that it was held out as a threat that if men did not join the Union, or did not come out on strike at that particular time, the other men would not work with them later on. I know

23 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Livesey—continued.

of my own knowledge that that was held out as a threat. I am quite willing to admit that it was probably an empty threat, but it did appear, on the face of it, as far as one can see, that there would be a tendency, to exclude all but Union men.

12,256. Now another and a more important question. In this summary of your evidence marked (d) you say that one of your objects is "by promoting cordial understanding between employers and workmen whose interests are equal in maintaining the efficiency and regularity of work at the port of Southampton"?—Yes.

12,257. In answer to Mr. Ismay you said you thought that result was attained or was being attained?—Yes.

12,258. Can you give me any indication or any evidence that it is—for instance, are the men doing their work in a cheerful, pleasant contented spirit?—Yes, I think so. We have had several joint meetings of the committees of workmen and employers. At these meetings the workmen have brought up various little matters which they have asked should be adjusted. I might mention one matter which was brought up. There seemed to be some feeling amongst certain of the men in the port that there might be an inclination to reduce wages, and it was asked at one of these meetings "What do the employers intend? Are they going to use this Association in order to reduce wages?" One after another of the employers got up and said no such idea had ever crossed their minds; they were perfectly honest in their intention, if it was possible, to maintain the wages at what they were, and that no such question as the reduction of wage had ever been discussed for one moment by the employers' committee. That being stated by one man after another, men of influence and position, who have numbers of men under them, at once produces a feeling that the employers are honestly wishful to keep wages up at the point at which we have arrived; and, therefore, this idea that wages were to be reduced has been abandoned. I have not heard of it for a long time, but at first there was some little feeling that perhaps there might be later on a wish to reduce wages.

12,259. Then you think that the spirit of mutual confidence is growing?—Certainly.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,260. Does the Dock Company do all the work of loading and discharging ships in Southampton?—The discharging of the ships is done by gangs of men as a rule employed by the ship's agents or the shipping companies. The Union Company, the Royal Mail Company, and the South-Western Railway Company employ their own gangs of men to discharge the ships. The Dock Company's duties begin when the goods are put over side on to the quay, and their men run the goods into the warehouses, sort them, load them up into the railway waggons, and of course *vice versa* in loading ships. So that the actual unloading of the ships,

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

as we call it, stevedore's work, is done by the shipping companies, and not by the Dock Company.

12,261. But the Dock Company do load the ships?—No they do not load the ships, and they do not stow the ships.

12,262. Is that done also by the men employed by the steamship companies?—Yes.

12,263. Are the steamship companies members of your Association?—Yes.

12,264. All of them?—Yes. Of course I might add to that that the work in the ships being of a harder character is more highly paid than the rougher kind of work in the sheds. The stowing of ships and the unloading of them is in a sense more dangerous and harder work than simply treating the goods when they come on the quay.

12,265. Is casual labour much employed in that work?—No, I think not. I think the bulk of the labour of that kind is permanent labour. Whether or not the men have to stand off when a ship is not in port, and have to go without their wages, I am not quite sure; but my impression is, that the bulk of that work is done by permanent men, for whom other work is found in between the arrivals of the ships.

12,266. What kind of other work?—Such as scraping, cleaning, and work in the sheds. Of course there is a great deal of that. These companies make Southampton their home, their head-quarters, and there is a great deal of odds and ends of work to be done about a ship. A ship comes into port and is put into dry dock, and a lot of cleaning and repairs and different things have to be done. So that all these companies have a considerable staff of permanent men, whose principal business is loading or unloading the ships.

12,267. Then, when you speak of casual labour at Southampton it applies to moving the goods when they are placed on the quays?—Yes, principally. In one sense the coal porters and the corn porters are casual men, because they get paid piece-work for different merchants; but, roughly speaking, all the men about whom the statistics are put in are the casual labourers, who simply handle the goods when they are put out of a ship on to a quay, run them into the sheds, sort them up there, and put them into the railway trucks for despatch.

12,268. Is there not a proposal now for the acquisition of the Southampton Docks by the railway company?—Yes, there is.

12,269. Do you think if that were carried out it would have any effect in reducing the necessity for the employment of casual labour. I mean, could not the railway company turn their hands to other purposes just as the steamship companies do when there was not so much work in the dock?—I should think not to any great extent, the chief difficulty being that the large number of hands is required in the months of June and July, when everybody else wants a large number of hands. All through the country everybody wants hands in the months of June and July. Therefore it is difficult to see how the railway

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

company could help us very much, though no doubt it would be true that the railway company would be in a much better position to put on a larger number of permanent hands than the Dock Company is, in. The Dock Company must only put on as many permanent hands as they can really see employment for, and for extra work they must take on casual men. One can quite understand that the railway company might perhaps be able to put on more permanent hands because they might have work elsewhere if they so arranged it

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

12,270. Has there been any question, to your knowledge, of the financial effect upon the Dock Company of the work of loading and discharging being done by the steamship companies?—I think in Southampton it has always been done in that way.

12,271. Has it been considered that the Dock Company is a gainer or a loser on that account?—On account of the steamship companies doing their own work?

12,272. Yes?—I am not aware of that.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. THOMAS MACCARTHY recalled and further examined.

Earl of Derby.

12,273. We understand that you represent the Southampton Dock and other labourers; is that so?—As part of the Dockers' Union, yes.

12,274. You are a member of the Dockers' Union, are you?—Yes.

12,275. Can you say what has been the general condition of those labourers from 1890 upwards?—Yes; we received notice in London, about the early part of March 1890, that the men of Southampton were anxious to join our Union, and a man was sent down there to address some meetings. We inquired into the condition of things at that time, and found that the casual dock labourers were earning 4d. an hour; that the work was very irregular indeed; that there were about 50 per cent. more labourers competing than were really wanted; and that the men hung about the docks from 6 or 7 o'clock in the morning, obtained an odd hour or two hours' work, and dare not leave for fear of losing the chance of obtaining that work until sometimes as late as 11 and 12 o'clock in the night, midnight; that is to say, men were 16, 17, and 18 hours hanging about the docks on the chance continuously. We found that the system pursued by the Dock Company was very demoralising, as we thought. For a number of years they had established a soup kitchen in the place, and at periods during the day they gave away soup and bread to these poor fellows who were waiting for work. I might here say that the wages of the dock labourers who were permanently employed by the Company was 19s. a week. From March until August or September of that year until the time of the strike we had a series of meetings, open air demonstrations, and so forth, until we had a membership there of close upon 3,000 men.

12,276. Members, do you mean, of the Dockers' Union?—Yes. Included in this number, of course, were gasworkers and men who were working in shipbuilding yards and yacht-building yards. There was one very bad state of conditions existing there. The South Western Railway Company's boats, which came from the Channel Islands with cargoes of dairy produce, came in at all times of the night, and men were constantly on the watch to get a job on board. In the busy season, from July, say, till

Earl of Derby—continued.

the end of August, it was customary to put from 20 to 40 tons of fruit as a deck-load on those boats. The men who were taken on to discharge them had to remove every package of that fruit, sometimes 400 and 500 packages, or from 20 to 40 tons, before they received one penny wages. Cases were mentioned to me where as much as 40 tons had been removed, and the men had not received one penny for it. It was not looked upon as cargo, and until they lifted the hatches and broke the bulk of the cargo below hatches they were not on pay. When they finished discharging the boats the average amount they received was 4s. 6d.; but the Dock Company's men who handled these goods on shore for the same amount of work received about 1s. 9d. During our organizing work (and I may say that I addressed a number of meetings there myself) we were very emphatic in denouncing what we considered to be the demoralisation produced by this indiscriminate giving of soup and bread, and we saw that in the summer time it induced tramps and scamps from all over the country to come into Southampton; men who had led no regular or proper life could, perhaps, earn an odd shilling now and then, they would be partly fed by the charity of the Dock Company, and they lived the life of a grasshopper in summer—God knows what became of them in the winter. We found that for a circle, say of 15 miles round Southampton through Hampshire and Wiltshire—and I might here say that I visited some of the villages round about myself—the wages were very poor indeed. We found men in Wiltshire, in the parish of Whiteparish, on the estate of Lord Nelson, working for 9s. a week, and they could get a chance in the lottery at the docks at Southampton of earning a sovereign a week. It seemed like Paradise to those poor fellows. These things tended of course to bring a great influx of men into Southampton. In the summer time a number of men who worked at the docks in the winter had small allotments, half acres, at a place, I think, called Sholing Common, I think that is the name of the place, and they grew strawberries for the London market. Some of these men told me that they could get for the season about 25l. profit on the

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MACCARTHY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

half acre, and they said that had they an opportunity of getting a little more land, or the local authorities chanced to give them a little more land, another half acre or an acre, that they would not have to come to the docks in the winter. We went on organising and increasing the membership, and about the middle of August—the “Times” of September 9 gives it as a fortnight before that, and that would be about the third week in August—a demand for an increase of wages was sent to every employer, shipping company, and dock company in Southampton. This of course being a demand for higher wages would be sanctioned; would receive the tacit consent of the executive of the Dockers’ Union; but had no rise of wages taken place at that time the men, according to rule, would not have it in their own hands to come out on strike. For some weeks the agitation had been growing very strong, and the men had threatened to come out on strike, and a considerable advance in wages had taken place all round. If you will pardon me I will read you the list (*handing in First Annual Report (1890) of the Dockers’ Union*). I think the members of the Commission have been given these lists from the Union. The corn weighers received an advance from 5s. per day to 6s. per day; the weekly men in corn stores from 18s. per week to 1*l.* per week; the corn trimmers from 3s. 6*d.* per day to 4s. per day; the corn bushellers from 2s. 3*d.* per 100 quarters to 2s. 6*d.* per 100 quarters; the corn runners, or those who carried the sacks of corn on their backs, from 2s. 1*d.* per 100 quarters to 2s. 3*d.* per 100 quarters; stevedores’ extra labourers from 4*d.* per hour by day and night to 5*d.* per hour by day and 6*d.* per hour per night after 6 o’clock; the stevedores’ extra labourers of the West India Company the same rate of wages; the London and South-western Company’s boatsmen employed by the Dock Company the same rate of wages and the same increase; the Dock Company permanent labourers from 19s. and 20s. per week and 4*d.* per hour overtime to 21s. per week, and 6*d.* per hour after 6 o’clock at night; the extra labourers or casual labourers from 4*d.* per hour by day, 5*d.* per hour overtime, to 5*d.* per hour by day and 6*d.* per hour by night; the London and South-western Steam Packet Company’s coal porters from 8*d.* per ton to 9*d.* per ton; the Union Steamship Company cargo work from 5*d.* per hour day-time and 6*d.* per hour night-time to 6*d.* per hour day-time and 7*d.* per hour night-time; the Union Steamship Company’s men ship work and general labour from 22s. per week to 24s. per week; the London and South-western Steam Packet Company cargo discharging 5*d.* per hour by day and 6*d.* per hour by night, to 6*d.* per hour by day and 7*d.* by night; the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company cargo work from 5*d.* and 6*d.* respectively to 6*d.* and 7*d.* Altogether, there were 1190 affected in that work; the total weekly gain was to 293*l.* 19s. 6*d.*, making an average for each man of 4s. 11½*d.* per week extra wages. That was after the demand had

Earl of Derby—continued.

been put to the companies by the Union. I may say that the attitude that the companies—the Dock Company included,—and other employers took up, with the exception of one or two small masters, was refusal to recognise the Union as such, and as it was not exactly a matter of dignity with us, but rather of pounds, shillings, and pence for the men, we did not mind that. The men asked, could they treat with the masters and leave us out. We said, “Certainly, get a rise of wages,” and they got it. Some uneasiness was felt amongst the permanent labourers of the Dock Company as it was reported that the Dock Company, intended revising the list again (after the rise of wages had been given), and on Sunday, the 7th of September 1890, a meeting of the permanent and other labourers of the Southampton Dock Company was called inside the docks on the Sunday afternoon. The purpose of that meeting of course was not made known on the post-card, but the men had to attend it or run the risk of losing their employment. Some of the local officials attempted to get into the docks and were stopped. It transpired afterwards that this meeting had been called to revise the payment. The report was spread that had the Dock Company’s terms been accepted, the average wages for the permanent labourers would be reduced to 3½*d.* an hour. Whether that was so or not we had no opportunity of judging—at all events, that was the impression in the men’s minds. At 12 o’clock on that Sunday-night the men refused to go into work; they had been ordered into work; the men at different parts of the dock working for the shipping companies, and for the Dock Company, and for other companies—these were not men who were affected themselves by the strike, but, I suppose, out of what is called sympathy for the other men having their wages reduced, or it being threatened so, they determined not to go to work. I may tell you that some weeks previously a deputation had come from Southampton, and waited on the executive in London, and they requested, amongst other things, that if the employers refused their demands, they should come out on strike. I have an extract from the minutes: “June 23rd 1890. A letter read from Southampton stating men threatened to strike, resolved that a letter be sent stating that we would not recognise a strike, and asking the secretary to do all in his power to keep the men at work.” That letter was sent to them. Further, the assistant secretary went down and addressed the men, and a resolution was carried in the Victoria Hall that the men would not strike because we believed that the gains obtained were fairly satisfactory, and there was no necessity for a strike. We did not think it was necessary. However, the strike took place, as I have said, and the men who were going to work on the following Monday morning were informed that a strike had taken place in the dock, and they remained outside. Nobody knew who gave the order; nobody knew how it was done; and although

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MACCARTHY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

I went down there a day or two afterwards during the strike I could not find out how it was. It seemed the rumour spread like wild-fire that the men were afraid their wages were going to be reduced, and by way of protest they refused to go to work themselves and the other men with them. On Monday the strike spread over Southampton pretty fairly, but on Tuesday it was general. The men congregated at the Dock gates. I have an extract from "The Times" here which shows what took place on the Tuesday. "Later on," it says, "a conference was held at the Dock House between the Mayor, Town Clerk, and the Chairman of the Watch Committee on the one hand, and Messrs. Sprow, Spragge, and other leaders of the dockers. It was subsequently announced that the conference was mainly on the question of interference with the mail and passenger traffic, and the dockers gave an undertaking that they should not be interfered with, and that the railway carriages containing those would be allowed to cross Canute Road from the station yard to the docks without molestation." That undertaking, of course, we were not aware of in London, but certainly no attempt was made to interfere with the passenger traffic or with the transit of goods in or out of the docks until (and I only take this from hearsay) the station yard was opened and an engine driven through the mass of the people who had congregated outside the dock gate. One man then jumped on the engine, reversed the lever and stopped her, drove her back into the yard to prevent disaster and accident. At all events the mayor of the town lost his head, telegraphed to Portsmouth for 250 troops, the fire brigade was called out, the police in the neighbourhood were called in to help the Southampton police; people were driven at the point of the bayonet from the dock gates, telegrams were despatched to us in London that a serious riot had taken place, and that the people were being beaten by the soldiers. At the time the telegram came, on the Tuesday, the 9th, I think it was, of September, it was too late for anyone to catch a train, and I was instructed by the President to proceed to Southampton at once. I went there, and arrived on the Wednesday morning, addressed the men, told them that no violence was to be used, that I would immediately seek an interview with the Dock Company and see what could be done in the matter. I called the officers together and inquired as to the reason of the strike, told them that it was entirely against the rules, and that no recognition of it as a strike could take place from London. I went to the South western Hotel where the masters were in conference and waited for five hours. I sent a note up, but no answer was returned. On the same day I met a gentleman whose name I do not know, but who told me he was a member or secretary, I think, of the local chamber of commerce, and I told him that the executive did not sanction the strike, that my reason for being in Southampton was to close the strike and order the men back to work, and

Earl of Derby—continued.

that as I could not find out a proper account from the men, if the employers would admit me and let us chat the matter over I had no doubt that in 24 hours the whole thing would be over and the men back at work. That I have every reason to believe, was taken to the employers, but they stood on their dignity and refused to admit any "agitator" or "emissary of the Union." The Rev. Canon Wilberforce of Southampton and the Catholic Canon Scannel, the Rev. Mr. Perrin, a Church of England minister, and another minister, a Dissenter, endeavoured to obtain an audience for me with the employers, but every approach was met with a refusal. I then requested them to admit me, not as a member of the Union, but merely as one wishing to put an end to the trouble. They refused to do it. The men were in a very excitable state, and were massed together at a place called the Platform, at about 600 yards from the Docks, most of the streets, of course, being guarded by troops in the meantime. I came back from the South-western Hotel, called the men together, and to keep them out of mischief, organised them into a procession, led them up through the town for a few hours till they got a bit tired, then bade them go home and wait developments; called another meeting of the officers, and a meeting for the following morning. A gentleman, who told me he was a magistrate, came to me and begged of me to do my utmost to keep the peace of the town. I said that we were not bent on mischief, and that no mischief would have been committed had it not been for the presence of soldiers in the streets, and the fire brigade playing on the men. It was impossible to play on these men or to beat them with rifles and for them to stand still and allow it to be done, and but for the efforts of the dockers' officers serious bloodshed would have taken place. However, on the following morning the men assembled in meeting; we endeavoured to organise another procession. It was then known all over the town that the London executive did not sanction the strike, and the men were ready to go back to work on Thursday. No attempt was made, however, by the employers to get over the difficulty, and I waited on them again, waited a number of hours, but met with the same refusal. I endeavoured to march the men in procession, and was informed by the head constable that if such an attempt was made to go through the streets again, force would have to be used, and we should be driven back. I told the men that it was no use running ourselves against steel, that the best thing they could do would be to scatter home. However in the course of the day a poster appeared signed by some of the employers and the Dock Company, in which the men were asked to go back to work, and were told that they would be protected from molestation, that is, that they would be protected from themselves. On Friday morning the men began going back to work, and the thing was completed by Saturday. On the following Monday, except for the bitterness that was left behind, Southampton appeared as if

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MACCARTHY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

there had not been a strike at all. In the meantime, the man who was in charge of Southampton, and I may say that he was not a London man, not a member of the executive, (Mr. Sprow), was locked up, charged with intimidation, and some 30 others were locked up and charged with various offences. The trial came off at Winchester some few months later. The original charge against Mr. Sprow was withdrawn, and 30 or 40 men who had been imprisoned with him were discharged, and Mr. Sprow was offered up as a holocaust to the wounded dignity of Southampton. I may say that he was not punished on the original charge; he was merely selected as an example.

12,277. Was he punished at all, do you say?—He was punished; he received three months imprisonment.

12,278. What for?—I do not know. I know that the original charge was intimidation, but that was withdrawn. What the punishment was for afterwards I do not know. Immediately after the strike, the employers called the men together, and formed the Free Labour Association, and the freedom of the men was at once shown by an order issued by the Dock Company, that no man should be admitted into the dock unless he had a Free Labour ticket. That was in operation until up to the time I was in Southampton last, about four or five months ago. No man seeking work from the Dock Company could seek work or enter the gates unless he had a Free Labour ticket. So far as our Union men are concerned they have nothing to say against the Free Labour Association, except that they do not expect any rise of wages to come out of it. Most of the matters discussed by the employers and the workmen in the Free Labour Association are first of all discussed in the Union branch room, but the men who speak out in the Union rooms dare not of course speak out in the Free Labour Association. Up to the present the rise of wages has continued, but soup is being given away as freely as ever, and the men can fight for a chance of employment just as well as ever they could. I think that is all the statement I have to make, unless it is that I have one or two remedies that I might suggest.

12,279. We will have these later. You say you do not complain, as I understood you, of the Free Labour Association?—Not if it was a Free Labour Association. Every man has the right of combination with others.

12,280. And as a matter of fact have the relations between employers and employed been harmonious of late in Southampton?—Well, there is order in Warsaw. They must be harmonious, the men have no other alternative.

12,281. You consider that the men have fought the masters and been beaten?—Exactly.

12,282. Is that your point?—Yes.

12,283. But I thought you said your Union did not authorise this strike?—We did not.

12,284. But the men organized this strike on their own account and they failed at it?—Well, I do not know how to explain that properly. It

Earl of Derby—continued.

seemed to come all at once—some sudden ebullition.

12,285. And the result was that they were defeated, and you consider that they are now in a position in which they must do more or less what the masters desire?—Exactly, except that they have better wages than they formerly had, which of course I attribute to the effort of the Union.

12,286. Now you say you have got some remedies to propose; what are they?—I would first of all say that shipowners should be entirely free to discharge and load their own ships and handle the cargo without the intervention of the Dock Company, or a master stevedore or any other middleman, that the middleman of course or master stevedore should be totally put on one side, and that the work should be done under a proper co-operative system by the working men.

12,287. You say the middleman should be put aside, but put aside by whom? By the voluntary action of the parties concerned or by any legislative prohibition?—In this case—and I would suggest this as an immediate remedy—by the voluntary effort of the workmen and the shipowners—that the men should take the place, the responsibilities, financial and otherwise, of the master stevedores, the Dock Companies in discharging and handling cargo, and other people who now interfere to the detriment of the men, that there should be a minimum payment for work done of four hours pay. You will pardon me, but I quite forgot to mention one thing in my statement.

12,288. Yes, go on?—It was a custom of the Dock Company (and I saw that myself), or rather a common occurrence, to employ men for two or three hours in the morning, and at dinner-time discharge them and take on fresh men, so that the hour for dinner would be saved; that is to say, when one o'clock came, large numbers of men were discharged, others were taken on in their places, and the dinner-hour was worked through by the fresh gang who came on. I would attempt to mitigate that by giving a minimum pay of four hours—no less—whatever time a man worked under that he should not receive less than four hours' pay; that instead of the men being allowed to hang about all day long, a rule should be made that only twice a day should the men be taken on, in the morning and at mid-day, or in the morning and at evening—except of course in urgent cases. With respect to further remedies an attempt, I believe, is being made by the railway company to buy the docks in Southampton—it has been talked about. I would think that a better state of things would be that the dock should be bought by the municipality, and that a fair-wages-clause should be adopted in all work done by or for the municipality. That would ensure to some of the dock workers, at all events, a reasonable rate of wages, and it would give them a chance of bettering their condition and of regulating the hours of labour.

12,289. Have you any reason to suppose that the municipality desire to undertake the heavy

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MACCARTHY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

responsibility of the management of the docks?—I am afraid they cannot see far enough.

12,290. Then what would you suggest if they were not willing to take it into their hands—would you force it upon them?—Well, I think the people are in favour of it. I would also say that allotments should be easier of acquisition round about that neighbourhood, as I am speaking of that neighbourhood. I have already instanced the case of strawberry growers, and if the local bodies there could let these people a little more land there would be a chance of them living on that land, instead of competing at the dock gates. I would also put in operation an eight hours' day. In dock work I know it is very difficult, but at all events the maximum should be a 48 hours week—no man should work more than 48 hours a week.

12,291. Have you heard what was said by the last witness as to the unequal pressure of the work at different times of the year?—I have been 14 years a dock worker, and I am quite well aware of that; but I believe, as a practical man, all those difficulties would be overcome. Where there is a will there is a way. I would further (and now I have to ask for a legal change) say that an amendment of the Trades Union Acts should be carried to alter the law and allow Trades Union funds to be used to finance co operative productive and distributive societies. This I believe would give immense play to Trades Unions in a better direction than in the direction of strikes, and it would minimise perhaps—or I rather think it would, and I hope it would—the frequency and the danger of strikes.

12,292. Is there anything else that you wish to suggest?—I do not think of anything else just now.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach

12,293. Are you acquainted with the condition of dock labour at Bristol?—Yes.

12,294. You are aware that at Bristol the docks belong to the municipality?—I am.

12,295. Is the condition of labour satisfactory there?—No.

12,296. Then I do not quite understand why you suggested to us, as a remedy for the condition of labour at Southampton, that the municipality should buy the docks?—Because it would be easier if the people exerted what power they have in Bristol to better the condition of the workmen than it would be in Southampton.

12,297. But, according to you they have not done it?—They have not done it. And again, the intervention of the master stevedore, the middleman in Bristol, also conduces to irregularity of work and to bad wages—bad conditions generally.

12,298. But if the people of Bristol were satisfied that they ought to introduce into the management of the docks a fair-wages' clause, for instance, such as you have suggested, they have the power to do it through their power over their own town council, have they not?—I believe they have, but the mere fact of the

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

municipality acquiring docks without working those docks properly would not make it any better unless the people exercised the power in their own hands.

12,299. Do you mean, then, that Parliament should compel the municipality to introduce a fair-wages' clause?—No, not at present. The people can do that if they choose.

12,300. Then you would leave the municipality free?—I would leave the municipality free in that direction, because I cannot yet see my way clear to Parliament interfering in the settling and arranging of wages, except in relation to its own immediate contracts.

12,301. And yet in one great instance where the docks do belong to the municipality you are not satisfied with the conditions of labour?—I am not satisfied, because other things happen.

12,302. What other things?—I have already said that the middleman exists.

12,303. Then how can you propose it to us as a remedy that the municipality should purchase the docks?—Because it is the first step in the right direction; it gives the people the power if they like to use it.

12,304. As a matter of fact, they do not like to use it?—I could not say that in all cases.

12,305. No; but it is so there, is it not?—In Bristol?

12,306. Yes?—I could not say "yes" to that, because I have not been in Bristol for some time, and I do not know what they are doing now.

12,307. But they have not used it?—They are going in that direction, at all events.

12,308. When you suggested a minimum day of four hours, did you mean that that should be a matter of agreement between the employer and employed, or that the Legislature should interfere?—I would not ask the Legislature to interfere in a question of wages; but I would say this, that in all municipal contracts there should be a fair-wages' clause, and that should be one of the provisions, that a minimum rate of wage should be paid, with a minimum amount, either three or four hours, as the case may be. There may be a fair-wages' clause in any municipal contract, which should say: these men shall be paid at a stated rate per hour; then men may be given half-an-hour's work, and we should have the same old irregularity of employment existing, even under a fair-wages' clause.

12,309. Then all these matters which you suggested in order to ameliorate the conditions of the dock labourer should, in your mind, be carried out by the municipality, the municipality being pressed to do so by its constituents?—Exactly. I do not know that that applies to all of them. There are some things of course which the municipality could not do. The Legislature would have to interfere, in my opinion.

12,310. What are they?—The municipalities at present have not sufficient power.

12,311. Any municipality may apply to Parliament for power to purchase its docks, may it not?—Yes, but it would have a great deal of difficulty in getting through, especially when it had to combat vested interests.

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MACCARTHY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tom Mann.

12,312. Respecting the conditions of labour at Bristol, do you know how they compare with the conditions of labour in Southampton?—The men are much better paid.

12,313. You know that they are?—Yes; since the advent of the Union in Bristol the wages are very much better.

12,314. Can you give any instances as to the particular kind of labour and the rate of pay received in Southampton and the rate of pay received in Bristol?—I think I could do that in a minute. (*After referring to papers.*) I am afraid it would take a little time.

12,315. Do not trouble about it?—If you gave me a little time I could answer that fully, but I can say offhand that the wages do compare very favourably indeed with Southampton, and, in some instances, they compare very favourably indeed with London. In some departments of the corn trade the men receive better wages there than they do in London.

12,316. How do other ports compare with Southampton?—Very well indeed. Southampton is one of the very worst paid ports in the Kingdom.

12,317. At the present time?—At the present time.

12,318. After having had that advance of wages?—Oh, yes.

12,319. Will you give us an instance?—On certain stevedoring work the men who load the ships there receive 6*d.* per hour for it; for the same class of work in London or in Liverpool men receive certainly a better rate of payment than that; a much better rate of pay. For instance, in London they receive for the same 8*d.* per hour by day and 1*s.* an hour overtime.

12,320. And what do they receive in Southampton?—In Southampton they receive 6*d.* and 7*d.* respectively for what is paid in London 8*d.* and 1*s.*; and you must also remember that this 8*d.* and 1*s.* has been paid for the last 15 years in London.

12,321. With regard to discharging, what do they receive in Southampton?—5*d.*, and 6*d.* overtime. The rate in London, of course under the Dock Company, is 6*d.* and 8*d.* respectively, and under the co-operative system anything from 7*d.* to 11*d.* an hour.

12,322. So that Southampton is still considerably below other ports?—Very much below other ports. It is in fact one of the worst ports I know of and I know some seven or eight ports.

Mr. Tait.

12,323. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that no men were admitted to seek labour at the docks in Southampton who had not a free-labour ticket?—The men came to me and complained that they were not allowed inside the docks until they could produce a free-labour ticket, and that, therefore, they were compelled to join the Free Labour Association.

12,324. Do you know whether any priority of employment is given to those who hold a free-labour ticket against those who do not?—I could not say that; I know that numbers of the

Mr. Tait—continued.

men were singled out for punishment, and were not given work for months after the strike.

12,325. Were they members of your Union who were singled out?—Yes.

12,326. Do you know any who were not members of your Union who were similarly punished?—I do not, because my knowledge, of course, extended mostly to union men.

12,327. When you speak of having an eight hours' day or a 48 hours' week introduced for dock work, do you mean that the 48 hours per week should be compulsory by Act of Parliament?—I do. I mean that no man shall be allowed to work more than 48 hours per week at the docks.

12,328. And you would ask Parliament to legislate in that direction?—I would; in fact, in all trades.

12,329. You have stated here to-day, in answer to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, that while you would ask Parliament to legislate and to fix the hours of labour, you would not ask Parliament to fix the wages of labour?—That is so.

12,330. Now, is there any reason why they should not do the one as well as the other?—I rather think that the question of wages would balance itself irrespective of the hours of labour, because men would certainly not live under a certain standard; and discontent at having to live on low wages is increasing.

12,331. Yes; but if it is good on the one hand to ask Parliament to fix the hours you could with the same reasonableness ask Parliament to fix the wages?—But I cannot see that it is so much a question of wages as it is of irregularity of employment. Take the lowest wage that we know of, in London for the ordinary labourer, 6*d.* per hour; if a man worked 48 hours per week for 6*d.* per hour, which would be 2*s.*, it would be infinitely better for him than the present conditions if he could be assured of that; and the chances are that the absorption of the unemployed by the 48 hours week or the eight hours' day, would prevent a large number of the men who are now working 100 hours a week, while some are only working five or six.

12,332. Then we can infer that the reason you ask Parliament to legislate is for the purpose of utilising the unemployed labour, and you think as a natural sequence of that employment that wages would regulate themselves?—But I would not ask Parliament only to legislate in the case of an eight hours' day because of absorbing the unemployed, but for many other reasons.

12,333. But that is one reason?—That is one reason.

12,334. And that is your reason for being against Parliament interfering with wages, you believing that with the introduction of an eight hours' day, wages would regulate themselves?—Yes, I think so.

12,335. Now, you speak of the purchase of docks by municipalities; have you given any consideration to the great amount of money that is required for the purchase of the one?—Well I have. I have given some consideration

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MACCARTHY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

to that, because I know it would take a large amount of money to do it.

12,336. What system of purchase would you suggest to the Commission?—I would not care about suggesting any just now, because I have not thought it out, although I know that of course it would be an immense amount of money, but it may be done by loans spread over a number of years, although then would come the difficulty of pledging a future generation for what we were endeavouring to enjoy in this generation. We have had too much of that.

12,337. You have not thought it out as to whether it should be done locally or upon the rates of a particular town, or whether that town should apply to Parliament for loans of money at a low rate of percentage from the various funds at the disposal of Parliament; you have not thought out which would be the best thing to do?—No; not in that direction, because I did not know that there was any money to be applied to such a purpose.

12,338. Parliament has many departments from which municipalities can get various loans, on proper securities, of course?—Yes.

12,339. The security that you would give to Parliament, if you have to get the loans, would be the security simply of the rates?—I have not thought that out.

Mr. Bolton.

12,340. By the action of the Union, I understand the rate of wages in Southampton was materially raised?—Yes.

12,341. But a great objection which still exists, and existed formerly, was the great number of people brought into Southampton seeking work at the docks as casuals?—Yes.

12,342. What has been the effect upon the number of casuals of the raising of the wages; is there a greater number or fewer than formerly?—There is a greater number, but I do not know what the proportion is.

12,343. Has not the increased rate of payment been an inducement to a larger number to come to Southampton?—There is no doubt it would be, but I could not say it is.

12,344. You have no knowledge?—I have no knowledge of that.

12,345. All that you know of the matter is that there is a number of casuals?—That is so, and I have given the reasons that tend to make still more.

12,346. You make no complaint, I think, of the Free Labour Federation with respect to the rate of wages paid; they have not attempted in reality to reduce the rate of wages so far?—Not to reduce the rate of wages, because that would be simply flying in the face of their professions.

12,347. I merely asked the fact, and the fact is so?—That is so, yes.

12,348. But you state very positively that the Dock Company refuse to admit labourers within the gates unless they hold a Federation ticket?—They did so up to a few months ago, and I know nothing to the contrary to-day

Mr. Bolton—continued.

12,349. You cannot say that they continue to do so?—I know that they did three or four months ago—up to that time.

12,350. Are you positive of that, even up to three or four months?—I am positive of it. I know that only, of course, from the fact that the men have come and complained of it.

12,351. Another of your complaints, I think, is that the Dock Company induces the casuals to come to Southampton by free gifts of soup, and so on?—Yes; I think that helps to demoralise the men.

12,352. Are you positively sure that the Dock Company does do that?—I know that the officials of the Dock Company and the shipping companies and others subscribe to this fund, and that the shed where it is distributed is inside the docks.

12,353. Are you sure that that is done by the Dock Company; that is my question?—By the Dock Company alone?

12,354. Not by the Dock Company alone; but are you sure that the Dock Company does spend its money in any way in the gratuitous supply of soup?—I am just about as sure of that as that I am alive.

12,355. You likewise stated, I think, that at that meeting which was held within the docks no one but dock employes and those invited were allowed to attend?—I beg your pardon.

12,356. You referred to a meeting called by the Dock Company on a Sunday?—Yes.

12,357. And I think you stated that no one was allowed to attend, except those specially invited, and those who belonged to the dock?—At all events so far as the workmen were concerned that is so, because two of our men were imprisoned for attempting to land in the docks on that day to attend this meeting.

12,358. Then you state of your own knowledge, do you, that that took place—that the people desirous of attending that meeting were refused admission?—The evidence I have for saying that I have given you, that is to say, if you will pardon me, that these two men who were imprisoned were charged because they attempted to attend that meeting by landing on the Dock Company's premises.

12,359. You have expressed a desire for the acquisition of the docks by the municipal authorities?—Yes.

12,360. And I think that the reason you gave and the advantage which you stated would follow and be derived from that course, is that the work at the docks would be better paid, and the business of the docks better carried on than at present?—That is one reason, but the broad principle is that all these things should be under democratic control—under the control of the people.

12,361. Are you acquainted with Glasgow?—No.

12,362. You are not aware that the Glasgow docks are all municipal?—I think they are.

12,363. You do not know whether there have been strikes there?—There have been strikes there—so I have read.

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MACCARTHY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

12,364. Then the inference is that the municipalisation of the docks in every instance would not prevent strikes?—While there are middlemen hanging about, of course not.

12,365. Would you make the acquisition of the docks by municipalities compulsory?—Well, I have never thought that over—I do not like compulsion.

12,366. Then at present it is no change that you are suggesting, because, I think it is within the power of municipalities at present to apply to Parliament for power to acquire the docks?—It is within their power to apply to Parliament, but it is one thing to apply to Parliament, and another thing for Parliament to allow you to do what you ask—as an instance, the eight hours day.

12,367. Is that a parallel case to the acquisition of the docks?—No; but there an application to Parliament has been made, time and again, but Parliament has not allowed it.

12,368. But you cannot answer the question whether or no you would make it compulsory?—No; only by stating that it is no use compelling a man to do what he cannot see right in doing.

12,369. You are in favour of an eight hours' day by legislation, are you not?—Yes.

12,370. But not in favour of a Parliamentary interference in the rate of wages?—That is so.

12,371. Now, what do you anticipate from an eight hours' day—do you anticipate increased wages?—Generally.

12,372. To the individual?—No, the bulk of wages, I think, would only increase in the same ratio as it does now.

12,373. But you anticipate that the same rate of wages for an eight hours' day would be paid as for the twelve?—I think so.

12,374. Then, given a certain amount of work, the cost of performing that work would be exactly increased 50 per cent.?—I do not know the percentage.

12,375. You know the difference of percentage between eight and twelve?—Yes, I beg your pardon. At all events the evidence that I have read goes to show that production is considerably accelerated by working shorter hours.

12,376. But whatever the difference, you do not suppose that a man would do in every class of work as much in eight hours as he would do in twelve?—No, and why should he.

12,377. I am not questioning why or wherefore. I am merely asking your opinion as to the fact. If he did not do as much, that would be so much added to the cost of doing any given amount of work, would it not?—As you put it, yes, of course.

12,378. And can you put it in any other way?—I can only put it in this way: that whatever the cost of production may be now, the proportion of wages—the bulk of wages paid to the workmen all over the country—does not rise in the proportion that the bulk of profit goes to the classes who do not produce.

12,379. You object to the rate of wages in Southampton being so very much lower, or

Mr. Bolton—continued.

lower than in other ports?—I state that I believe they are in the ports that I know.

12,380. Do you think that it would be just that the rate of wages in every part of the kingdom for doing exactly the same work, should be the same?—Other conditions being equal.

12,381. But are they?—No.

12,382. Then should the rate of wages be the same?—Should the rate of wages be the same?

12,383. Yes?—Well, of course not.

12,384. Then is it not possible that the cost of living at Southampton is less, we will say, than in London?—The cost of living may be less; I am not prepared to dispute it.

12,385. And consequently there is some reason for the rate of wages being somewhat lower in Southampton than in some other parts of the Kingdom?—If the cost of living is less, and other things are equal, what you say would be perfectly right, but I do know, from my own knowledge, that the standard of living, irrespective of the cost, is very low indeed in Southampton, that the men are badly paid, that they are badly fed, and that they are badly housed; and that state of things, at all events, should be altered.

Mr. Ismay.

12,386. You have given evidence before the Commission previously, I think?—Yes.

12,387. How often?—I think I was here two days; on two occasions.

12,388. Two separate occasions?—I think so: I am not quite sure.

12,389. This is the third time you have given evidence before the Commission?—It is the second or third time.

12,390. You do not remember in what capacity you gave evidence before?—I have given evidence in each case as an officer of the Dockers' Union, and as a dock worker.

12,391. Can you tell the Commission what is the present position of the Union at Southampton?—The present position of the Union, compared with what it was before the strike, is very low indeed. There are just some few hundreds in the Union.

12,392. Is it what you would call a live organisation at the present, or not?—Well, it is alive, what there is. There are, I think, some 200 or 300 men there altogether; there were 2,000 or 3,000. Of course, the Union as compared with what it was, is entirely broken up.

12,393. By the action of the employers?—Oh, no.

12,394. Then why?—The Union was broken up before. The Union was practically broken before the Free Labour Bureau was instituted.

12,395. Why was it broken?—It was broken for the reason that the men left it because the executive were not paid strike pay, contrary to rule. You see the organisation had not taught them; there had not been sufficient time to show these men what organisation was properly, and they had not been accustomed to the discipline and order and rule of a union. Of course they are not to blame for that.

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MACCARTHEY.

[Continued.]

Mr *Ismay*—continued.

12,396. Then it was through the quarrel with the executive in London really?—Well, I suppose that may be stated as the chief reason. I may say that since they have left our Union, another union has sprung up there which large numbers of them, I believe, have joined.

12,397. You cannot tell us much about that?—I do not know much about that, of course.

12,398. You have told us there are some 1,200 men, I think, whose average wages have been increased about 5s. per week?—Yes.

12,399. You did not tell us what the wages were before the advance?—I think I gave them—I will read the list again if you like.

12,400. No; just the average, that is all?—I think I can give you the average.

12,401. What did those men earn before the agitation?—What did they earn before—I can give you one or two details of that.

12,402. I want it in the aggregate?—I have not got it made up in the aggregate.

12,403. You stated that they averaged about 5s. advance?—Yes.

12,404. But I thought you did not tell us what it was before or what it was after?—No.

12,405. You think that the result of the agitation was an advance of about 5s. all round?—I think that would be shown. It seems to me that the plan of this report (*see Question 12,276*) which I hold in my hand is to add, of course, the gains, and compare them with the rates paid before the strike or paid before the Union was formed.

12,406. You told the Commission about the Dock Company's officials requiring the men to remove sometimes as much as 40 tons of cargo before they were put on pay?—Yes. These were not Dock Company's men, I believe they were the men employed by the South-Western Railway Company on the ships.

12,407. The middlemen?—The middlemen, I think, in that case. But at all events the Dock Company's men had to remove this stuff on the quay, and the relative rate of wages is shown in the fact that the men for the whole of the cargo of that boat would receive 4s. 6d., and the Dock Company's men would only be receiving 1s. 9d.

12,408. I do not know that I quite understand you—had the men, before they commenced to earn wage, to remove this large amount of cargo without payment?—Yes.

12,409. Where; in the ship?—On the ship's deck.

12,410. On the ship's deck?—Yes; it was mostly packages of fruit.

12,411. For which they received no pay?—For which they received no pay—their pay did not commence till they got to the cargo.

12,412. Does that state of things exist now, do you know?—I could not tell you that. I know it existed previous to the Union being formed—it went on that summer.

Earl of *Derby*.

12,413. You spoke of the municipalisation of the docks in Southampton and elsewhere—if

Earl of *Derby*—continued.

the docks were municipalised, would not the effect be that the ratepayers of the town in general would be gainers by their being worked cheaply, and would be losers if they were worked at considerable expense?—That is so, broadly stated.

12,414. Well, would not the effect therefore be, that if any question arose of increasing the expense of working the docks by giving higher wages or working shorter hours or in any other way, you would have the interest of the whole body of ratepayers as employers on the one side, and the interest of the dock labourers on the other?—The interest of the dock workers, quite true, but at the same time the town around the dock land would be inhabited by workers in the docks, not only manual labourers, but clerks and others, such as shopkeepers, who would benefit by the increased wages just as they may lose by the increased rates.

12,415. You think they would be content to pay higher rates for the sake of the indirect advantage?—Well, if they were of my mind, they would.

Mr. *Livesey*.

12,416. You said that one of your principal objects in advocating the eight hours' day was to ensure the absorption of the unemployed—not the sole object, but that is one?—Just so.

12,417. Supposing we got an eight hours' day all over the country and all the unemployed were absorbed, do you suppose there would be no unemployed ever after or in the future?—Oh, well, you see, I am not a prophet.

12,418. Suppose there were. Suppose we get a fresh crop of unemployed in the course of a few years, then what would you do; would you again reduce the hours?—Undoubtedly.

12,419. To six, I suppose?—To six or four, and another thing I would do, I would compel those who only work two hours a day and those who work no hours at all and get the best pay for it, to work too. Every man should do some useful work.

Mr. *Austin*.

12,420. How many branches of the Union have you in the agricultural districts?—Something like 28, I think.

12,421. Have you been effective in improving the condition of the agricultural labourer since you established those branches?—Yes, generally speaking—I have not had much to do with that myself.

12,422. To what extent?—Well, in some cases the wages have been risen 2s. a week—I believe in parts of Lincolnshire and Oxfordshire wages have been risen 2s. a week.

12,423. I suppose you know it is very hard to organise the agricultural labourers?—It is one of the most difficult pieces of work that a man can set about.

12,424. Do you consider that the State should interfere on behalf of the agricultural labourer in preference to the Trades Union?—How do you mean?

28 January 1892.]

MR. T. MACCARTHY.

[Continued]

Mr. Austin—continued.

12,425. That the State should take up the condition of the agricultural labourers?—I do not quite gather the scope of your question.

12,426. I understand you to have stated before that to organise the agricultural labourers is very difficult?—Yes.

12,427. In fact it is almost impossible, in consequence of the large area they cover, and all efforts, up to the present, have been almost a failure in consequence of that, do you not think that the State should interfere on behalf of the agricultural labourers to improve their condition?—Do you mean in making the allotments easier to gain, or not?

12,428. Not exactly with reference to allotments, but in a more general application of the land?—I believe that the State should enable the people to get at the land easier, that the intervention of the State should be sought and obtained for that in order that they may get at the land and work it.

12,429. Speaking of the municipalisation of the docks, have you taken into consideration the effects it would have upon the employment of labour?—Upon the employment of labour?

12,430. Yes. Would it increase or decrease if the docks were municipalised?—I would take it that if the docks were municipalised—of course this is my way of looking at it—it would indicate a progressive change in public opinion, and that while docks were being acquired, progressive changes would be going on in other directions. I would expect to see the land easier of access, and that although there may be less, that the regulation of work in the towns may put on one side many of the men who flock in now for casual labour, and that there would be opportunities in other directions for them to be employed.

12,431. Do you know what effect the formation of limited companies has had upon the employment of labour in this country at the present time?—I do not.

12,432. Are you aware that they have decreased the employment of labour?—No; I did not know that.

12,433. Speaking of the municipalisation of the docks therefore, you have not taken into consideration strictly the effect it would have upon the employment of labour, whether it would increase or decrease?—I do know that rings and trusts and so forth, and that centralisation of labour tend to the employment of a less number, because production is greater. Of course, machinery and other things would accomplish that. That is why I contend that there should be an eight hours' day for that reason.

Mr. Trow.

12,434. How would you elect the comptrollers of the docks supposing they were municipalised?—I have not gone into that.

12,435. Who is to be responsible for the money that is borrowed, the ratepayers who get the benefit, and who reside round the docks, the dockers, or the nation at large?—The common

Mr. Trow—continued.

sense of the people, or those who would advocate the passage of such a law, would find out the ways and means of doing that.

12,436. You have just stated that dock people who live surrounding the dock and the shipping companies—clerks and others—would derive the benefit, and that that would compensate them for increased rates. Will you tell me how much farther it extends?—How much farther what extends?

12,437. The benefit; because if they are only to be benefited to the extent of the rates, who is to be responsible?—I believe that the people, as a rule, would benefit.

12,438. But you should explain under what control the docks should be placed, and how the benefit is to be derived?—Of course, had I known that a scheme was required, I would have done my utmost to produce one.

12,439. Can you give us a case where municipalisation has been to the benefit of workers generally?—The first instance that comes to my mind is the municipalisation of the Halifax trams. I believe that the men there are working something like, I think it is, an eight hours' or a 10 hours' day, at all events.

Mr. Tait.

12,440. Just to be correct, I think it is the Huddersfield, and not Halifax, that you are referring to?—I will take it from you.

Mr. Trow.

12,441. We will come back to this question of freedom, because I am interested in this. You stated that you have no objection to the Free Labour Association, if it is really free; will you explain how it is not free?—One of the reasons why I thought it was not free, was because the men were compelled to show a free-labour ticket before being allowed to go into the docks to look for work.

12,442. You said the men have the right to combine; that was the reply you gave?—Yes; everyone has the right to combine.

12,443. Have they also the same right to refuse to combine without the interference of any other men or any other society?—I should think so.

12,444. If you had 2,000 or 3,000 now, as compared with 200 or 300, and 200 or 300 were outside your Society, would your Society use any pressure to compel these men to enter the Society?—I cannot tell you what they would do.

12,445. Well, have they done so?—The Society, as a society—no, they have not.

12,446. Have not your branches sent intimations in to the proprietors that unless these men join the Society, your men would cease work; you have done that?—Yes, they have done that; some of them.

12,447. Is that freedom?—Is that freedom?

12,448. Yes?—Well, you see, they are not perfect men.

12,449. But, here are two or three thousand now, who do not interfere with you, because

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MACCARTHY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Trow—continued.

they recognise the right of freedom; but, if the condition was changed, on your own showing, freedom changes then to coercion?—You are at liberty to think as you please, I should think.

12,450. There is another question. With regard to the eight hours, would you make it legal?—Yes.

12,451. Would not you interfere with the individual freedom of tens of thousands of men who are opposed to that, and are convinced it would be detrimental to their interests to adopt it?—Would I interfere with the individual freedom of action? Certainly I would.

12,452. Would you?—There is too much individual freedom. There is freedom for any man to starve, and I would interfere with that.

12,453. And you would not allow 10,000 men meeting together, or 30,000, and discussing the matter coolly, to set up their opinion against yours with regard to what was best for them?—Of course I would allow them; undoubtedly I would allow them.

12,454. Very well; then I say, in the case of 30,000 or 40,000 men—I may say 120,000 men—who are opposed to the legal enactment of the eight hours' day, would it be freedom on your part to enforce upon them that which they feel is detrimental to their interests?—So far as I understand, we work by the rule of the majority,

The witness withdrew.

Mr. THOMAS MORGAN re-called and further examined.

Earl of Derby.

12,459. You have heard the statement made by the last witness that the Dock Company had issued an order that no man should be admitted, as I understood, to work, who had not a free-labour ticket; is that so?—I believe that to be entirely a mistake. Before the strike occurred, the dock gates at Southampton were thrown open, and men used to go in and do as they liked, but it was found that it would be better to close the gates, and only admit men who were properly engaged for employment, a custom which, I believe, is quite universal in London. Then it was made an order that no man should be admitted until he had an engagement ticket from the foreman; but there has never been any proposal whatever to restrict the employment to those men only who hold free-labour tickets.

Mr. Tait.

12,460. It was in reply to a question put by me that Mr. MacCarthy gave that answer?—I do not know whether Mr. MacCarthy has made a mistake—whether it is simply a mistake, or whether he has been misinformed; but it is very important that it should be known that the Free Labour Association has never made itself a close ring, and does not desire to do so.

12,461. It is a fact that there are only certain sections of men who can get into the docks at Southampton, and that they must have what

Mr. Trow—continued.

and I would say, that if the majority of the people in any district, or in any part, said "We will not have this," then they need not have it. I would not force it upon them, of course, in that sense.

12,455. You would have it purely voluntary?—No, I would not; but I say that, where a trade in a locality would say "We want certain legislative restriction as to the hours of labour," let them have it.

12,456. If it would ruin all the trade?—But it is neither for you nor for me to say offhand that it means the ruin of the trade.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,457. What do you mean by a trade; do you mean the workmen in that trade belonging to the Union, or do you mean union men and free labourers too?—I am not considering the question of the Union, but the people generally, just for the moment; I think the mass of the workers in that trade.

12,458. What do you mean by the mass—a bare majority?—Well, I do not know about a bare majority, but we work just now by bare majorities. Personally, I would rather think that, in a matter of that kind, a fair majority, say, a two-thirds majority, would seem to me to be a reasonable number who should decide.

Mr. Tait—continued.

you term an engagement ticket before they get in?—Yes.

12,462. Therefore, if any casual man, or any one coming into Southampton, or any person in Southampton, wished to get employment at the docks, he would not be able to get at the foreman in order to obtain employment unless he held that ticket?—Yes, he could, certainly.

12,463. By what method?—He goes into what is called the labour yard. There is an opening from the street into a large covered yard. The foreman requiring certain men goes there, and these men are there to be employed; he engages as many men as he requires, each man, as he engages him, is given an engagement ticket, and the police at the dock gate then let him in. There is never any question whatever as to his holding a free-labour ticket.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,464. Would not preference, in engaging men, be given to those who belong to the Free Labour Association?—Not by any rule or regulation of the Dock Company or of the Free Labour Association. There is no doubt that at the time when the Free Labour Association came into existence, practically all the men belonged to it, and therefore there was no need to raise the question. In addition to that, also, it should be borne in mind—Mr. MacCarthy spoke of it—that, just after the strike, as the strike was

28 January 1892.]

Mr. T. MORGAN.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

collapsing, the employers put out a declaration that they were willing to take their men back to work. That was the position the employers held from the very first; as they said, there has been no proper ostensible reason for this strike. There is only one thing the men can do; they have left their work without notice, and the only one thing for them to do is for them to return to work; therefore we put out a notice, the whole body of employers did so, stating that we are willing to take the men back who will return to their work; that was the first condition of any arrangement. A whole month passed, a month-and-a-half passed after that, everything went on smoothly and comfortably before the Free Labour Association came into existence. It has never been attempted in any way to make a close ring of it. There were two other little matters, if I might refer to them; they are very small, but still, at the same time, one does not like to let matters pass without a contradiction. First, as to the Dock Company supplying soup to the men. I think it was suggested, more or less, that there was a certain amount of bribery in it. But the Dock Company has never done anything of the sort. The Dock Company has found the room or sheds for that purpose in the winter when work has been very bad, and the superintendent of the Dock Company and his head official, Mr. Johnson, have very kindly taken charge of a voluntary fund for the purpose of helping the men in times of destitution. It is entirely a charitable and voluntary thing. It happens to be centred at the docks, because that is the most convenient place for it, and no suggestion can be allowed for a moment that the Dock Company, as a company, has engaged in this matter at all. Then there was one other matter which Mr. MacCarthy spoke to, that his men being discharged at the dinner hour from work, and fresh men taken on afterwards, in order to escape payment by the docks for that dinner hour, the rule being now, that if a man works through the hour for dinner he is paid for the

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

dinner hour. Of course, it can be seen that that would be a way of economising, but it is within my own knowledge that no such plan as that occurs. Men are taken on for the job, it might occur occasionally, here and there, that the job ends at the dinner hour, but there is no such rule for a small economy of that kind. The Dock Company are quite *bona fide* in taking the men on for a job, and if they work during the dinner hour they are paid for it. There were some statistics also given from the Dockers' Annual Report, I believe it was. With regard to them, I am sorry to say that I have not got the particulars with me, but when this report came into my hands, I carefully examined it, and there are many inaccuracies in it, and I would like, if I may, to state that I do not agree with the figures which Mr. MacCarthy has given. If it was necessary, I should be very glad to hand in a detailed statement of the figures.

12,465. I think we need hardly go into that. The figures are not admitted, you say?—No, not by us. In other words it comes to this, that the Dockers' Union have taken credit for a great deal more than they ought to take credit for.

Mr. Tom Mann.

12,466. Do I understand that there has not been that advance which is stated in the report?—That a great deal of those advances of wages given in that statement have not been made. Many of the errors arise from the original wages being put down at less than they ought to be. Take the Dock Company's extra men; 4d. per hour by day and night, whereas it was 4d. per hour by day, and 5d. per hour by night. They are not very important errors.

12,467. That is an important error from my point of view?—That is the kind of error.

12,468. Are there any other errors?—There are many; I should be very pleased to give you particulars of them privately, if you like to have them.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. ALEXANDER HENRY VARNIER called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

12,469. You represent the Plymouth and District Free Labour Association, do you not?—I do.

12,470. Are you honorary secretary to that body?—I am.

12,471. What class of labourers, for the most part, compose that Association?—Those connected with the house-coal trade.

12,472. House-coal importers and merchants, is that not so?—Yes.

12,473. They do not, I presume, form the whole of your Association?—No.

12,474. Can you name any other trades that you represent?—We comprise representatives of every trade in the three towns of Plymouth, Devonport, and Stonehouse.

U 72729.

Earl of Derby—continued.

12,475. What are the conditions of labour in your district; there are a certain number, I suppose, of men regularly employed all the year round?—Yes.

12,476. Are they the majority?—The minority.

12,477. And a large number of casual labourers?—Yes, a very large number.

12,478. That depends, I suppose, upon the arrival of ships from abroad?—Yes.

12,479. What are the general hours of labour in the district?—From 6 a.m. to 5 p.m., with time for meals.

12,480. That is, practically, I suppose, 10 hours, or nearly so?—Yes, practically. Then there is, both in the morning and the afternoon,

N

28 January 1892.]

Mr. A. H. VARNIER.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

about a quarter of an hour allowed for what they call allowance time, when the men take refreshments.

12,481. And what is the ordinary rate of wage for men, regularly employed?—About 1*l.* a week, but then, in addition, there are various ways, particularly in the house-coal trade, by which that pay is increased 2*s.*, 3*s.*, 4*s.*, and 5*s.* a week.

12,482. What kind of privileges do you refer to?—They do various things, the cart-men, for instance, in going to the various houses, get gratuities from the people, and so forth, and they consider that a carter's billet is a very satisfactory one.

12,483. In reference to the men employed for discharging cargoes, what are they paid?—They are paid at the rate of 2*d.* per ton per man, which averages for sailing ships about 6*s.* a day, and for steamers, 8*s.* to 10*s.* or 12*s.* a day, in accordance with the quantity discharged.

12,484. Now, have the men whom you represent had any difficulty with the employers?—No.

12,485. Have they had difficulties with the unionists?—Yes.

12,486. Perhaps you will explain to us what has happened; I understand from the paper that you have put before us, that when your Association was first formed the unionists refused to work with free labourers, it that so?—Yes.

12,487. I ought to have asked you how long has your Association been in existence?—About 18 months now.

12,488. Is there a similar objection now, on the part of the free labourers, to work with unionists?—There is, I am sorry to say. We do all we can to lessen it, but human nature is human nature, and the free labourers suffered so much at the hands of the Unionists when the Unions were in full force, that, I am sorry to say, they retaliate now, but we, the executive of the Association, and the merchants, do all we possibly can to minimise that. One of the rules of our Association is that the men shall work with society men or non-society men, in the same employ if required.

12,489. You make that a rule?—We make that rule.

12,490. Therefore, if there is any exclusion, it is the work of the men themselves?—Yes, purely.

12,491. And not of the Association?—That is so.

12,492. Have any strikes arisen upon this question of the two classes of men working together?—Yes.

12,493. When?—In October of 1890. That was the only strike which occurred in Plymouth, and that was the occasion of the founding of the Association.

12,494. Now, in this Free Labour Association, what special conditions have you?—With reference to the engagement of the men? It is perfectly free; any man is perfectly free to join the Free Labour Association.

Earl of Derby—continued.

12,495. But when he has joined it, what does the Association do for him?—We issue a brass check in addition to a copy of the rules of the Association, and that brass check is a guarantee to the merchants of the port that he is an enrolled member of the Association, and that entitles him to work, if there is an opening for him to do so.

12,496. You are an organised body, in the same way that the Unions are?—Very similarly.

12,497. What are the Unions with which you are in competition?—The Bristol and West of England Labourers' Union, the National Gas-Workers' Union, and the Dockers' Union.

12,498. And has the effect of your Association being formed been to diminish the amount of support given to the Unions?—Yes, most materially.

12,499. I forget, but I think you have not told us how many members you have?—We have, I think, roughly, about 500 now, but the number is very small, because we ran out of the members' brass checks which are actually enrolled on the register. We have ordered some more, and as soon as that is in order, we could easily double those numbers.

12,500. You do not take in everyone who wishes to be admitted?—Not everyone, not indiscriminately.

12,501. Can you tell us what were the grievances which led to the strike to which you have referred as taking place in 1890?—Yes, I will give you a brief description leading up to it. In the summer of 1890 the Unions come to Plymouth and endeavoured to enrol the whole of the men engaged in the house-coal trade, as their members, and as soon as they had done that, about July and August, they begin trying to make the men in one way or another dissatisfied with the conditions under which they were working, but they never once stated that they would alter, or endeavour to alter, the rate of pay. The rate has been for many years, 2*d.* per ton per man, although during the strike, it was endeavoured to be represented to the public that 2*d.* per ton was the price paid, keeping back the fact that it was 2*d.* per ton per man, which made a very material difference. In August of 1890 various merchants having depôts at the eastern end of the harbour were supplied with copies of the bye-laws of the three Unions to which I have referred, with an indirect intimation that those were the regulations under which the work would be carried on. As also honorary secretary of the Coal Merchants' Association, which had been formed some two or three years previously, I called that body together, and although we could not see our way to recognising the Union as such, we were as anxious as possible that the men who had been working with us harmoniously should not be upset by the work of the agitators, and we felt that we should endeavour to come to some satisfactory arrangements with them, and as a result we had several meetings with representatives of the three Unions, and also with the workers themselves. One of the

28 January 1892.]

Mr. A. H. VARNIER.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

points on which they particularly laid stress was the working of steamers with steam gear. Now, I would like just to draw the attention of the Commission to the fact that steamers bringing gus coals, and also bunker coals for the mail steamers calling at Plymouth, and so on, invariably, or almost invariably, use steam winches, but they decided that for the house-coal trade it should not be allowed, practically imposing about 4*d.* a ton upon those merchants who wished to use steam gear. There were various other smaller points. They wished also to impose an additional number of men to do the work, which, for many years had been accustomed to be carried on by a certain regular number of men, according to the distance that the stores were situated from the edge of the quays. The merchants of the port were quite prepared to consider any reasonable suggestion on the part of the men, but although we had two or three meetings with them, we were invariably unable to get any answer from them when we put a definite proposition before them; of course, the great point, which was the rock upon which the whole thing struck, was the working of unionists with non-unionists, and that point was emphasized on the 29th of October, when one of the firms at the eastern end had a cargo arrive, and they proposed commencing the discharge in the usual way; but one of the men proposed to be engaged was not a member of one of the unions, and the other men who were going to work declined to do so. As a result, the whole of the work of the house-coal trade of the port was stopped. I may say that not only was the work stopped, but it was stopped in the roughest possible manner. We tried on two or three occasions to commence work on this ship, but our men who went to do their work in their ordinary way were simply prevented from doing so by the menacing attitude of the members of the unions, who assembled so thickly around the place where this particular ship was, that they were really unable to do their work. The result was, that for many days no work at all was done in the port as far as the house-coal trade was concerned. In order that we might get men to work at all for us on the Monday following, we were obliged to go to the superintendent of the police and to make him guarantee us a certain number of men to convoy our men from the police station at about half-past five in the morning to the wharf, where we proposed to begin discharging. It was more like a Babel than men going to their proper work. The union men had got to know that we proposed to do this, and tried in every possible way to prevent the work being done. They took hold of two or three of the men, they caught them and ill-treated them very badly, and were brought before the magistrates, and received proper punishment; but for more than a week we had to enlist the assistance of the police, and the police had to line the edge of the quays, and keep back the mob of men on both sides to enable the work to be done. I may say also most particularly, that one of the great points

Earl of Derby—continued.

in our negotiations, about a month before the strike occurred, was that if there were any question in dispute, that should be submitted to arbitration, but the representatives of the unions persistently refused to entertain anything of the kind, and therefore we felt that it was impossible for us to proceed, if there were no definite basis upon which to go.

12,502. How long did that state of disturbance continue?—The very rough disturbance lasted about 10 days, I should think. We had to have police protection right through, and we naturally were unable to get men to do any work for us for some considerable time, and the loss entailed was incalculable. I may say that the only occasion that we have had during the last 14 or 15 months to have any general meeting between the employers and workmen, has been on the question of the distribution of the work. We had such a large number of men anxious to join the Association, and the difficulty was to arrange it. We have had several meetings, and we do the utmost that we can, so that all the men shall get their turn of the work.

Mr. Ismay.

12,503. The mail boats coal at Plymouth now, do they not?—Yes.

12,504. During the strike in London, were any of the mail boats coaled at Plymouth?—Yes.

12,505. Several?—Yes.

12,506. Had you any difficulty with the men then?—I am speaking exclusively on behalf of the house-coal merchants; there was no strike amongst the steam-coal merchants, but I am aware that the steam-coal merchants were pressed by their men, and I believe had imposed upon them certain conditions which they considered unreasonable.

12,507. You do not know whether steamers which ought properly to have been coaled in London, but which were coaled in Plymouth, were done by free or union labour?—They were done by union labour.

12,508. They were done by union labour?—Yes, then, I believe.

12,509. Then, at present there are two parties in Plymouth?—Yes.

12,510. Free and union?—Yes.

12,511. How are they divided?—I should think the free labourers comprise eight-tenths of the labourers engaged in the house-coal trade.

12,512. And in the steam-coal trade?—Now, owing to the result of that strike, I do not think they are practically members of the Union; but the steam-coal merchants have not thought it desirable to press the question one way or the other.

12,513. They employ them indifferently?—I believe they do.

12,514. But, as a whole, the Union is not in the ascendant?—By no means now.

12,515. Have you much surplus labour?—Yes, a great deal.

28 January 1892.]

Mr. A. H. VARNIER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ismay—continued.

12,516. To what cause do you attribute that?—Plymouth is a large centre, at least we consider it a large centre for the two counties Devon and Cornwall, and I think, more particularly shall I say, arising out of the publicity that was given to the high rate of pay in connexion with the coal trade, it has attracted a large number of men from the country districts; and I think I may say that the numbers of the unemployed, or of the casual labourers, have increased to considerably more since the strike than they were before.

12,517. Owing to the influx?—Owing to the publicity that was given to the wages that were paid. You see the men earn, say, when they are working from steamers, 10s. or 12s. a day, and from sailing ships, which is easier work, about 6s. a day.

12,518. And they come in and take their chance?—They come in and take their chance.

12,519. Perhaps Plymouth is a little gayer than the country, which may have something to do with it?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton.

12,520. What are the conditions under which the men join the Free Labourers' Union?—The primary condition is that a man shall work with society or non-society men in the same employ if required. That is the primary condition, and that, of course, is the rock on which the Union split.

12,521. You said that you did not take them indiscriminately. You did not allow of membership indiscriminately?—No.

12,522. What are the reasons for the exclusion?—Character mainly. There is a committee of the workmen to whom all the names for membership are submitted.

12,523. For membership of the Association? Yes, the labourers themselves have their committee, and when there is a batch of men to be elected, the names are submitted to the committee. Then, as in one or two cases, when a man has been objected to, and it is thought that he has been objected to unreasonably, if he has been able to make out a good case, he would come to the honorary secretary of the Association, who would call a joint committee of employers and employed together, and the case would be thoroughly threshed out.

12,524. That is a court of appeal, in fact?—Exactly, and the admission of the man, or otherwise, would be decided on the merits of the case.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,525. Are the members of the Union in Plymouth, so far as you know, much more numerous than the members of your Association?—No.

12,526. Not?—We are far more numerous.

Mr. Bolton.

12,527. Your men are eight-tenths of the total, I think you said?—Yes.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,528. Is yours an organisation, like the Southampton organisation, for settling disputes between masters and men?—Very similar.

12,529. You heard the evidence given from Southampton, I suppose, did you not?—Yes.

12,530. Have you the same kind of organisation; separate committees, and a joint council?—Yes, almost precisely the same.

12,531. Have disputes been referred to the council?—Yes, frequently.

12,532. Can you describe what kind of work has been done in that respect?—As I think I mentioned, there was only one question which one might term serious, and that was the division of the work. We find it, and have always found it, difficult to satisfy everyone; I suppose we always shall, and our endeavour has been to divide it up as fairly as possible.

12,533. Yes, but you have had no question of wages or of hours?—As far as we are particularly concerned in the house-coal trade, no.

12,534. Or in any other trade?—There have been disputes in other trades.

12,535. Other trades connected with your Association?—Not so directly as others. The building trade, for instance, has been the centre of two or three troubles, and the Chamber of Commerce Board of Conciliation endeavoured to help the masters and men to come to a satisfactory issue, but were unable to do so. That section is not represented upon our Association. I think we have as many as 15 or 20 trades—I am speaking from memory now—who are actually represented upon our Association.

12,536. But in none of them has there been a question of hours or wages?—Not since we have been formed.

Mr. Austin.

12,537. Your Association is described as a free-labour Association—still it is a combined Association—is there preference of employment given to men who hold the tickets?—Yes.

12,538. There is?—Yes.

12,539. How can you call it a free-labour Association then?—Because there is no charge. It is perfectly free.

12,540. But if preference of employment is given to men holding the tickets, how can you call it free labour?—Because it is free.

12,541. I want to know, if preference of employment is given to men holding the ticket, how can you call it free labour?—Because the unions decided that no labourers should be employed unless they were members of their societies; and we were obliged to form an Association in the same manner.

12,542. So that the way it stands at present, in Plymouth, is that employment is given to men only who hold the free-labour ticket?—The free-labour ticket.

12,543. And would you condemn the unionists for declining to work with people who do not hold union tickets?—One of our primary rules, as I said in the first place, was that the men shall work with society and non-society men in the same employ, and our experience has shown

28 January 1892.]

Mr. A. H. VARNIER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Austin—continued.

that the unionists will not work with non-unionists. But it is perfectly free so far as the men are concerned.

12,544. But you admit that no man is employed unless he holds a free-labour ticket?—Yes.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,545. I understood the witness to say the preference was given to free labourers; but I do not think he said no other men were employed?—No, I did not.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. GEORGE FREDERICK TRELEAVEN called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

12,549. Are you a coal merchant of Plymouth?—Yes.

12,550. And how many men do you employ?—Nineteen regular hands, but mostly casual.

12,551. Besides men who are paid by the job?—Yes. They are the more numerous by far.

12,552. Do you belong to the Free Labour Association?—I do.

12,553. And the Shipping Federation?—I do.

12,554. What wages do you pay to the men whom you employ?—Not less than 20s. weekly, and perquisites such as the previous witness has explained.

12,555. And to porters?—2d. per ton per man.

12,556. What are the hours of labour?—For the daily people, 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., with proper meal times and allowance times; times that they take for refreshment between these meals.

12,557. The men who are paid weekly, I suppose, are employed all the year round?—All the year round.

12,558. With regard to porters, I suppose they are only taken on as ships come in?—Yes.

12,559. The employment, I apprehend, is not dangerous, and the accidents are not frequent?—That is so.

12,560. Have you had any trouble with the unions?—Yes, a great deal.

12,561. Did they object to your employing non-unionists?—Yes, very strongly.

12,562. As a matter of fact, did you employ non-unionists?—It transpired that there was one non-unionist working for me, but this I did not know at the time.

12,563. And you were asked to discharge that man?—I was.

12,564. And you declined?—Yes.

12,564a. What followed?—In plain English I was threatened with ruin if I did not do so. I took the consequences. It ended in a very long law-suit.

12,565. Were the men called off from the ships that you were employed upon?—They were, and they all left except the men on the

Mr. Austin.

12,546. The fact of preference being given is quite sufficient. If preference is given, then it is not a "free-labour" Association?—We consider it is.

Mr. Bolton.

12,547. Do you admit unionists to your Association?—Yes.

Earl of Derby.

12,548. In theory you do not exclude them, but in practice they very much exclude themselves?—Exactly.

Earl of Derby—continued.

ship where the non-unionist was employed. They stayed.

12,566. Was anything done to them by the strikers?—Yes, there was great excitement, and one of the men while carrying a basket of coal across a quay—the smallest man it was—was knocked down.

12,567. Was the man who did that legally punished?—Yes, he had six weeks' hard labour.

12,568. Now you employ unionists or non-unionists as suit you best?—Yes.

12,569. You have had no further dispute upon that point?—None whatever.

12,570. Was the question with regard to the employment of non-unionists the one upon which the principal difficulty with the unions arose?—It was the only one, so far as I am concerned. My circumstances were a little different to those of the previous witness, because I carry on business at another end of the town, and the circumstances are somewhat altered. My trouble began long before the general one to which he has made reference. Mine was really at the start an isolated case, and only became general with the others some weeks afterwards. But I had no difficulty whatever as to hours or wages. That was admitted by the union secretary.

12,571. Then, as you put it, your difficulties arose entirely out of this: that you claimed the right to employ whom you pleased, and the Union said you should employ none but unionists?—Yes. There are two sentences here which I should like to read from the "Daily Mercury," October 15th, 1890, which gives an account of an interview which the representatives of the Trades Unions had with me. They called upon me, and desired to know what my intentions were, and Mr. Curran, who was the spokesman, said he "thought they were justified in saying that at the present time they were engaged in discussing a question between the merchants and the union men of Plymouth, and he must congratulate the merchants upon their selection to advocate their cause. They believed that this was not a

28 January 1892.]

Mr. G. F. TRELEAVEN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

"question of price, nor one of detail, but one striking at the very base of Trades Union principles, and the three unions as represented that day were determined to resist to the utmost what was a deliberate attempt to break up the unions." That was his statement. He admitted that there was no question whatever—and all this has been admitted in the court of law since as being correct as to the dispute having nothing to do with wages or hours.

12,572. When Mr. Curran spoke of an attempt to break up the unions, did you understand him to mean that you and other employers would not recognise the exclusive right of union labour?—At the time this discussion was taking place I had only one man who did not belong to the Union who was in my employ, and I had a large number in my employ. I did not know that he was a non-unionist until they drew my attention to the fact, and desired that I should dismiss the man, and that I refused to do.

12,573. As a matter of fact, you carried your point?—I did.

12,574. And now you have no further trouble?—No further trouble. They are working better than I have known them for several years now.

12,575. Then, have you anything to complain of, or is there any alterations of the law you wish to suggest?—No. I think that things will probably right themselves in our neighbourhood in this way because, as far as I can find out, all the merchants, almost without exception, are quite willing to pay liberally, and to treat the men liberally, and I believe the men will in time find it is not to their advantage to pay so much per week for the very doubtful privilege of being called off their work, which they do not want to leave. That was actually done. I said to the men "Why have you left your work; you have broken your contract and stopped these vessels, do you object to working for me personally." They said "No, not at all." Then I said, "Do you object to the wages," and they said "No, not at all." Then I asked them "Do you object to the hours, or is there anything to object to," "No," they replied, "but we are obliged to leave because the Union has ordered us to." That is the answer I got. Then I said, "You are now getting nearly 10s. per day, you have earned 1l. 3s. 4d. up to Wednesday noon, and if you go on strike you will only get 10s. a week." They said "Yes, but it is no use our disobeying the Union. We have remonstrated with the secretary, and said to him, 'What do you want us to leave for, we have nothing to complain of,' but he said 'that we must obey.'" Well, that man obeyed, and he has since come back to me, and he told me that he had 4s. 10d. the first week, but the second week he was told it was not a relieving office, and he must get away. I offered to produce that man in court when the case was heard before the recorder, but his evidence was objected to by the representatives of the Union.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,576. Will you explain what is meant by paying 2d. per ton per man?—Yes, in this way. We will suppose a steamer is in, or a ship. It is the custom of the port to recognise it as necessary to the discharge that there shall be a certain number of men in each gang—whether there are one, two, three, or four. That is to say, there must be five men engaged to work the coal in the hold and to lift it—three in the hold or two on the deck, or *vice versa*, according to whether it is at the bottom or the top. Then there must be three men to carry. That makes eight. There must be a weigher; that is nine, and an unhooker, who stands on the plank and unhooks it after it gets on the men's back. The unhooker is generally a youth or an old man who is past work, who generally gets half-pay. Then 1s. 7d. a ton is the amount paid on that steamer for discharging into the carts or trucks alongside.

12,577. Does that apply to sailing ships too?—Sailing ships are a bit different. I will explain that. Sailing ships discharge less rapidly, and they have a rate per day, running from 30 to 50 tons per day, on their charter party. I yesterday discharged one with 45 tons on the charter party, and that must be got out at the rate of not less than 45 tons a day. The crew in that case work the cargo in the hold—that is if there are men enough—if not, men are put on to do it at the captain's expense. He has to put them over the side. That is the usual custom in the port. Then I or any other merchant has to provide three men to work and one weigher, for which the captain pays half—that is the weigher. And then you see the number of men employed are reduced, because the discharge is slower, and the captain of the ship employs his own men rather than ours. With steamers, the transit is so rapid that the steamer men could not go about from port to port and work cargo as well, and therefore they allow part of their freight towards the expenses of this work.

12,578. When your men are employed in discharging, what kind of wages per day do they earn in discharging steamers and in discharging sailing ships?—Well, to bring it up to date, I may say with regard to one I was discharging yesterday, I was by contract obliged to work not less than 45 tons a day. Therefore, every porter engaged on that ship was given 4s twopences a day, which was 7s. 6d. a day. When discharging steamers, there is no limit to the speed at all. It then depends upon the weather. The men might say, "there is a steamer coming to-morrow. May we work on till 8 o'clock, and finish this one to-night." I might perhaps reply, "certainly; do that by all means." Then you see they get paid by the ton, and sometimes I have known them earn as much as 15s. a day. But then it is a very hard day. The average day's work is from 60 to 70 tons per man, and that makes from 10s. to, say, 12s. That would be an average day's work on a steamer.

12,579. For how many hours?—Now they do not begin before daylight much. Perhaps they would begin about 7 o'clock. Then I

[28 January 1892.]

MR. G. F. TRELEAVEN.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

have insisted on a rule this winter that we will not have any working by night. We know almost to a shade, what the men can do in a given number of hours; and, according to the size of the steamer, we put on the number of gangs which will make sure of getting the vessel out by daylight. That is to say, we have left off just after 5 o'clock this winter, I will put it in this way: Suppose 60 tons a day to be a day's work, which they can do in ordinarily fine weather, and we will suppose the cargo to be 750 tons, I should put on seven gangs to ensure its being finished by daylight. But the money would come to the same amount. It is 1s. 7d. a ton on the whole of the cargo divided up between the seven gangs. More men are employed, and, of course the division per man is slightly less.

12,580. They would be done in 10 hours?—They would be done in 10 hours per day.

Mr. Bolton.

12,581. Is the work in your port regular or irregular?—It is irregular; it is controlled, you see, partly by the weather.

12,582. What would be the average earnings of a man?—It would be difficult to say, some of the men when my trouble began stuck by me. They said "you have served us very well; we shall not run away." They stuck well to the work, and I have naturally rather favoured those men; and they have earned as much as 11l. 15s. in three-and-a-half weeks. They have been in almost constant work ever since, and I should imagine that they would average all over 2l. a week, take all the year round.

12,583. Then you have a number of casuals as well?—Yes, a number of casuals.

12,584. What will they earn?—That is difficult to say. But I could give you a guide. Suppose I have a steamer to-day and she is two days discharging, they would average perhaps 1l. to 21s. per man. Then a neighbour has a steamer coming perhaps to-morrow or the next day, and as soon as they have finished mine they go there. They are migratory. They go from one firm to another.

12,585. What will they average a week in a year?—That I do not know, but I should think by the law of general average as the wages are so high, and as there are more people engaged in this work than there is really work for them to do, their wages would come, on an average, to what an ordinary carter, say, would earn. The men are constantly changing from weekly situations to one of these situations, so that I should think they would not earn on an average more than 25s. a week, take one week with another. Because the law of average settles it. There are sure to be a lot more men in a thing, if there is good pay, than there is work for them to do.

12,586. You got over your difficulty with the Union by establishing a Free Labour Association?—Yes, partly that, and by a long law suit.

12,587. Was the action for breach of contract?—I think the men who were willing to work for me were afraid to do so, because they thought

Mr. Bolton—continued.

the power of the Union was greater than that of the law. That seemed to me to be the condition of things. And I was compelled to take action against the three union secretaries, and the magistrates fined them 20l. each and costs, which decision was confirmed by the Recorder. The men then got to feel that the Union was not so powerful as they had thought it was, and that the law was stronger, and that they could finish the work without molestation, or that, at all events if they got molested, the people who molested them would be punished. That was established.

12,588. And what are the conditions of membership of your Free Labour Association?—Anybody who belongs to our Association must be prepared to work with any other man whether he is a member of the Union or not. The question of Union must not be raised.

12,589. Have you found them adhere fairly well to this stipulation?—Fairly well, till they got the upper hand in point of numbers, and then I could see indication that they were rather inclined to retaliate upon the Union which served them so badly now that they, in turn, had the upper hand.

12,590. But you set yourself against any retaliation of that kind?—Yes. I really believe it will all settle down as soon as the friction gets worn off, because all the merchants I think, deplore that sort of thing, and it will settle itself down by-and-by.

Mr. Ismay.

12,591. What gave rise to the law suit that you referred to just now?—The fact that the three union secretaries came to my office and informed me (I have all the particulars here), that unless I consented to employ only union men, they would unite together and prevent my business going on—ruin me, in fact. I said "I will think it over, and I will see you again when this vessel, which has now the non-unionist working on board is finished, and then I will give you my decision. Meanwhile, that vessel must be discharged—union or no union." They agreed to that. Then they came to me later on when the vessel was discharged, and I told them I had thought the matter over very carefully, and that, as they were not a legally constituted body, they had no authority whatever to come to me and say that they would ruin me if I would not do as they told me; and that I must decline to accede to their request, and employ only union men. I said, I never considered I had any right, morally or legally, to prevent a man joining the Union, nor had they any right, in my opinion, to tell me I should only employ union men, and under those circumstances I should not accede to their request. Then they said "Very well, then, you must be prepared for the consequences." I said "All right, I shall be prepared for the consequences," and, I added, if they carried their threat into execution and stopped all my work, I should certainly begin legal proceedings, and make them pay for intimidation, &c. That was done.

28 January 1892.]

Mr. G. F. TRELEAVEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ismay—continued.

12,592. You followed it up?—Yes, certainly.
 12,593. At your own expense?—At my own expense. Part of that will be returned to me some day by various employers in the district who thought that I had done the proper thing; and who thought it was unfair that I should bear the whole of the expenses, and I may say that the Shipping Federation (as it was partly a shipping matter, and I am a member of the Shipping Federation), decided that my conduct was such as they could approve of, and that they would pay a share of the expenses.

12,594. You have told us about discharging. Have you anything to do with loading steamers at all?—Nothing. I am always discharging.

12,595. Then, is yours house-coal or steam-coal?—House-coal. It was steam-coal some years ago; but that branch of the trade has been abandoned. I know something about the steam-coal trade, as it then existed, but I know nothing about it now.

Duke of Devonshire.

12,596. Have you any opinion on the subject of Boards of Conciliation, and as to whether they are practicable or not?—At the time all these troubles were on, that was attempted by the merchants. They said "We do not want to be unreasonable, if you tell us what you will agree to." But they could not get anything out of the Union in that way. It was only after we got things our own way that then we heard that they would be willing to go by the decision of a Board of Conciliation; but we said "We have nothing to conciliate about; it is all finished."

12,597. You have had, I understand, no dispute except on this one subject of the employment of non-unionists?—That is true. I could read the speech of Mr. Curran, from which I have already read an extract, which he made when he and two more leaders of the men called on me. He said (and it has been accepted as evidence in the law courts since), that he "thought they were justified in saying that at the present time they were engaged in discussing a question between the merchants and the union men of Plymouth. They believed that this was not a question of price, nor one of detail." They knew that at the time. So that disposes of that. When I drew his attention to the fact that they were endeavouring to force men into the Union, whether they liked it or not, he smiled at me and said "Yes, that is our duty. It is our duty to force the weaklies" (as he called them) "into the Union for-union purposes." He told me that distinctly. That is down in print. This was an extract from the newspaper account of that very interview (see "Western Morning News," 10th October 1890). "Mr. Treleaven said 'of all things he desired peace, but at the same time 'uninterrupted control of that business which 'his own brains' labour and capital had built 'up. Why should he employ blustering men and squabblers? Besides, many men had said 'they would never have joined the Union had

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

"they not been forced. Mr. Curran: Yes, and 'we mean to force them. It is our business to 'protect the weaklies by forcing them under 'our control.'" That was admitted in the Court as evidence.

12,598. Then, according to your experience in your business, there is no work for a Board of Conciliation to do?—Not at present, owing to the very fact that from that time down to now I have never had a dispute, and I had not had any before.

12,599. I think you are hardly able to state what the average wages earned by the casual labourers is?—No; because there are so many things, as I have explained. It seems to me that the fact of wages being so high in our neighbourhood has induced a lot of men to come there. That has certainly been so since the Union began its operations, and since it got public how much they received. A lot of men have, in consequence, come into the neighbourhood and taken up coal-porters' work. The Union men said "We will not work for you because you employ a non-union hand." "Very well, then, you can cut along," I said. Then people have taken their places, and now they are out altogether, or most of them. So that it has, I think, if anything, increased the number of unemployed.

Mr. Austin.

12,600. Previously to the strike of 1890, had you any conflicts with the men?—No, no conflicts.

12,601. You got on well with the Union?—Well, I saw very little of the Union. I knew that the Union existed, because, as I have just explained, all of my men, except one, were members of the Union.

12,602. Do you give preference of employment to men holding the free-labour ticket?—Yes, and yet no. Yes, in this way, that when the Union men said, pursuant, I suppose, to directions given, "We will not work for you because you employ a non-union man," I said to the men who were working and were willing to work for me, "I shall certainly stand by you if you stand by me"; and in that respect I have given them preference because they stood by me. And, as the Union men have come to their senses gradually and come back to their work so they have been taken on, and there has never been, under any circumstances on my part, anything like an unkind word, or following them up or persecuting them in any way. As soon as ever they returned to their work they were taken on in their turn.

12,603. Suppose a number of men said that they would not accept a ticket, would you give them employment?—That has never occurred.

Mr. Courtney.

12,604. You told us that when the magistrates imposed these fines and the recorder supported them, the free labour people took heart?—Yea.

28 January 1892.]

Mr. G. F. TRELEAVEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Courtney—continued.

12,605. What happened when the judgment of the recorder was reversed?—The Free Labour Association had then arrived at such a pitch and was so prosperous that that did not affect us then. The time had gone by. A demonstration was attempted with a view to re-establish the Union on its old footing; but it seemed to utterly fail in our neighbourhood. The men had realised that there was nothing to gain by paying so much a week into the fund when the only thing they could get out of it—there being no dispute as to wages and hours—was the very doubtful advantage of being called off work when they did not want to leave.

12,606. Then there has been no attempt since the judgment of the Superior Court to re-establish the rule about employing only union men?—There have been several meetings and speeches and that sort of thing, and demonstrations; but they have utterly failed to shake the free labour men at all. They find that it is to their advantage, as well as to ours, to go on uninterrupted by any outside interference.

12,607. And the Union officials have not taken any action?—They have not taken any action in the way of going to law, or anything of that sort. They are active in trying to keep their forces together.

12,608. You said, in answer to the Duke of Devonshire, that there was no call for a Board of Conciliation now?—I am speaking only for myself, because we have no disputes, and have not had any since.

12,609. Suppose a Board of Conciliation had existed prior to your dispute, do you think it would have been efficient?—At that time, I am afraid not, because you see we tried that on; but the Union, fancying itself in the ascendant, thought itself able to dictate terms to us, and they would not have it. I have here records of that, where the whole thing was threshed out in the papers, and letters sent, and their replies thereto were published in the daily papers at the time.

12,610. You tried to start arbitration?—Mr. Varnier, the secretary of the Association, did. I was not a member of that committee, because, when I was asked, I said "I am afraid it will be no good, they will not see us, or if they do, they will treat us rudely, and I am not disposed to put myself in that position."

12,611. You thought the passions were up?—I did.

12,612. But, suppose if, instead of trying arbitration, then, there had already existed a Board of Conciliation, do you think it might have been efficient at an early stage?—I think before it got to be such a red-hot thing it might have been useful; but I afraid at that time it had gone a little too far. I think really that

Mr. Courtney—continued.

the impetuosity of the representatives of the unions was mainly the cause of the strife. I do not think it would ever have happened but for that. They were indiscreet.

12,613. Things were too hot to start it then; but if there had been a Board of Conciliation in the port, you cannot say what effect that Board might have had at an early stage, in the way of preventing its getting so hot?—I think it is likely that it would have been most useful.

12,614. And you would be ready, therefore, to support the establishment of a board now?—Certainly, I should.

12,615. But no attempts are being made to set up such a board?—I think so. I fancy there is a board that was started. I remember being called, with one or two others, before a board which was intended to be a Board of Conciliation, formed of independent gentlemen of the neighbourhood; and we were asked then, as one of the questions from the other side, whether we would recognise the Union, or not. I then asked what was the meaning to be attached to our "recognising" the Union. The answer was recognise them as an institution. I replied, that as far as I was concerned, there was no need to recognise the Union officially. I had no trouble with the men at that time, because it was all over, and I was disinclined to recognise the Union as an authority, interfering between me and the men, and I declined.

12,616. You did not refuse to recognise the Union in the sense that you would not employ Union men?—No, not by any means. But I certainly would not recognise their right of interference between me and the men.

12,617. When was the attempt made?—Soon after the great strike of October 1890. I should think, by this time, we had got to about November or December—that is to say, we had got the best of this fight altogether, and then arbitration or a Board of Conciliation, which had been declined just before, was again suggested, and this time by the other side.

12,618. It was after Mr. Bompas' decision?—It was after the magistrate's decision. Mr. Bompas' decision did not come till the middle of January of the following year.

12,619. It was between the magistrate's decision and Mr. Bompas'?—Yes, just as our Free Labour Association had taken root.

Earl of Derby.

12,620. As we understand, "recognising the Union," in the sense in which the phrase was used to you, means negotiating with the men exclusively through the officials of the Union?—That was how I understood it. When I asked the question, that is exactly what I understood it meant; and that I declined to do

The witness withdrew.

28 January 1892.]

Mr. G. CREECH.

[Continued.]

Mr. GEORGE CREECH called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

12,621. You are a member of the Plymouth and District Free Labour Association?—Yes. I am the chairman of the Stevedores.

12,622. What trade do you represent specially?—Coal-portering. My former work before this was mostly grain carrying for Mr. Ketson King, of Plymouth.

12,623. How many members does your Free Labour Association number?—They have issued out 425 tickets, and there are 60 or 70 men on the rota waiting to get tickets—old union men.

12,624. How many are regular men employed weekly by the merchants?—About 100. That is, weekly.

12,625. And the remaining 300 are coal-porters?—Yes.

12,626. We have been told that their pay is fixed at 2*d.* a ton per man, is that the case?—Yes. It would run more than that. Sailing vessels, they average about 7*s.* 3*d.* to 8*s.* a day. That is what they are generally paid on sailing vessels.

12,627. And rather more for the steamers?—The steamers run more, because it is more urgent for getting out.

12,628. What are the hours of labour?—The hours of labour are: steamers, 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., and sailing vessels from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m., except Saturdays—and then it is 4.

12,629. Is the employment regular or irregular?—Irregular mostly. Certainly, steamers you can rely on more than you can sailing vessels. I have got three or four steamers in Plymouth at the present time, and two or three sailing vessels. You can never depend on sailing vessels the same as you can the steamers on account of the winds and fogs and things.

12,630. Are there many accidents?—No. I have only had one accident right through. That was in a sailing vessel. That was on account of the seamen being foreigners, and the captain having his own men in the hold. Our men generally work in the hold. We never had an accident in that way.

12,631. Have you had any trouble with strikes?—No, not since—had no trouble or bother whatever.

12,632. Not since 1890?—Not since we started. In fact, we have got plenty of union men now ready to come in, but we have got the whole complement back now pretty near.

12,633. In the first instance, at the time of the strike, did the Union say that no man should work who was not a member of it?—Yes; I can't prove that to you. On Mr. King's steamboats coming into the dock, they came down and demanded your book, and if a man said he had been laid up sick, and only owed 4*d.* or 6*d.*, they would do that man out of the 3*l.* or 4*l.* worth of work which the steamer might run to. Other places I do not know much about, but, in the West of England, if a man had finished one boat, the stevedores would put another man in his place, but he had still to keep up his contributions.

Earl of Derby—continued.

12,634. Were you a member of the Union?—Yes, till I joined the Free Labour Association. There was no getting work, and you could not starve or see your wives and children starve.

12,635. You thought the Union exercised too much control?—They did in the West of England; that is the only place I can answer for.

12,636. At the time of the strike was there any difficulty in getting free labour?—No. Well, at the first commencement there was a little delay. There were three vessels lying in, but we got plenty of men in the course of a week or so. The merchants set to work themselves to help get out their own vessels, so as not to have them under demurrage.

12,637. In the event of any difficulty arising between the employers and the men, do you think that your Association is capable of settling it?—Yes.

12,638. By the action of a joint committee consisting of both classes?—Yes.

12,639. Do you think that better than any Board of Arbitration or Conciliation?—I think it would be, myself, a great improvement too.

Mr. Bolton.

12,640. Can you say what are the average earnings of your casual men for a twelvemonth?—I dare say they average, for the 12 months, from 1*l.* to 25*s.* a week: that is including the summer months, when it is slack. There is not so much coal in then as in the winter months. Some weeks, in the winter months, they pick up 2*l.* 10*s.* or close upon 3*l.*

12,641. Then you have not men there in great excess of the number required?—No. And another very important thing I can tell you in regard to free labour. When I was working before, when the Union thought you had done your daily toil, and you had a wet shirt, instead of going home, you generally found the stevedores kept public-houses, and therefore you had to wait about, perhaps three or four hours, and, if you did not go to the house to speculate a shilling or two on beer, you never got a job. Then, that is another great improvement, now it is paid by the master. Your work is done, and there is your money.

Earl of Derby.

12,642. The money is paid by the master now?—Yes, by the master.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,643. You said you did not like the interference of Union officials with you?—Yes.

12,644. Were these officials Plymouth men?—No. Sprow was one of the officials, and he belonged up in the neighbourhood of Southampton, somewhere; but Shepherd was a Plymouth man, born and bred in a place, I think, called Kingsbridge, just on the borders of Plymouth. That is the only other one. Those were the two officials for Plymouth.

12,645. You did not, perhaps, like a stranger coming in?—No; that was not the question at

28 January 1892.]

Mr. G. CREECH.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

all. One was a Plymouth man. I can tell you, though, that Sprow was a man very much liked in the West of England till he carried on too far—till the men disliked him—when he demanded this, that, and the other thing, which was not reasonable at all, and was only injuring the men that were working under him.

Mr. Courtney.

12,646. Was there any rough work going on during this strike?—Oh, yes; at the first commencement of it.

12,647. Can you tell us anything about that?—I was there through it myself, so I ought to know a little about it. Men were afraid of their lives; bricks, and things of that sort, were knocking about. They had to be protected by the police during the time. That is on the North Quay, Plymouth.

12,648. Did you, yourself, suffer anything?—I certainly found that the ships were lying about, and several of us turned the Union up, and went and joined the Free Labour.

12,649. You suffered no personal ill-usage yourself?—When I was up here last, after I went back to Plymouth a man knocked me down in the streets when I was going home from my work. I was just leaving one of my masters at the time. He came behind me, and I should never have known who it was if it had not been for a man who was behind when he knocked me down. He was tried after I went back, and he got fined 1*l.* and, I believe, costs.

12,650. What was he?—He is a union man, but he has got his name down at our office,

Mr. Courtney—continued.

trying to get a ticket. He has been to me 10 times since he was before the magistrat: to get a ticket.

12,651. Was the fine paid?—Yes.

12,652. Who paid the fine?—The union man. One of the officials of the Gasworkers' Union paid his fine.

12,653. Do you mean it was paid out of the official funds?—I could not say about that; that I could not answer for; but he paid the magistrate's clerk, because I saw him do it in court. I did not know who the gentleman was till afterwards. He belonged to the Gasworkers Union.

12,654. And now this man is trying to get on your Association?—Yes, on four or five occasions. He came on the quay to me yesterday, where I was working—that is about the fourth or fifth time—asking to get work.

12,655. Does he refer to the action that he took?—Yes.

12,656. What does he say about that?—He said he was in default, through it.

12,657. Did he beg you to excuse him?—Yes. He was looking for me to beg pardon. I was here, in town. I had not had time to see the man when I went back.

12,658. Did he try to put the fault on anybody else?—No; he took the blame himself.

Mr. Austin.

12,659. Were you sent here by the Free Labour Association of Plymouth to speak on their behalf?—No.

12,660. You represent nobody but yourself, then?—Myself; that is all.

After a few minutes.

Mr. Bolton.

I hear the witness did not understand your question, Mr. Austin.

12,661. Do you represent yourself, or are you sent by a body?—I am sent by the body of men.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

29 January 1892.]

Mr. G. MONRO.

TWENTY-FOURTH DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Friday, 23th January 1892.

PRESENT :

The Right Hon. The EARL OF DERBY, K.G. (CHAIRMAN).

The Right Hon. SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH,
Bart., M.P.
Mr. J. C. BOLTON, M.P.

Mr. SAMUEL PLIMSOLL.
The Right Hon. LEONARD COURTNEY, M.P.,
and Mr. M. AUSTIN (Group C.) also attended.

Mr. GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Mr. GEORGE MONRO called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

12,662. You come from Glasgow, I understand?—From Glasgow.

12,663. And you represent the Free Labour there?—Yes.

12,664. In what sense are you connected with free labour—do you belong to any association?—Not officially.

12,665. But you are yourself unconnected with any Union?—We are unconnected with any Union.

12,666. And therefore you consider yourself as representing the Free Labour party?—Yes.

12,667. How many years' experience have you had?—I have been 15 years in the stevedore business in Glasgow, principally connected with the mineral stevedoring.

12,668. The stevedores in Glasgow are licensed, are they not?—There are about 40 licensed stevedores in Glasgow licensed by the Clyde Trustees.

12,669. By the Clyde Navigation Trustees, do you mean?—Yes, who renew their licenses yearly.

12,670. Do they take contracts with the shipowners?—These stevedores compete with each other in securing work from various shipowners.

12,671. To load or discharge ships?—To load and discharge ships, Yes.

12,672. Do they employ men?—The stevedores employ the men to do the work, for which they pay them principally by the day; and they also supply the necessary tools for the working of the cargoes.

12,673. The men are paid how?—The men are paid hourly, and generally paid every day. As a rule they are paid every day. One or two firms have a system of paying them about twice weekly or so, but there is only one or two who do that.

12,674. How many men are there doing this dock work in Glasgow?—I should say there are from about 5,000 to 6,000 dock labourers in Glasgow.

Earl of Derby—continued.

12,675. What is the rate of pay?—The present rate of pay is from 5½d. per hour to 8d. for day work and from 5½d. to 10d. per hour for night work. The day work is from 6 o'clock in the morning, and the night work from 6 at night to 6 in the morning again, or 5 in the morning, perhaps.

12,676. And the hours worked, what are they?—From 6 o'clock in the morning till 6 o'clock at night.

12,677. With a half-holiday on Saturday?—As a rule there is a half-holiday on Saturday with most people.

12,678. Are there many cases of accident, and is there any provision regularly made for them?—Accidents are not very frequent, and some firms have a small accident fund to which their men contribute, perhaps, 3d. per week, and in the event of being disabled or partially disabled, they get probably 15s. a week. In the event of any man being killed, I suppose they give his representatives probably 50l.

12,679. Have you had many disputes as between the Union and non-union men?—We have had a great many disputes between those two classes.

12,680. How have they mostly arisen?—They have mostly arisen from the action of the Union men refusing to work alongside the non-union men. In fact, in all cases they have arisen in that way.

12,681. According to your experience, do they adopt that as a general rule—a refusal to work with non-union men?—Yes, they have always done so.

12,682. And do they continue to do so now? Well, not now.

12,683. What has made the change?—There have been so many men leaving the Union that the Union has not the strength to propose these terms now.

12,684. Have there been numerous strikes in the last two or three years?—In the last two

29 January 1892.]

Mr. G. MONRO.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

or three years there have been three or four strikes.

12,685. How have they arisen?—Principally on a question of wages.

12,686. Has there been any strike lately—I mean in the last few weeks or months?—No, there has not.

12,687. Now, we understand that you have something to suggest to us as a means of preventing strikes in future. Will you explain what it is?—At the time I wrote that summary, I was of opinion that it might be a very good thing for both men and masters to have a proper code of rules drawn up in every work, so that they would understand each other, what they were doing, and the terms they were employed on; and to appoint a mutual committee to discuss any questions that might arise. Of course every place has its own peculiar difficulties, its own peculiarities perhaps, so that the same rule perhaps would not meet every case; but that is the only plan I can think of that would have the effect of preventing strikes or in some way settling them anyway.

12,688. Would you have a certain amount of notice given on either side if an alteration of hours or wages was desired?—Yes, either side to give notice to the other that they intended having an alteration, and during the time from giving the notice until the time expired probably the committees could discuss the matter to see whether any decision could be arrived at.

12,689. And if no agreement can be come to, do you propose that the opinion of all the workmen concerned should be taken?—Yes, I think that would be the next plan, to allow the workers themselves to vote on the subject by ballot if possible, so that each could have the chance of giving their true opinion.

12,690. You say "by ballot," I presume, in order to prevent intimidation?—Yes, to prevent intimidation.

12,691. So that every man may have an opportunity of expressing his own opinion?—Freely.

12,692. If those means fail, do you think anything else could be done?—I do not know of anything else that could be suggested.

12,693. You do not believe in outside interference in such cases?—I do not believe in outside interference.

12,694. I think you have expressed your opinion strongly in favour of leaving every man free to work as he pleases and on what terms he pleases?—Yes, I am very strongly of the opinion that every man should be allowed to work wherever he likes and make his own terms.

12,695. I suppose we should all agree in that in the abstract; but, as a matter of fact, do you consider there has been a good deal of intimidation practised?—Yes, there has been a good deal of intimidation.

12,696. Is there anything you wish to add?—I would just like to state what has been my experience with the Union officials in Glasgow with regard to carrying on work. In 1887 we had a strike for an advance in wages, the men

Earl of Derby—continued.

were at that time being paid 6d. per hour, and wanted a penny more—7d. After about a week's standing still, the masters gave in to their terms, and after they had started, the men got up a small local Union among themselves, and they gradually introduced new rules into the working of vessels; so that the stevedores, about the end of 1888, made up their minds that they could not carry on their work unless they dispensed with the use of those Union men. They advertised for labourers who would not be under the subjection of any Union, and would not be under their direction, but would take instructions from the masters, and work as they wanted them. We advertised for men and got them; did not reduce the wages or anything; it was not a question of wages or anything of that sort,—it was merely a question of how the work was to be carried on. This continued for a good time, until perhaps 1889. At that time the National Union of Dock Labourers commenced. That was an entirely new Union. They had the majority of labourers in Glasgow in their Union shortly after they came into existence. They printed a book of rules, and gradually introduced new rules, whether in the book or not—made them for themselves daily, and hampered the stevedores greatly in the carrying on of the work. In fact, the officials of the Union were the masters, instead of the stevedores themselves. There is a great quantity of pig-iron comes into Glasgow from Barrow-in-Furness. It happened in 1890 that for about six months there was no pig-iron allowed to come into Glasgow, because the Union officials would not allow the men to handle pig-iron coming from Barrow owing to a dispute going on there with the Union. That lasted for about six months, and no pig-iron came into Glasgow during that six months from Barrow. They also stopped vessels which, having gone into Belfast with cargo, had been discharged in Belfast by non-union men; they refused to allow their Union men to work these ships in Glasgow when they came there, and caused great detention to the vessels at times. This state of matters went on until December 1890, when the Union became still more strict, and would not allow their men to work in any ships that had shipped non-union sailors or firemen on board. We had many cases of vessels being half loaded, and after they had been about half loaded the men would be called ashore out of them. The men themselves had no grievance against the stevedores, and were quite willing to work, but would not be allowed to do so. The reason that they gave was that they were supporting the Sailors' Union in doing so. In addition to that, we have had cases of vessels arriving in Glasgow from Spain with pig-iron during the blast-furnacemen's strike. There was a blast-furnacemen's strike in Glasgow. These vessels that arrived with pig-iron were not allowed to discharge the pig-iron, in order to support the blast-furnacemen, to be in sympathy with them, to prevent pig-iron being brought in. There was great detention to

29 January 1892.]

Mr. G. MONRO.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

steamers through that, too. But these difficulties were ultimately got over by the Shipping Federation, which started in Glasgow in December-1890. Things had almost come to a standstill at that time by the Union officials stopping ships working, and the Shipping Federation came to the assistance of the stevedores, and said that they would support them in every way in carrying on their work; that they were not to submit any longer to Union rules, but employ any man they liked, either Union or non-union men—it did not matter, as long as they would work alongside of each other and do their work, they would give them all support. The result was that when we intimated to our men that we would employ anyone the Union hands all left, and we had to fall back upon free labour. This state of matters lasted for about a week when our own men commenced to come back asking their places back again. They of course forfeited their rights in the Union when they came back, but gradually they all worked their way back, giving up their Union badges, I suppose, on coming back. Most of these stoppages were what were called sympathetic strikes. But in addition to that we had also troubles with different Societies, different Unions. For instance, in Glasgow there is an old Society of harbour labourers who had been in existence for about 40 years, and when the National Union came into existence they tried in every way, I suppose, to get rid of this Society; and the plan they took was, supposing any vessel coming into Glasgow had been discharged by the old Society men, they refused to allow the Union men to load her, and owing to some stevedores in Glasgow employing nothing else but old Society men they often did discharging work, and when the vessels came along to load with other stevedores who employed Union men they found that they could not get men to work. Of course the stevedores had to fall back upon old Society men to do the work, and the Union seeing this gave up that in a very short time. They saw it was not going to pay them to have their men standing idle when the work could be carried on without them. But several times it had caused delay to ships through their putting that in force. This old Society has a very good rule for bringing about a good relationship between employers and employed as to strikes. They have a rule in their Society that before a strike can be proclaimed they must put the matter before the Provost of Glasgow, the Provost of Govan, and the Provost of Partick, in whose hands the matter must lie for a fortnight before any definite action can be come to on the part of the men; and, of course, it entirely rests with those three Provosts to say whether a strike should go on or not. I will read you the wording of the rule, "No strike shall be organised unless decided by three-fourths majority of the whole members of the Society, and that only after the matter in dispute has lain for one clear week before the Honourable the Lord Provost of Glasgow, the Provost of

Earl of Derby—continued.

"Govan, and the Provost of Partick, as a Board of Conciliation to act between the parties." I think that is a pretty good rule.

12,697. Is there anything else that you wish to add?—I do not know that there is anything else that I can say.

Mr. Bolton.

12,698. Has that rule of the old Society ever been acted upon to your knowledge?—It has never been acted upon. It has never been required.

12,699. The Provosts have never been required to act?—No, it has never been required.

12,700. Is that in consequence of an objection taken by the men to that?—I understand that it is quite a new rule, perhaps only about two years old, and there has been no dispute since it was made.

12,701. Have there been many strikes in which the old Society were interested prior to the date you have given, I think of 1887?—I could not speak as to that. I have never had any connexion with the old Society before two years ago.

12,702. You cannot answer one way or the other then?—I cannot.

12,703. Your Free Labour Association was established in 1890, I think?—There is no Free Labour Association. We merely employ free labour. We do not recognise Unions in any way—we merely employ men.

12,704. You have no Free Labour Association?—No Association.

12,705. And the men themselves have not attempted to form themselves into a Union?—The men themselves have not attempted to introduce any Union rules. In fact they do not belong to any Union.

12,706. In addition to the 40 licensed stevedores in Glasgow are there not some unlicensed?—Most of the large lines of steamers do their own stevedoring work without employing one of these licensed stevedores. They do their own work, employ their own men, and pay them themselves without employing a stevedore.

12,707. Were those lines affected by the strikes in 1887, 1888, 1889, and so on?—Yes, they were more or less affected.

12,708. In reference to the remedy which you have suggested by which there should be meetings of the men and the masters, how would you ascertain the views of the men; would you have the men appoint delegates?—Yes, I would have them appoint delegates from among themselves, from among men who actually were working at the work in question, so that they would be able to discuss all the different points of the question, and be able to express the men's views and also understand the question from probably an employers' point of view.

12,709. Assuming that these men were members of Unions, would you have them, if they pleased, represented by their agents?—I do not think so. I have no charge to make against men in Unions if the officials would not dictate to them the terms. The officials in Unions, so

29 January 1892.]

Mr. G. MONRO.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

far as my experience goes, have caused all the trouble. During all these stoppages to ships the men had no actual grievance, and they were sorry to lose their work. It was much against their will that they knocked off working at all. They were called off work by the officials; they did not want to leave it at all.

12,710. Would not that be rather in the case of sympathetic strikes?—That was in the case of sympathetic strikes. That is what I refer to.

12,711. But assume that the question is one for an increase of wages?—Well, if the men had a Union I would not object to an official being present at any meeting.

12,712. But would you have him as the representative of the men?—No, I do not think so. I would not have him as the representative.

12,713. You want to see the men themselves?—Yes, I want to see the men themselves.

12,714. And in the same way as respects the masters, would you have them?—I would have them representing themselves too without any official from either association if they had any.

12,715. You stated that you have had some experience of Union officials which was not agreeable. Can you quote instances?—We have had instances of officials coming round seeing how the work was getting on, and if they found anything that did not please them they would intimate that if it occurred again they would instantly call the men away from their work. For instance, they had a rule worded in a particular way that so many men must be at a particular job, say 12 men, well probably there would not be room for more than six at the job, and six men would be quite willing to work it. If a Union official happened to see only six working at it he would immediately stop the whole thing until we put on 12, and probably six of them would be standing doing nothing looking at the other six.

12,716. And that is the class of interference by officials to which you object?—I object to officials interfering where the men are quite agreeable that the work should go on—to where the men have no actual grievance themselves—to the official coming and making one.

12,717. You spoke of Barrow iron being excluded from Glasgow for six months?—Yes.

12,718. That must have had a very bad effect upon the trade?—I suppose there was about that time probably 4,000 tons of pig-iron coming in a week from Barrow. That was totally stopped coming by steamer.

12,719. How was the work of the foundries carried on during that time, do you know?—I suppose it must have come by rail a lot of it. Of course pig-iron comes from other places besides Barrow, I merely referred to the port of Barrow. They did not allow it to come in from Barrow; they brought it from other ports at the same time.

* 12,720. A large quantity of English pig-iron used in Glasgow comes by way of Grangemouth

Mr. Bolton—continued.

does it not?—There is a lot comes by Grangemouth.

12,721. The bulk of it, does it not?—I would not like to say the bulk of it.

12,722. More than a half?—Probably that, yes.

12,723. That, of course, was not affected by that stoppage?—No, that was not affected.

12,724. Do you know whether the quantity coming by way of Grangemouth increased in consequence of that strike?—I could not speak as to that.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,725. Do you and the men that you employ do all the work of loading and discharging ships, or do you simply stow the cargo and take it out and place it on the quays?—That is all we do.

12,726. Then there are other men to remove it from the quays, bring it from the railway trucks to the quay or remove it from the quay to railway truck?—Not in Glasgow. There are cranes used for lifting it direct from a ship to railway trucks. The railway runs right alongside the quay and cranes are used for lifting cargoes from ships into trucks and from trucks into ships.

12,727. What class of men work those cranes and do that work?—They either belong to the railway companies or to the Clyde Trustees. The cranes do not belong to the stevedores at all. They do not own the cranes.

12,728. With regard to wages and other matters, you do not speak as to these men I understand?—No, I do not refer to these men at all when I speak about wages.

12,729. Are they mainly in the employment of the Clyde Trustees?—Yes, they are nearly all.

12,730. Have you any knowledge of the wages which would be received, or the work that they do?—No, I could not speak as to their wages at all.

12,731. Are there many of them?—Probably 500 I would say.

12,732. Are they a variable number, or men constantly in employment?—They are in constant employment; they are paid weekly; they are employed weekly.

12,733. Then there is no casual labour of that kind in Glasgow?—None of that kind.

12,734. Your men and those men do all the work then of loading and discharging?—They do all the work.

12,735. So that the question of casual labour, which is so difficult elsewhere, does not arise very much in Glasgow?—Well, with stevedores' men of course it does. They are not employed constantly; the stevedores merely employ the men as they require them, according to the state of trade, whether there is plenty of ships or otherwise.

12,736. Is there a great difference in the number of men employed by the stevedores at one season of the year and at another?—No the seasons have not very much to do with the difference, merely trade at some times is busier

29 January 1892.]

Mr. G. MONRO.

[Continued.]

Sir *Michael Hicks-Beach*—continued.

than at others, and there is no special season for briskness coming round.

12,737. Has the question of casual labour been a very great difficulty in Glasgow?—Not so far as the quay is concerned—not so far as docks are concerned.

Mr. *Austin*.

12,738. Have you ever been a member of a Union?—I have never been a member of a Union.

12,739. Therefore, I suppose you are not acquainted with the advantages acquired by the workmen of this country owing to their organisations?—No, I have not heard that they have reaped any advantages from that.

12,740. Could you give us the number of members that this Free Labour Society comprises?—What do you refer to.

12,741. The Free Labour Society of Glasgow?—I did not say there was a Free Labour Society.

12,742. I see in your summary here you say "Our men's Society"; what do you mean by that?—Our men's Society?

12,743. Yes?—I will have a look at it and see.

12,744. Is there, or is there not a Society?—"Our men's Society has a rule that provides for arbitration in disputes." I referred to the old Society.

12,745. Speaking of your men, do you mean the members of the Union or the members of the Free Labour?—That is a mistake my saying "Our men." I mean the old men's or the old Society. It is merely a clerical error there.

12,746. The work of the dock labourers in Glasgow, I understand, is very hard, is it not?—Well, some portions of it.

12,747. Could you give us the average wages of a dock labourer all the year round?—Our own labourers have been making last year from 25s. to 30s. a week, sometimes 2l. a week, sometimes over 2l. I have myself paid men regularly 45s. a week for about a year,—some men, but I would say the average would probably be 27s. 6d.

12,748. Would it be right to say that the average wages of dock labourers were not more than 15s.?—In Glasgow?

The witness withdrew.

Mr. JAMES SMITH PARK called and examined.

Earl of *Derby*.

12,763. You are here, I understand, as representative of the Glasgow Shipowners' Association?—Yes. The Association includes most of the Glasgow shipowners engaged in the foreign trade, and represents over 800,000 tons of shipping.

12,764. You are connected with Messrs. Allan of the Allan and State Line steamers, and your evidence, I presume, will specially have to do with your experience in connexion with their

Mr *Austin*—continued.

12,749. Yes?—I would say they are more than 15s. in the case of those who are willing to work,—those who seek work.

12,750. Yes, but you are aware that the dock labouring work in Glasgow is to a great extent casual?—Not to any great extent.

12,751. I understand it is?—Not to any great extent. In Glasgow men have got into a system of going to a certain place and standing by that place expecting to get the work, and they generally get the first chance of any work that is going.

12,752. As regards accidents, are they pretty numerous?—Not very numerous.

12,753. Is there any compensation to the men meeting with those accidents?—Some firms have an accident fund that the men contribute probably 3d. per week to. In the event of being hurt they get 15s. a week.

12,754. For fatal accidents is there a payment?—In fatal accidents I understand there is 50l. paid to their representatives.

12,755. But there are only some firms that have this fund?—Only some of them.

12,756. You state here that you would not wish for outside interference in cases of dispute?—Yes, I state that.

12,757. And that if both parties could not agree, why they would have a stand-up fight between them?—They would just have to stand until some of them gave in.

12,758. What objection would you have to outside interference in the way of arbitration?—The only objection I have is that an outsider would not know of the points in dispute; that those who are immediately concerned know more what they are talking about than any outsider could possibly do, I should say.

12,759. When both sides cannot agree and determine to fight, what would you put forward for the purpose of averting strikes?—I could not suggest any means of arriving at a decision when both sides refuse to agree.

12,760. And according to that, then, things would go on as usual?—Things would have to go on as usual.

12,761. Strikes would occur?—Things would have to go on as usual.

12,762. Would you not prefer going to arbitration to that?—No, I do not think so.

Earl of *Derby*—continued.

business?—Yes. I have been connected with them for over 20 years. We are very large employers of labour, tradesmen, shore and ship labourers, sailors, firemen, and others. In my position I have had intimate acquaintance with this department of our business, and during labour troubles was much at the head of our labour organisations. The evidence I have prepared relates more directly to our labour experiences, but it is typical and has much in

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

common with that of the other shipowners of the port. It will enable me to present it in a connected manner if the Committee can receive it in the order in which I have arranged it. I will during its course or at the close, which will perhaps be better, answer, as far as I can, any questions that may be asked of me relating to it.

12,765. Of what does your Glasgow service consist?—From April to November we have three to four steamers sailing and arriving per week, and during the remainder of the year two or three per week.

12,766. Can you give us some particulars of your labour staff in connexion with these services?—Besides doing the loading and discharging of our steamers, we directly employ tradesmen for the repair of our vessels and for fitting passenger accommodation, &c. The number of hands varies according to the pressure of work. Our wages directly paid at Glasgow during the past 12 months, including that of sailors, amounted to about 120,000*l*.

12,767. How is the work of loading, discharging, and coaling of your steamers done?—The loading and discharging of cargo are done by labour directly employed by ourselves, but the coaling is done by contract at a rate per ton.

12,768. Is this the usual practice at your port?—Both methods are largely in force. In some cases all the work is contracted for, but steam lines which have regular and frequent sailings at fixed dates, and who consequently employ a large body of men, do the work direct, while others employ master stevedores at a rate per ton.

12,769. Are the men's wages the same in both cases, and what are they?—No; the liners pay 6*d*. per hour during ordinary hours and 7*d*. overtime, and the stevedores pay 7*d*. and 10*d*. respectively.

12,770. Has this difference of wages always existed, and what is the reason of it?—It has in my time. Stevedores are understood to work the men harder than the liners do, and they work with smaller gangs, that is, for a given job they will employ fewer men.

12,771. Do the same men work sometimes with "liners" and sometimes with "stevedores"?—Yes.

12,772. You have said "liners" pay 1*d*. per hour less than "stevedores," is this your practice?—No. We pay 1*d*. per hour more in our particular case than some of the other lines. This arose out of the strike movement which I shall later explain.

12,773. Are your quay labourers paid by the hour, or have you weekly men?—By the hour. We formerly had a large number of men on weekly wages, but, as I will explain later, we have ceased to have such since the strike of 1889. In the coasting trade, weekly men are still employed.

12,774. About what amount of money will your own men earn on average by hourly wages?—The average wage of our regular

Earl of Derby—continued.

hands is about 33*s*., some earning as much as 45*s*.

12,775. What are the overtime hours?—Overtime is paid after 2 p.m. on Saturday, between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m., and for any work in excess of 10 hours between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m., if cattle should be landed on Sunday, as sometimes happens, such labour is paid at overtime wages. Men ordered out in anticipation of a vessel's arrival are paid at the usual rate for time waiting, with a minimum of 1*s*. 6*d*., whether steamer comes up the river or not.

12,776. How are men engaged?—There is a foreman to each hatch who engages his squad of 14 to 20 men, and there is a head foreman for each steamer, who controls sub-foremen.

12,777. When are men paid?—Our practice is to pay every day at 6 p.m. except Saturday, when they are paid at 2 p.m., unless paid off during the day or night, when they are then paid.

12,778. Do you work much overtime, do you find any objections to it on the part of the men, and have you any limit to the time men may work?—Our business unfortunately requires a considerable amount of overtime, but we limit it as much as possible; it is unprofitable as labour. Men never object to work overtime, and I have had personal experience of men being disappointed that all their work was not to be overtime. We try to prevent men working more than a day and a night consecutively, but it is not unusual for men to work during the day to a stevedore, and to apply to us for night work.

12,779. In your oversight of work what steps do you take to prevent accidents through defective gear?—We have two competent men in charge of all cargo gear, who report any defects and withhold from use gear which they think unsafe. Each hatch foreman has also the oversight of the gear that he is working. The chains of the slings are of the best quality of crane chain, tested when new and retested at intervals at the public machine. All our crane boilers have for years been insured with a first-class insurance company, who examines them periodically, a system which the Clyde Trust have made compulsory in regard to all boilers on the quay.

12,780. Have your efforts to prevent accident been successful?—Yes, we have practically no accidents from defective gear.

12,781. Have you many accidents from other causes, and how do you treat the sufferers from them?—Considering the extent of our work we have very few serious accidents. On the passing of the Employers' Liability Act, we insured against claims, thereby paying a considerable sum as premium, which formerly was available as assistance for sufferers. We felt, however, that it would be a pity that men suffering from accidents should be left to the strictly legal treatment which the insurance company would alone give, and we instituted an accident society for their relief.

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

12,782. Will you explain somewhat of the working of your society?—The firm gave a donation to start its funds, and 2*d.* per week is collected on one day of the week from every man then employed. In the event of accident, alimnt, besides medical attendance, is paid at the rate of 12*s.* per week for the first 12 weeks, and thereafter 8*s.*, but with a total allowance of 12*l.* In the event of total disability or death, 12*l.* is paid. In special cases the firm have also given some assistance, and in cases of permanent disablement endeavour to give employment as watchmen.

12,783. Have you any system of piece-work?—Our work generally does not lend itself very well to piece-work, and proposals to introduce it to parts that it would suit have not been favourably received by the men, so that the only piece-work that we have on the quay is grain weighing. Some stevedores who tried piece-work in discharging abandoned it as unworkable.

12,784. How is grain weighing paid?—8*s.* 3*d.* per 10 tons divided among the squad employed, as follows:—Weigher, 1*s.* 11*d.*; backer, 1*s.* 10*d.*; filler, 1*s.* 6*d.*; two bag-holders each, 1*s.* 6*d.*

12,785. What wages will these men make?—On a year's average the weigher makes with us about 32*s.* 6*d.* per week, backer about 30*s.*, and the others about 25*s.*, in addition to which, when not weighing grain, they earn something at hourly work in the sheds, but these men can in a very short time, by working hard, earn a large sum in a day.

12,786. How are the coalmen paid?—They get stevedores' wages, 7*d.* and 10*d.*, and on an average very many of them earn 35*s.* per week.

12,787. What wages do your seamen and firemen get?—In the North Atlantic trade 4*l.* 15*s.* per month, and in the South Atlantic 4*l.* 5*s.* per month, in both cases the men being fed and lodged by the steamer.

12,788. Do you employ labour-saving machinery, and do the men object to it?—We do. Besides the usual full complement of steam-driven winches on board the steamers we have six large powerful cranes on the quay, one of which is used for loading coal direct from the railway trucks, and elevators for discharging grain. There was some objection to the latter when they were introduced a few years ago, and the company owning them had to bring men of their own to work them at first, but there is no difficulty now. These elevators are in use at Liverpool as well, and we have for years urged our London friends to have them introduced there, but they informed us that the resistance of the London men would be too strong.

12,789. You have something to tell us, have you not, regarding your experience of strikes at your port?—Yes; in the summer of 1872 the wages paid by the liners were 6*d.* per hour, and 7½*d.* overtime, and, by the ordinary operation of the law of supply and demand, this was increased without a strike to 7*d.* and

Earl of Derby—continued.

9*d.* in the autumn of that year. These rates continued till June 1874, when the men demanded an advance to 8*d.* and 10*d.* This was resisted, for trade did not justify it, it was steadily going back; a strike ensued, and the result was that by the following month the wages instead of being advanced were back to the figures of 1872; viz., 6*d.* and 7½*d.* Trade continuing to fail, and the number of men being greatly increased by the influx of strangers during the strike, the less capable men were not employed, but to meet their necessities employment was found for some who volunteered to work at 1*d.* per hour less than the fixed rate, so that they might get some share of the work. Speedily, however, all were pressing to get work at the cheaper rate, and this became, and remained the wage of the port, with the extra for stevedores' men, till the spring of 1889, although an unsuccessful effort was made to raise wages in June 1880. In the spring of 1889, trade reviving and demand increasing, an advance of 1*d.* per hour was asked, and ½*d.* was conceded without stoppage of work. In the month of May a further demand was made for ¼*d.* of advance, and in all probability this would have been given, as there was a feeling that we might improve the class of men on the quay if we had a minimum of 6*d.* per hour, but the men, under the direction of leaders, entered into combination with the seamen and firemen, and took up a position which put it out of our power to arrange with them, and caused the leading shipowners to combine to resist their demands.

12,790. Will you explain in further detail how this was?—They required an answer to their demand on a fixed day under threat of suspending the work, but they stopped work before the period they had fixed had expired, and they announced that they would not return to their work, even if they got the advance demanded, unless the seamen and firemen obtained the increase in their wages from 4*l.* 10*s.* to 5*l.* which they had demanded. The seamen and firemen also intimated that they would not return till the labourers obtained their demand. The strike commenced on 2nd June, and was not completely over till 8th July. The seamen and firemen were the first to return to their work, which they did without receiving any advance, the quay labourers following a few days later also without advance. A few weeks later the wages of the quay labourers were voluntarily raised by their employers, who gave the ¼*d.* per hour that had been previously asked, and these wages are still given. The seamen and firemen's were advanced to 4*l.* 15*s.* per month in January 1890, and so remain.

12,791. Had you any difficulty in filling the places of the men on strike?—In the strikes previous to 1889 we obtained labour comparatively easily; our chief difficulty was intimidation, which, however, was nothing like what we experienced in 1889. In 1889 labour was more scarce, but even then I think there would have

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

been no difficulty in getting sufficient men, but for the terrible intimidation experienced.

12,792. Will you give us some of your experiences in regard to this?—We had a number of men on weekly wages, bound to give a week's warning, but they were so terrorised by the strikers that, except one or two, they deserted work without notice, many of them telling us privately that they did so solely because of threats of bodily injury and of threatened boycotting if they wrought for us. Similarly, nearly all our foremen deserted us, several having been threatened and attacked on their way to and from their homes. The strikers congregated in hundreds outside the sheds, shouted threatening language to men proceeding to work, stoned men whom we brought up the harbour in tugs, for we dared not walk them along the streets, and even stopped buses and cabs in which men were being driven down to our sheds and forced the occupants out. Such a reign of terror was for a time in force that the men working for the various lines were afraid to leave the sheds and had to be housed either on board ship or in the sheds. At one time we alone had nearly 600 men housed in our loading and discharging berths. We were literally in a state of siege.

12,793. Can you give us some particulars of the intimidation?—One of the few weekly men who had stuck to us was proceeding to our steamer to begin work when he was set upon by several of the strikers, and so severely beaten that he was confined to his bed for three weeks. There were many such cases, and men who could not be coerced by bodily fear on their own account were got at through their family affections, the wives and children of these men being threatened with maltreatment if they did not join the strikers.

12,794. Have you yourself heard men being threatened or seen them attacked?—Yes, frequently. I would explain that we at first drove the men down in buses, members of our staff, including myself, going in the buses to prevent the strikers entering them, and we frequently heard threats of violence shouted to the men, many of whom were so terrorised by the time they got to the quays that they refused to remain. On one occasion we endeavoured to march some men down from our office to a tug near by, but the strikers came and literally forced the men away. We then took to driving the men down in cabs, our staff going on the box beside the driver, and they stopped the cabs and forced the men out. We then adopted the plan of putting only three men into a cab at a time, two of ourselves going inside with them, and getting detectives to follow us in hansoms. On the first occasion that we adopted this plan I happened to be in one of the cabs which was followed by a yelling crowd over Jamaica Bridge, they threw stones into it and smashed the windows, and running alongside tried to force open the door. They continued to run with us, and when we got into a quiet street they stopped our cab, but my companion and

Earl of Derby—continued.

myself were out at once and arrested the fellow who had stopped the cab, and handed him over to the detectives, who immediately appeared, and whose presence alone enabled us to stop the crowd in their endeavour to force our men out of the cab. The man we had captured having a previous conviction against him for assault, did not get out on bail as usual, and got a sentence of imprisonment instead of the customary fine, which being paid by the men's Union does not act as a deterrent. We had any number of cases of respectable men seeking work who were so completely cowed by the threats of the strikers that they went right away home. This copy of statement, the accuracy of which we had confirmed by the railway authorities, shows how men were treated. (See Appendix 79.)

12,795. You were yourself knocked down by the men on strike, I believe?—Yes; and I have an extract from one of the newspaper reports of the case which gives a pretty fair account. For a moment I was in great jeopardy, and I was afterwards told that I might have been kicked to death if I had not had my chief assailant on top of me. He got out on 20*l.* bail, which he, or rather the Union, forfeited by his non-appearance, so that he got no punishment; but the man who tried to rescue him, having a previous conviction against him for assault, was not let out on bail, and got 60 days' imprisonment.

12,796. How is it that men attacked did not charge their assailants?—There are various reasons for this. Very frequently the attacks were made in the dark, and when the attacked party was alone, and even had it been otherwise it was practically impossible for those attacked to recognise their assailants, who were strangers to them. Even in the case of Glasgow men being attacked this held good, as the plan was adopted of sending pickets, &c. to parts of the harbour where they were not so well known, so that, for instance, the men who crowded round our sheds were not the men who usually worked there. The great difficulty, however, was that the men were deterred by fear of future consequences from charging men who assaulted them, even when they knew them. Police protection in such circumstances is quite inadequate—men are dogged and injured when no one is nigh to help.

12,797. How do you know men are afraid to bring charges against their assailants?—Many of the men have told me so, and I have seen men assaulted who immediately after asseverated most strongly that men whom I had myself seen assault them, and had charged, had never touched them. I have also taken the depositions of men who had been assaulted, and who promised faithfully to turn up the next day to give evidence, but who never appeared again. Some indeed, I did not expect to do so; they were so visibly terrified.

12,798. Have you any other proof that men are prevented by terror from taking work?—Yes; a very striking proof of it is that where we have had labour disputes simultaneously at

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

Glasgow and Liverpool, as we had in 1890, we can get hundreds of Glasgow quay labourers, including many of our own men, to go round to Liverpool to work, while, similarly, we get Liverpool men to come round to Glasgow, the explanation that the men themselves gave being that they could work without the same fear in a place where they were not known.

12,799. After the men returned to work, did you find that work went on pleasantly?—No; we were put to almost daily inconvenience by the delegates of the Union, who seemed anxious to discover fresh causes of annoyance, and when their requests were not complied with they adopted the plan of stopping our work, and this even when the dispute was between the men and themselves.

12,800. Can you give us any particulars of the cases in which they stopped the work?—When a man was found working in a squad and was not a member of their Union, if notice were not given early in the day that overtime would be worked, which was done when possible, when overtime was being wrought, and a number of their members idle, and we did not knock off a sufficient number to make room for them (this, I may say, was often done, and the men offered by the delegate found utterly incompetent); without any complaint on the part of the men, if the delegate thought that there was not a sufficient number of men in a squad, at the truck, at the stow in the shed, or in the hold, he would insist on more being employed. If a man were discharged by us for good reasons, the delegates threatened to stop the work if the reasons did not satisfy them. Meetings of the Union were held very frequently, and the men would be told to attend them, and would leave our work in a body, irrespective of its urgency. On one occasion when we did not allow some men to resume work the next day who had left it in such circumstances, McHugh, the general secretary of the society, came to the quay, and stopped all work for two hours, and only allowed it to be resumed when the men in question were taken on. In fact, the interference was perfectly intolerable, and our work would have been stopped altogether had not our quay managers humoured the delegates to an extent that would hardly have been tolerated had it been known.

12,801. Which Union do you refer to, and do you still work with its members?—The National Union of Dock Labourers, which we first knew of in 1889. We worked with its members till March 1890, but at that time, as you are doubtless aware, a great battle for free labour, brought on by the intolerable action of this same Union, was being fought at Liverpool. The shipowners were prevailing, and the Union officials thought to strengthen their hands at Liverpool by putting pressure on our firm at Glasgow, and they, therefore, without any warning whatever, stopped the work at our vessels at Glasgow, and told us that it would not be resumed until we made our Liverpool friends give in to their demands at Liverpool. This we could not do, but we saw the Union

Earl of Derby—continued.

officials here, and represented the unreasonableness and impolicy of their action, which they professed to deplore as much as we, and got them to communicate with McHugh, who was then in Liverpool, but to no use, the instructions being emphatic to continue to "boycot." We offered the men 1d. per hour more during the continuance of the battle at Liverpool if they would resume work, but without avail, and so anxious were we not to bring fresh labour into the city, that we refrained for a week from taking any steps to obtain same. A great number of our men expressed their strong disapproval of the action of their Union, but were afraid to start work with us. Men from elsewhere began to join our service, when a new complexion was put on matters by our getting a hint that the members of the Glasgow Harbour Labourers' Union should be approached, as they would probably be glad to take up our work.

12,802. Is that another Dock Labourers' Society?—Yes, one that has been established as far back as 1853, and includes the better class of dock labourers.

12,803. Did you approach them?—Yes, and found that they thoroughly disapproved of the tyrannical methods of action of the new Union, which body had indeed threatened them with extinction, unless they amalgamated with them. The result was an arrangement with them to take up the work at our steamers, we paying stevedores' rates of wages, 1d. more than the liners' rates, and working with stevedores' reduced gangs. We have worked pleasantly with them ever since, and a lot of the best of our old men, encouraged by having this Union at their back, have joined it and deserted the other.

12,804. How did the other Union act in the altered circumstances?—They were in a great state, and at once came and tried to get us to take their members back. We explained that as they had refused to do our work and had told us to serve ourselves, we had done so, and intended to stand by the men who had taken up our work, but for curiosity I asked the deputation, supposing we took you back, and that on account of any other dispute that took place in Liverpool or elsewhere instructions were given to again stop our work at Glasgow, although they had no dispute with us, would they follow such instructions, and I was told that they would have no alternative. Failing in their efforts to get taken back, they sent representatives, I understand, to the American ports to try and get the stevedores there to block our work, but again failed. Their president, McGhie, and general secretary, McHugh, then called on us to see if they could not induce us to take their members back, and threatened to do everything possible to injure us when they found we would not. The following is a very mild account of the interview, that I wrote to our Liverpool firm after it took place:—"Glasgow, 2nd April 1890, Messrs. McGhie and McHugh of Dock Labourers' Union and Boyd of Seamen and Firemen's Union called as

29 January 1892.]

MR. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

“deputation. McGhie was chief spokesman, and explained that object in calling was to let us understand as clearly as possible that in the event of our continuing to employ the ‘Old Society’ labourers or others instead of those of their Union, or employing non-union seamen or firemen, they would do everything that they possibly could to interfere with our business in every port of the Kingdom and in America, and that, in addition, they would do their very utmost to induce emigrants, in Ireland especially, not to travel by the ‘Allan Line.’ He said if they could not succeed otherwise they would try by payment to deprive us of our present labourers. He said that they regarded Allan Bros. of Liverpool and Leylands of Liverpool as head of the opposition at Liverpool, and they were determined to carry out the ‘war’ with us to the bitter end, if they spent the last penny of their funds in doing so. McGhie explained that it was he who had told the men to give as little work as possible in return for their wages and McHugh endorsed the sentiment. McGhie made it very plain that his Union was determined not to rest until they had it so strengthened that they controlled the work at every port in the Kingdom and compelled every shipowner to accede to their terms. He said that the Union men at Liverpool were simply working alongside non-unionists for the moment to serve their ends, and that the moment they were strong enough, say in a few weeks, they would not do so, and that the Liverpool shipowners were much mistaken if they thought they would not have to pay sweetly for the four weeks’ strike.”

12,805. How did these strikes affect your coaling, which you told us was done by a contractor?—It was completely stopped, as, although our contractor was willing, in order to implement his contract with us, to pay the advanced wages demanded, they would not work for him at our vessels.

12,806. Did he employ men of the same Union as you, and what happened when you were boycotted?—Yes, he employed members of the new Union, and they refused to continue to work for him when we were boycotted, but the moment the other Union took up our work they started, which we allowed them to do, as we had no desire to interfere with whom our contractor employed.

12,807. And have his men worked peaceably?—For a while they were troublesome, but I believe this was simply at the instigation of the officials of the Union, as the men themselves could give no reasons for their action, and now I believe none of them are in the Union at all, they are so disgusted with the trouble they got into.

12,808. And how did the seamen and firemen act in the emergency?—They also, by the direction of their officials, followed the action of the New Dock Labourers’ Union, and although they were regularly manning the vessels of

Earl of Derby—continued.

other owners loaded by members of the same Labourers’ Union who loaded ours, refused to join our ships.

12,809. What did you do in these circumstances?—We ignored the Seamen’s Union, resumed the practice of signing our men on board our ships, and got our crews despite the Union’s efforts to prevent us, the men themselves being in sympathy with us.

12,810. Did the Seamen’s Union oppose your signing your crews on board steamers?—Yes, and I hand herewith a copy of the notice they issued warning men not so to sign.

12,811. Why did they object?—Because if men only sign at the shipping office they have only one place to watch, and can most effectually intimidate the men. I would like to make a statement regarding this question. Apart from the great loss of time and money occasioned by crews, many of whom are employed all the time the vessels are in port, having to proceed to a distant shipping office to get paid off and to sign on their agreement, we have always found it an enormous disadvantage in cases of labour disputes that we should only be able to engage our crews at one recognised place instead of being, like all other employers of labour, free to engage them when and where we please; and we hold that the sailors’ interests will be sufficiently guarded if the articles of agreement be approved by the Shipping Office authorities, and if the paying off of the men be supervised by them. We once in case of a strike obtained, with great difficulty, permission to engage men at our own office, and as showing the audacity of Union officials I may mention that on that occasion I caught the secretary of the then Seamen’s Union in the act of forcing out of our office a seaman who had entered it to sign articles. We got him convicted and fined 10*l.*, which was at once paid out of the Union funds.

12,812. Have you anything further to say as to seamen?—Yes. I think there should be some more effectual means of punishing men who deliberately decline to implement their agreement. We have had frequent experience of men, whom we afterwards found were members and delegates of the Union, signing our articles of agreement to make us believe that we had got our crew and then never join, and we could do nothing to them. We had also much experience of delegates going down on board our steamers as if to sign articles, when their object was to get among the men and prevent them signing by threats. Only on one occasion, however, were we able to get conviction of such, when the man was fined 5*l.* or 14 days, the Union as usual paying the fine.

12,813. Can you not get damages from men failing to join?—The law does not hinder our trying, but practically we cannot. We can raise an action for proved loss, but it is practically impossible to recover unless the man be a married man with a furnished house, when by selling the furniture we may recover something, if when sold it is found that there

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

is a balance left after paying expenses and the landlord's claim for rent, which is preferential to ours.

12,814. Have you any remedies to suggest for this state of things?—The remedy would be to restore the power of imprisonment for failing to join a vessel without reasonable excuse, which worked perfectly satisfactorily before, and while I cannot hope for this power being given generally, I do not think it should be objected to where it can be shown that men deliberately engaged without intending to join. I think, too, we should have perfect liberty of contract as to the terms of our engagement with our men, and perfect liberty as to the periods for which we would make these, and, as I have already said, freedom to sign these engagements when and where we please without the presence of an officer of the Mercantile Marine, all of which at present the law forbids. The Mercantile Marine authorities might continue to have the supervision of the articles of engagement, to secure that these are quite clear and in proper form, and they might be present at the paying off of the men. The penalties against men signing articles under a false name should be rigorously enforced, and should be imprisonment instead of a fine, and they should be forbidden under penalty to sign on for one ship before they are clear of their engagements for another. The power which seamen have at present to give 48 hours' notice that they will not join a ship should be qualified by the proviso that this could only be exercised when there is a *bond fide* reasonable excuse for not joining. I would also give shipowners power to arrest the wages of men, wherever found, for expenses or loss incurred through their failure to join their ships or for deserting them in a home port, precisely as we at present have for desertion in a foreign port.

12,815. Have you had much trouble through unionists refusing to work with non-unionists?—A great deal, and some seamen and firemen have had to be prosecuted and fined for refusing duty after they had joined their ships; they refused because there were non-unionists on board.

12,816. Are your officers members of the Union?—No, although it was the aim of the Union to get officers under their control also.

12,817. You said something about not having weekly men among your dock labourers since the last strikes. What is the reason of this?—We found the new Union objected to weekly men, inasmuch as the only terms on which they would allow their members to arrange for a weekly wage were that they should get paid at the full ordinary hourly wages, which was out of the question. We also found that having weekly men had a tendency not to give us the same free offering of hourly men as when all our men had to be engaged daily. The manner, too, in which our weekly men broke their contracts with us removed a chief inducement to having these.

Earl of Derby—continued.

12,818. In regard to putting down intimidation, have you anything to propose?—I would suggest that the punishment for intimidation should be imprisonment without the option of a fine, which, being paid by the Union, is not deterrent. I would also treat as intimidation men following others in a crowd, shouting threats at them, and would prevent them collecting in crowds outside the places of employment. I would make all picketing illegal. With the facilities for making causes of dispute public, by means of the press and otherwise, there is no longer any reason in the excuse that picketing is necessary to warn men that they are going to take the place of men on strike. In our case we have, indeed, always been careful to let men quite understand that there was a labour dispute before we engaged them.

12,819. Have you any views as to legislative interference with the hours of labour?—I do not believe in the State interfering to fix hours of labour, unless for non-adults and females and those engaged in dangerous callings, or where long hours are dangerous to the public; and even in such circumstances we should be careful what we do, in case we legislate away a man's means of subsistence by not having due regard to foreign competition. It would be ruinous unless the workers can get other countries to act with them, which I am afraid is a Utopian idea at present. Speaking only for myself, I believe in short hours for hard physical work, if men would only work honestly for the time they do work. Many, however, who have had experience of the harder work and shorter hours of American ports, hold that these exhaust men sooner than the system in this country. I fear, too, that in great part the wish for shorter hours is but a means to more overtime. Whatever be done by combination or otherwise to shorten hours, or define a day's work, many businesses, such as our own, could not be carried on properly without full power to work as long hours as necessary.

12,820. I think since you prepared the evidence that you have given us you have read that given by Mr. Wilson of the Seamen's Union?—Yes.

12,821. Do you wish to refer to some statements made by him?—Yes.

12,822. Will you tell us what your experience of Mr. Wilson has been?—At our interviews with him he has in the main professed to be conciliatory, but our experience of him and his Union is that they have only been conciliatory so long as they felt they were not sufficiently strong to be otherwise, and that they have not hesitated, as my evidence has already shown, to use the full force of their organisation in the most coercive way.

12,823. We have heard something as to seamen's food, what have you to say as to that?—A dietary scale approved by the Board of Trade must form part of the ship's articles of agreement, but there is a more varied scale known as Dr. Spooner's, which is frequently

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

used as an alternative, and I believe it is the practice of most owners like ourselves not to stint their men with food. We never have complaints.

12,824. What have you to say as to desertions?—Desertions are most frequent, and in our experience increasing. Mr. Wilson would have you believe that this arises from bad treatment. This is not my explanation. Men desert only when they can re-engage for the run home at wages more than recouping them for any wages they forfeit through desertion. Such forfeiture never compensates the ship. Men, too, no doubt find the temptations of foreign ports such as San Francisco a further inducement to desert.

12,825. What have you got to say as to the employment of foreigners?—We have never preferred foreigners; and while the action of Wilson's Union is a strong inducement to employ such men, I am sure that British shipowners would always prefer equally well-behaved British tars.

12,826. Now as to the action of the Union officials in regard to discipline, have you anything to say about that?—Mr. Wilson denies that his officers have done anything subversive of discipline, and says he disapproves of unionists who have signed on refusing to sail because some non-unionist had been signed. Our experience on both these points is the reverse of this.

12,827. Now, what have you to say as to Mr. Wilson's statement as to men signing on board ship?—He gives as a principal objection that men signing on board do not see the men they are to sign with, as they go into the cabin one at a time. This has never been the case with our steamers at Glasgow, and yet we were the first to encounter his opposition to signing on board.

12,828. What have you to say as to the statements made by Mr. Wilson as to forcing men out of ships in foreign ports, and as to medical attendance and hospital expenses of invalided men left abroad?—I simply cannot understand how he should make such, as the actions he alleges are distinctly provided against by the Merchant Shipping Act.

12,829. What have you to say as to his allegations as to deduction for advances from wages of deceased seamen?—Distinct provision is made for such cases under the Merchant Shipping Act, the Board of Trade requiring to be fully satisfied as to deductions, and this is a form of account which our masters send from their various ports of sailing to meet the Board of Trade requirements, and I understand similar forms are generally used (*handing in form*).

12,830. Do you consider the increased wages in force are due to the action of the Union?—Not in the main, but of course this is a point that is very difficult either to prove or disprove, but in regard to Mr. Wilson's statement on this head, I would point out that in 1874, when we had no Union to deal with, wages from Glasgow were about as high as now, and those of firemen were even for a short time higher.

Earl of Derby—continued.

12,831. What have you to say as to Mr. Wilson's recommendations that the greater part of a seamen's wages should be paid by owners from week to week if desired by the seamen?—It is in my view most unwise, and is not suggested in the interests of the seaman. He would come into port with but little money due to him, and would have no assurance that his wages would not all have been spent in his absence. It would increase temptation to desert his ship in foreign ports whenever he could earn more money by doing so, and the result of all this in the end would be reduced wages to him; the economic law would compel this. I am in favour of permitting a part of his wages, not exceeding a half, to be given on long voyages by advance notes or allotment notes for providing outfit for himself and support of his family, but this should be a matter of agreement at the time he signs articles.

12,832. Have you anything else to add to what you have stated?—I would just like to make a slight reference to Mr. Plimsoll's remarks the other day. These remarks have been made so shortly before my coming here that I have had little time to prepare anything. I would wish in the first place to point out that as he is reported in the "Glasgow Herald," Mr. Plimsoll's statement is eminently misleading. In the first place one would judge from his remarks that he attributes the serious loss of which he complained as arising mainly from vessels which had deckloads. It is no doubt known to Mr. Plimsoll that a very small portion of the losses are due to such causes, the great bulk of losses of life in British shipping being indeed due to strandings and collisions. He also gives the statement on the authority of Mr. Chamberlain, as if it had never been either challenged or refuted. Now, it is on record that Mr. Chamberlain's figures, based as they were on the information supplied by the late Mr. Gray of the Board of Trade, were immediately challenged by shipowners, and in their opinion utterly refuted, but I would specially point out that Mr. Gray himself, at the last sitting of the Royal Commission, which sat subsequent to Mr. Chamberlain's statement, himself admitted that one in 76 would be a more correct figure to give than one in 60. It was also shown by shipowners at the time that the figures as to the number of seamen employed were most misleading, and that 250,000 at least instead of 200,000—the basis that Mr. Chamberlain took—would have been more accurate. It was also shown from the statistics that were given at that time that four-fifths of the vessels lost were vessels under 500 tons tonnage, which are really not those that concern the great foreign marine of Great Britain. I would also like specially to point out that the average of years on which Mr. Chamberlain's figures were at that time taken was very strongly called in question. If I recollect aright it was based on averages of three years. A short average like that is most misleading, because we all know there are some years that from exceptional causes have

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

very great losses. For instance, in the year 1881-82, the weather was exceptionally severe, and as a proof of this I cannot do better than mention, that the loss of life from fishing-boats rose from 79 in 1879-80 to 592 in that year. The figures that Mr. Chamberlain took in regard to foreign shipping were based on an average of five years. I would like to quote the exact words in which Mr. Chamberlain qualified his reference to the foreign statistics, which I think in all fairness should have been quoted by Mr. Plimsoll. "I really am not justified in asking the House to rely on these figures, but so far as they go they would seem to show that loss of life is less in foreign sea service than in our own." I would also like to point out that in giving the foreign figures as one in 271, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Plimsoll in adopting his figures, takes several nations and slumps them together, and it is in this way that he is able to make his average 271, because he is able to include in these figures the case of Italy, where it seems that the loss of life was one in 454 of the seamen employed. In Italy Mr. Chamberlain pointed out the vessels were chiefly small vessels sailed by the owners. But in Germany, which is one of the principal foreign maritime nations, the loss was one in 123. I would further point out that we have really no accurate statistics, as Mr. Chamberlain himself admitted, in regard to these foreign marines, and when such very striking errors were found to have been made in British statistics, which are admittedly kept with much greater care than those of foreign nations, I think we are entitled to assume that there is equally a likelihood of even greater errors in foreign figures. I would also like to point out that the figures which Mr. Chamberlain gave were some 10 years old, and the following figures are those taken from the Wreck Abstract issued by the Board of Trade in July 1891, where they give the loss in 1884-85 as one in 164, 1885-86 as one in 223, 1886-87 as one in 142, 1887-88 as one in 157, 1888-89 as one in 200, 1890-91 as one in 207.

12,833. Is there anything else you wish to say?—I have nothing else.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,834. You have suggested that the power of imprisonment for failing to join a vessel without reasonable excuse should be restored "where it can be shown that men deliberately engaged without intending to join"; how can you show anything of that kind?—We have had cases of men repeatedly signing on ships and repeatedly failing to join. We have even had cases of men signing for one of our steamers, and before she had sailed from the port of Glasgow some of the men have signed articles on for another steamer sailing on the same day as ours, and sailed in her without any notice to us whatever that they were not going to join our vessel.

12,835. That would be rather a proof of fact than of intention, would it not; you cannot

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

prove intention?—I think you can prove intention by men's actions.

12,836. Do you mean that supposing a man signed twice in that way he should be liable to imprisonment?—Yes. I think if a man, supposing he is shown regularly to sign on vessels and should regularly fail to join, we would be entitled to hold that that man intentionally did it.

12,837. Then your suggestion is that a certain number of repetitions of signing without joining should justify imprisonment?—I should say that was one way. I have not considered all the ways in which we would prove intention. If we had a law providing that a man were to be punished if he deliberately signed without the intention of joining, I think that we would be able to devise the means of bringing it home to him.

12,838. You also ask for greater facilities for signing agreements with your sailors?—Yes.

12,839. But why—is not the facility that is now accorded you of signing on board your ships sufficient?—It is not. The delegates of the Union are able to watch our ships almost equally as well as the shipping offices, because they ascertain at the shipping office when they are going to sign on board our ship, and that is a known spot.

12,840. So long as the law provides that such agreements must be signed in the presence of an officer of the Mercantile Marine is it not almost necessary that they must be signed in some known spot?—Possibly it is necessary; that is why we have suggested that the law should be amended—that the reasons no longer exist why we should require to go to a fixed place to sign. Let the officer of the Mercantile Marine, if necessary, supervise the agreement, but leave us free to sign on men when and where we please.

12,841. How could the agreements be supervised if they are not signed in the presence of the officer?—The agreement could be got in the form the shipowner proposed to have it signed; it could be lodged at the Mercantile Marine Office in duplicate, if necessary, and initialled by them before the shipowner was allowed to sign the men on.

12,842. Then it would be impossible to alter the agreement when the men came to sign it?—Yes; we should be quite prepared to take the risk of that.

12,843. But the men might wish for an alteration?—Then if we wished alterations we would have to go back to the shipping office. As a matter of fact there are practically never any alterations in a ship's articles. The question of wages is the one that is the matter in dispute.

12,844. The question of food might also be in dispute, surely?—I never heard of the question of food being a matter of dispute.

12,845. Do they always accept what you propose to give them?—We always put in the Board of Trade scale.

12,846. You are aware, surely, that there is no Board of Trade scale?—There is a scale authorised by the Board of Trade.

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

12,847. You are aware that the form of agreement simply specifies certain provisions without at all specifying the quantity of those provisions which should be given, or which of them should be selected?—I have here a copy of a ship's articles, and you will find in it the quantities of the different articles stated (*handing in copy*).

12,848. No; the quantities are not stated. This is simply a printed table with the days of the week, and the articles—bread, beef, pork, tinned meats, and so-and-so; without specifying either which of those articles should be given or how much of those articles should be given?—Excuse me, but I think you will find the figures are filled in.

12,849. The figures are filled in by you and the sailors?—They are filled in by the Mercantile Marine Office before signing.

12,850. The figures are filled in by the Mercantile Marine Office in accordance with the wish of the parties who agree; is that not so?—They are filled in regularly in those articles by the Mercantile Marine; but even were it as you said it would simply mean that we would fill in our dietary scale before getting it initialled by the Mercantile Marine, just as at present.

12,851. Yes, but do you not know that as a matter of fact the law does not provide either for the quantity of the articles to be given or for the articles which should be given?—I know that the Act simply provides that there shall be a scale of provisions approved by the Board of Trade. There is a certain scale of provisions which has been approved by the Board of Trade, and that is the one which is regularly put in the ship's articles, because, naturally, a scale having been approved by the Board of Trade, it is in the ship's interest to put that in, because it at once avoids any question being raised by the Board of Trade. We are accustomed to feed our men on a more liberal scale than that Board of Trade scale.

12,852. Do you suppose that you can be punished if you make any kind of agreement that you choose with your men as to the food that is to be given?—Not if the Board of Trade allowed it; but, as I understand, if we put in a scale different from that which you have there it would be open for the Board of Trade to object to that scale; it would have to be subject to their approval, and that is why I say that a ship has no interest in putting in a scale different from that which has already been approved by you.

12,853. Is there not some rule at present under which a seaman is not allowed to sign again in a port for six weeks if he fails to go in a ship which he has signed on?—There is a rule that he is not allowed to sign—I do not think there is any provision for six weeks—he is not allowed to sign until he has signed off another vessel; but it is the commonest practice in the world for the men to sign under different names.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

12,854. How can any law possibly prevent that?—If it were detected the man should be punished.

12,855. He could be punished now, could he not?—As I explained, there is no practical punishment owing to abolition of imprisonment. If we choose to prosecute them and try to recover anything from them, if they have any means we could recover from them, but as a matter of fact we cannot recover anything. What I do know is this, the Mercantile Marine Office regularly allow men to sign on for another ship when they know that the man has failed to join the ship for which he first signed. All that they do when they know it is that they tell the master who is taking the crew of the fact, but they do not object to the man's signing.

12,856. Then is it not open to the master to refuse to sign the men?—Yes, of course it is, but the master of the succeeding ship has no interest in the subject; he wants to get his man.

12,857. But if he chooses to accept a man who has shown himself untrustworthy, does he not deserve to incur any loss—that follows?—Yes, but it is not that man that I am interested in; it is the man previously—the man the seaman has failed to join—it is he who is the sufferer.

12,858. You say it is a constant practice of men to sign and resign without intending to join ships?—Yes; the proof of it is shown by the desertions. I stated that desertions are increasing. I may mention that in 1877, which was I think one of the last years when we had the power of imprisoning men who failed to join, there were 22,930 men signed on at the port of Glasgow, and out of those only 267 failed to join; whereas in the year 1891, 7,367 were signed for the Allan Line of vessels alone, that is one-third of the total number that were signed on in 1877, and yet of that reduced number no less than 353 (or nearly a half more than the desertions for the three times greater number) failed to join.

12,859. Why do you consider that the presence of an officer of the Mercantile Marine at the signature of an agreement is not now necessary whereas it was necessary formerly?—Because the men are so very much better educated now, and there are means of publicity in regard to grievances; and then there is the fact that they are combined, and that people are looking after them. There are the short voyages, too, now. It is quite different from what it was in former times when men were ignorant.

12,860. You think the men are competent to take care of themselves?—Perfectly competent. I think a man, too, who is earning 4*l.* 15*s.* and his food, which is making about 7*l.* a month of it, ought to be able to take care of himself.

Mr. Plimsoll.

12,861. You were speaking of the numbers of fishermen's lives lost; in one year you said there were 79, and in the following year about 500?—Yes.

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Plimssoll—continued.

12,862. And you spoke of that as justifying a good deal of caution or scepticism as to the returns of loss of life generally?—No: I was arguing from that that short periods of series of years were apt to be misleading, as it might so happen that they might include a year or two of excessive losses arising from exceptional causes, and I mentioned these two years as being typical of such exceptions.

12,863. Are you aware that the loss of life in fishing boats is recorded separately from the loss of life in the mercantile marine?—Yes, but I was instancing that matter of the greatly increased loss of fishermen in that particular year as proof that that particular year was a year of exceptional severity.

12,864. No doubt, as to the fishing boats?—Yes.

12,865. Do you think that you were justified then from that in inferring a like wide range in the totals of losses in the mercantile marine?—What I argued was that 1881-82 was a year of exceptionally severe weather; that was the statement that I made, and in proof of it I instanced the fact that while in 1879-80 only 79 fishermen's lives were lost, in 1881-82 592 such lives were lost, proving that there must have been exceptional severity of weather in the latter year.

12,866. Would that not rather be a reason for contending that the loss of life in fishing vessels varied very much. Do you think that you are justified in inferring that there is a similar divergency or range in the loss of ocean going vessels?—I most unquestionably hold that exceptionally severe weather must have something considerable to do with the losses of life at sea, and I instanced that as a proof that that particular year was a year of exceptionally severe weather.

18,867. In fishing boats?—Well, if it is to be argued that exceptionally severe weather only applies to certain vessels, that may be so, but I hold that exceptionally severe weather will apply all over.

12,868. You objected also to the averages being computed on very short terms, but in some cases is that not unavoidable? For example, when the committee in 1843 were anxious to ascertain the effects upon the loss of life of the legislation which prohibited deck-loading, deck-loading had only been prohibited for three years and they could not take a longer term than that. Do you say there was any unfairness in taking those three years and contrasting them with the three years preceding 1839, when the deck-loading practice was not interfered with?—You take in the case of foreigners a longer period of five years, and do not give us any particulars to enable us to compare the foreigners equally. I think that it is unfair to take a short period, for the reason that I have mentioned—that one exceptional year of severity may very largely swell your average. It is unfair to take a short average, but if you do take three years for the one you certainly should take three years for the other, for the foreign statistics as well as for the British statistics.

Mr. Plimssoll—continued.

12,869. It was no question of foreign vessels at all?—I beg your pardon; it was very much foreign vessels.

12,870. Parliament was anxious to ascertain the effect of certain legislation upon our own ships, which had only been in operation for three years, and there was no longer term available; there was nothing unfair surely in giving the three years and contrasting them with the three years preceding the change in the law. It was shown that the loss of life average so far as the three years was concerned had been 306, whilst deck-loading was allowed, and that it was reduced to 106 since it had been prohibited?—The point that I was referring to was not deck-loading; it was the point that Mr. Plimssoll made—that the loss in British shipping was one in 60, while that in foreign shipping was only one in 271 employed. I pointed out that in the way he had put it it was represented as if this loss arose in connection with deck-loading, whereas the losses in deck-laden vessels are but a very small fraction of the losses on which these figures are based.

12,871. Would you be surprised to hear that Mr. Plimssoll did not infer from deck-loading to the whole subject, but he gave deck-loading as a part of the subject?—Well, I refer to the report in the "Glasgow Herald," and that is all that I can speak to; it certainly gives that impression. I am glad to hear that it is erroneous, as it makes his statement not quite so misleading as it otherwise would be.

12,872. You are of opinion that it is misleading in any case?—Yes, I consider that it is misleading.

Mr. Bolton.

12,873. The change that you made under the circumstances that you have detailed for men working for you was that you raised your rate of wages to the rate paid by the stevedores?—Yes.

12,874. The effect of that was that you got the same work done by a more limited number of men?—Yes, that is the expectation. Of course it may not always be the case.

12,875. What has been the pecuniary result with you?—We have no such statistics as would enable us to judge of that, but you would perhaps be able to judge it sufficiently if I give you the number in different gangs. For instance, in working an elevator under the old system we would work with 16 men, whereas with stevedores' gangs we usually only employ 14. In working flour formerly we would have 24 men, now we would have 20; in working general cargo we would have 19 men, now we would have 17; in working ordinary loading where we would have 16 men formerly we now would only have 14.

12,876. And if you take the reduced number of men and compare that with the increased price the result must be just about the same?—Very much the same.

12,877. You cannot say absolutely?—No, not absolutely, because sometimes from pressure of of work we still employ larger gangs.

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

12,878. Have you at any time a deficiency of labour on the quays?—Sometimes if there happens to be a large rush of vessels there may be a little scarcity, but as a rule we have a full number; of course the fact that our business is very large makes the men come more about our berths, and we get pretty well the first call.

12,879. Have you at any time or frequently any excessive number of men—of casuals waiting and unable to obtain employment?—I would not say excessive; of course at times there will be unemployed, but Glasgow is in this peculiar position, as I daresay you know pretty well that the labour is absorbed in a number of ways. Many of our dock labourers go to the shipbuilding yards, and, in the winter time, when some of the work falls off a little and the men who are less regularly employed would be apt to be left out, a number go and get employment in the foundries and do not come down to the quays at all. Then the fact that we work, as a rule, shorter hours in the winter time spreads the work over a greater number of people.

12,880. As a matter of fact there is not an excessive amount of labour in Glasgow?—No, I should say not.

12,881. You spoke of a benefit society, I think?—Yes.

12,882. And of the rates that are given by your firm, I think, in cases of accidents?—Yes.

12,883. Am I to understand that those rates would have been higher had it not been for the imposition of the legislation which has taken place in reference to employers' liability which has caused you to expend money in insuring yourselves out of it?—We could hardly compare the thing, because we had no society of this kind before the Employers' Liability Act. What we used to do was to deal with each case on its merits.

12,884. And as a matter of fact can you state whether your contributions now and before the passing of the Employers' Liability Act are larger or smaller?—I do not know that they are any larger, probably about the same, but we are saved an infinite lot of worry; it is handed over to the insurance company, and it is a great relief to us.

12,885. You would object to a further extension of that Act probably?—Yes, we think it has gone quite far enough already. We think it is just an encouragement to litigation; certain classes of lawyers get hold of the men and worry the employers.

12,886. With respect to the rates of wages paid now in the port, I think you said that at some period in the seventies the rates of wages were as high, or rather higher than they are at the present moment?—Yes, they were actually higher for a short time, and they were as high for a considerable period.

12,887. You spoke of the time when wages were raised, or attempted to be raised, by the action of the Sailors and Firemen's Union, and which I think failed?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

12,888. You subsequently raised the wages?—Yes.

12,889. Did you raise those on the demand of the men, or simply in consequence of the scarcity of the men?—Labour was scarce and we advanced it.

12,890. So that it was the demand which caused you to raise it?—Yes, that was just it.

12,891. The demand for labour?—Yes.

12,892. And not the demands of the labourers?—No.

12,893. In reference to the payment of wages to these men, you pay them every night, do you not?—Yes, every night.

12,894. Do you pay them at your own office?

—We pay them at our own pay-box at the quay.

12,895. Always at the same place?—Yes.

We pay them whenever they are knocked off.

12,896. For a time, I think I may say from your evidence, you did endeavour to arrange matters with the officials of the Union?—Yes.

12,897. And you say that that was utterly useless?—Yes; they made agreements with us and did not keep them.

12,898. And you have now set them at defiance?—Yes.

12,899. In the Clyde I think there is no free federation?—Yes; there is the Shipping Federation.

12,900. The Shipping Federation extends to there?—Yes, but we are not in it; the regular Atlantic liners are not in it; practically all the other shipping of the port is, I believe, in the hands of the Shipping Federation.

12,901. It was stated here, I believe, by Mr. Wilson that they looked upon Glasgow as a union port?—Yes, I believe it was one of their strong ports. One of the reasons for that is that the state of the quays lends itself very readily to intimidation, as you know there are long lines of open quays.

12,902. But does that state of matters still continue?—We have had no strike now for some considerable period, so that there has been no occasion for intimidation.

12,903. You have no difficulty with the men now; they do not object to serve with non-union men?—Nominally they do not, and in reality I believe they do; they make it so hot for a non-unionist if he gets on board a ship that the non-unionist as a rule is glad to join the Union.

12,904. When engaging men for your own vessels do you inquire whether they are unionists or not?—No, never; we sign any suitable men on who come forward.

12,905. Do you know as a matter of fact whether you employ unionists and non-unionists in the same ship?—I do not know as a matter of fact; we have a very strong impression that at the moment they are principally union men who join the ships.

12,906. You are very anxious to revert to the old law against desertion. Could your object not be attained by some other method than that—by joining the Federation, for example, and employing only men who will engage to serve with

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

non-union men?—We do not know about that; we never have joined the Federation, and we do not specially care about combining with others to manage our own business; we do not think that we should be put in such a position that we have to join an association to get just treatment for our men.

12,907. No, but you are seeking a change in the law in order to attain a certain end?—Yes.

12,908. If that end could be attained by joining the Federation, why should you not prefer that?—We think that we want a very reasonable thing. I have said that we practically do not hope that the old law of imprisonment can be re-enacted, but where a man can be shown to deliberately sign on a vessel without joining—if it is, in fact, fraud—we do not see why he should not be imprisoned precisely as for any other fraud.

12,909. And assuming that you would agree to give a certain dietary to your men, or some other engagement which could be shown in the end had not been fulfilled, would you object to the owners of those vessels being subjected to imprisonment?—I do not know as to imprisonment; we would not object to be punished.

12,910. But you would like to select the punishment?—If it were so you must remember that we would not be doing that by our own action. If we deliberately made arrangements not to fulfil our contract to feed our men according to our scale, I, as a shipowner, would not hesitate to say that I would allow you to imprison me, but the position might be that we might put the proper provisions on board, pay for them, and send them away, and another servant, a fellow-servant of these men, might through some swindling even sell our good stores and substitute bad ones.

12,911. But the responsibility would come upon you, and properly so?—It would be very hard to make the responsibility come upon us in a civil contract of that sort.

12,912. Still it is a civil contract in both cases, and why should not the responsibility be the same?—I think that it is not exactly the same. The man has his action entirely in his own hands; we have not.

12,913. Have you any evidence to show that excessive deck-loading has not increased loss of life?—I have not gone into the figures of deck-loading; all I can say is that we have been carrying deck-loads of cattle for the last 15 or 16 years, and we have not had any single case of loss of life or injury to life arising from these deck-loads, and we are the largest carriers of cattle in the kingdom.

12,914. What is applicable to your well-found ships you think is applicable to every tramp?—I have very little doubt it is. I do not mean to say from that that there is no loss of life from deck-loading. I do not say that, because I have not inquired into the question, but what I say is that in our experience we do carry deck-loads with perfect safety.

12,915. You refer merely to your own vessels?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

12,916. With respect to signing articles on board ship or elsewhere, is it a common thing for the articles to be altered at the time of signing on?—I do not think there is ever such a thing as altering the articles.

12,917. It is fixed beforehand?—It is fixed beforehand. As I said in reply to Sir Michael, it is practically only the question of wages over which disputes arise.

12,918. And what is the benefit to the men of having a marine officer present when they sign on, assuming that the articles had already been approved and initialled by the marine board on shore?—I do not know that there is any benefit; we hold that there is no benefit; that it is not necessary.

12,919. But if you could obtain the advantage of engaging your men as other employers engage them—when and where you please—you would be willing, I presume, to agree to any necessary provisions, such as that the articles were such as the Board of Trade and the shipping office would approve?—Certainly.

Mr. Austin.

12,920. Since the establishment of the Seamen's Union are you not aware that the wages of the seamen have increased to a great extent, and that their condition has been materially improved?—I do not know anything in our experience showing that their condition has materially improved. Wages have advanced, but we do not consider that that is owing to the Seamen and Firemen's Union.

12,921. Is it not a fact that there is more attention paid by shipowners at the present time to the seamen's condition than formerly?—I am not aware of any change in that respect.

12,922. Are you aware also that the Board of Trade or the various shipping masters in the United Kingdom have received great assistance from the officials of the Seamen's Union?—I am not aware of any such fact.

12,923. Arising out of a question put by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach as regards the seamen not joining a ship without becoming imprisoned, are you aware at the present time that it is within the power of the various shipping masters (and that power has been exercised by them) not to sign seamen for six weeks?—I do not know as to that provision, but I do know that men regularly sign within a very much shorter period.

12,924. The shipping master has the power at present?—I do not know that he has that power; I was not aware of it, but what I do know is that he does not exercise it at Glasgow.

12,925. I have seen it exercised?—That may be.

12,926. As regards the signing of men on board ship, is it not for the protection of the seamen that they are signed on in the shipping office?—I have no doubt that that originally was the object, but we do not consider that there is any protection now, and we are quite satisfied that the reason the Seamen and Firemen's Union

29 January 1892.]

Mr. J. SMITH PARK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Austin—continued.

object is that it gives them greater facilities to watch and intimidate the seamen.

12,927. If the State formerly thought it was necessary to have the seamen signed on in the shipping office, what change has taken place which makes it necessary for you now to sign them on board ship?—I say that the spread of education has made seamen very much better able to look after their interests than they were 40 or 50 years ago when these arrangements were made. I should be very sorry to think it otherwise.

12,928. You know that in signing on board a ship seamen will not pay that attention to the reading of the articles that they will when a shipping master is there?—I do not know any such thing, but as a matter of fact the shipping master is present on board the ship when they sign the articles, so that there is no difference in that respect.

12,929. Yes, but in your evidence you say you should have "freedom to sign these engagements when and where we pleased" without the presence of an officer of the "Mercantile Marine"?—Yes; that is what we wish, but I understood you were referring to the ships at the present time.

12,930. As I have stated, when signing on board a ship seamen would not pay that attention to the reading of the articles that they would pay in a shipping office?—That is merely a matter of opinion, and I should say that the contrary would probably be the fact—that when the seaman felt that he had to look to himself to guard his own interests he would be quite as likely to attend to the articles of the agreement even more carefully than when a shipping master is present.

12,931. And it is for the protection of the seamen that the State has found it necessary to have the seamen signed on in the shipping office?—Yes, but the fact that the State 40 or 50 years ago might have found it necessary to do is not necessarily a reason why it should consider it either necessary or desirable in the present day.

12,932. As regards intimidation, are you acquainted with the law at present in existence?—I am, in a general way.

12,933. Are you aware that in the present state of the law you can get convictions for that?—No. I know that in actual practice you cannot get convictions. There is a provision in the law which was referred to by Mr. Cornuck very fully, which practically renders the Act nugatory.

12,934. A man at the present time, if he is brought up for intimidation, and if it is proved against him, can be convicted?—Yes, but the difficulty is proof; and we hold from our ex-

Mr. Austin—continued.

perience that the congregation of hundreds of men around the place of work howling and shouting at men, although it is practically impossible to bring the conviction of that home to individuals, is intimidation of the severest kind.

12,935. Yes, but the present law deals with that very severely?—We know that in practice it does not deal with it, because we have tried again and again and have never been able to succeed, and we say that there is no reason in the altered circumstances of the day for such a congregating of the men to intimidate in that way.

12,936. You say you would make all picketing illegal; how would you define picketing?—I would say collecting about places of work, and meeting the men on their way to and from their work in crowds.

12,937. Suppose a couple of men met some seamen coming out of a ship; would you call that picketing?—No; I do not know that we could call that picketing.

12,938. Would you say if six men met them you would call it picketing?—It is difficult to say the exact number, but I should say any number that has a tendency to intimidate men—to frighten men. Picketing was permitted, as I understand, for the purpose of allowing men to inform others that strikes were taking place, and that therefore they should not go take the place of the men on strike. Now, I hold that with the facilities for letting men know of strikes now-a-days by the press and otherwise there is no occasion for men to congregate about the places of work and meet the men, because we know perfectly that that simply means that they tell the men, "You will get your head broken if you work here." That is what picketing means in practice.

12,939. Are you aware that in the recent strikes which have taken place seamen were brought from one port to another under false pretences?—I have heard that stated; I do not know that it has been proved; but speaking for ourselves I know that it is the habit of seamen and others, when they come to a port and are persuaded by the men on strike to leave, to state frequently that they did not know there was a strike, when we know for a positive fact that it was most clearly explained to them before they came that there was a strike.

12,940. In the cases that I have mentioned would you have a law against the shipowner for bringing men under false pretences from one port to another?—I fancy that any man is liable under the common law for making engagements with another man under false pretences. I do not profess to be a lawyer, but I fancy he can be got at if he really makes false pretences.

The witness withdrew.

29 January 1892.]

Mr. S. FISHER.

[Continued.]

Mr. SAMUEL FISHER called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

12,941. We understand that you represent the Carliff, Penarth, and Barry Coal Trimmers' Association?—Yes, I am the secretary of that Society.

12,942. What is the nature of the work done by the members of the society?—Our men trim or stow coal and coke into the holds of vessels.

12,943. You are paid by the ton?—We have a tariff; we are paid by the ton.

12,944. What districts does your Association include?—Cardiff, Penarth, and Barry Decks.

12,945. How many men are employed at this work?—I should say about 1,600.

12,946. And how many of those are in your Union?—Practically about 1,200—about three-fourths of them.

12,947. Now, I believe you have come here to say that the work on which they are engaged is dangerous?—It is dangerous.

12,948. And that many of the vessels that you have to load are not properly constructed for the trade?—That is our experience and our opinion as men having to do the work. We ask that the steamers and vessels be better ventilated, and we ask that there be more holes cut between decks in the case of three-decked and two-decked vessels and steamers, and better ventilation made.

12,949. In order to let out the gases that may be explosive or dangerous?—Yes, that is so.

12,950. Since your Society was formed in May 1888 to the end of last year, that is between two years and a half and three years, how many members have you had on your accident fund?—324 up to November last.

12,951. And what did they receive?—Upwards of 834*l.*; the exact money was 834*l.* 14*s.*

12,952. How many have been killed or died from accidents at their work?—We had six members up to November last.

12,953. And what have their friends or families received from the Society?—We paid over to them 36*l.*

12,954. The danger, I understand, arises from explosions and from ships taking fire?—That is so.

12,955. In a paper before me you have given three cases in which vessels took fire apparently while they were being unloaded?—While being loaded.

12,956. In one of those cases there was a loss of life—two men killed and others hurt?—Yes.

12,957. In the second and third cases no one was hurt; but men lost their tools?—Yes. I have other cases since that, particular cases which have been brought under my notice.

12,958. And you think the danger would either be got rid of or at any rate very much diminished if holes were cut in the decks to let out the gases?—That is so, and of course a better means of exit for the men in case of fire or explosions. The men as a rule stand in a particular spot under the decks to trim the coal, and we think that a hole should be cut

Earl of Derby—continued.

immediately over them for them to escape should anything happen.

12,959. You have found the shipowners as a rule not unwilling to meet you, you think?—They have been fairly good to us, and I have tried to meet us, I think, fairly well. We have very little complaint to make; some of them think that we put them to unnecessary expense and trouble, but taken altogether they have acted very fairly.

12,960. Then it is not so much because you have a great deal to complain of as regards the the employers, but on general grounds of security you think it desirable that the authorities should see to this cause of danger being removed?—Yes, we think that it would be better all round, and cause less friction perhaps, if the authorities insisted upon these holes being cut in the boats and vessels.

12,961. You have had no strikes, as I understand, since your Society was formed?—No, we have had no strike in our trade at all. I have been connected with the dock for about 10 years and I do not remember a strike at all among the trimmers.

12,962. You have what you call a disputes committee which, as I understand, is practically a board of conciliation?—That is so. It consists of one colliery proprietor, one shipowner, and one trimmer or a man representing the trimmers.

12,963. And that body has acted satisfactorily in deciding matters in dispute?—We have had several cases before that committee, and so far, as far as I know personally, it has given every satisfaction to all parties.

12,964. You have got an advance of wages about 14 months ago, I understand?—Yes, 1st December 12 months.

12,965. How much was it?—We had a penny per ton rise on all vessels over 1,000 ton—not steamers, but sailing vessels only; a penny per ton on all sailing vessels carrying upwards of 1,000 tons of coal. We also had a small rise of a farthing per ton on all vessels carrying less than 200 tons of coal—very small vessels.

12,966. You asked for that increase and had a conference with the employers, and the matter was amicably settled?—That was so. We appointed delegates and met a committee of the merchants and went into the matter, and had several meetings, and the matter was decided amicably.

12,967. Then in point of fact the only thing which you complain of is what you think an unnecessary liability to accidents, which might be diminished by Government enforcing precautions?—Really we do not complain very much at all. It is not in the matter of complaint, only to do away with a little friction, just to have that matter put right.

Mr. Bolton.

12,968. I see that the advance that you got in 1890 is 1*d.* per ton on all sailing vessels

29 January 1892.]

Mr. S. FISHER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

carrying over 1,000 tons?—That is what I said.

12,969. And a furthering on all vessels carrying less than 200 tons?—That is so.

12,970. There are two things that I would ask you to explain. What is the rate of wages paid between the 1,000 tons and the 200? Is there any advance there?—No advance at all. We tried to get one halfpenny per ton on those vessels from 500 tons to 1,000 tons, but that was one of the things that we had to give way in.

12,971. Between those two points there has been no change?—There has been no advance at all.

12,972. Would you also say why is the increase more in the case of vessels of 1,000 tons than in vessels of 200 tons; is it more labour or what?—Yes; the extra labour seems to be in very small vessels, because the facilities in small vessels are not so good for loading, and the large vessels are very much heavier to work. Their hatches are farther apart because of the vessel having greater length, and the men have to throw the coal sometimes three and sometimes four times in order to get it into position.

12,973. That accounts for both advances, and for no advance in the one case?—Yes; it was considered by the merchant, and also by the men, after talking the matter over, that the 500 tons vessels, or from 500 to 1,000 tons, were not so heavy after all to work, and that was one of the points we gave way in.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

12,974. Is there a greater danger of explosions while the ships are being loaded than after they are loaded and at sea?—I would not like to say there is a greater danger. I do not think so, because when they are loaded the hatches are put on, and of course the gas would generate quicker.

12,975. While they are being loaded, by cutting these openings I understand that sufficient ventilation is secured to obviate the danger of explosion?—Yes.

12,976. But have not these openings got to be closed when the vessel gets to sea?—I do not know about those between decks. Of course the upper hatches are battened down, but I do not suppose they would put the hatches on the small holes. We only ask for small holes, just room enough for a man to come up; just 2 feet by 18 inches would be large enough; and that is all we ask.

12,977. Merely between decks?—Merely between decks.

12,978. Of course while you are loading, the hatchways give you ventilation above deck?—No; that is the difficulty. You see we have to oblige shipowners, and also merchants, in getting despatch. We are living in a fast age, and we have to give despatch. They say, well, here is a steamer coming in, and we want her out again; sometimes the next tide. At any rate the shipowners do not wish their vessels kept in dock

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

very long, and so they hurry the work along, and the hatchways are completely blocked up; and sometimes the men have as much as 100 or 150 tons of coal over them. They are completely buried, and all the hatchways blocked up, so that there is no air going down into the hatchways.

Mr. Courtney.

12,979. What were the circumstances of the origin of this affair which happened on the "Souverain"?—I should say the accumulation of gas, and she had also been carrying petroleum.

12,980. Did it begin with an explosion?—I was not there at the time, but I went across to Penarth in the morning to attend to my work. I was then engaged as a foreman. I was secretary of this society, but I was also doing other work, and the men that I had charge of were loading this vessel. The fire had got complete hold of the vessel when I got there in the morning, and I could not get any very satisfactory account of the origin of the fire. The man who was in charge was scared, and had gone away home; but, however, I should think that it was an accumulation of gas, and that the men whilst working, or after they had just left the hold, used the candles for trimming, and that there must have been a slight explosion and fire after it. I cannot account for it in any other way.

12,981. It is rather conjectural?—Yes; I cannot give a definite reason.

12,982. What would be the average wage earned from year's end to year's end by your men?—I should think I would be safe in saying from 35s. to 2l. a week.

12,983. They earn that on an average throughout the year?—Yes, I should think so.

12,984. From 35s. to 2l. a week?—Yes.

12,985. What would their ages run from?—Young men commence to work, I should say, from about 19 or 20, and of course they continue working as long as they can work. We have some men on our books who are 60 and 65 years of age.

12,986. Are they mostly people born in Cardiff, or do they come to Cardiff from the neighbourhood or how?—Of course Cardiff is a very growing town; it is growing very rapidly, and they are not all natives, but we have some from all parts of the country, I should think. Many Welshmen are employed, men who have formerly worked in the coal mines. I fancy these men make the best coal-trimmers, as they have experience of working coal.

12,987. In moving coal?—Yes.

12,988. Would you say it was impossible for a man earning 35s. or 40s. a week to effect some saving, beginning at 19?—Not if he was of temperate habits; but it is quite little enough for a man to live upon in a place like Cardiff, where everything is very dear, especially house rent.

29 January 1892.]

Mr. S. FISHER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Courtney—continued.

12,989. I suppose a single man could live in Cardiff on less than that?—Yes, certainly a single man could.

12,990. You are thinking of a man with a wife and some children who would find it hard to live on that?—Yes.

12,991. But the man might be earning these wages apparently for some years before he was married?—Yes, he would be a few years of course.

12,992. Are there any inducements to save at any period?—I do not quite understand the drift of your question.

12,993. People do not save sometimes because there is no easy way of accumulating their savings and investing them. Is there any complaint that there is a want of opportunities?—I have never heard of any. Of course we have the Post Office Savings Bank, and we have many building societies and institutions of that kind. There are plenty of facilities for saving money, I should think.

12,994. Are they used by your men?—To some extent, yes.

12,995. Are they brought home to their notice, in fact?—I do not know that they are directly.

12,996. You do not make it part of the work of your organisation?—As officers of the Association we talk to the men sometimes in our public meetings, and ask them to be sober and to be thrifty. That is our aim and object, to educate them in that way. We try to keep the drink off the work, and we try to make them sober and thrifty in that way. I have been a working man all my life, and I know the advantages of thrift and sobriety and that sort of thing, and I should like every other man to get on.

12,997. Would you say it was impossible for a man who began earning wages such as you described at 19, and remained unmarried for five or six years, and saved during that interval, and saved during the first years probably after his marriage, would you say it would be impossible for him to accumulate enough to leave off work by the time he was 60 or 65?—No, I do not think so.

12,998. Supposing there was adequate machinery for taking care of his savings and investing them?—No, I do not know that a man can save very much getting 2*l.* a week.

The witness withdrew.

The Rev. JOHN WILLIAM LEWIS called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

13,011. We understand that you have been and are acting as a curate in the east end of London?—Certainly. I was curate of Saint Mary's, Johnson Street, St. George's in the East, until the end of last year. I am now curate of Bow Parish Church.

Mr. Courtney—continued.

12,999. Is that more than an impression? Have you tried to put into figures and work out what it would come to?—No, I cannot say that I have tried to figure it out. I am judging pretty well from myself and others whom I know who are steady honest men.

13,000. Are there any cases within your experience of men who have made any savings sufficient to meet old age?—No, I cannot say that I can remember anyone just at present who has accumulated enough to keep him after he is 60 years of age.

13,001. This kind of trade of course has been developing in recent years on a large scale?—Cardiff trade has increased.

13,002. You would not have to deal with a great number of veterans as yet?—No, not so many.

Mr. Austin.

13,003. Is there any inspection of ships?—I believe the Board of Trade inspect steamers and vessels.

13,004. How often do they come round and inspect them?—I could not say that.

13,005. Have you seen them inspected where this employment has been carried on?—No, but I will tell you what I have heard when I have spoken to the shipowners or to the overlookers or captains—anyone representing the ships—they have said "Well we cannot have this done for you, because the Board of Trade will not allow it," but ultimately, whether the Board of Trade allowed it not, they have cut the holes that we wanted.

13,006. Do the employers contribute to the accident fund?—No.

13,007. And in all the accidents that have occurred the members receive assistance out of what they got from the society?—Yes, we pay them 12*s.* a week for 26 weeks, and half-pay as long as they remain disabled.

13,008. Have the employers ever expressed a desire to contribute to the accident fund?—No, but I may say that we contemplate forming a superannuation fund, and I have consulted some of the employers about that, and have found their willingness to contribute towards that fund.

13,009. Were it not for your society those men would have been thrown on the ratepayers, I suppose?—Yes, some of them, no doubt.

13,010. Is it only what you give them that prevents that?—Yes.

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,012. And you have, in that capacity, acquired some knowledge of the conditions and mode of life of the dock labourers?—For the last two years I have been chairman of some of the local branches of the Dock Labourers' Union.

29 January 1892.]

The Rev. J. W. LEWIS.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,013. Chairman of the Union?—From September 1889 to September 1890 I was chairman of two branches, and from October 1890 to October last year I was chairman of one branch of the Dock Labourers' Union.

13,014. I understand that you divide the dock labourers into two classes, those who get their living entirely, or almost entirely, by that industry, and those who work at other occupations, and only come occasionally to the docks. Is that so?—Yes, my lord. The dock labourers, I have been acquainted with and know by experience, are the men who for the most part live in Stepney, Wapping, St. George's in the East, Ratcliff, and Shadwell.

13,015. They are the regular dockers?—Part of them.

13,016. You have come to tell us, I think, about the abuses that arise from casual labour?—Yes. I have set down on this paper some of the ideas that have come uppermost in my mind about it. The casual labour makes a good many men, after a few years' work, incapable of doing regular steady work six days in the week.

13,017. Obviously their labour is irregular and uncertain?—Yes.

13,018. What do you mean when you speak of daily payment being one of the abuses or evils attending it?—A man who has done a day's work in the London Docks would be paid 3s. 3d. at 4 o'clock—the day's payment—and he leaves the docks with the 3s. 3d. in his pocket and very likely turns into his favourite public-house on his way home. If the men were paid weekly instead of daily, there would be more encouragement for thrift.

13,019. In that case you mean you would only turn them into a public-house once a week instead of six days a week?—That is so.

13,020. Do you say that it makes men after a few years incapable of doing steady work?—The habit becomes a sort of second nature. They have been used to irregular work. Three days a week is about the average of the casual dock labourer at the end of town which I am acquainted with, and after from 10 to 20 years work three days a week, they are quite unable to do six days.

13,021. If the work comes to them regularly they will not take it?—They do not like it steadily week after week. They prefer a burst of labour 36 hours at a stretch, it may be or very likely 24 if they can get it.

13,022. Then I think you say that this casual and irregular employment makes the men thriftless?—Yes, it does. It is almost impossible for men who do not know whether they will get work next week to join a provident club or keep up the payments to a provident club.

13,023. I suppose a man is less willing to save in any way when he knows that the first cessation of work will eat up all his savings?—Certainly. For a year I was chairman of 1,100 men whom I met two or three times a week in a sort of official capacity as chairman, and of course many other times individually; and out

Earl of Derby—continued.

of the lot I suppose not more than 25 belonged to provident clubs.

13,024. Do you think that was from carelessness, or were their means insufficient to enable them to contribute?—From both causes I should say. Not very often, but sometimes these men went four weeks without getting a day's work.

13,025. Then if they had nothing put by how did they live?—That would be difficult to say. Sometimes their wives did a little washing or what not, if they had wives. Sometimes they ran into debt; sometimes they lived upon the generosity of their mates who had work.

13,026. And do you find that the condition of things, which you describe, encourages intemperance?—I think it does, especially the daily payment.

13,027. There cannot be a very great amount of intemperance in the case of men who only work three days a week. Where do they get the means?—There were some statistics given in one of the local papers a few weeks ago, which showed, I think, that 18 or 20 thousand people were in the public-houses of Saint George's-in-the-East, and some streets round about, on a certain Saturday night. The amount spent is almost incredible in proportion to their earnings.

13,028. You tell us of the objections to the existence of this casual labour, can you point out any means of getting rid of it?—Not entirely.

13,029. Can you point out any means of lessening it?—If the interests of the Port of London could be unified it would certainly lessen it.

13,030. You mean, if all the docks could be in one hand, so that then the men could be transferred from one to the other?—The docks and wharves, the wharves especially. Now it is to the interest of every wharfinger and to the manager of every dock to have at his own gates as many men as ever he can possibly want on an emergency; and that creates a crowd of men constantly all the morning and every morning.

13,031. I understand your argument, but at the same time if there is such a crowd around any particular dock or wharf, and if there is no demand for the men's labour elsewhere, does it not prove that there is more labour than there is employment to find for it?—Quite true, my lord; there is more labour than employment.

13,032. You might regularise the employment to some extent, but would there not remain a surplus of unemployed or partially employed?—There would.

13,033. What I understand you to say is that there would be fewer casuals and more regular men employed. Is that what the Union desire?—Tom Mann and the authorities of the Union wish for regular work rather than casual labour if it can be obtained. If your lordship will look at this paper you will see that I would assist and do all I can for what I may call the regular casuals at the expense of those who now and then do a day's work in the docks.

29 January 1892.]

The Rev. J. W. LEWIS.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,034. You would endeavour to have as many men as possible regularly employed so that there should be as little surplus of casual labour as may be?—Yes.

13,035. But you do not point out how that is to be done, otherwise than as you say by unifying the management of the docks?—No, I see no other way. It is impossible for employers to pay men when there is no work for them to do, and I think the wage they receive is amply sufficient.

13,036. Then you come here to suggest some remedies for the evils which we all admit; will you explain what they are?—The first thing to do is to organise the labour as much as possible.

13,037. What do you mean by that?—Every man throughout the country, I think, should join a Trades Union, his own Trade Union or Trade Guild.

13,038. You would have no Non-Unionists?—None at all anywhere.

13,039. Then practically one way or the other you would make it compulsory for a man to place himself under the control of the Union authorities?—A man should do so.

13,040. Would you do that by any legislative proceedings?—If necessary I would, but I think it might be done without. In the case of the Dock Labourers' Union, I think if the Union could come to some amicable arrangement with the dock authorities, it would be possible to improve the labour of the docks by making all the men join the Union. I speak after two years practical experience with two branches of the Union.

13,041. But, as a matter of fact, are there not a considerable number of men who, whether their reasons be good or bad, do not care to join any Union?—That is so.

13,042. Do you think it fair that they should be altogether excluded from work?—Let them join the Union.

13,043. That is to say, unless they are prepared to sacrifice their individual freedom of setting their own value upon their labour and working such conditions as they please, they should not work at all?—They are more likely to obtain the conditions they desire by joining the Union, and by belonging to a large body, than by protesting or speaking out individually.

13,044. Is there anything else besides compulsory Unionism which you have to recommend?—I would first mention better food.

13,045. How do you mean "better food." They must provide their own food?—Yes; they must provide their own food. Most of these men live in single rooms, many of them in upstairs rooms of cottages. In St. George's-in-the-East the majority of the houses are four-roomed houses. The person who takes the house lives in the two bottom rooms, and sublets the two top ones, each of which is occupied by the family of a labourer of some sort. Now the grates in these rooms are utterly unfit for cooking, and even if they were fit for cooking they have no utensils, and probably the woman

Earl of Derby—continued.

has no knowledge of cooking. I maintain that the quality and quantity of the men's labour depends to a large extent upon the quality and quantity of the food that he eats, and the men fly to drink in the absence of good food. I should like to see throughout the East of London good shops where the men could obtain good meals cheaply.

13,046. But is not that a matter of supply and demand. You would not, I suppose, establish them by any State authority?—No, I do not say that.

13,047. Or under any municipal control?—I should like to see something in the shape of the Folk's kitchens of Vienna.

13,048. Will you tell us what they are?—It is partly a philanthropic movement, started by a certain number of ladies and gentlemen of Vienna with a view to providing food for the working classes, and they manage, by means of great economy in buying provisions and what not, to give remarkably cheap meals to the workmen. The places are crowded. Of course one can there get beer with the food.

13,049. Are there not many cheap cooking shops in the East End?—There are very few indeed where you can get a decent meal.

13,050. What prevents their being established if they would pay?—I suppose it is not the genius of English people to get up cooking shops. The idea has been no doubt in the past that every man should have his meals at home, and that I maintain is becoming more and more impossible every year.

13,051. What you are proposing does not require or admit of any interference by Parliament or by the municipality; it is simply a question of setting up establishments which would presumably pay?—I would much rather see it established by voluntary effort, but if it cannot be done in that way, then I should say, let either the municipality or Parliament step in, because it is something imperative I maintain.

13,052. Is the State to tell a man where he is to get his dinner?—These men do not very often know where to go. When they leave the docks in the evening there is no place where they can possibly get anything to eat, and they go into a public-house. There are plenty of public-houses.

13,053. I think we may assume that what you propose can be done, if the men themselves are willing to support such establishments, without any interposition of the State, by private agencies?—Yes; I trust it can. An effort has been made within the last few months, as perhaps your lordship knows, to supply this want.

13,054. I think you have mentioned in your proof as among things that are wanted, cheaper rooms?—Yes. The cost of a room varies from about 1s. 9d. to 4s. in the parts I have mentioned. There are a few rooms so dark and so dirty that they can only get 1s. 9d. for them; the average would be from 2s. 6d. to 3s. 6d. a week, and that, I maintain, is too much for one room.

29 January 1892.]

The Rev. J. W. LEWIS.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,055. Then how do you propose that that want should be met?—Only by lessening the rent of the houses.

13,056. You suggest the State is to interfere again to fix the rent of the houses?—No; I do not say the State should interfere unless it is absolutely necessary.

13,057. How do you propose it should be done?—I would have cheaper rooms, even if this involved the houses being built on the block system. The people themselves prefer four-roomed houses rather than huge blocks; but it is necessary that they should have cheap rooms, and if all that part of London is covered with huge blocks of buildings, it would be better, I maintain, if the rooms were cheaper than at present with four-roomed houses.

13,058. You are satisfied with making that suggestion, without undertaking to point out the precise manner in which it should be done?—Certainly.

13,059. Is there anything else you wish to suggest?—There was one other suggestion I wish to make in the way of remedies. Halls and meeting places for provident or trade clubs in the east, north, and south-east of London are very few and far between. If a provident club wishes to establish a branch in a particular part it very often has to go to a public-house. I think that that is a want that might be supplied in the future.

Mr. Bolton.

13,060. You said, if I did not misunderstand you, that the wages earned by the casuals was amply sufficient?—Yes, 6d. an hour.

13,061. I think we have had an estimate given here of their wages being as low as 9s. a week?—That depends upon the number of hours they work.

13,062. You do not think 9s. a week enough?—Oh, dear no.

13,063. How do you reconcile your statement that the wages are sufficient with the fact that they sometimes earn only 9s. a week?—What I mean is that I deem the rate of wage, 6d. an hour, as being sufficient.

13,064. If they had constant employment?—Yes.

13,065. But in the absence of constant employment?—Then they have to manage as well as they can.

13,066. I think you said you would arrive at some better mode of employing or keeping the casuals employed by unifying all the docks and wharves. Do you suggest all the docks and wharves should be under one management?—Yes, under one authority; under one set of interests. I wish to explain what I mean. At the present time each wharfinger wants at his gates as many men as he can possibly wish for in any emergency, and every wharfinger wants the same; because, owing to competition, he wants to get the work done more cheaply than his neighbour if possible.

13,067. But how would that necessity be obviated by having them under one manage-

Mr. Bolton—continued.

ment?—If they could be moved from one wharf to another when wanted the wharfinger could wait for them for half an hour, or an hour, it may be. At present he feels he is sacrificing his interest if he does that.

13,068. Have you consulted the wharfingers on that point?—I have spoken to the authorities of the Dock Labourers' Union.

13,069. Have you consulted the wharfingers?—Tom Mann told me that he consulted the wharfingers.

13,070. Have you yourself?—No, I have not consulted them on this point.

13,071. You do not know whether the wharfingers would be willing to have it said, "Your work must stand for half an hour or an hour until we get men from the different ports, say from Tilbury?"—No, I do not, at first hand.

13,072. Do not you think there might be some little practical difficulty there?—I think it is only because of the competition that they are so anxious to get men in five minutes.

13,073. But is there not competition between ports as well as between docks and wharves?—Yes; but I think the extra 25 minutes could not matter as between port and port.

13,074. You are not a merchant?—No; but I have been in business.

13,075. You never found that competition made a loss of half an hour of importance?—Not between one place here, and another 500 miles away.

13,076. You would have all the dock labourers Unionists?—Yes.

13,077. You would prohibit by legislation the employment of men not in the Union?—Not by legislation.

13,078. Then how would you do it?—By an examination of tickets at the dock gates once a week.

13,079. That is assuming the dock owners took the same view as you have done?—Yes, I think that would be the readiest way to bring it about.

13,080. But suppose they did not; would you compel the dock owners to employ only men in certain Unions?—I would not compel them, but would seek to get them to do so by coming to an understanding about it.

13,081. Would you practically compel them?—I would try to get them to consent to it. I would not say more than that.

13,082. Then would you fix the rate of wages?—Do you mean by legislation?

13,083. In any way? Would you authorise the Unionists to charge any rate of wages they pleased, or whatever they might think fair?—If there was some sort of amalgamation between employers and employed I should not think that would be a practical difficulty.

13,084. What is the amalgamation you have in your mind between employers and employed?—Between the dock directors and the Union authorities.

29 January 1892.]

The Rev. J. W. LEWIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

13,085. That is to say, if they could agree?—Yes.

13,086. But, assuming they could not?—Then there must be difference of opinion, and a strike if necessary.

13,087. We find now that there are a very much greater number of men applying for labour at the docks than can obtain employment?—Yes.

13,088. And those who do not obtain employment at the fixed rate of wages might be willing to take a lower rate of wages; would you prohibit the dock companies from employing those men?—I think you are assuming that I should do all this by legislation.

13,089. No. I want to know how you are going to do it. I am assuming that you propose to give to the Unionists certain powers of freedom of action, and I am trying to ascertain whether you would give to the dock proprietors and wharf proprietors the same power of freedom of action?—But surely they have it now.

13,090. You would take it from them, I think?—No, I beg your pardon, I do not propose taking anything from them. I spoke of a mutual arrangement.

13,091. Do you suggest that both parties should be at liberty to deal with each other as they please in future?—As they are now.

13,092. But you wish to compel all the men to join the Union?—Yes, I do.

13,093. Consequently, that would not be the same as it is at present?—It would be the same as it was a few months ago, and practically is now, at Millwall for instance.

13,094. You mean that the Unions have broken down?—Oh dear no, not that at all. The tickets are not examined at the dock-gates, but the men themselves belong to the Union. At Millwall I believe the tickets are looked at.

13,095. Union men, some time ago, would not work with Non-Union men?—I believe at the London Docks they work side by side.

13,096. But a short time ago they would not work with Non-Union men?—That is so. They work side by side now.

13,097. You want to stop that?—I want all to join the Union.

13,098. You want to stop the employment of Non-Union men?—That is the first step, I maintain, towards ameliorating the condition of dock labourers.

13,099. I want to know whether you would preclude the dockowners from employing Non-Union men?—Not by law.

13,100. Would you take steps practically to preclude them in some way or another?—I think that the Union authorities might approach the dock authorities and say, "If we could come to some understanding about the examination of cards at the dock gates, we can provide you with better labour than you get from the more casual people."

13,101. But assume that the dock authorities do not concur in this view?—Then they can

Mr. Bolton—continued

say "No!" and things can go on as they do now.

13,102. And that would end your plan?—Yes.

13,103. Your attempt would be a failure in fact?—It would.

13,104. You have spoken of philanthropy aiding the action of the workers themselves. Yesterday we had a leader, Mr. Tom MacCarthy, whom perhaps you know, who condemned philanthropy. Do you concur in that?—I condemn what is usually called charity—the giving of doles and tickets and relief strongly, but I certainly do not condemn philanthropy.

13,105. I do not quite see the distinction. The point which Mr. MacCarthy urged yesterday was that at Southampton the dock authorities provided soup for the men and thereby brought in a number of people from the country, increasing the number of casuals. He also spoke, I think, with some contempt of philanthropic efforts of that kind. Do you agree in that?—I should, think if the dock company provided soup, it was not an entirely disinterested action on their part.

13,106. You think it would be objectionable that they should induce men to attend there, and then in the case of their not having work for them, they should give them some soup?—Of course, I am not a master of the circumstances of the whole case, but I think if a dock company provides soup for the men it is not exactly philanthropy.

13,107. One of your remedies is cheaper rooms?—Yes.

13,108. How would you provide cheaper rooms?—That is a very difficult question and I was asked that before. I can only say by having cheaper rent.

13,109. Do you know whether the returns in rent from the rooms in which these men live makes the investment profitable or otherwise?—Do you mean to the owners of the houses or to the tenant?

13,110. To the owners of the houses?—I do not know.

13,111. If it is profitable can you account for its not being extended, and so cheapening the rooms?—No, I cannot.

13,112. Then, unless you can so build these rooms as to make it profitable to let them at a lower rent, how do you expect such houses to be expended or how do you expect the cheaper rooms to be obtained?—I have proposed no definite way of getting cheaper rooms; all I maintain is that if a man is to live decently he ought to have, if he has a growing-up family, more than one room, and he cannot, with his present rate of wages, get more.

13,113. The evil we admit, but the difficulty is how to cure it?—There are so many vested interests in the way, I fear.

13,114. You are proposing a remedy, but if there are no possible means of applying that remedy, what is the use?—I have no practical remedy. We might have plenty of utopian ones.

13,115. With regard to halls for meeting; in the same way it would not pay to provide

29 January 1892.]

The Rev. J. W. LEWIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

these?—No, it would not. There I should certainly ask the municipality or Parliament to step in and build these places—not to carry them on. When they are built the men themselves will keep them going; they will pay a small rent for the use of a room or hall.

13,116. And you would compel every parish to provide a certain number of halls?—Not every parish. No, I think there might be an amalgamation of parishes.

Mr. Plimsoll.

13,117. When you spoke of a man being compelled to join the Unions I suppose you did not mean that they should be compelled by law, but that it is your opinion that their interests would be best protected by joining the Union?—The first step, I think, towards ameliorating the condition of the men is to get them to organise.

Mr. Courtney.

13,118. What I understand you to say is this, that there are many more labourers seeking for this work than there is work to distribute among them?—Yes.

13,119. And you want to have the number reduced to a sufficiency to keep the work reasonably going at a reasonable wage?—Yes.

13,120. Do you really demand a Union for that purpose, or is not this all that you require—namely, a register of workmen to be kept by the employers?—It is better, I think, for the sake of the men, that there should be a Union.

13,121. But that is a word that may give rise to some prejudice. Is that the essence of the scheme of reform of the dock labourer?—I do not fight for the word. Call it guild or anything else you please, but I want the men to feel that they belong to an organised body.

13,122. Is it not rather this: that you want that the number of recognised labourers should be just sufficient to carry on the work?—I should not care if it was a little more than sufficient, because the work must be more or less variable; but I want organisation at any cost among the body of labourers. I think it is to their interest.

13,123. It would be judicious to adopt a form of organisation which would offend the least number of prejudices?—True.

13,124. I do not see what you require (taking your own position) more than the registration of the workmen, so that those who are registered should have priority of employment?—The Union would attend to the interests of the men. I think, more than a mere bureau of labour.

13,125. But that first step would go a long way towards realising what you desire?—It would go some way, I grant.

13,126. Are you yourself London bred?—No.

13,127. How long has your experience been in the east?—About seven years east and south-east.

13,128. And you know many of these dock labourers, individually?—Hundreds.

Mr. Courtney—continued.

13,129. What would be their general history?—If we take for instance No. 11, a department in the London Docks, nearly all the labourers belong to the branch of which I was the chairman last year. They varied in number. The number employed varied day by day from 20 to 200, as there was work or not; but of the 200 I suppose at least half of them would be born and bred in the immediate locality of St. Georges in the East, Shadwell, Wapping, Stepney, and just round there. The rest would come in from the country.

13,130. Those who were so born and bred there; would they be the children of dock labourers before them?—That I do not know. I should not like to say yes or no to that. Very probably, I should imagine. Many of them have worked at nothing else.

13,131. But one half of them would appear to be immigrants who had gravitated there?—Yes. They came from some other part of London, or from the country.

13,132. To the lowest form of work?—Yes.

13,133. Now supposing you had got your work organised, and that the employers saw it was to their advantage to have people they could rely upon, and whose wages would be sufficient to keep them, so that they would be always at hand, how about the immigrants then?—I do not think that if one looks at the dock labourers one ought to look at the mere casuals, who may turn up from all sorts of quarters in order to get a day's labour at the docks. If we are to ameliorate the condition of the dock labourers we are bound to shut out men who are broken down, and the very refuse and scum of all the east of London and of England. That is why I stand by the Union, because it is the first step towards organisation.

13,134. I am only endeavouring to carry out your plan, and to understand what you mean. You want to have the dock labour so organised that there should be an army of labourers just sufficient, or a few more perhaps than absolutely necessary to carry on the work?—Yes.

13,135. And you do that because you think the condition of the labourers would be very much improved, and you say it would also be in the interest of the employers to have people whom they could depend upon to do good work?—Yes.

13,136. That being the case, and other circumstances existing as they do now, there would still be a tendency for a considerable accretion every year gravitating towards the docks; would you meet that accretion very severely by leaving them alone?—Not necessarily. I think possibly something might be done. There are plenty of remedies, though I am not going to suggest them, such as municipal workshops. There are all sorts of ways of doing it. There would always be a certain number of unemployed, the broken down and the failures from all sorts of trade organisations. What I said was that the best way of meeting the difficulty, as far as I could see, was by organising in every department of manual and skilled work, so that every

29 January 1892.]

The Rev. J. W. LEWIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Courtney—continued.

man could start life by belonging to his own Union, and then he can be looked after by his own Union.

13,137. But there is as you admit a continually encroaching wave of half broken down people; how are you going to meet that?—If labour were entirely organised from the top to the bottom, then a man with a Union ticket, no matter what he was—carpenter, dock labourer, or whatever else, could go to the branch he belonged to and say, "Now I want my mates to give me a lift." We have done that in the branches of the Dock Labourers' Union many and many a time. Any one who knows anything about working men will know how ready they are to subscribe to help any of their mates.

13,138. You think that would be adequate to meet the number of people who come from the country?—I think that is the best way of doing it. If people in that case come in from the country and voluntarily give up their agricultural ticket, and their agricultural employment, well I do not quite see what sympathy one can have for them. If they chose to stay in the country where they would be known, and where they belonged to an organised branch of labour, then there would be some chance of their getting help.

13,139. At all events you are not at present deeply concerned with those degraded people slipping down to a lower level?—I am not so concerned that I would sacrifice the regular dock labourers for them. I do not want the London docks to be as they were some years ago, and as they partly are now, a mere sink as I say into which is poured all the refuse of London. I should like to remark that the condition of the labourers seems to vary up and down the river. The nearer one gets to Tilbury, as far as I can find out and have seen, the more the dock labourers become organised. But in the heart of London, in the London docks, at the wharves thereabouts, and the up-town warehouses, people come in from all parts. These who have never done a day of dock labour in their lives come in.

13,140. There is a more festering mass there?—Yes.

13,141. Are there no shops of Lockhart's in the east end of London?—Yes.

13,142. Are they much used?—Not by the working men who want cooked food.

13,143. They give just what you have been asking for, do not they?—No.

13,144. Do not they supply cheap food?—Not cooked meat so much; tea and coffee and bread and butter, and that sort of thing. These men want meat.

13,145. Do not they give cold meat?—It is very rarely asked for.

13,146. But if asked for, is it not there?—I have been into Lockhart's scores of times, but it is tea and coffee and bread and butter.

13,147. The great demand, no doubt, is for tea, coffee, and cocoa?—Yes.

13,148. But do not they provide meat for those who ask for it at the cheapest rate, as far

Mr. Courtney—continued.

as we know?—No, not at the cheapest rates. The shops I am referring to—I have nothing to do with them and I do not want to advertise them—are what they call the Tee-to-tum shops.

13,149. Who started those?—A gentleman named Buchanan, I believe.

13,150. Then spontaneously, as a mere matter of business enterprise, the want is so far met?—So far; but yet not in the way the working man desires, and I think needs. What is wanted is a combination of an eating shop with the chance of getting a pint of beer.

13,151. There is already an ample response to the working man's desire to drink beer?—The men want beer, and I do not see that a pint of beer with a man's dinner hurts him at all; it may do him good. Men do not like tea with their meals.

13,152. Has there been any attempt on the part of those interested in the east end of London to start provision shops where beer could be supplied?—Not where beer can be supplied.

13,153. Might not that be attempted?—It would be very difficult on account of the licence and the regulations. It would have to be fenced in by all sorts of regulations.

13,154. It would be easier to be done by a company than to be done by the State or the municipality?—Yes, I think it would.

13,155. If that is part of your remedy, would it not be desirable to make an attempt at it?—I should like to see it done, I am willing to confess; and I think it would pay, though it would be something entirely new, I should think.

13,156. Do not you know whether it has been tried elsewhere?—No, I do not. I do not think it has been in England.

13,157. Or Scotland?—No, I do not think so.

13,158. With respect to cheaper rooms; do you know the Katharine Buildings, near the Saint Katharine Docks?—No, I do not.

13,159. It is a large pile of buildings built by a company some six years ago?—Is it near the Mint—near the chief entrance of the St. Katharine's.

13,160. I do not know?—I think I know where you mean, but I do not know anything about those buildings at all. I know something about some of the Peabody Buildings.

13,161. But they are of a superior kind?—Yes, very much so.

13,162. Are you not aware that there are many rougher piles than the Peabody piles?—There are one or two rougher, but of course it is the interest of the agent to get the very best tenants he can in every block.

13,163. Do you know what the rents of these rougher rooms are?—They vary within the limits I have stated.

13,164. Are they cheaper than the rooms in the four-roomed houses?—In most of the blocks you have to take two rooms at least, except in the upstairs floors at the very tops of the buildings. In the Peabody Buildings they will

29 January 1892.]

The Rev. J. W. LEWIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Courtney—continued.

not allow a man, wife, and grown-up children to occupy one room.

13,165. But the Peabody Buildings are but a small section of all of the buildings that have been provided in the east end of London?—True.

13,166. I am asking you your experience of the buildings which are adapted to a much poorer class of the inhabitants than the Peabody Buildings?—Yes, it seems to me they always go up in respect of respectability; and the rougher and worst classes go the smaller houses—to the slums.

13,167. By a process of natural selection?—Yes.

13,168. At the same time continual efforts are being made to provide accommodation for them? Yes, many efforts.

Mr. Austin.

13,169. You having had many years' experience of the East End of London, I will ask you what was the condition of the dock labourers of the East End previous to the great strike a couple of years ago?—No doubt it was on the whole very much worse than it is now.

13,170. Therefore the Union has improved the condition of the men?—I believe it has. It is, however, a long and a slow work, and one cannot expect very much in the course of two years.

13,171. What are the average wages all the year round of the dock labourer in the East End at present?—From the hundreds of inquiries I have made, I should say that the majority of the dock labourers work about half time. Perhaps the more fortunate of them may get seven days in a fortnight throughout the year. Sometimes they get overtime, but at other times they are three or four weeks without any work at all.

13,172. And I suppose they have large families to support?—In some cases they have.

13,173. And how are they supported?—Partly by charity and partly by running into debt; that is, by pawning anything they have to pawn in time of need, perhaps taking out the articles so pawned when there is a little work. There is a considerable amount spent in charity every year in the East End, and money is given away by the various churches and chapels, and tickets also are given away.

13,174. You spoke about a lot of these men coming in from the country. Are there many of the dock labourers who came in from the country?—Yes, I have found hundreds.

13,175. Would you shut those men out from coming in?—I should discourage them most distinctly.

13,176. But what would you do with those men who do come?—They must take their chance the same as they have to do now.

Mr. Austin—continued.

13,177. Would you have the State make any provision for them?—No, I would not invoke the State to do anything for them.

13,178. Are they to be thrown upon the ratepayers?—If they cannot get work they are practically thrown upon the ratepayers now, because they have to go into the workhouse, I fear.

13,179. Then would it not be the duty of the State to take the matter up so as not to have them thrown upon the ratepayers?—Yes, but it is such a troublesome business to get the State to take up the thing that I do not like the idea of it. I think if an evil can be remedied without applying to the law it is far better that it should be, merely on the score of time.

13,180. If it could not be remedied, and the ratepayers were taxed for these people, do not you think it would be the duty of the State to relieve the taxation?—If the end is relief of taxation, I should say do it by all means.

13,181. Has there been any effort made by the municipality to provide dwellings for the dock labourers in the East End?—Not by the municipality but various agencies have made some provision. There are the Peabody Buildings; and the Guinness Trust, I believe, is going to run up a block.

13,182. In suggesting improved dwellings, would you have the municipality make provision or the State?—The municipality, if possible.

13,183. And then you would have the ratepayers taxed?—Yes, if necessary.

13,184. You also referred to the necessity which I cordially agree with you about, of providing of club rooms. At present to your knowledge many of these branches meet in public houses?—They have to meet where they can.

13,185. That has a demoralising effect?—There was a rule among the original rules of the Dock Labourers' Union that no branch should meet at a public-house, but it was necessary to break through that rule after a time, as it was quite impossible for them all to meet at other places.

13,186. Do not you think it would be desirable to have public rooms built for the working classes by the authorities?—I would rather see it done if possible by a grant, say, from the Charity Commissioners if possible, or some other State funds or what not. Large grants have been made towards Polytechnics, I believe, and I think it would be a good thing if similar grants could be made towards these eating rooms and public rooms for provident societies and guilds rather than that the ratepayers should be taxed.

13,187. I understand you would apply part of the available funds to establishment of these rooms?—If it was possible I should like that.

13,188. Do you think that would produce a good effect upon the general social condition of the dock labourer?—Yes, it would supply a great want.

The witness withdrew.

29 January 1892.]

The Rev. M. HARE.

[Continued.]

The Rev. MARMADUKE HARE called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

13,189. You are, I presume, acquainted with the East End?—I am.

13,190. What has your connexion with it been?—I am a vicar of Christ Church, Watney Street, in the parish of St. George's-in-the-East.

13,191. Then you have had a good deal of experience of the dock labourer?—I have.

13,192.—And you wish to suggest to us some means of improving the condition of that class?—I do.

13,193. In the paper you have put into my hands you suggest that the wages are sufficient as regards rate of payment if sufficient work were assured. That represents your view?—It does.

13,194. You mean if regular work throughout the week at that rate could be obtained the wage would be sufficient?—Yes.

13,195. Then we assume that what you complain of on behalf of these men is the irregularity of the work?—The irregularity of the work is one evil. What I mean to say is that a man may get one full week's work and then get no work for three weeks.

13,196. Can that be altogether avoided, do you think, considering the conditions of dock life?—I think by the abolition of overtime and by some rules as to the number of hours' work that should be permitted of a man (eight hours I should suggest for a dock labourer) much greater regularity would be insured.

13,197. Do you mean that the men should not work longer than eight hours, or do you mean that they should not be engaged for a less time than eight hours, or do you mean both?—I think if an eight hours' limit were appointed that there would be no difficulty in finding a man eight hours' consecutive work, but I do not think in dock work a man can possibly do more than eight hours' work in the 24.

13,198. Then your first proposition is that there shall be no overtime, or as little as possible, for I suppose you would admit that to abolish it absolutely is impossible?—I can quite understand that: but as a rule there should be no overtime.

13,199. And you think the eight hours' day should be adopted?—If possible.

13,200. Now you have on your précis a proposition which I do not understand—that no army pensioners should be employed. Will you explain what you mean by that?—I find in my parish a large number of men come down from the army—not tradesmen, but men with a small pension sufficient to locate themselves, but not sufficient to support themselves, and they take the work from men who have all their interests in the neighbourhood of the dock; and also I have reason to believe that the officials of the dock companies give an undue preference to army pensioners.

13,201. I presume that is because they are men who have been under discipline?—I can quite understand that.

13,202. Why do you specially object to their going into the neighbourhood of the docks, I

Earl of Derby—continued.

presume you do not object to their finding employment somewhere?—I think that there are more than sufficient dockers to do the whole work of the London docks at present in London, and some protection should be afforded to them. I cannot myself understand why the medical profession should be protected, and the legal profession, and you may also say the clerical profession, while a docker should be entirely unprotected.

13,203. Then your objection is not exclusively to army pensioners, but to anybody coming in from other trades or occupations?—Generally yes, but specially army pensioners, because they have just sufficient to starve on. They have not sufficient to live on. They are more likely to come.

13,204. Then you consider the people actually employed in the docks, and their families, have a preferential claim over anybody else to the employment?—Yes.

13,205. And you would discourage the coming in of strangers from any other occupation?—In every possible way I would.

13,206. And if every other trade and district were to adopt the same principle, do you think that would work?—I am afraid I am not prepared to say.

13,207. Now, I see you say that rates of cargo ought to be settled before the job has commenced. Do you mean that a man should know what he is to get before he begins working?—He should know at what rate he is to be paid for a cargo.

13,208. Is not that ordinarily the case now?—As I understand, according to the agreement, the result of the Mansion House inquiry, it was this—that a rate should be declared; but as a rule they rush the men from the gates to the job, and say, "We will tell you the rate directly," and in many cases the rate is not declared until after the job is completed.

13,209. Does it not come to this—that there are many men so anxious for a job that they are perfectly willing to take it without making inquiry?—Yes.

13,210. Now what do you mean by abolition of exertion money?—Money is promised or given to the gangers—to the chief of a group of men—if they get their work done within a certain time.

13,211. What is the objection to that?—The objection to that is that they put an unfair number of men on to the work.

13,212. What do you mean by an unfair number of men?—They will put 40 men on to a piece of work which ought to be the work of 20 men; but the money as a whole is given to one person; and I contend that he should supply a reasonable number of men and not an unreasonable number.

13,213. But who is to decide what is a reasonable and what is an unreasonable number of men?—I should think that there would surely be ordinary laws of labour economy which would decide that.

29 January 1892.]

The Rev. M. HARE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,214. One man is anxious to have a job finished very quickly, and he puts, as you say, 40 men upon it?—Yes.

13,215. Another man is not so pressed for time and he puts 20 men upon it, and they take twice as long?—Yes.

13,216. Why is the one system better than the other?—Because the work is too much distributed. It is distributed among too large a number of persons, so that none of them can live.

13,217. Your object is to reduce the number of those employed altogether?—Decidedly, at the docks.

13,218. We have had a good deal of evidence here, showing that it is the wish of the Unions that the work should be spread over a larger number of people; you do not agree with that?—I do not agree with that at all.

13,219. You want it concentrated in a few hands?—Not a few; but so that a fair man might rely upon having at all events four or five days' work in a week. At present he can only rely, as far as my experience goes, if he is an accomplished docker and a man well known, about three days. Then too the exertion-money is the cause of the weak men being injured. They are over-pushed by the gangers.

13,220. I suppose that objection to exertion-money is not an objection which you are alone in taking; you have heard it taken by others?—I have heard it. It is a general objection among my docker friends.

13,221. Is not the real objection that it induces the men to work hard, and so to leave less work for others?—It comes to that, very much.

13,222. So that you do not wish men to be stimulated by the prospect of increased profit to do their best; but that they should be encouraged to take their work easy?—I think the tariff is sufficient, but I do not think a man is justified in doing a shilling's worth of work in an hour, because they will only allow him to earn sixpence in that time, and if he did he would unfit himself for future work.

13,223. You think that the spirit of industry is so strong among the dockers that many of them voluntarily injure themselves by over-work?—Oh, I think so among the older men.

13,224. You have given us another proposal—strict adherence to the rule of taking on hands only twice a day; what do you mean by that?—The men come at 6 o'clock in the morning to be taken on. A certain number are taken on. The others are left standing at the dock gates thinking they may be taken on at any moment. Opposite every dock gate there are one or two public-houses, and they fill the public-houses; but if they knew they could only be taken on at certain hours they might go back to their homes or they might seek employment elsewhere. As it is, men lose a great deal of time. Then there is one other matter I should like to mention with regard to that particular point. I think it would be very much more desirable, if it were possible (I do not know whether it is

Earl of Derby—continued.

possible; I doubt it), that they should only be taken on once a day; because I find that steady men go there at 6 o'clock, they fail to get taken on, they hang about all day, and another man, a dosser, who has been sleeping comfortably in a doss-house until 11 or 12 o'clock in the morning will turn up at about 12 o'clock and step in before the man who has been waiting ever since six.

13,225. Then you say that there should be free access to books. You mean by that, that the men should see on what principle they are paid?—Yes.

13,226. I will not question you about that, because we have frequently had it discussed by other witnesses. Lastly, you say that the work should be regular as far as possible?—Yes.

13,227. That is, I suppose, that the largest number possible of the men employed should be men regularly at work all the year, and that the proportion of casuals should be small?—Yes; I think it would be comparatively easy for the companies to employ a much larger number of regular men; and it would discourage casual labour, and I think those men might find work in other parts. Then there are one or two other things I should like to mention. There is the danger of the docks. Frequently in going round I have seen men carrying heavy loads on their shoulders across a plank certainly not more than 18 inches in width extending 12 feet over the water. I think that there should be some very strict rule prohibiting the companies from allowing such narrow gangways. Then there is another matter which of course has come home very much to us in the East End—the unguarded quays, which are a grave source of danger during foggy weather and so on.

13,228. Are the gangways narrower or is the danger greater than in the case of carpenters and men who work on a scaffolding?—I think the danger is greater, because they are carrying a load over water; and water is supposed by the dockers to have a very strong attraction for the men.

Mr. Bolton.

13,229. Have you lived for many years in the East End?—I have been two years in my present parish, and two years in the south of London, along the river, and I have been five years an incumbent in the suburbs of London.

13,230. Then you have had nine years' experience in London?—Yes.

13,231. And your principal remedy, I think, for the difficulties to be overcome and for the irregularity of work is that no man should work more than eight hours?—As a rule.

13,232. You would not object to another set of men taking up the work at the end of eight hours?—No.

13,233. You are aware that the dockers themselves object to relays?—I do not think it is a unanimous objection. I am not aware that it is by any means unanimous.

29 January 1892.]

The Rev. M. HARK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

13,234. Are you aware that we have had evidence here to that effect?—No, I was not aware of that.

13,235. You stated you had an objection to exertion-money. I should like to understand you on that subject. You would limit, I infer, the work which the strongest man should do to the limit which the weakest man of the company could safely perform?—I do not think I said that at all.

13,236. You did not wish the work to be so pressed that any man should be injured by the work he did?—No.

13,237. Consequently the limit of work of the whole must be the limit of the weakest man?—I do not think so. I have watched gangs of men working many times, and I have always found there is a certain consideration for the weaker men by the stronger ones. They do not expect them to take so many turns with them. They will soon, however, pick out the lazy ones. I think they would arrange the quality of labour very well among themselves.

13,238. But, generally speaking, you do not wish the work to be more than a weakly man can fairly perform?—Not for a weakly man.

13,239. But if a weakly man is working with a strong man—a man who can do half as much work again—would you allow that strong man to do half as much work again?—I think the dockers have already got their tariff; and, as I imagine, that is not a matter that is likely to be altered; and every man should do his best for that money.

13,240. And then would you allow the dock authorities to pick out the strong men and to refuse the weak ones?—No.

13,241. Then does not that come back to the same thing that the strength of the weakest man is to be the maximum of power exerted by the strong man?—I do not think so.

13,242. You spoke of the protection afforded to the legal profession, the medical profession, and the church. What is the protection? Are the number of medical men in a certain district limited?—They are certainly limited by a professional code.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

13,243. Are they?—By professional etiquette. A man will not as a rule go and start a practice in a town unless he purchases his right there.

13,244. Can he not?—It is unprofessional if he does.

13,245. He will have some trouble perhaps in establishing himself, but he can do so?—It would be unprofessional. I was brought up to the medical profession, so I know something of their etiquette. But they have other protection. A man cannot go and commence practice unless he is a qualified man.

13,246. He must be qualified; that is, he has to prove he is a qualified practitioner; but I think that as many men as please can, so far as the law is concerned, establish themselves where they like?—Yes, so far as the law is concerned.

13,247. Is a lawyer also precluded from taking up his abode where he likes and following up his profession?—Merely by professional etiquette.

13,248. How do you want these dockers to be protected?—My opinions no doubt are peculiar, and I should establish some sort of law in relation to immigration. I should distinctly prevent a country man from migrating into the towns.

13,249. I see you also propose to exclude the army pensioners from employment at the docks?—Yes.

13,250. Even although the employers themselves, according to you, prefer them?—I think the employers themselves or the officials of the company prefer them. The officials of the company are unfortunately retired military men in a large number of instances, and they give, I think, undue preference to men of their own profession.

13,251. Then you would not allow the dock companies to have a free hand in that matter to employ those people whom they prefer?—I should use all constitutional means to prevent their employing these pensioners.

13,252. What would be the constitutional means of preventing their employing people whom they preferred?—An agreement between the Dockers' Union and the directors.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Tuesday, the 16th of February 1892, at 11 o'clock.

16 February 1892.]

Captain E. B. HATFIELD.

TWENTY-FIFTH DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Tuesday, 16th February 1892.

PRESENT:

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE.

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF DERBY, K.G. (CHAIRMAN);

The Right Hon. Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH,
Bart. M.P.
Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, M.P.
Mr. T. H. ISMAY.
Professor MARSHALL.

Mr. SAMUEL PLIMSOLL.
Mr. HENRY TAIT.
Mr. T. BURT, M.P., (Group A.) and Mr. M. AUSTIN
(Group C.) also attended.

Mr. GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Captain EDWARD BRAILEY HATFIELD called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

13,253. Will you tell us what experience you have had in regard to seamen and their affairs?—I am 55 years of age. I have been connected with the sea service for about 40 years in various capacities. I have had 20 years in active sea service as sailor, officer, and master, 14 of which I was in command of both sail and steam. I hold a master's certificate of competency from the Board of Trade. I gave evidence before the Royal Commission in 1874 on behalf of the Mercantile Marine Service Association. I was in business from 1874 to 1884 as a shipowner and ship insurance broker, and for the last seven years I have been acting as ship broker, marine surveyor, and superintendent at Liverpool. I was about five years a director in the United Kingdom Insurance Company. I have been a member of the Birkenhead Town Council for six years, serving upon the Ferry and other committees, and for a number of years a member of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce. I have been a member of the Executive Council of the Mercantile Marine Service Association for the last 18 years, and I am now Vice-President of that body, numbering about 3,000 masters and officers. I was a member of the committee of the Liverpool Seamen's Protection Association, and two years president of that body. I was delegated by both Associations to give evidence on their behalf before the Royal Commission of Inquiry for the prevention of loss of life at sea in 1886. For the past 10 years I have been on the Executive Committee of the Cliff Homes for Aged Mariners, also on the Committee of Administration for the Liverpool Seamen's Pension Fund, founded by Mr. Ismay. In February 1876, I wrote and published a treatise upon the subject of seamen, training boys, and a national benefit

Earl of Derby—continued.

fund, and sent a copy to the late Earl Beaconsfield, and have appended to the summary of my evidence a copy of his acknowledgment of it. In 1884 I worked out the details of my scheme of National Insurance and Providence for British mariners, and in 1885 had it registered, and from time to time have lectured upon the subject, issuing thousands of pamphlets and circulars upon it in this country, also in Germany and France. In 1885 Mr. Gladstone acknowledged receipt of my National Insurance and Provident Scheme, as per copy of letter, also appended to my summary. I have received many acknowledgments from high sources. In the beginning of 1889 I acted as chairman for the seamen and firemen in Liverpool to get a rise in their wages. I warned them against striking, or attempting to interfere with the trade of the port; they disregarded my advice in that respect, and I withdrew from their movements.

13,254. When you took the chair for the seamen and firemen in the year 1889, did you consider that the wages were too low?—Yes; the great depression in the shipping trade, from 1884 to 1888, had forced wages down considerably all round, and then when the revival came, with brisk trade and good freights, the men sought to participate in the improvement by a rise in wages, and I thought that they were entitled to consideration.

13,255. Did the shipowners concede the rise of wages?—Yes, nearly all of them gave a rise of 10s. per month at once.

13,256. Then how did the difficulty arise?—Some of the leaders thought that as the first rise had been gained so easily, they might force the shipowners to rise another 10s., but the shipowners declined to be coerced, and so a strike was brought about. The shipowners

16 February 1892.]

Captain E. B. HATFIELD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

could not be forced; they manned their ships and kept them going, so after a great deal of bitterness and rowdiness, with privation and misery, the seamen and firemen got to work again at their former rates, as I had warned them.

13,257. Then in your opinion they gained nothing by striking?—No; they were in rather a worse position at the end of the strike, because a good many lost their employment through the introduction of fresh hands.

13,258. Were the rates which they had asked for afterwards conceded by the shipowners?—Yes, in the following year the shipowners in the large lines gave the mariners a rise of 10s. of their own accord, obviously for the purpose of keeping them contented.

13,259. Then, though the strike could not have had an immediate effect, according to your own statement, had it not an indirect effect in producing this rise of wages?—Of course a man must ask, and the more forcibly he asks, perhaps in some cases, the more likely he is to receive. But, as a matter of fact, the shipowners did beat the men, and, I believe, they could have beaten them again if another strike had been brought about, but the shipowners, evidently to keep things quiet, met them at the first intimation that they would like to have another rise.

13,260. I suppose we may take it that there would not have been quite the same anxiety to keep them quiet if there had not been a strike the year before?—I think so.

13,261. Do you consider that sailors and firemen are now fairly well paid?—Yes, as times are at present with shipping I think they are, but I think that masters and officers in many cases are underpaid, especially the officers.

13,262. How do you know that?—I hear complaints, and I see their poverty and distress. In the case of captains and officers they are men of considerable education and attainments in a scientific profession, and hold very responsible positions with regard to life and property, yet a great many of these men are at the age of 55 or 60 in want and distress, and their families badly off, a state of things quite incompatible with the manhood and respectability of the service. When the Ismay Pension Fund was first opened in Liverpool there were 600 applications in about a month, more than half of which were from masters and officers, all genuine cases, well recommended. It took us four months to look into those cases. The fund provided for about 60. Then there are thousands of others lower down in the scale who had not the courage and influence to fill up the proper papers and make application, who get into workhouses or eke out their existence in misery and destitution.

13,263. You assist a large number with small pensions?—We also assist a large number from the funds of the Association.

13,264. What Association is that?—The Mercantile Marine Service Association, Liverpool.

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,265. And in addition to that you have got certain homes and free cottages, have you not?—Yes, we have the Cliff Homes, which accommodate about 60, besides a number of free cottages; but with all our efforts we cannot overtake the misery and destitution around us.

13,266. You tell us the sailors and firemen are now fairly well paid; that is, they are paid as much wages as the service will allow, speaking generally, but if with all that poverty and destitution is so great among them, have you anything to propose to remedy the evil?—By establishing a national insurance and provident fund, to which employers and *employes* shall all pay alike a sufficient sum to keep it up, so that each individual in the service, upon certain conditions, shall be entitled to a sum of money sufficient to afford a minimum of sustenance whether they are in need or not; it is to be theirs by right, without taint or disabilities, so that independence of manhood and respectability will be maintained.

13,267. You propose that the employers should contribute to such a fund; do you propose that they should deduct anything from the present rate of wages for the purpose of doing so, or that the contribution should be given in addition to wages?—That it should be given in addition to wages.

13,268. That is, in point of fact, a rise of wages all round?—Yes.

13,269. Is not that a little at variance with what you said, that the sailors and firemen are now fairly well paid?—My proposition goes farther than merely the question of wages. At present there is no bond of sympathy between the employer and employed such as there should be for the common good and stability of interests of all parties. I start with that as an imperative rule and sustaining principle, as otherwise there will be antagonistic principles and destructive elements at work which will ultimately overthrow the fabric or drive the wage-earner back into serfdom, either of which is alike disastrous. It is the house divided against itself.

13,270. You admit, I suppose, that wages are ultimately fixed by the necessities of the trade, and by the competition between various employers, and also between the men?—Considerably so, but not entirely.

13,271. What I want to put to you is this: Assuming that you require the employer to contribute towards a pension fund, which may be a very good scheme, will not the effect of that be that the employer will consider that what he so contributes ought to be deducted from the wages that he pays?—I think not. There are two methods of creating a common bond of interest between capital and labour or employer and employed. One is to give the *employe* a share in the profits and loss, which I do not think is at all practicable; the other is a common fund for the purpose and upon the basis of which I have mentioned. If you compel the wage-earner to provide a fund entirely out of his own wages, you widen the breach between him and his

16 February 1892.]

Captain E. B. HATFIELD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

employer, and as fair wages is an unknown quantity and uncertain, and in this country, where competition is so great, wages is mostly based upon what a man can live upon; even if his wages were doubled, the cravings of appetite and a little better living in his family would absorb the whole of it, so he would ever be at war with his employer for more wages in agitations and strikes, which would be far more expensive to the trade of the country and less satisfactory to wage-earners in the final results.

13,272. Then you consider that this payment can be enforced upon employers without creating any tendency to lower wages?—I think so.

13,273. Then you propose that there should be a pension to all seamen who arrive at a certain age; you fix it earlier, do you not, than the age which has generally been spoken of with regard to pensions for service on shore?—I fix it at 55.

13,274. Why do you take it at an earlier age than in cases of other occupations?—Because in the sea service men are required to have the full strength and use of their limbs or organs and faculties of body and mind. Sailors must be active to go aloft if necessary, to go in the boats; their eyesight and hearing must be good, &c. With captains and officers the case is somewhat different. As long as their general health and powers of mind are good, they can go all right, but even they find a difficulty in getting employment after 55. And with a sailor it is almost impossible for him to get a berth after 50. He usually sticks at 49. You will hardly ever find a sailor to register himself over 50, whatever his natural age may be, because he knows that it is fatal to his employment; and if he is driven to find employment on shore, he is like a fish out of water; he has no connexion with the other trades and unions of men.

13,275. I believe you have handed in a scheme for insurance and for a provident society for seamen?—Yes (see *Appendix* 80). I have here a letter from the late William Cliff, which I think is entitled to great weight on account of his great practical experience, and after establishing his homes for aged mariners, and seeing the working of it, he says, "I have to thank you for your note enclosing copies of insurance and provident society for seamen, as proposed by you, and shall be very glad if some such scheme is carried out.—Yours sincerely, W. CLIFF."

13,276. I will not take you through the figures which you have put before us in your summary, but I think the inference you draw is this, that if you take all sailors not more than one in every five will reach the age of 55, with 40 years' service?—Yes, I think that is one of the points. That is starting at 15, as a boy.

13,277. You have got your scheme fully stated, I apprehend, in a paper which you have sent in?—Yes, I have (see *Appendix* 80). Before leaving the subject I would like to say something in regard to Government contributions.

13,278. Do you propose that the Government should also contribute to this insurance fund?—

Earl of Derby—continued.

Yes. I should like to explain that my first idea, which I have here in a pamphlet (see *Appendix* 81), was based upon a contribution from the Government. As the seaman's calling is somewhat precarious, he cannot always be at sea on wages; there will probably be a considerable shortage in the receipt from wages; suppose we put that down at about one-third, which would be a large allowance. As the employer would only contribute equal to what the wage-earner paid, there would also be a third less from that source, making a full third of the whole amount short of the 900,000*l.* which it is proposed to be raised by my scheme. This gives an opportunity for the Government to contribute one-third, and make the triple cord strong in binding all classes together with bonds of interest to each other and to the country.

13,279. I suppose you would admit that if the Government is to contribute to a scheme of this kind it must do so in the case of any other trade or occupation?—Yes. In attaching this suggestion to my scheme I wish to say that my first scheme as registered in 1885 is based upon this principle of the Government paying one-third; but I was then met with the cry that you cannot give sailors Government aid unless you also give it to other wage-earners and agricultural labourers, &c., which caused me to drop the Government contribution out, only asking them to refund the money for dead seamen's effects, about 300,000*l.*, to help them make a start. But public opinion has altered since then. Ireland has got a Land Bill for the assistance of the lower classes by Government aid, similar assistance is about to be extended to small farmers and agricultural labourers in England, and a general pension fund is seriously talked of for all wage-earners in this country, to be largely contributed to by the State, besides the Public Schools Grants recently. Therefore, seeing that the public opinion and the Government have recognised the principle of State aid upon proper lines, I beg to lay before the Commission my alternative plan for the raising of the money for the National Insurance and Provident Fund for British Mariners which would be thus; say, mariners of all grades in the British merchant service raise 300,000*l.*; employers pay equal to *employes'* 300,000*l.*; and Government pay equally 300,000*l.*, making 900,000*l.*

13,280. I think we understand generally the proposal which you put before us. Now, have you anything to say about the manning of ships?—Yes. I have here a manning scale for sailing ships and steamers, which I prepared in 1884, which has been considered by practical men, and certified to be about right. I now put it before the Commission. (See *Appendix* 82.)

13,281. Do you mean by that, that no one should be allowed to go to sea without a certain number of men in proportion to the tonnage of the ship; is that so?—They ought not to go, but I do not propose to make it an Act of Parliament. I think that a standard rate

16 February 1892.]

Captain E. B. HATFIELD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

should be held up before owners and masters and underwriters, and that they should be warned against the danger of going to sea short-handed.

13,282. Then what you propose is simply a manning scale which shipowners may or may not act upon as they please; is that not so?—I do not propose to make it compulsory at the present time, but I think that if it was more seriously considered, and held up before them, they would see the necessity of it, and agree to it more generally.

13,283. What you call its being "held up," and "put forward," simply means that you or somebody is to advise them to do this, and they may do it or not as they please?—Yes, and also, that in Reports of Commission it should be remarked upon seriously. I have always found shipowners as a rule are inclined to regard whatever is seriously thought to be necessary the same as with the provision scale, they generally agree to a certain thing.

13,284. I will ask you a question as to a matter of fact. Do you think, as a matter of fact, that there is at present a danger from under-manning, and that many ships go to sea short-handed?—Undoubtedly there is danger by under-manning, and hardships are increased upon the crew of a ship that is short-handed; but from what I see and hear I think that the tendency is to keep on reducing the number of men, and I believe a great many ships are pinched for a hand or two.

13,285. Then you wish to tell us something about the dietary scale?—I think the food question is one which requires the attention of anyone looking into these matters. Take first the article of fresh water, it is now three quarts daily. It has been that for the last 40 or 50 years; when crews were nearly double in number what they are now, and ships were much smaller; and as water is such a very important thing for the health of the crew, I think that it should be made a full gallon as a standard. Then take the article of wheat-flour, which is one of the most nourishing articles of diet in the whole world, and most satisfying; it is carried in a compact form, that is to say, in barrels, it is convenient to carry, and I think that that should be increased considerably from what it is now. There is no regular rule. Some give it twice a week, some three times a week. I have here a statement showing that in 1844 the shipowners agreed to give their men wheatflour every alternate day, which would be about four times a week (*handing in Scale of Provisions*.) Flour must have been very much dearer then than it is now, and crews being larger it must have been more expensive for them to have given their crews flour. Then, again, I take the article of sugar, which is also one of the most nourishing and comforting things that a man can eat or have in his diet, especially where he has not a large scale to pick from, such as dried fruit and other sweet things. He has to depend upon his sugar as a standard, and I think that ought to be given to them in about

Earl of Derby—continued.

double the quantity that they have at present. Then as substitutes, if a higher and better standard is made out in these leading articles, it will also raise the standard of substitutes—things that are provided in the place of it, and so the men would get a better scale. Without going into all the little details, I think the other details are very well chosen.

13,286. You propose that this should be a regulation sanctioned by Act of Parliament, do you?—It has not been by Act of Parliament yet. If the scale is not improved without Act of Parliament it may become necessary to have an Act of Parliament for it.

13,287. What I meant to ask you is this: Whether you mean to enforce these things which you consider desirable upon shipowners, or whether you are merely giving good advice?—I am loth to suggest Acts of Parliament if it can be done without, and I find, as a rule, that shipowners do conform very often when pressure is put upon them in these matters.

13,288. Conform to what?—Conform to public opinion and the demands of their employes.

Mr. Ismay.

13,289. Do you think there is much under-manning now at sea?—No, I do not, but as I have said I think on many ships they are just a hand or two short, but to say that a ship is seriously under-manned, I do not think so.

13,290. Is it on board of sailing ships or steamers that you think the under-manning is chiefly to be complained of?—I hear of it from both. Some classes of the tramp type we hear of only having three or four men.

13,291. What sized steamer with three or four men?—800 or 1,000 tons.

13,292. Three or four men, excluding the officers?—Excluding the officers.

13,293. Then how do they find men; do they keep watch and watch or how do they work?—They relieve one another the best way they can.

13,294. Still, if there are only three men and we require one man at the wheel and one at the look-out, and somebody must be below, how do they manage then?—Well, it is not sufficient; there is where the difficulty and danger comes in. I hold that for any considerable sized steamer there should be eight seamen; four in a watch.

13,295. And you contend that these vessels are a source of danger to themselves and to other vessels because of their inefficient look-out?—Decidedly so.

13,296. Are they in the foreign trade or in the coasting trade or where?—In the foreign trade I think mostly.

13,297. Then how do you propose to remedy this: good advice will not do—you have tried that, have you not?—Keep on warning them, and if it does not have the desired effect, then make an Act of Parliament and fine them. Speaking of sailing ships, I do hear occasionally of them being a little pinched and short-handed,

16 February 1892.]

Captain E. B. HATFIELD.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ismay—continued.

but I do not know of any one case where I could say that it has led to disaster.

13,298. Is that in large or small ships?—Principally in the large ships.

13,299. Large sailing ships?—Large sailing ships—and medium size—from 1,000 tons upwards.

13,300. Is that not owing to an entire change in the weight of the yards and the masting of the ships; is it not on a different scale to what it used to be?—They have decreased the number of masts, but I do not see that that can reduce the number of men so considerably as they have. There are certain heavy things that have to be done, furling a mainsail, for instance, or a foresail, any of the large sails in heavy weather, or handling the ship in heavy weather if overtaken in an emergency, things which are large and heavy and require weight and strength.

13,301. Are there not sailing ships with crews of 35 to 40 men?—There are some very large ships of 2,500 to 3,000 tons.

13,302. Are they not manned more in proportion than a ship of half the tonnage would be with half the number of men?—They would be manned more in proportion.

13,303. I want you to give the Commission the benefit of your experience. You see you have been a sailor, you have been a shipowner, and you have occupied various positions, and I want you to give us the benefit of it?—As a rule the ship of 3,000 tons does not carry double the hands that one of 1,500 tons would do. If they did carry double the hands they would be well manned.

13,304. Would they not be over-manned in proportion?—In proportion they would be, I should say, very well manned.

13,305. Would not they be over-manned?—I would not say that they were over-manned. It would make it a little easier for those who were on board.

13,306. As regards the food on board the sailing ships, what is it that you complain about, or what is it that you think ought to be remedied. Is the meat sufficient?—I think that the quantity of meat is sufficient. It might be varied, and ought to be varied considerably with more canned meat—fresh meat.

13,307. I suppose it is only with sailing ships that you find any difficulty as regards the food?—I think so principally.

13,308. On account of the long voyages?—Yes. I believe that steamers generally of all classes feed very well.

13,309. But you very seldom hear of cases of scurvy now, do you, on sailing ships?—Not often—very seldom.

13,310. Have the accommodation and food improved of late years in sailing ships?—The accommodation, I believe, has improved. I would not say that the food has improved.

13,311. Has the accommodation not been generally moved out of the fore-castle to houses on deck in a modern ship?—Yes.

Mr. Ismay—continued.

13,312. Has that not given more light and air and ventilation?—Yes, I think the accommodation has improved.

13,313. Distinctly improved?—Distinctly. I would like to say before leaving the question of accommodation that I do hear complaints of not having space enough. Seventy-two cubic feet, I believe, is the regulation allowance for each man. I have generally given 100 feet in anything that I have fitted up for men, which I believe is necessary, and would be better. In the very large ships they have now, and with the smaller crews that they carry compared with what they did formerly, I think they can well afford to give them a little extra space.

13,314. You would increase the allowance per man?—Yes.

13,315. That is deducted from the tonnage of the ship, is it not?—Yes.

13,316. So that the owner does not pay dues upon it?—The owner does not pay dues upon it.

13,317. Have you anything more to say about the accommodation?—No, I think that is all. I do not complain or find fault with the accommodation, but I do hear some complaints, and I think it is well not to allow it to come to a serious question.

13,318. Is the disposition on the part of the shipowners rather to meet these questions liberally or otherwise?—I think the shipowners would like to do what is right, provided he is brought to understand that it is necessary to do that.

13,319. Then he will do right if you compel him?—Not exactly compulsion, but he must feel that it is necessary for the well-being of his trade and business to do a certain thing, and I think then the inclination is to adopt it.

13,320. Is that from a disposition to treat his employes well, or is it simply the feeling which you say is not compulsion, but still a feeling on his part, or an opinion on his part, that he should adopt it, or what is it?—It is partly that they are subject to public opinion. There is a good deal of pride amongst the shipowners; they like to keep their ships well, and to sometimes boast of what good things they do for their employes. I think that if it can be brought before their minds that a certain thing is deficient, that it ought to be improved or different, the inclination is amongst shipowners generally to adopt that.

13,321. You see we are not legislating for the good shipowners, of whom you admit there are some, but we want to legislate for the owner who will not be acted upon by public opinion. How are you going to do that?—I do not draw that distinction which some people draw between good and bad shipowners. Some may be a little more difficult to persuade than others, but I believe from what I have seen and known of them they are all inclined to do what they think is necessary. Of course they have great competition, and they are obliged to run things pretty fine at times.

16 February 1892.]

Captain E. B. HATFIELD.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ismay—continued.

13,322. Then as regards the food. What have you to tell us about that?—I have heard a good many complaints about it—that they have not change enough in their diet—have not fresh meat enough, potatoes, and such things. A good many have given marmalade. They ran that marmalade question until the seamen got almost disgusted with it; they stopped part of their meat for it, I believe, and one thing and another. Marmalade is a very excellent thing, no doubt, in reasonable quantities, but it will not take the place of meat and other sustaining foods.

13,323. It is only supposed to come in at the end of the meal, not at the first?—Yes, just so.

13,324. As regards wages, what are the wages out of the port of Liverpool now for firemen and for seamen?—In the Western Ocean trade I believe it is 4' 10s. for seamen, 5*l.* for firemen, sailors on long voyages, I think, get 3*l.* in sailing ships.

13,325. And you do not find fault with those wages?—No. I think as times are, that they are fairly good wages.

13,326. But you complain that the officers' wages are not what they ought to be?—Yes.

13,327. What are the officers' wages now? About what would they average?—Some large ships are paying 7*l.* and 8*l.*, and 5*l.* and 6*l.* for second mate.

13,328. Sailing ships?—Yes. Some owners will pay, perhaps, a pound more respectively. Now take the chief officer of a large ship. That man must be a whole, sound man of experience, and if he is such a man of experience, he will probably have a wife and children, and he can scarcely keep himself and his wife and children in a respectable manner such as the chief officer of a fine large ship ought to do upon 8*l.* or 9*l.* a month, and sometimes less. The consequence is that we find a great many of these officers hanging about, and trying to get masters' berths for the sake of the wages of course, but I hold that the chief officer's berth on these large ships—

13,329. Sailing ships, are you speaking of?—Yes, and some of the tramp steamer type too, I believe, do not pay as well as they ought to do. I hold that the chief officer's pay, and, in fact, the second officer's also, should be sufficient to encourage a man to be contented in the officer's berth.

13,330. Would you not have him desire to become a master?—Of course, let him take his promotion if it comes to him, if he can get it, but if he cannot get that promotion his wages as an officer should be sufficient for him to live on in comfort.

Mr. Tait.

13,331. Might I ask you whom you represent here?—I represent Captain Hatfield.

13,332. No other?—I am Vice-President of the Association at Liverpool, which is a very large Association of masters and officers, and, as far as my knowledge goes, I would be very pleased to speak on their behalf.

Mr. Tait—continued.

13,333. Were you deputed to do so?—Not specially.

13,334. Then I may take it that you just represent yourself?—You may take it that I do.

13,335. Now, in 1889, when you presided at the meeting of sailors which you afterwards retired from owing to their determining to strike, you had satisfied yourself that the wages were too low?—In the first instance.

13,336. And the result of that strike was that they got an advance of 10s.?—No, I do not say so, but I say that in the first instance by asking for 10s. they got it, and then afterwards they endeavoured to get 10s. more, and they did not get it—not through their strike.

13,337. The first advance which they got of 10s. was the result of their striking, as it were, against your wishes?—No, decidedly not.

13,338. Then how did they get it?—The shipowners conceded the 10s. without any strike.

13,339. After the strike was over?—No, before the strike.

13,340. Then, notwithstanding that you withdrew from the meeting, the men still got what they thought was reasonable and fair without striking?—They got it, and were getting it before I withdrew.

13,341. They had not to strike then before they got the 10s.?—No, they had not—not before they got the first 10s.?—It was for a second 10s. that they struck.

13,342. Now you have said in answer to Lord Derby that you think, considering everything, the men are fairly well paid?—Yes, considering the hard times that are now on.

13,343. And you have also said in answer to him that when the Ismay Fund was started in Liverpool a very large proportion of the applicants for benefit under that fund were officers and masters?—Yes.

13,344. And you further stated that you thought that they were underpaid, as there was a considerable amount of destitution and poverty in their midst?—Some of the masters and officers are underpaid in some trades.

13,345. You said a number of them were in a state of destitution and poverty?—Yes.

13,346. And in answer to Mr. Ismay you have said that on sailing ships the class of men whom you say are in this position of semi-poverty and distress have from 8*l.* to 9*l.* per month?—Yes.

13,347. Now, what wages have they in steam vessels?—In the large lines they get, I should think, some of them 15*l.* a month.

13,348. Have you known any of them with 15*l.* a month, or any of their families, being in that same poverty-stricken condition?—They might come to that distress in their old age when they get up in years—not while they are in active service. I would like to say this, that when a man is in active service, receiving his pay 8*l.* or 9*l.*, or even less, he makes that do; he is not in a state of destitution, neither he nor his wife nor his family. But he cannot lay up money upon it, or he does not do it; the consequence is as soon as his work stops when he

16 February 1892.]

Captain E. B. HATFIELD.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

gets up in years or any accident happens to him then he is in destitution.

13,349. So now you say that he cannot lay up money, or at least that he does not do it, can you give us the reason, you who have been a captain and have had charge of these officers, why they do not make provision for their old age?—They use it up as they go along; they live upon it.

13,350. They live up to it, you mean?—They live up to it.

13,351. And some of them would live beyond it if they had the opportunity?—Undoubtedly they could always live a little better, and a few shillings or a pound or two a month for a man in that position—and it is quite a position to be an officer of a ship—would not supply margin enough for him to lay by unless he is compelled to.

13,352. You also suggested to the Commission as a reason why they should receive special consideration, and pointed out the fact that they have to be whole, sound men, and that they should in virtue of being officers be able to keep their children in respectability?—Yes.

13,353. In answer to Mr. Ismay you said the wages of seamen were 4*l.* 10*s.*, and of firemen 5*l.*, on the Western Ocean, and that sailors in sailing ships just now were receiving 3*l.*?—Yes.

13,354. You have stated that you think that is quite sufficient under existing conditions for these men?—As much as the service can afford to pay in its present depressed state.

13,355. Notwithstanding that, you think that the service is able to pay something more to the officers?—Decidedly.

13,356. Then how do you come to reconcile your position that we should make some suggestion to the shipowners that the officers' pay should be increased, while at the same time you are not prepared to say that the seamen's pay should be increased, or the firemen's pay?—Because the officers are men holding responsible positions and are educated to a considerable extent, and altogether they hold a higher position. It is incumbent upon the safety of the trade that officers and masters should be really good men, and in order to keep up that standard they must be paid, whereas the seaman, if he is a man of strength of limb and body, does not require that high standard for his calling.

13,357. You have expressed a desire that there should be a better understanding between employers and employed, meaning shipowners and their sailors and firemen?—I think so.

13,358. Do you think that it is one way out of the difficulty to give an advance of wages to one class of the service and refuse it to another, do you think that would bring about better conditions?—As a matter of fact the officers have not agitated, and have not had any rise in comparison with what the seamen have done.

13,359. But they have had a rise?—I think there has been a little rise by force of public opinion on the subject, but there has been no general movement amongst the officers—no

Mr. Tait—continued.

strike or anything of that kind. Probably shipowners I think in some instances have themselves felt that they ought to give a little more, and have given 10*s.* a month more, but that is not sufficient—it is not the same proportion.

13,360. But you are prepared to say that the seaman who is receiving 3*l.* a month should be contented, whilst the ship's officer, who has a wage varying from 8*l.* to 15*l.* or 16*l.* a month, should get an advance?—The ship's officer where the seaman gets 3*l.* would only get about 8*l.*

13,361. Even put it at that?—Where the ship's officer gets the larger wages, in the Atlantic service, the seaman gets 4*l.* 10*s.*

13,362. Just so; that is the same proportion, 3*l.* to 8*l.* and 4*l.* 10*s.* to 16*l.*?—About the same.

13,363. About this National Insurance Fund which you propose, I have a copy of your scheme here, but I have not had time to read it—will you tell us, as briefly as possible, what is the principle which you base this fund upon?—The principle is that the seamen should pay 2*s.* 6*d.* per month, I have taken the month as a definite thing in order to work out my figures, but that might be made into a certain percentage upon the earnings. Whatever the seaman pays, the master and officers I put down for double, that is 5*s.* per month, and whatever the *employé* pays I put down the owner or employer to pay an equal amount.

13,364. From these contributions you bring up the round figure of 920,000*l.*, annually?—Yes.

13,365. Now, how are you going to get the seamen to pay this 2*s.* 6*d.* a month—by legislation?—By legislation—make it compulsory.

13,366. And would you also make it compulsory for the shipping company to pay this 450,000*l.* out of that 920,000*l.*?—Yes. Whenever a shipowner pays off his crew he must deduct from the men, according to the time and wages they have earned, the regulation amount, whatever is decided upon; having done that he must pay down the same amount alongside of it, and then if the Government is to contribute, as I have suggested in my alternative plan, the shipowner must render an account to the Government, and they are to supplement it with an equal amount to whatever the shipowner pays.

13,367. In your alternative proposal you say that 300,000*l.*, would be contributed by the *employés*, I take that to be masters and officers included?—Yes.

13,368. And 300,000*l.* by the employers?—Yes.

13,369. And 300,000*l.* by the Government?—Yes.

13,370. Will you tell us the reason why you would ask the Government to contribute to any such particular fund on behalf of seamen?—Because they are recognising the principle that they have to afford State aid to many of the lower classes. They are giving free schools, they are bringing in agricultural relief, and public opinion seem to be growing upon the

16 February 1892.]

Captain E. B. HATFIELD.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

subject, so that a general pension fund is seriously talked about for all classes; and if any class in the country has a claim upon the Government, I do think that the seamen, as a class, have the first claim.

13,371. With regard to the free schools, you base your argument upon the principle that we have given a free education, at least to a certain extent, and for the same reason you would ask the State to interfere on behalf of sailors, and you have also stated that there are in the air at present proposals for a pension fund, but are you aware that the proposal presently in front of the country is of a voluntary character, while yours is to be compulsory?—I am aware of it.

13,372. Are you also aware that the party who is to be a recipient from that fund shall pay a contribution which is thought to be commensurate with the benefits he is to receive?—I am quite aware of that too.

13,373. Therefore, there cannot be any analogy between your proposal to tax the rate-payers of this country for 300,000*l.* per year for the sailors alone, and the scheme that is presently in front of the country?—I do not think that the voluntary system if it is carried out according to the proposal that is before the country will succeed.

13,374. That has to be seen—you are only speaking in the prospective in that sense?—Therefore, I recommend that it should be made compulsory. I have always done so.

13,375. Now what would you do with the other 7,000,000 workers who have to contribute towards this 300,000*l.* for the sailors—what are you prepared to do with them—there is poverty and distress along with them?—I would make it compulsory upon them too.

13,376. Then I may take it that you are prepared to come with a huge scheme of pensions for all workmen?—Yes.

13,377. Now it has been stated before this Commission that a sailor's life at sea is a pretty pleasant one—from your long experience as a captain and a master, is that your opinion?—Sometimes it is pleasant and sometimes it is very unpleasant.

13,378. You would not be prepared to say in an off-hand way that it is a pleasant occupation?—I do not say it is more pleasant than occupations upon land where there is labour involved.

13,379. Have you any proposal to put to the Commission for the purpose of reducing the hours of labour at sea?—No, I have not. I do not think it is practicable.

13,380. Do you think the hours are short enough or long enough—which?—I do not think it is practicable to apply hours of labour at sea—I think it would lead to danger, to disaster. While they were debating and talking whether they should jump out and tack ship or furl sails, or something or other, the ship might be struck with a squall and capsized or run upon a rock.

13,381. May I take it that as an experienced seafaring man you are perfectly satisfied with

Mr. Tait—continued.

the wages which are at present paid, and the hours that are worked just now by the men?—I do not say that I am satisfied. I am not satisfied, for instance, with the freights that ships are getting; I am not satisfied at all with the income either of the ships or of the seamen, but I say, having regard to the miserable freights that are going, I do think that seamen can hardly ask for a rise of wages at the present time. If a boom of good business was to come on then, I should say that they might be entitled to another rise.

13,382. Just so; but my question was especially relevant to the present time. I say at the present time are you satisfied as to hours and wages?—As to hours I do not think it is practicable to interfere with the discipline of the ship—it must be left to the captain and his officers to act according as emergencies arise.

13,383. While you are prepared to legislate for the purpose of getting this large pension fund which you have suggested, you are against the same principle of legislation being put into operation to limit the hours of labour to what the Government may think necessary for a sailor, and also to regulate the wages of labour by legislative interference?—Yes, I am against that. I am against interfering with and regulating the hours of labour at sea at all events, or regulating the price of labour at sea by Government.

13,384. Will you explain to us the reason why?—In the first place, in regard to the hours of labour, I think it is entirely impracticable and dangerous to interfere with the present wages and modes of discipline at sea.

13,385. By legislation?—By legislation. I think it would be subversive of discipline, and that it would lead to very great disasters. In regard to the wages of seamen I think we can fairly leave that to supply and demand. Whether the time will come I do not know, but I do not think it has yet arrived, when Government should interfere with the wages of seamen, whatever it may be on shore.

13,385*a*.—If you are not prepared to legislate on the question of wages, under what principle do you suggest to the Commission that we should interfere with the private liberties and rights of both sailors and shipowners, and tax the country to the extent of 300,000*l.* per year by legislation?—From the fact that 42 per cent. of the population, after arriving at the age of 65, according to well-authenticated statistics, are either in the workhouses or seeking parish relief. Mr. Booth puts that percentage at 38, and the Reverend Canon Blackley, I think, puts it at 42. I think that is a sufficient cause to alarm the country as to the present condition of its population. We all have the greatest respect for the friendly societies, but inasmuch as those societies and all other methods and means come short, and have failed to provide for the well-being of the people, I do think it is time now that some other and more effective means should be adopted, and as voluntary means do not seem to succeed I think it should

16 February 1892.]

Captain E. B. HATFIELD.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

be made compulsory, for as a matter of fact these people in their poverty and distress, their destitution and starvation, which is under our eyes, are not free, and the authorities of the country have to interfere and provide for them—to take them off the streets, stop the scandal, stop the inhumanity, if we may say so, of man to himself, therefore, I think it should be compulsory.

13,386. Have you any suggestion to make to the Commission for the purpose of preventing the disputes which occur between capital and labour?—I think that a general scheme of this sort would prevent that. I do not know of anything else that will do it.

13,387. You do not believe in arbitration?—Arbitration is good as far as it goes, but before you can arbitrate there must be a cause, and a crisis, and there may be a stoppage of work, perhaps a serious one, before it comes to arbitration.

13,388. Not if the rules governing the conciliatory board of arbitration have been complied with I think, that could scarcely occur in that case?—Arbitration has been spoken of, and it has been adopted for some years now, and yet we see very serious strikes going on.

13,389. Might I ask you whether you are a shipowner or have any shares in ships?—At the present moment I may say that I have no shares directly in ships.

13,390. Might I ask you further if the firm or anything you are interested in in shipping is a member of the Shipping Federation?—No.

13,391. Are you aware that the principal witness for the Shipping Federation in the person of Mr. Laws, who represented the largest amount of shipping interest which has yet given evidence before the Commission, has suggested that there should be a Government official for the purpose of preventing these disputes?—I daresay I have heard of it—he suggested a good many things.

13,392. Will you take it from me that he did do so in his evidence?—Yes.

13,393. Now, in reply to Mr. Ismay, you said that you did not admit to the extent that some people did, that there are good and bad shipowners?—Not in the sense that the words are commonly used. There might be a criminal shipowner the same as a criminal anything else. It has become a fashion to say a good shipowner and a bad shipowner, but I think it is an erroneous idea, and false way of putting it.

13,394. Have you known any ship go down which, previous to its sailing, you, personally, would have thought unseaworthy?—No, I have not.

13,395. If there were cases of that kind arising, and coming under the cognisance of the Government—of the Board of Trade, for instance—would you not give Government some exceptional powers to deal with those men as against owners who keep their vessels in good order?—Certainly, I think the Board of Trade have such power.

Mr. Plimsoll.

13,396. Have you any personal knowledge of the kind of accommodation which is provided for men on ships of a low class, say those engaged principally in bringing coal to London?—No, I could not speak for the coasting trade that way.

13,397. Since you sat down at the table your name rather struck me. May I ask you, without giving offence—I have no intention of doing so—whether you are the same Captain Hatfield whom Mr. Chamberlain referred to on the 19th May 1884, in proposing the Bill for insurance?—I am the same Captain Hatfield.

13,398. He said that at that time, out of 12 ships owned by you, you had lost 11?—I believe he did. It was an untruth which I clearly demonstrated at the time, and, as far as I could, I convinced the country. I could not bring an action against Mr. Chamberlain, because he spoke from his place in the House of Parliament and by privilege, and I was advised that I could not prosecute him or I should have done so.

Mr. Burt.

13,399. In answer to Mr. Tait, you said that the seamen's wages might be safely left to be regulated by the laws of demand and supply; why would you not apply the same principle to the regulation of the wages of captains and officers?—I do, I leave it, only when my opinion is asked, I say I think that captains and officers in some instances—it is only in some trades—are underpaid. Still, I do not propose to go to Parliament to ask Parliament to make a law that shipowners shall raise their wages any more than for the seamen. I think that both parties have got to agitate in one way or other through their Unions, but they need not go to extremes, they need not knock off the work. I believe a great deal can be done by approaching employers in a reasonable and fair manner, and what cannot be carried by argument I think the argument for it is necessarily weak.

13,400. Do you know anybody who advocates going to Parliament to fix wages?—I do not, I am not sure that it has not been hinted at in a general way, but I do not know that anyone seriously purposes that.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

13,401. Did you take the advice of an actuary on this scheme for insurance that you have put before us?—No. I have worked it out myself entirely on data that I have been able to gather from one source and the other. It has been circulated far and wide, I think about 10,000 copies, and amongst the insurance companies. I have never had it challenged or disputed as to its correctness. I do not say that it is absolutely correct, neither will any scheme be absolutely correct in all its details, but I think that it affords sufficient as a guide and a standard to show what can be done.

13,402. Are you aware that there was a scheme of pensions for sailors in the mercantile marine, and allowances to their widows and

16 February 1892.]

Captain E. B. HATFIELD.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

children, actually in effect at one time?—Yes, some years ago, previous to 1854, and earlier than that. It was wound up.

13,403. Are you aware what happened to that scheme?—I am.

13,404. Are you aware that it was found absolutely insolvent?—Yes.

13,405. That the assets had to be taken over by the Government, and that every year since then Parliament has had to vote a considerable sum in aid of the pensions which accrued under that scheme?—I believe that is so.

13,406. And yet you propound to us a scheme that has not been examined or certified by any actuary—a scheme which has been prepared merely on your own authority?—I propound my scheme upon the authority of statements which I have gathered from actuarial statements, and also from my own practical experience. There is quite a difference between the payments I demand and the payments that were given in the old scheme, which was something like a shilling a month in a fast-and-loose kind of way, whereas my scheme calls for 2s. 6d. per month, to be supplemented by a like amount from the owner, and also something from the Government. We cannot pay benefits unless there is money collected, and if a scheme is good and worth bothering with, it ought to be well contributed to. You cannot take more out of a jug than you put into it, that is certain, and if the fund is not made strong, you cannot give adequate benefits. When I see that seamen pay so liberally to support their unions and little societies that are got up, which do them little or no good, then I think that it is time for the authorities to step in and say: "Here, you pay about the same amount, or even if it is a trifle more, to a sound Government scheme, and we will guarantee that you shall be secured against poverty and distress in your old age, and also have something afforded in case of sickness and accident." My scheme thoroughly provides for the whole estate of seamen and their widows and children.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

13,407. Is there any other matter that you wish to bring before us?—I would only like to say further in regard to this scheme that the smaller schemes that I have seen or had to do with have all failed (as has been stated about the former Government scheme), and I think all small schemes will fail. The Shipowners' Federation scheme is good as far as it goes, but it is only a little one-sided affair. It is like a man giving a bonus to his servants and saying: If you will do so and so, we will give you something; but it is nothing of a sustaining character. I know exactly what would happen to those widows who would get the 25*l.* in a few weeks, they would be coming to the likes of our Association in poverty and distress asking for aid. Therefore, I want to see a scheme established which will be of a sustaining character and keep them in a fairly comfortable position—keep them out of the workhouse.

Mr. Ismay.

13,408. Do you think that between the shipowners and the officers and seamen—leaving out any State aid—some such scheme could not be worked?—I think it could be worked.

13,409. Leaving out the State?—Leaving out State aid. This plan of mine is between the shipowners and the men, but I have also an alternative plan for State aid, seeing that there has been so much talk lately about State aid.

13,410. Do you consider the conditions under which the mercantile marine or the employers of the mercantile marine carry on, are so different to any other employment as to call for some such scheme?—I think so. For instance, in case of a general war or anything of that sort, we know that the seamen of the country are in a manner the right arm of Great Britain. In order to man the ships in case of accident or anything occurring, making it necessary to send out a double number of ships, the seamen are impounded for the service.

13,411. Even on those grounds you would ask for State assistance as well?—Yes.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. WILLIAM HANNAY RAEBURN called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

13,412. You are a managing owner to what are called tramp or cargo steamers, are you not?—Yes.

13,413. How many years' experience have you had in that trade?—About 20 years.

13,414. Are you also chairman of the Clyde District Committee of the Shipping Federation?—Yes.

13,415. And a member of the Clyde Trust?—Yes.

13,416. And a member of the Local Marine Board and Pilot Board?—Yes.

13,417. Now you wish to make some observations concerning the evidence given by a Mr. Darby, who appeared before us, I think?—

Earl of Derby—continued.

I may just say, in regard to why I thought it necessary to say anything about this, that the evidence of this ex-member of the Federation has been referred to by Mr. Wilson, and then, of course, I do not know what weight Mr. Darby's own evidence may have had with you; but I should just like to say a few words regarding it to give you some little idea as to the dependence that might be attached to that evidence. I might say, in the first place, that this Union in Glasgow, the Seamen and Firemen's Union, was formed greatly through the exertions of this same Mr. Darby, and that after some lapse of time we (I am speaking for the shipowners)

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAEURN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

found this Union had waxed very strong, and was putting us to a very great deal of inconvenience and a great deal of annoyance. Mr. Darby, in his evidence, spoke of deputations to the shipowners asking for a rise of wages. I can say, and I represent a very large number of Glasgow shipowners, that we are perfectly ignorant of any such requests or deputations. The beginning of a great deal of trouble certainly was a demand made by the seamen in coasting steamers, which was made, as it were, the one day, and because not granted the next, the steamers were bereft of their crews—not a proceeding, I think, that anyone would consider likely to conduce to friendliness on the part of the shipowners. Certainly that movement of the men gave rise to an increase of pay from 25s. in the coasting steamers to 27s. I have no doubt, of course, that credit is taken that that rise would never have been given except it had been for the exertions of this Association, of which Mr. Darby was the moving part. Just to finish with this witness's evidence to whom I have referred, some months before the Federation was ever heard of, I was waited upon by Mr. Darby, who had by that time left the Union, because, as he said, his moral nature rose against it, and Mr. Wilson and he seemed to have got to deadly enmity. Shortly afterwards he heard that this Federation was being formed, and came to me and asked if we could find him some post in the Federation. My remark to him was that I was not very keen to have much coming and going with an ex-official of the Union, especially as I had known the tactics which that Union had pursued. However, at Mr. Laws—Mr. Laws, you understand, is the secretary or manager of the Federation—earnest solicitation we employed this man in a subordinate position, but we found him simply useless from fear of the Union, from which he had seceded, and in the end we gave him his warning, as he was so often absent as a witness in libellous actions which were going on among various officials in the Union. In the end he came and asked aid for his wife and family, and the Federation and some few private friends of the Federation subscribed 10*l.*, on condition that the man leave Glasgow. I give you that simply as a commentary upon this witness's statement that he left the Federation because he found it to be a scheme for the breaking up of the Union—because he found it to be inimical to the welfare of seamen. Far from that being his excuse, he was really discharged as being of no use to the Federation, and, as he said himself, he was very thankful to be done with both Union and Federation. I would now, having regard to that witness, like to say a word or two upon the state of affairs which prevailed in Glasgow before the inauguration of this Federation. I may explain that there have been for a long time in Glasgow two labour organisations—one called the Old Dock Labourers' Union, and the other the National Union of Dock Labourers of Great Britain and Ireland, sometimes known in Glasgow by the

Earl of Derby—continued.

name of McHugh's Union, McHugh being one of the leading spirits. This old Union which I refer to is more of a friendly society, providing benefits for men laid aside through sickness and giving assistance in case of death; and, generally speaking, the better class of labourers belonging to Glasgow are members of that Union, but the stevedores who employ these men are not members of any Union. The other Union, the National Dock Labourers' Union, for the most part consists of Irishmen, and these men handle the rougher sorts of cargoes. At the time of the strike in Glasgow in 1889, of which you have had some evidence from a representative of the Allan line, this National Dock Labourers' Union did their very best to prevent the Allan and Anchor line steamers from being loaded or discharged. While the Allan line was trying to defend its position the old dock labourers supplied men to discharge and load the cargoes, but in this my firm and the tramp vessels of Glasgow were in no way mixed up. However, about six months after this occurrence took place one of our vessels arriving with a cargo of Esparto grass was discharging. We employed one of the stevedores whose men belonged to the Old Dock Labourers' Union; we did it not because they belonged to the Old Dock Labourers' Union, but simply because we had been in the habit of giving that man a part of our business. As soon as the grass was commenced to be discharged the weighers struck at the instigation of the National Dock Labourers' Union. Thereupon I was waited on by an official of that Union, a delegate, who informed me that unless I discharged the men of the Old Dock Labourers' Union who were working at the ship his Union would take very good care that when our vessel went to the coal cranes to be loaded work would be stopped. When I said that I was not prepared to be dictated to by him or any other man as to whom I should employ, he then said we are also in league with the National Seamen's Union and we will take very good care that if you do not discharge these men you shall have no crew. Thereupon, knowing what was before me I got the stevedore who was discharging the ship to promise to load her, though that was not his usual work, and I sent one of our captains—the captain of the ship—through to Dundee to get a crew. He got a crew, and they were sent down by rail to Greenock. As I had known what sort of work these Unions could do I feared that these men would be assaulted, and violence used at Greenock to them, so I applied to the chief constable there to furnish a guard from the station. Well, strangely enough, and I leave the Commission to conjecture who instigated the mob, or who induced the mob to assemble, as it was not a usual thing to be having a crew taken from the railway station at Greenock and sent down to the dock—sure enough when the crew arrived there the whole road from the station to the dock was lined with roughs, and only through the protection of the police was that

16 February 1892.]

- Mr. W. H. RAEBURN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

crew saved from rough usage. Then I had a message sent to me by this same Darby that the next ship I would not manage to get away quite so easily. When the next ship came to get her crew, I tried in vain in every port in Scotland to get a crew which would sail with union or non-union men—what we called a free crew, and in the end I had to pocket my pride and go to Darby for a crew. Well, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Darby have said a great deal to you about some of the strong features of the Union, one of them being to see sober men and a respectable class of men put on board. I can only say that a more scandalous crew never was sent to a ship than this same Union delegate or secretary sent to ours. So bad in fact were they when put on board at 9 o'clock at night at Greenock, that they were not able to hold the pen to sign their names or make a mark, and the Board of Trade official who must superintend the shipping of crews had to return the next morning when the men were a little more sober. That was a sample, and the only sample of a crew I have ever had directly invited from the Union. Then having made these remarks, I would like now to speak of the opposition we met with when the Federation did come into existence. While we were getting into working order we found a most deadly opposition raised against us. There was a steamer called the "Godrevy." We wanted some men to complete her crew, and after the greatest possible difficulty these men were got, and I may say that out of that case arose a conviction for crimping on the part of the Federation. If your Lordship will allow me, I will just read this letter written by our secretary in Glasgow to Mr. Laws, as it is referred to by Mr. Wilson in his evidence. He accuses the Federation of crimping. The letter reads, "I had a long talk to-day with Mr. Ross, shipping master here, regarding the opening and working of a register office. He pointed out all the difficulties in the way, and stated that in his opinion if any of our officials assisted in supplying the crew, they would be liable to be prosecuted for crimping, and he wound up by saying that he was sorry to say that he was about to report the case of the 'Godrevy' to the Board of Trade to-day. In this case you will remember you sent the captain to me to assist in getting free labour, and I passed him on to Mr. Sutcliffe, who is applying for a post in the register office, and he assisted the captain in completing his crew." I suggested to Mr. Ross that as the Federation had register offices in London, Liverpool, Sunderland, &c., and as the question of assisting an owner or master to obtain a crew was one which the Federation looked upon as important, it might be advisable for the Board of Trade and for the Federation to make a test case in London, where it could be fought out at headquarters. Mr. Ross promised to convey this suggestion in his report. "I would venture to add that you should take an early opportunity, in view of this possible

Earl of Derby—continued.

"prosecution in Glasgow, of consulting your solicitors on the subject, and further of endeavouring to arrange with the Board of Trade, if they mean business, to have a test case in London and not in an outpost." I may say with regard to that, that I think it has been conceded, that Federation officers have the right to engage crews. At any rate whether it may have been openly conceded or not, there can be no doubt that no prosecutions have since followed on the Federation officers assisting to ship crews, so that with regard to that case in which this man Sutcliffe was fined for crimping, if the same thing happened now I think he would not be fined, as our present superintendent is doing the very self-same thing that he did, and it is being done in every port in the kingdom. We had no sooner got over the difficulty with the "Godrevy" than the steamer "Gairloch," belonging to a Glasgow owner, was in difficulties, and this case brings into prominence the tactics of the Union, which Mr. Wilson would have the Commissioners believe never adopted an aggressive policy. This steamer was loading in Glasgow for Constantinople, and was preparing to ship on a crew on the 16th of October, when the Union became aware that there were three Arab firemen on board, who had been brought from the East on the promise that they would be taken back again. The Union refused to allow any of their men to ship unless these Arabs joined the Union or were discharged. You will remember that Mr. Wilson laid great stress upon the benefits the Union gave to the men, but it would be interesting to hear him explain how it would have profited these Arabs to have been members of the Union. Would his Union have followed them out to their native land, and given them these benefits which he graphically described to the Commissioners? These benefits were money for shipwreck claims, for losing clothes, legal protection, superannuation grant, and sick payments. Messrs. Gardiner, the owners of the "Gairloch," very rightly refused to comply with the demand of the Union, and knowing of course that that meant they would not get a Union crew they set about looking for a free crew. We got one, but the man we employed—and I believe, speaking from memory, it was Darby himself—had been watched, and when he arrived at the ship's side on the Thursday found a crowd of Unionists on the quay, and his men refused to go on board. Next day this man, either Darby or one of the other officials, took a lot of men up to the owners' office to get them selected. The owners selected a crew, and sent them down to Helensburgh, where they were to be taken off by a tug, which had by this time gone down to the tail of the bank, as it was quite clear that the crew could not be got on board in Glasgow. On the arrival of the train the men were met by a Union picket, and ultimately they all went away. We got five men sent down again at midnight; and had a tug waiting for them and got them on board, but next morning they all refused to sign. On Saturday the federation

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RÆBURN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

sent one of its other officers down, with the owners' clerk and superintendent, and finally succeeded in getting a free crew and getting the ship away; but these men of ours were dogged all over the place; boats were sent off to the ship by the Union, the crew were hailed and asked if they wished to come ashore. On the fifth of November—this is another instance I will give—the steamer "Waterloo," belonging to an owner who was a member of the Shipping Federation was subjected to a strike of dock labourers acting in sympathy with the Seamen and Firemen's Union. We arranged to ship a non-Union crew, but as we had received information that any attempt to put a free crew on board would be attended with violence, the Secretary wrote to the Superintendent of Police asking that sufficient protection should be given, otherwise it would have been absolutely unsafe for the men to have gone alongside.

13,418. In this case you did obtain the crew?—In this case we did obtain the crew.

13,419. And you put them on board?—Yes. It will be taking up a little of your time, which I dare say can be very ill-spared, but I would like to give you the instance of the "Craighill," because it was the first glaring case of those sympathetic strikes that we encountered. Of course these others were of a similar character, but not so pronounced as this. On the 18th December the steamer "Craighill," belonging to a Glasgow firm of shipowners who were members of the Federation, was loading coal at the coal cranes, the labourers at which place, as I have already said, belonged almost entirely to the National Dock Labourers' Union. Suddenly these men told the stevedore, that is to say their employer, that they were not going to continue loading the cargo if the ship was going to take a non-Union crew. Thereupon, as chairman of the Federation Committee in Glasgow, I sent for the stevedores working at that quay; not one stevedore alone, but all the stevedores. These stevedores are not members, as I have said, of any Union, and they were in no way personally mixed up with this quarrel. They reasoned with the men, but all to no purpose. Thereupon I said to the stevedores: If you have no command over your men, and are not prepared to make them proceed with the loading of this vessel, we shall employ labour, even if we have to go to the other Union, the Old Dock Labourers' Union, for it, and if we once go there we are not going to make a cat's-paw of that Union, but we will continue to work with them. The men were told this by the stevedores, but still they insisted on stopping work, and in the end the vessel was loaded by the men from that other Union. Then there came the job of getting her crew on board. Knowing the difficulty of getting these men signed on at the shipping office, we gave notice that we would ship on board. There was an immense crowd at the quay; the men got on board, but some of them came ashore for their clothes, and these were assaulted and intimidated, and the end was that there was not one

Earl of Derby—continued.

single man dared to go back to the ship, so that we had to send to Newcastle for a crew and have it put on board by police protection. Then there were the cases of the "Behera" and the "Glenbervie," in which the shipping master and Board of Trade officials had actually to get the crew out by the back door, as the front of the office was a mass of rioters. Then there is the case of the "Naparima," of the same nature, the only difference being that when the Union secretary, Mr. Boyd, found that the men were going in spite of him, he even went so far as to order one of the boarding masters who were present to take the clothes from the men who had come out of his house and not allow them to go; and there was an organised band of roughs outside, but fortunately for us we had sufficient police protection. Now, I would like to draw your Lordship's attention to this: in all these cases I have been giving you there was no question of wages involved; it was simply a question of whether we would be at the beck and call of this Union and fulfil its commands as to whom we should employ. In fact, there was no question of accommodation or of victualing; nothing except that one question of who is to be master—the Union or the employer.

13,420. I understand you wish to make some comment on the statement that Mr. Wilson made before us with regard to the charge against his Union for practising organised intimidation?—Yes. I was struck in reading Mr. Wilson's evidence with the following question and answer; at any rate it was so reported. Of course, I had to take it from the newspapers and I do not know whether it is absolutely correct, but I take it as being so. He is reported as being asked, "You are prepared to say of your own knowledge that, as far as you are aware, no violence has been committed by members of the Union against free men?" and he answered, "That is so; never to my knowledge do I remember a free man being assaulted by a Unionist at the Shipping Office." Being further pressed by one of the members of the Commission as to whether within his own personal knowledge he could say that intimidation was not practised, he went a step further, and said that there was no such thing; that moral suasion was all that had been used. I can only say that opposite our Federation Office in Glasgow there were four pickets constantly kept, and upon a signal when any man approached to register his name in the Federation books that picket was reinforced by a whistle being given. I have myself walked down the street—of course the men knew that I had something to do with the Federation—their signal was given and there was immediately a large collection of men assembled at the office door, and so difficult did we find it to carry on our business that I had personally to go to the Lord Provost and the Chief Constable and beg them to furnish police protection, not only in that street in which our office is situated—I mean the Federation Office—but at the approaches to it, because we found that it was not generally in the street that these

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAEBURN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

assaults were committed, but in some bye-streets leading to or from this particular spot.

13,421. You got extra police protection, I understand?—We did; and that, of course, enabled us to carry on our business with more peace. Of course, if I were only dealing in generalities in saying these assaults were committed and there had been no convictions, it might be taken that I was giving wrong evidence, that it was only supposition; but fortunately for our case we have any number of convictions to quote. In 1890 a delegate from London was fined 63s. for assaulting one of the Federation officers—this very self-same man, Darby. On the 10th February a Union fireman was fined two guineas or 21 days for assaulting another of our officers. On the 12th of the same month a Union fireman was sentenced to 60 days imprisonment at the Sheriff Court for following and assaulting a non-Union fireman, named Craig, who had been in the Federation Office registering for employment. And on the 30th June another Union fireman was sent 30 days to prison for assaulting Robert Cassie, Federation officer, and calling him “scab,” &c. In all these cases, strange to say, the culprit was defended by the Union solicitor. In the case of a man who got 60 days imprisonment I was in Court myself. That was a most unjustifiable, a most brutal assault, committed upon two inoffensive men who had been simply searching for employment at our office. After the most conclusive testimony against this man, this Union solicitor rose to ask the Sheriff whether he could not see his way as a warning to impose a nominal fine. Of course we know who pays these nominal fines—they are no deterrent at all. However, the Sheriff, very properly I think, gave the man no alternative, but sent him 60 days to prison. After these imprisonments, because the fines we found seemed to have had no deterrent effect—after these committals to prison, we found the intimidation gradually died down till about the middle of last summer, when we began for the first time to have perfect peace and no pickets, or no interference of any kind with the conduct of the Federation business.

13,422. That you assume was in consequence of the convictions which took place?—We believed so.

13,423. And of the men becoming satisfied that you were strong enough to defend your own people whom you employed?—We believed so.

13,424. Have you anything more to tell us about Mr. Wilson's evidence?—I would like to say that, in reading his evidence, I saw he spoke of the benefit shipowners would derive if they would only recognise his Union, meaning by this that they should countenance it as the only combination of seamen. He was asked if he meant that the owners were to place themselves entirely in the hands of his Union for getting crews, and his answer was “Yes.” Well, we know what we suffered when we were pretty much in the hands of that Union

Earl of Derby—continued.

before the Federation came into existence, and I think we had enough experience of it then not to try it again. I do not believe that Mr. Wilson's or any other Union can guarantee to see that crews are sober when they are put on board, and that there is no desertion. I consider the Federation uses a great deal more care in the selection of its men than the Union ever did; and my experience has been that when a seaman or his family are in distress, it is not to the Union they apply, but to their employers. I think if the men were asked, they would most of them admit that the owners are still their best friends.

13,425. I would ask you this in passing. When you are requested to recognise the Union, that I presume means that you are requested to recognise the Union as having a monopoly of supplying men for employment?—That I take it from Mr. Wilson's answer is exactly what he means. Then I think the only other point in that evidence of Mr. Wilson's that I have anything to say about is about the question of crews joining their vessel in a drunken state. I notice Mr. Wilson was asked, “Is it true that sailors when starting on a voyage very frequently start in a drunken state?” and his answer was—it is one of the strangest answers for any man who knows anything about seamen—“That is one of the slanderous statements made as a pretext by men who have got crimps to procure the men, who have given them a bottle of whisky and made them drunk before they started; I admit that. Some of the refuse that are imported are drunken, I do not admit that they are sailors.” Well, all I can say is that in the many years' experience I have had of dealing with seamen, before ever our Federation was heard of, I found it was one of the rarest possible things for a cargo or a tramp boat such as I have experience of having got away with her crew all sober. It is a very distressing statement to make—a very distressing confession, but it is absolutely so; in nine cases out of ten there are a number of men simply unfit to stand up, let alone to do any work, the consequence being that in Glasgow, on going to sea, when the ship gets to what we call the Tail of the Bank at Greenock, she has to cast anchor and wait till these men have sobered and become fit for work. Now, if Mr. Wilson says it is only the refuse—men that he does not call sailors—who are guilty of this conduct, then the logical conclusion to draw from that is that they are very nearly all thriftless and refuse.

13,426. As a matter of fact, do you think that the state of things has improved in that respect; is there less drunkenness when men ship than there used to be?—I am sorry to say that I do not see any improvement. I cannot say that there is more of that prevailing than there used to be, but it prevails to a very large and to a very sad extent. As to suggesting a remedy, that is one of the evils of the age which it is very difficult to suggest a remedy for.

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAE BURN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

Everything is being done that owners can do. I will not say all that they can do, but a great deal is being done in the way of sailors' homes and places where the men may go when they come on shore, where they will get innocent amusement, and we are quite willing as owners to do all that we possibly can to bring the men to a better state of conduct. This question of drunkenness and desertion leads me to speak of the charge which has been brought—well, it amounts to a charge in the way it has been put—namely, that so many British shipowners employ foreign crews. It seems to be a very deadly sin in the eyes of some of the witnesses who have given testimony here—a very deadly sin—that the British shipowner should be so mean and so unpatriotic as to employ a foreign crew.

13,427. I suppose that the state of things which you have described in regard to drunkenness has a good deal to do with that preference in so far as it exists?—Yes. I am sorry to say that this vice is more peculiarly one of British seamen. We find in Scandinavian crews especially great sobriety and good behaviour. It is not a question altogether of the shipowner himself, but it is a question of his captain, who has got the command of these men when at sea. We have 13 captains, and I have had some evidence on that. Time after time captains have applied to me for permission to ship an entirely foreign crew. Some years ago I expressed some surprise that they should wish to ship a foreign crew, but when I knew the difficulties they have to contend with through the insubordination and through the insobriety and other evils of British seamen, I am not at all surprised to find them seeking to have foreign crews. I had an example lately with one of our steamers home from Calcutta. The men had just been paid off. Unfortunately we know what a British crew looks like very often when they have been paid off. These men were sober, and they were respectably dressed. I said to the captain, "This is a particularly nice crew you have." He said, "Well, if you will let me take foreign crews that is the sort of crew I can get, but if you wish me to take British crews I will not guarantee very much good from them."

13,428. Where was that crew shipped?—That crew was shipped in Antwerp. I believe that every British owner, and I am sure every British captain too, would only be too happy to give a preference to his own countrymen if their conduct was the same good conduct that we find in foreigners. It is not, I would say, entirely a question of drunkenness on joining or failing to join we have to complain of. After we have got a crew, and the vessel goes to foreign ports, I do not think anybody except those engaged in the trade would believe the amount of trouble that captains have with these men. I have to go through all the correspondence that comes to my firm, and it is the commonest possible thing in reading a captain's letter to find that he has had to put two or three men in gaol for having knocked the chief

Earl of Derby—continued.

engineer down or having bled the chief officer's nose, or something like that, showing that the captain's life is made a burden to him by such conduct. Of course, if he can get a well-behaved obedient foreign crew we are not surprised at his wishing to take them. It is not a matter of wages; the captain does not pay the wages of the ship. It has been charged against shipowners that they employ these crews because foreign crews can be had cheaper; they are not so particular about their accommodation; they are much meeker, and can be sat upon more easily. My experience is that as a rule wages in foreign ports are not much less than they are in our own ports, but then, as I say, the captain has nothing to do with the wages: it is not a question with him of the wages; it is a question of good service. Then with foreigners. My experience is that Scandinavians and Germans, or men of that nationality, are far more particular about their accommodation than British sailors; they like a good comfortable fore-castle, and when they get it clean they keep it clean. As to the matter of food, I think they are quite as particular as any of our own countrymen about the food they have.

13,429. Then you take it, as a general rule, that captains would prefer to employ foreign seamen, and that they would do that not because the foreign seaman is cheaper—for that makes no difference to the captains—but because he is much better behaved?—It is so. I may just add this. I was recently very much surprised by a request made to me. I thought that probably the captains stuck to the nationalities I have mentioned, more especially the Scandinavians, but in a late case the request was made for Greek firemen. I said I thought the Greeks were a very bad lot—I had always understood that they were very quarrelsome—and the reply I got was, "Not half so quarrelsome as the British firemen." This naturally brings me to say a word or two about the victualling of the crews, on which the Commission has heard some evidence already. I noticed that one of the witnesses, the leader of the Seamen's Union, said that he had known cases where men had deserted and left a large sum of money in their owners' hands rather than remain by the ship, as they were so badly fed and badly accommodated, and he gave an instance. I suppose we may pick out gross instances in every trade. This instance which Mr. Wilson gave may be perfectly true, but I say it is an instance which is very much the exception. So that you may have some idea of the complaints which are made, and the ground of them, I have a case of my own, which is typical of a good many.

13,430. Would you state it?—This steamer of ours had shipped a crew in this country and gone out to the East, and from there to America. Now it is a well-known thing that the wages in America for seamen and firemen are very much higher than they are here. I am sure the President of the Board of Trade knows how many complaints have been made by the

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RABURN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

Chamber of Shipping about this desertion of crews abroad, and the set of men who have arisen there who ply, as their calling, the abstracting of crews from ships and getting them, by being paid for it, situations at higher money. This vessel of ours went to New York, the true state of affairs being that the men really wanted to get off the ship to get these higher wages. The "Seafaring," or some such paper—I think it is the organ of the seamen—made out that there was an organised attempt on the part of the captain and officers to have these men put in prison, so that the wages owing them should be forfeited. The true state of affairs was this. The men first of all shammed sickness. A medical man was got who pronounced them all perfectly fit for duty—nothing wrong with them. Then the next proceeding was to assault the chief engineer, for which they were put in prison. In the case of some of them, as their term was up before the steamer had left, they were taken on board; the others were left in prison; but at the same time their money was not forfeited because the money was paid. They were paid off in the regular form before the Consul, and the ship was the sufferer, because we had to take substitutes at 6l. 5s. as against their 4l. 15s. "Seafaring"—this organ of the seamen—says that the men deserted entirely because of the bad food, so that all the trouble arose because of the bad food. I have prepared a note of the victualling of that ship. She cost 1s. 7d. per man per day over the voyage. The food was bought from the best of suppliers, and was of the best quality, and if it were any information to the members of the Commission, I would be very pleased to put in the victualling bills to show the variety of the food, the cost of the food, and other details connected with it.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

13,431. Let me look at the victualling bills?—I will put them in (*handing in victualling bills*). We have read a great deal about owners—I do not know who they are—who go hunting about to buy totten meat at 1d. a lb., or something like that, with which to supply their crews. I can only say, speaking for a very large section with whom I compare notes—that is, the cargo trade, the steamship trade—that I do not find any of that sort of thing. I find that the food bought is pretty much as that bill which I have handed in shows it to be—salt meat costing about 3d. and 3½d. per lb., and fresh meat 6d. My experience is that if you give men bad meat you would very soon hear about it. Even when you give them good meat you hear about it. It is a very difficult thing to please them. Very often it is not the quantity of food, nor the quality, that perhaps gives rise to the complaint, but the cooking of it. You can understand that the very best of meat will be spoiled by a bad cook, and wasted by a bad steward. Unfortunately we cannot get cooks and stewards to our mind. No one would be more thankful than shipowners to have good

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

cooks and good stewards. I may say that a movement in this direction is being made now in Glasgow, the lead being taken by a large sailing vessel owner, Mr. Peter Dennison. Last night, I believe, was the first demonstration of this cooking class for sea cooks. Mr. Dennison has the idea that as under a technical grant money is being used for teaching girls to cook, he does not quite see why that fund should not be used for teaching these sea cooks to cook, as we are certainly quite as much dependent upon them as upon the girls who are being taught out of that fund now. A most influential committee has been appointed to carry this work on, and a guarantee fund started, so that if we cannot get any State fund, or any fund belonging to the city to undertake the work, the shipowners will do it themselves. These cooks will have a certificate certifying that they have passed through a practical course of training. We all know that if we can get a good cook, a cook with such training, we will not grudge an extra 10s. or even 1l. a month more to a proper man, because we feel that so much of the comfort of the seamen depends upon good cooking. There is no course of cooking just now. A man who signs on as cook may be a man who never cooked in his life, and knows nothing at all about it. I may say that our experience is that the best cooks are either Indians, or foreigners at any rate. We find, they have seemingly, a great aptitude for it, and perhaps they take more to it. We have always endeavoured to get foreign cooks, and, as a rule, when we get these men, we have fewer complaints. I hope, therefore, that this scheme which is now being very influentially started, will go on and be taken up by all ports, and that we shall see a great improvement in this matter, which I certainly think is one in which there have been great evils in times past, and are still. Of course you may understand that in steamers the question of scurvy and of those other diseases which arise from a prolonged course of salt meat does not occur, because a modern steamer now is so shortly out of one port till she is in another, that really it is a question of fresh beef nearly all the voyage, and so many vessels now have the means of keeping the meat in good order that some might almost not need to carry salt meat at all.

Earl of Derby.

13,432. Then, if I understand the general substance of your evidence upon this point, it is this: that as a rule you think the meat supplied to the sailors is good, but that it is often spoiled by bad cooking?—It is very often spoiled by bad cooking; and a great many complaints which we hear, and which may have got to the ears of philanthropists, or those who are taking up the cause of the men, are really to a large extent groundless.

13,433. Do you think it is likely that in any considerable number of cases a sailor would have deserted his ship and left a balance in the ship-

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAE BURN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

owners' hands because he had reason to complain of the food?—I have never known of a case in my own experience, and I have never heard of one except the one I have read in Mr. Wilson's evidence.

13,434. They have the right to complain to the nearest consul, have they not?—Yes, and they take full advantage of that power—that is my experience of them.

13,435. You do not find that they are at all slow to appeal to the protection of the law, or that they will not apply to the Board of Trade or the consul?—No. I think that is one thing in which the teaching that they have had lately has been eminently successful. Whether they have improved morally or socially I am not prepared to say, but there is one thing they know plenty about now—their rights.

13,436. Presumably a captain would rather comply with the demand even if he did not think it quite reasonable than run the risk of his ship being detained for examination?—Yes, I think very often for the sake of peace captains do things which they do not think necessary.

13,437. Now you have told us of the trouble which you have had with seamen and firemen; is there any trouble with the captains and officers?—No, I am happy to say that with the captains and officers we have very little trouble indeed. They are generally speaking a very respectable lot of men, and they are very loyal to their employers. Unfortunately, in that as in other matters we have to cope with a little insobriety, which I am sorry to say too often spoils good men; but we have great peace with our captains and officers; I cannot say quite the same about the engineers.

13,438. There is a difficulty with the engineers, is there?—Yes, we have found through the late troubles that the Engineers' Union, to which a great many men belonged, was in active sympathy with Mr. Wilson's Union. I had an instance in my own experience in which, because the men, who had been shipped on at Glasgow, and the vessel afterwards going to Cardiff, did not have the Cardiff scale of wages, we had a letter from a 'el-gate of the Union saying that intimation had been given to the ship repairers and boiler makers in the port to do no work to the ship, unless we gave those men the Cardiff pay. That is to say, the men agreed with their eyes open to take the Glasgow pay. The steamer goes to Cardiff; the pay there is a 1l. or 30s. more, and because we will not give them that pay, then the ship is not allowed to be repaired. It so happened here that she had a shaft to take out, and because of that no one was to be allowed to touch that shaft. I suppose if the wages in Cardiff had been found to be 10s. or 1l. less than the wages in Glasgow, there would have been no attempt made on the part of the men to have been put on the Cardiff level then.

13,439. They would not have consented to level down although they wanted to be levelled up?—I should think not.

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,440. Now what is the custom as to paying off crews—is it done at the end of each voyage?—Yes, that is so. I notice that in the evidence given before the Commission here, it was mentioned that it was a great evil to pay off crews at the end of the voyage, and thus throw the men out of employment, because the men lost so much in a year through this process, I can only say that all owners who have any regard to the proper working of their service would only be too glad if the men would stick to the ship. We have to pay off at the end of the voyage, but we would keep those men on pay still, though they might not be on sea pay, on sea articles till the vessel was going to sea again. But we find, I think, that this is the general experience. I think every owner knows it—that at the end of the voyage the men come on shore, and they do not feel inclined to go to sea again until their money is gone. It is not one case out of 20 where the same men go back in the same ship. For instance, some vessel goes into Newcastle, and the crew belongs to Glasgow, the men who may have been away for a time naturally want to go home and see their families. Perhaps the ship is only in port four or five days, and they do not want to go back again in that time. Whatever the cause may be, we cannot, even if we wished it, get the men to stay by the ship after the voyage is ended.

13,441. They like change?—They like change. It seems as if they would not do without it—as if it must be so.

13,442. Do you find the same thing to be the case with regard to foreign sailors?—No. It may be because those men's homes are not in this country that they stand by the ship. We have foreigners who have sailed in the same ship for years and years. I have a man now who has been in our employ 18 years. He goes back every voyage.

13,443. You gave two reasons for the frequent changes besides the love of change in itself, namely, that they wish to stay and see their families for a longer period than the sailing of the ship would allow if they are to go back in her, and also that they do not like to go to sea again until all their money is gone?—Whether they like to do it or not I do not know, but they do not do it.

13,444. Now a proposal has been made that in order to diminish the number of desertions the men should sign 43 hours before sailing?—Yes, I notice that that was a suggestion that was thrown out. Before ever I heard of it being made before this Commission I had tried it, but I certainly found no benefit from it. I may have been unfortunate in my experience of it, but in the instances in which I tried it I found that in one of them not one single man turned up. I do not quite see what benefit it would be. I do not think any owner would object to ship on 43 hours if he finds that it would be of any benefit. There is no dead set made against that.

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAEBURN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,445. You do not think it would make much difference?—I do not think it is really a matter of much consequence, some do it and some do not.

13,446. You have told us as to the food and cookery, now, as to the accommodation; do you think that it is better now than it used to be on board ship?—Speaking of the class of vessel I am accustomed to see and to manage, I decidedly think the accommodation is much improved, and that owners have a sincere desire to make it as good as it possibly can be made. Those poky little forecastles which formerly existed, I do not think we find many now, and I had an instance lately in my own experience, where, instead of having the paint locker and storeroom in almost the same place as the forecastle, those have been taken up on deck though the Board of Trade do not make it obligatory. They have been removed so that there should be no smell of paint and oils and stuff down below. The vessels have now water-closets, generally flushed from pipes on the deck, wash-deck pipes, and stoves are placed in winter in the forecastle. As regards the safety of the men at sea, there are lighthouses now fixed on board most modern vessels for carrying the lights so that the men are not exposed to the weather when they have to trim the lamps. The man who steers the ship is not exposed in a modern ship to the inclemency of the weather as he used to be, he is generally situated in a steering-house, steam steering-gear is used a great deal, and the working of the ship is done by steam winches, and I think that no man who knows the subject thoroughly can possibly doubt that a great deal has been done to make life at sea easier. It is a most uncomfortable life, I think, all the same, but still we are doing all we can to make it better, and I think that these examples which I have given show that that desire is being carried into execution. Then I have spoken about what I consider also to be a great improvement—that there is so much fresh meat being supplied, and tinned meat and good water.

13,447. You have told us now that voyages are shorter, and that salt meat is used to a much smaller extent?—Of course I am speaking of steamers, sailing ships I do not know about, as I have not managed them.

13,448. When the men fall ill on board or when they have to be sent to a hospital, who pays the expenses?—The shipowner pays for the hospital and the doctor's bills. I may say that there is not almost a port into which a steamer enters but there is a doctor's bill. I suppose one of the first men to come on board a ship is a doctor who is generally paid, not altogether by the amount of service that he may render; but I notice that 5*l.* seems a common fixed charge in a great many ports for the doctor. Of course, the medicines are all supplied by the owners. I might mention a case which might be of some interest. I shall

Earl of Derby—continued.

not mention any names, so as not to give pain to the relatives of the man to whom I am referring. This man died lately on board of one of our vessels from the result of a severe attack of syphilis. I think altogether throughout the voyage in connexion with hospitals and doctor's bills we spent some 30*l.* on this man which passed through our agents' accounts and were debited to us; when we were settling the balance of the man's wages through the shipping office the shipping master would not allow those expenses to be deducted from the man's wages and the matter, I understand, has been referred to the solicitor of the Board of Trade. The reason given to me in the meantime, a strange reason, was that this was a sickness beyond the control of the man. It seems a very strange reason, but it is the reason I got in Liverpool when I demurred to this expense being put on the ship. In an ordinary case of sickness—sickness in the ship's service, I would not object, and never have objected—I consider the owner ought to pay that; but I do draw the line here. I do not think we ought to pay such expenses when the man himself is entirely to blame. That shows how careful the Board of Trade is over the interests of the seamen, when a point even of that kind has to be so carefully dealt with, and is referred to head quarters. Then, many times, unfortunately, we have had cases of death in the ship's service in foreign ports. The funeral expenses and all those things have been paid by the ship. I do not know, there might be mean owners who will not pay these things, but I do not think, speaking for my fellow owners, that I know many who would saddle these upon the relatives.

13,449. Now in the case of the death of a seaman, I understand you have to account, through the Board of Trade, for all money due to him?—Yes, we have. We have to show them from the articles the wages that the man had shipped at; we have to produce proof of what has been paid to him, either in advance, in allotment notes, or by money, or by supplies from the captain; and the Board of Trade is very particular indeed to see that all this is done properly and in order. The money is then deposited in their hands together with the man's effects, whatever they may be, and they see that they are given up to whoever has the proper claim to them. This power of supervision I may say is being most carefully taken in hand by the Board of Trade, and they are getting more particular every day.

13,450. If the captain has advanced anything during the voyage he is called upon to prove the advance; is that not so?—It is entered in the captain's books, but of course to make the matter beyond all doubt, as it might be alleged that the captain put down money that he never gave to the man, or charged him with tobacco that the man never got, I think it would be making security doubly secure if the man was asked or made to sign the entry at the time of getting the money or the supplies, and then his signature would be there just as in the case of an advance

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAEURN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

and allotment note as an absolute proof that these things had been paid or given.

13,451. Now can you tell us anything about the benefit fund which the Shipping Federation has set on foot?—I expect that this has either been spoken to by Mr. Laws, or will be spoken to more fully by some other witness, but I think it shows that the Federation and shipowners generally have some desire to do something for the seamen, when amidst all these troubles which I have been speaking of, which we have had to encounter since the Federation came into existence; they have had time, or they have taken time to inaugurate a scheme, which though a small one to start with, is one which I think is the beginning of something better and greater, and one which I am happy to say in the six weeks it has been in existence has been very largely taken advantage of. I was at a meeting of our district committee yesterday, and I was very gratified at the superintendent having such a good list of men who had availed themselves of this fund. I heard Captain Hatfield say that all these small things inevitably came to grief. I do not know. I think that this is supplying a want—it may not be nearly covering the ground—but every little thing that can be done is always helping on what is wanted.

13,452. Now we have had the statement made that the officers of the Federation gave employment in preference to men who pay them for so doing?—As the evidence was tendered here—as it reads at any rate in the public prints—it would seem to be alleged that not only was this systematically done, but that the Federation itself was conniving at it and was quite content that it should go on. I can only say that when the rumour came to our ears in Glasgow—I mean to the committee of the Federation—that two of our officials had taken money from men for giving them employment; we had the case investigated, and we had the very men who were said to have given the money up before us. We got them before us as soon as the ship arrived, before they could have been tampered with, and one and all declared that no such thing had ever occurred, that they had never been asked for money, and that they had never given money. There were two cases and they were both investigated, and the rumour was found to be absolutely groundless. I may say that Mr. Laws, who was consulted about the matter as to what we should do if we found any ground for the complaint, was most emphatic that there was to be no sparing of the officers, and that as they had dealt with a similar case in London, so must we deal with it in Glasgow—instant dismissal. So that you will see that we are absolutely opposed to any such thing being allowed, and any official of the Federation known to do such a thing would be at once dismissed without any character.

13,453. Of course you cannot be absolutely sure that such a thing may never have happened without your knowledge; but if it does happen you would dismiss the man if you could prove

Earl of Derby—continued.

it?—If we could prove it; if we could even get a very well-grounded suspicion.

13,454. Have you any Unionist seamen or firemen in Glasgow?—Our district superintendent pointed out to me in Mr. Wilson's evidence that Mr. Wilson states that Glasgow is one of the ports where the men all belong to his Union. This statement, I suppose, referred to some little time ago. Our superintendent has gone over our registration book, and in answer to one of the printed questions, "If members of any society or Union," he finds that 3,614 men state that they are not members of any Union, while 1,940 state that they belong to some society or Union. Of the latter, a number are officers, carpenters, and sailmakers, who are members of Unions, but not of the Seamen's and Firemen's Union, which goes to show of course that the statement that Glasgow is as it were entirely a Union port is absolutely untrue. That statement was followed by another one—that the men who were shipping as Federation men were Union men, and that they were taking very good care that they did not ship with any but Union men. Of course the Federation would be useless if that were the state of affairs. The very purpose of the Federation is that men shall ship with free men; that is to say, that they will not dictate with whom they will sail.

13,455. You do not show any preference to non-Unionists. You take them indifferently as they come, do you not?—Perfectly. I dare say we have many Unionists as well as non-Unionists who are regularly sailing in Federation ships.

13,456. If I understand it rightly, the sole condition you make is that they shall not object to work with non-Unionists?—That is so.

13,457. Now have you found the boarding masters in Glasgow taking any part in these difficulties?—At first we had a great deal of difficulty in getting men from boarding houses in the early days of the Federation. We certainly did think and believe that the boarding house masters were working hand in glove with Wilson. But lately I dare say they have found that the Federation was a very good and ready means of getting quit of their men, and now I notice that Mr. Wilson turns round and says that these men are being paid by the Federation for procuring men. I suppose he comes to this conclusion simply because these men are getting ready employment from the Federation. He thinks therefore that it is right to conclude that it is because they are being paid for it; it is a natural process.

13,458. I think you have told us already that you have no objection in principle to Unions, but only to the intolerance that Unionists show to non-Unionists?—That is exactly so. I think we all concede that it is perfectly right that the men should have a Union as well as the employers. I think perhaps seamen are particularly dependent upon Unions. So long as these Unions are conducted on proper lines there can be no antipathy to them, but I leave the

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAE BURN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

gentlemen here present to say whether the tactics I have been giving you a sample of are right and proper. I have in my hands here a case showing how far this way of Unions working permeates. It refers to the case of a railway company—the Barrow Railway Company—which had some trouble with Union men. Not only were the vessels which carried these rails from Barrow boycotted, but when they came to Glasgow no one would discharge them, no one would load them, no crew would go on board of them. Why it is subversive of commerce altogether. It would be perfectly impossible to conduct business if we were to be at the mercy of these intolerant Unions. And I do not think, I may say, in this regard, that the trouble chiefly springs from the men. I believe that if the men were either properly led or left to themselves, they would be much more reasonable, but I think it is men such as some of those I have been referring to here, who are the root of the whole difficulty. I do not believe that they are the friends of the seamen, and I do not believe that the seamen will in the end recognise them to be their friends who are making all this turmoil. These men have a very comfortable position, and I fancy if things became very peaceful, that occupation would be to a large extent gone. Agitation is life to them.

13,459. Now I think you have already disclaimed any intention on the part of the Federation to break up the Seamen's Union?—That is so. It has been alleged time after time, both here and elsewhere, that that is the object of the Federation. I can only say this, that having had a great deal to do with the Federation, both as the head of it in Glasgow and as a member of the executive here, the charge is unfounded. We are simply a defensive Union. But for this combination among shipowners it is difficult to say what would have taken place by this time. As to the charge that the Federation as a body had had anything to do in trying to beat down wages, I deny that totally. The rises and falls of wages will be regulated by the supply and demand. Now business is slacker wages are coming down; if briskness comes on again, naturally they will go up. It may be a difficult process to get them up; it is a difficult process, I confess, to get them down.

13,460. Is there anything else you wish to say as to Mr. Wilson's evidence?—No, I think I have dealt very fully with that. The only point I have got noted further is that he always reiterates that it is with the unscrupulous owners that his fight is. Well, I can only say that he has got to fight the whole Federation, and whether it means this, that the whole Federation are unscrupulous or not I do not know, but certainly I think that if he had been reasonable, there is a sufficient number of reasonable men in the shipping trade to have assisted him to do that which was reasonable; but I think when you find the whole trade arrayed against him it is something like proof that his ways have not been reasonable.

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,461. Now I think you wish to give some evidence in reply to what was stated by Mr. Plimsoll?—As I understand since I made my notes that there is going to be what I might call an official reply to Mr. Plimsoll, I do not intend to enter into it in detail. I would only glance at one or two points in a general way. I notice one thing, that Mr. Plimsoll admits—but scarcely admits—I mean to say it is a sort of admission almost wrung out of him, that bad owners are in a minority. I would say this, that bad owners are in a very small minority. All these things one reads of—old vessels being built and sent away to sea in an unseaworthy state, over insured with the purpose of being lost—to a large extent this is romance, because I think anyone who knows anything about the sending of ships away to sea, or the management of ships, knows this, that in the first place you would need to have in your conspiracy the captain and the men who are to take these ships to sea, and, in the second place, for once that a vessel is lost there may be 20 times that she puts into the nearest port in a damaged state, and then all comes out—if there is anything to come out that is to say—all comes out, so that it would be a losing game, a decidedly losing game, for a man systematically to set himself to over-insure, and to send unseaworthy ships to sea. Of all the shipowners I know—and I know very many on these coasts—the Cardiff, Newcastle, and Hartlepool shipowners are all of my class of steamer, the tramp steamer, I do not think I could lay my fingers upon a single instance of these charges that we hear of. As to the question of over-insurance, of which we heard so much before the Royal Commission, I do not know whether it has occurred to Mr. Plimsoll and others that the matter of insurance, to begin with is a very expensive thing. The tramp boat premium varies from 8*l.* to 12 guineas. You might pay that for years and years, and never have a loss. In the second place, underwriters charge a much higher premium for a low-valued boat than they do for a high-valued vessel, so that the tendency of those who insure these ships, and who have to pay the loss, is rather to have the insurance kept up than to be made less. There is another point: according to the law a ship is liable for 8*l.* on her gross registered ton in case of collision. Now take a boat of 2,000 tons. I know many of them, and just now the owners would gladly insure them for about 12,000*l.* But if that vessel were to get into collision it might be said she was over-insured 4,000*l.*, 8*l.* a ton on 2,000 tons being 16,000*l.* To keep one's self safe under the very law of the land you have to keep up your insurance to what might be called in a particular ship an over-insurance. One of my own vessels that I would be quite content to insure for 12,000*l.* I am compelled to insure for 16,000*l.*, and I have no doubt if that vessel were to go down, and if it were to come out before the Wreck Commissioner or before a Court that this vessel for which I had paid 10,000*l.* was insured for 16,000*l.*, it would be called a gross

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAEBURN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

case of over-insurance, and a great inducement to send her to sea in an unseaworthy state.

13,462. Whereas in fact, as I understand you, that is not done by your choice, but is forced upon you?—It is so by force of circumstances.

13,463. You have no doubt heard much of the prevention of strikes by arbitration or conciliation, carried on by boards established for the purpose. Do you think there is anything in that idea or not?—I have given that very careful attention, and I am forced to the conclusion that such means would fail. Within a very short space of time I have noticed two or three cases in which, when the award did not suit the men, they threw up the decision. There was a case occurred in Newcastle which we all know about just now,—the root of a great strike, and the masters would have been absolutely bound by the decision; at any rate, I mean to say honourably, for it would not have been open to them to have backed out of it, but the men say that the decision does not suit them,—in effect they say that,—and the consequence is they throw it aside. I am afraid that would happen in too many cases. Then it is a cumbersome thing before we can get any of these disputes—for instance, about a ship which is loading under the cranes at the present moment—decided. Why it might take a week to do it. No; I am afraid we must just fall back upon our respective strengths and fight it out.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

13,464. These accounts which you have handed in show a great variety of food supplied to the men, do they not?—Yes, they do.

13,465. They show tinned meats, beef and mutton, soups, marmalade and other matters?—They do.

13,466. Do you supply fresh potatoes?—Certainly; that is one of the largest items. I think you will find it in one of the accounts there, the fresh meat account. One of the very largest items in the victualling of a ship is potatoes; in fact, I may say that they generally demand potatoes three times a day. I would like to say a word or two about the question of undermanning, upon which Captain Hatfield gave some evidence. Of course he spoke more of sailing ships. My experience is that the general run of cargo steamers are sufficiently well manned, and the captains and engineers positively refuse to sail unless you give them sufficient men. As to a steamer, for instance, as Captain Hatfield talked about, being provided with three men, I do not know any captain or engineer who would go in that steamer. To fix a scale of manning, I think, would be a vast mistake, and taking one vessel of 1,000 tons and another one of 2,000 tons, no man surely would for a moment advocate that the one vessel should have double the number that the other has. There are certain things to be done, the ship has to be steered, a look-out has to be kept, and there must be a spare man or so; but you would never go up to a 4,000 ton ship and multiply the number by four.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

When you see the tonnage of ships increasing so largely, and crews not increasing so largely, there may be an inference that that is a proof of undermanning, but I think that anyone who knows practically about it will know that it is not so.

Earl of Derby.

13,467. Do I understand that it comes to this that a very large ship requires fewer men in proportion to her tonnage?—Yes. Of course it only requires almost the same number of officers, and almost the same number of engineers, and a cook and a steward, and a messroom boy, and after that then of course a man or two more, but not double nor three times nor four times the number as the tonnage increases.

13,468. Is there anything else that you wish to put before us?—No, I think that is all I have to say.

Mr. Ismay.

13,469. How long have you been a shipowner?—Nineteen years to be quite correct.

13,470. Have you had any experience of seamen at other ports than at Glasgow?—Yes, at other ports as well as at Glasgow.

13,471. Are they worse at Glasgow than in other ports?—No, I would rather have a Glasgow crew than a crew from some other ports that I know.

13,472. You gave us rather a lamentable account of the state of things in Glasgow, or rather I took it to be in Glasgow. Do you think it prevails to any extent in other ports?—I think perhaps that insobriety prevails there rather more than in other ports, but in the matter of desertion I do not think Glasgow is any worse, if as bad, for instance as Hull. I am sorry to say that I had as a matter of absolute truthfulness to give so black a report; if I had been able to have put it less strongly, I am sure I have every desire to do so as I have great compassion for seamen, and great sympathy with them; it is a very hard life.

13,473. Then do you think, in your experience, that they have improved or otherwise during the 19 years you have been an owner?—I am sorry to say I do not see any improvement. I cannot say that there is any more trouble with them than there used to be, but I cannot honestly say that I see an improvement. Our worst men are firemen. A great many of the remarks I made more particularly refer to firemen who are, I think, rather a poorer class of men than seamen.

13,474. I am glad you have said so because I think, as regards seamen, that perhaps it was rather strong as a whole?—I am sorry if I did not quite distinctly enough distinguish between seamen and firemen. We are inclined to call them all seamen, so it may be a calumny.

13,475. And all this in spite of what you say from your point of view the shipowner has done to improve his position?—Yes.

13,476. Have you many desertions abroad?—Compared with the number of men we employ, I would not say we have very many. It is not nearly so bad in the steamship trade as it is

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAEBURN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ismay—continued.

with sailing ships going to Frisco, and some of those places. I daresay we should have more if our traffic was more with America, where the wages are higher, but in other ports we have not a great many.

13,477. As regards the victualling you put in some bills, were the bills for supplies taken on board in Great Britain or a foreign port?—I put in a Glasgow bill of provisions, a London bill of meat and vegetables, and a Gibraltar bill for provisions. I could at the same time, if it would be any information to the Commission, put in the victualling bills of the whole voyage, some meat supplied in the East and other things, some at the Canal, and some in America.

13,478. I think it would be well if you were to put them in for the whole voyage?—Yes.* I think when I do so you will see that one very expensive item, namely, potatoes, bulks very largely in all the bills. I may say with all our steamers that we always supply potatoes; there are no substitutes for potatoes and we always supply them.

13,479. As regards the difficulties you have had in Glasgow, it is owing to the tyranny on the Union that you joined the Federation I understand?—It was; we were simply you may say compelled for personal convenience and safety.

13,480. And you were not allowed to carry on business in the way that you thought was right and proper?—No; the samples I have given show that the Union was to dictate what stevedore you would employ, what crew you were to employ, and what engineer to do your repairs, in fact everything.

13,481. And you could not fulfil the engagements you had entered into?—We could not.

13,482. But otherwise you had no objection to employing Union men?—None at all; I have no objection. As I say there must and naturally should be Unions for seamen as well as for other classes of workmen.

Mr. Tait.

13,483. Might I ask you was it you, as secretary to the Federation, or Mr. Laws, as manager of the Federation, who engaged Mr. Darby whose evidence to-day you have rebutted to the extent you have done?—Allow me to correct you. I am not secretary of the Federation. I am chairman of the Glasgow District Branch Federation.

13,484. Can you tell me whether it was the district which engaged him or the general manager?—The committee of which I am chairman engaged Mr. Darby.

13,485. Now, before the Federation came into existence at all, had you a shipowners' association in Glasgow?—We had a shipowners' association for general purposes, which as a rule did not have anything to do with questions such as we have been speaking about.

13,486. Did not have to do with trade questions?—No, not prominently.

Mr. Tait—continued.

13,487. Have they been called together at any time to do so?—We have our regular monthly meeting. We were never called together over any question of labour trouble.

13,488. They never asserted themselves with their influence or their capital or their funds for the purpose of protecting the shipping trade?—No. I may explain to you that this Association of which I am speaking, and which is called the Clyde Steam Shipowners' Association, is the Association that had to do, with the agitation at the time of Mr. Chamberlain's controversy. It is an Association which looks after Bills in Parliament. For instance, it also looks after any new policy adopted by Harbour Boards, such as the Clyde Trust, &c.; in other words it has to do with fiscal matters generally affecting the shipping trade; but it never had occasion to have anything to do either with or against Unions of workmen.

13,489. Did you ever, as an individual shipowner, give the Sailors' Union that fair recognition which you thought they were entitled to as representing a large body of workmen?—In answer to that I would only say this that we never knew the Seamen's Union; it never came across our path; it never met us, or asked us to meet it. The first that we ever knew of its active existence was at the time I am speaking of when it suddenly—I say, it advisedly—suddenly sprung up as a dictator.

13,490. In the evidence which has been put forward here, it has been stated that from the inauguration of the Union, up to the time that this evidence was given in November, there had been increases of wages from 1*l.* to 2*5s.* per month, and in weekly boats from 5*s.* to 6*s.* per week; are you prepared to say that is correct?—Will you tell me what date you refer to as the commencement of the Union. I cannot speak from my own personal experience.

13,491. The Union commenced about September 1888, and this evidence was given in November 1891?—I have already, in my evidence in chief, referred to the matter. The first I know of personally was, I should think, about the year 1889. The trouble began not with foreign-going vessels, but with such vessels as the Clyde Shipping Company, Sloan's and Burn's boats. The men made a demand, through their Union, to increase the pay from 2*5s.* I do not know any case where it was 2*1s.* The increase asked was 7*s.* 8*d.*

13,492. That would be to 3*2s.* 8*d.* per week?—Yes, to 3*2s.* 8*d.* per week. The demand appeared so outrageous, as I may call it, that the Clyde Shipping Company and Sir John Burns and others said, "No, we will not listen to it." The men knew, however, that these mail steamers were bound to sail at a certain hour, and, knowing the importance of these vessels sailing, and that it was a most inconvenient thing for them to be kept back, they struck the very next day, and after a few days the owners conceded 2*7s.*, that being a rise of 2*s.* About six months later, I think it was, they voluntarily and without being asked, and without a strike, increased it to 2*8s.*, where it stands to-day.

* According to promise these were forwarded on May 28rd, 1892.—G. D.

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAEBURN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

There were some boats in the Bilbao trade, in which the wages then were from 27s. to 28s. Those were increased to 32s. 8d., and are down now to 30s.

13,493. In regard to crimping, it has been stated here that a boarding-master in Glasgow, of the name of Sutcliffe, was fined 20*l.* for crimping?—That is an instance which I gave you. In the infancy of the Federation, before we were really established, and before any officers were appointed, this man Sutcliffe, of whom nobody seemed to know anything in the Federation, offered his services, as a man accustomed to deal with seamen, and Mr. Bird, our Secretary, employed him to get this crew for the "Godrevy." He did and got one crew which did not get on board. Mr. Ross, the shipping master, reported him for crimping, and he was fined. I read a letter of Mr. Bird to Mr. Laws, asking that as this was the first of a great many cases that were likely to occur, a test should be made in London, and, as I endeavoured to explain to the Commissioners, that which Mr. Sutcliffe was fined for doing is being done, and has been done ever since systematically in every port. I understand the President of the Board of Trade, when he was lately asked to legalise it to give permission to an agent of the owner to engage crews, was not inclined to go to that length, but he said, "You are doing all that is necessary just now; you have regularly appointed men who are finding crews, and there are no prosecutions."

13,494. The witness who gave evidence here stated that the shipowners had paid that 20*l.*; do you know whether that is correct or not?—Of my own personal knowledge I do not, but I think it would be only right, seeing that the Shipping Federation employed Mr. Sutcliffe to do this which they did not know to be wrong, or if they did know it to be wrong still it was a necessity that it should be done, it is only right that they should pay that fine.

13,495. Did they pay it?—I do not know of my own knowledge that they did; I should think most likely they did.

13,496. Was there any prosecution in regard to the intimidation you complain of in the Craighill case?—There was no prosecution, for one reason there was so much of it going on it would be rather difficult to have singled out any particular one.

13,497. You made one very serious statement. If I understood you correctly you suggested nine-tenths of the men who went into their ships after being engaged were not strictly sober?—I think you have not quite taken me down correctly. What I said was in nine instances out of 10 no ship got away without some of her crew being drunk—that is to say one or two of the lot.

13,498. You still think that is true of the men that are engaged in the various ships in Glasgow?—I except the regular liners, because they have got, one may say, the best class of men. These men have wives and families and come into Glasgow and go out of Glasgow regularly. The tramp seamen are a more migratory body.

U 73722.

Mr. Tait—continued.

13,499. Have the people of Glasgow done anything to counteract this?—When I mention such names as Mr. Alexander Allen and Mr. Smith, who are well known for their liberality towards seamen, and when I tell you these men have subscribed liberally towards seamen's homes, orphans' homes, and have opened an additional sick children's home, and that we are providing rooms with games, and papers and journals for the men, you will see that we are trying to bring the best influences to bear upon them. As you know, in Glasgow and probably in Scotland generally the unfortunate evil of strong drink prevails, not only in one but among all classes, and unfortunately the seaman has a very rough life of it and during the few days he has in port, as Dickens has said, "Every-body is waiting for Jack."

13,500. You mentioned that captains were favourable to foreign crews, and stated that one reason was that they were more sober, and could be more depended upon?—Yes, that is quite true.

13,501. May I ask if the foreign men receive the same pay as others?—If a foreign crew is shipped in this country they always receive the same pay. If they are shipped in Hamburg or Antwerp the pay in some instances is less, but in some it is not. For instance, in Hamburg lately we shipped a crew at 3*l.* 10s., when we should have been paying 4*l.* 5s. here. That was 15s. less. But while the seamen were engaged at 3*l.* 10s. we had to pay 4*l.* 10s. to the firemen, the same wages as we pay them here because there was a Fireman's Union, and the firemen were more difficult to be obtained.

13,502. So I may take it that the crew you mentioned to Lord Derby was shipped in Antwerp?—That crew had less money than the Clyde rate.

13,503. And you say the men struck against the foreigners there. Did they strike because they were getting less money than what was the recognised wage of the port?—I do not quite follow you. Who struck?

13,504. You said in some instances the foreigners had been struck against, that the seamen had struck against foreign labour unless the foreigners would join the Union?—The only case in my evidence in which I said nothing at all about a strike against foreigners was the case I gave you about the three Arabs. The Union insisted upon their either joining the Union or being paid off. I have not given any instances in my evidence in chief of any intimidation or rioting against a ship because she had a foreign crew.

13,505. But it is a fact that you sometimes engaged at foreign ports sailors at less wages than those which obtain in the port to which the ship actually belongs?—That is so.

13,506. I think you heard the whole of Captain Hatfield's evidence this morning?—I did not hear the whole of his evidence. I could not, at the distance I was sitting, hear it all.

13,507. Did you hear that part with reference to captains' and officers' pay?—I think Captain

X

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAEBURN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

Hatfield was rather referring in his evidence all through to sailing ships than to steamers. But I agree with him so far that while seamen have had advances varying from 1*l.* to 30*s.*, and even as much as 2*l.*, I must confess that I have not seen many advances to the officers; that is to say, they have not gone up in proportion.

13,508. But the wages which the officers have would be a wage which would relieve them of destitution?—That is quite true. But the point of Captain Hatfield's evidence, if I understood it aright, was this:—If you have an officer at 8*l.* 10*s.* a month, and a seaman at 3*l.* 10*s.*, it is rather hard when the seaman gets 4*l.* 10*s.* if the officer cannot get more than 8*l.* 10*l.* It is a great hardship for him to see the boatswain, who has only a very small responsibility as compared with him getting 5*l.* 5*s.*, while he is only getting 8*l.* 10*s.* I think if I were a chief officer I would be rather inclined to grumble.

13,509. You gave us some statistics as to the number of those employed by the Federation who belong to Unions, and of those who do not; may I ask you how you got them?—That information was given to me by the superintendent of the Federation, who keeps the register book of the Federation which seamen who are taking employment with the Federation sign. There is a series of questions put to them in that book:—"Do you belong to a Union?"—"Yes." "What Union?" And those figures are collected from that book.

13,510. Therefore it is a condition of receiving the Federation ticket of Glasgow that you should reveal to the Federation officials what connection you have with any particular Union?—It is not in Glasgow only.

13,511. Is it all over the country?—I believe that question appears in all the books. But at the same time it is only right to say, unless you may not know it, that we care not what Union a man belongs to, and the only condition laid down by the Federation is that he will not dictate who his companions are to be. That is to say, while it is quite open to a man to say, "This is a bad-looking set of fellows you are shipping; I am not going to ship with them;" he shall not go further and say, "Because you have got a donkey-man on board who is not a member of our Union I will not sign."

13,512. Is that the only cause of complaint you have against Unionism?—Then there are these sympathetic strikes. If you displease one of these Unions you have all of them on your top.

13,513. You say you approve of Unions provided they are on proper lines?—Yes.

13,514. What would you consider proper lines?—That is an exceedingly broad and difficult question to answer.

13,515. If these particular points of objection—that of refusing to work with non-Union men, and the sympathetic strikes—were removed, do you think your main difficulty would be overcome?—I certainly think if these Unions did not adopt the dictatorial policy which they do now and did not engage in these sympathetic strikes, we should have as little to complain of as we have at the present moment about this old

Mr. Tait—continued.

Dock Labourers' Union which was in existence long before I knew it. We have never had an hour's trouble with it.

13,516. There is one matter which you have suggested which I am anxious to get at an understanding of. You say that the root of the evil was the agitation, if I followed you correctly, and you thought that the agitation was the result of the action of persons who were the paid officials of the organisations?—Knowing as I do, Mr. Tait, your connexion with Unions, and your views generally on that point, I hope you will not take offence if I say that I do think that the root of the difficulty has on many occasions been the paid agitator who stirred up the strife; and I particularly had in my mind's eye three men whom I named as I went along.

13,517. I wish to point out to you (and this has been given in evidence both by workmen and by employers), that the very best feelings of friendship between the employers and the employed exist in the case of the oldest Unions, as these afford facilities to the employers of dealing directly and without prejudice with the leaders, as they are termed, of the Union?—Yes. I have no personal disinclination or dislike to dealing with the officials of a Union instead of the employees themselves, if I find that that official is a reasonable man and a man who does not always take the side of his men, whether they are right or wrong, that he is a man who can speak his mind to the men as well as to the employers he comes in contact with. I fancy the fact of such a man as Mr. Knight being at the head of the Boilermakers and Ironworkers' Union is the means of getting many a dispute settled between shipbuilders and that Society much more easily than would otherwise be the case.

13,518. Therefore your only objection is what?—To the mis-use of the Unions—the new Unionism as it is called now.

13,519. I would like to correct you in the statement you made I think in answer to Lord Derby about arbitration. You stated you had recently had a case where an arbitration had been agreed upon between the employers and the workmen, and had not been carried out. Are you aware that there is a difference of opinion whether the arbitration was correctly gone about, and in accordance with the rules?—I can only say with regard to that, I have not the opportunity of being present at the men's meeting to hear their side of the question. I take my ground for what I said from the statement made by such men as Sir Charles Mark Palmer and some of the leading employers of labour on the Tyne, who are men I know personally, and men above all suspicion. Those men consider that the undertaking given in this case of the fitters and plumbers was not adhered to by the men composing one of these Unions.

13,520. You are also aware that, on the other hand, one of the Unionists says they were not parties?—I can hardly understand people going to arbitration—because I think it was conceded they did go to arbitration—without being bound to adhere to the award. If they gave evidence

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAEBURN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

there, I think it is an admission that the arbitrators had power to deal with the question and to settle it. Then it is not on that alone that I base what I have said. I have seen two or three instances of the kind. I cannot mention names. There are so many other things pass through one's mind that it is difficult to remember names. You will remember the late strike on the Clyde—the shipbuilders' strike. The men, notwithstanding the arrangement come to by their officers, refused to go to work and a strike ensued; and if I remember correctly, the reason the men in the end gave was—that the executive said, "You shall be entitled to no strike pay." I think you will admit that was a case in which the men refused to abide by the award.

13,521. Will you kindly inform us what are the responsibilities of the Clyde Navigation to the inhabitants of Glasgow so far as carrying on the docks is concerned—whether any profits are divided after paying interest on capital, or whether such profits, if any, are solely devoted to the purpose of making the docks more complete and more efficient for carrying on the shipping of the Clyde?—I may say, in regard to that, the Clyde Navigation, the owners of the Harbour of Glasgow, are not a community trading for profit, as are the East and West India Docks, and the St. Katharine Docks of London; though I do not suppose the shareholders of those companies think they are trading at much profit; but, however, be that as it may, the money that the Clyde Trust borrows from the general public at such and such a rate of interest, is all as it were sunk in the works of the harbour and in the plant necessary to keep these works in good order. The Clyde Navigation do not own warehouses; they do not employ stevedores or labourers as the London docks do. The quays are free to any one who likes to work at them. The employers of the Clyde Trust are simply the harbour officials, the harbour-masters, the captains, engineers, seamen, &c., who man the dredgers and hoppers, the men who repair those vessels, and the vast army of labourers who work in the docks. There have been no strikes or labour troubles in the history of the Clyde Trust as far as I remember—certainly not during my connection with it. The men, as far as I know, are not members of any Union. They may be. They are not asked. They get a weekly wage. They are engaged, you may say, daily, but are paid weekly or fortnightly as the case may be. They have some benefit funds; and they have a very good time of it, I think, a very good employment, and they have not been mixed up with any of these troubles of which I have been speaking.

13,522. Therefore we may take it that after paying interest upon capital, all the profits that are earned by the Clyde Navigation are put to a fund for the purpose of making the Clyde better in every respect for shipping?—Yes. There is no such thing as profit paid. It may be found in the assets of the concern being a great deal more than its liabilities, but except

Mr. Tait—continued.

for paying interest to the bondholders there is no money paid to any one.

13,523. How are the directors appointed; is it by popular vote?—The Clyde Trust is composed of members appointed by the Town Council of Glasgow, by the Merchants' House, by the Chamber of Commerce, by the Trade houses; and nine representatives are popularly elected by the ratepayers.

13,524. In the shipping interest?—No, not necessarily in the shipping interest.

13,525. What is the qualification for a vote for the nine?—I think you must pay dues to the extent of 100*l.*, or something like that. I may be wrong as to the amount.

13,526. But you can be said to be a popularly elected body?—I happen to be one of the members so elected.

Mr. Plimsoll.

13,527. I will hand to you a return to the House of Commons on a motion made as to the sale of provisions. If you will kindly look under the column of buyers right through that long list you will find the name of Cardiff appears 14 times, Bristol 3 times, Plymouth 14 times, North Shields 6, Portsea, Gosport, Falmouth, and so on. Now you will observe that meat was sold at 1*d.* to 1½*d.* per lb., and we may presume therefore was not very good?—I will only say as regards this, that I observe the return is for the two years ending 31st December 1875. The evidence which I have given to-day, based on my own experience as a shipowner, only dates from 1873, so that this is really a matter which happened probably before my time; and with regard to the names of the purchasers, looking down the list from beginning to end, I may say that personally I have not come across any of them. Having applications from so many different dealers in provisions, it seems strange that we have never been approached by any one of the people in this list. I do not even know them by name. I do not know what their business is at all. They are certainly not well-known names. What I said in my evidence was that I had not in all my experience of shipowners known of one buying meat at 1*d.* a lb.

13,528. There are shipowners and shipowners, and that there are shipowners willing to buy meat of that sort is proved by the fact that it was all sold?—Does it necessarily follow that it went on board ship because it was bought?

13,529. Would you not infer that, seeing that all the towns are seaport towns, and that it was bought at a price too high to make manure of it, although it was far too low to use for good food. Dr. Harry Leach reported thus to the Board of Trade: "The beef was decidedly bad. . . . The mate gave evidence as to the inferior quality of the beef and flour, and said that several casks of the former had been thrown overboard at sea," and Dr. W. Spooner in his report to the Board of Trade stated: "Sailors, as a rule, are fed on worse than workhouse or prison fare." I think I have shown enough to correct the very wrong impression which I think the witness's

16 February 1892.]

Mr. W. H. RAEBURN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Plimsoil—continued.

evidence was calculated to leave on the minds of the Commission?—I hope you do not believe for a single moment that this state of affairs which you have been describing is going on now to any extent.

13,530. I think there is a very great deal of food which is rejected from gaols and work-houses and prisons, and from the army and navy, which naturally gravitates to the only market where there is no inspection. Sailors' food is not inspected at all, and it never has been and it is needed 10 times more by them than by any other class of Her Majesty's subjects?—I can only say if you take the evidence of representative captains, they will tell you that they have cases of insubordination and complaint for very much less matters than stinking food, and if they were to try to give their crews poisonous food, there would not be a single soul of them go to sea; at least they would all leave at the first port if they ever got so far.

13,531. Then with regard to accommodation on board ship. In ships of your class the accommodation is all that can be desired, but have you ever gone on board any third-rate ships, especially sailing ships carrying coal?—I do not speak at all for sailing ships, because I have had very little experience of them, certainly not so much as would justify me in saying anything either for or against.

13,532. Would you be surprised to hear me say that I have been in fore-peaks where the paints and oils were swinging backwards and forwards on the heads of the men?—That can only be applicable to a section. These charges of bad accommodation and bad food can only apply to very exceptional people.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

13,533. Your firm, I understand, victual their own ships?—We do.

13,534. Invariably?—Invariably.

13,535. Are you acquainted with any cases where the captains have been entrusted with victualling the ships being allowed so much for it?—Our captains used to be entrusted with that. Formerly we did adopt that plan, but for two reasons we gave it up. One was that we had a great many complaints which we thought, though we could not prove it, might arise from the captains wanting to make money out of the victualling; the other reason being that we thought the victualling conducted by ourselves could be more economically done with the allowances we gave. The allowances used to be 2s. 6d. to captains, officers, and engineers, and 1s. 9d. for the men. The complaints we had were that the men did not get the half of that spent on them, and we now victual the vessels ourselves, and I may say it costs us on an average

Sir Michael Hicks Beach—continued.

1s. 6d. per man per day, officers and men all lumped together.

13,536. Therefore it costs you less than it did before?—Yes, and is much more satisfactory.

13,537. And you are certain that the men get the victuals?—I am perfectly sure of that.

Professor Marshall.

13,538. Has not the price of victuals fallen in the meantime?—Most things have gone down in price. When I say 1s. 6d. per man per day, I am taking the case of where a vessel has started here with a good victual bill, and has not been victualled very much abroad, where things are dearer.

Mr. Austin.

13,539. Are the complaints which you made with regard to the drunken habits of the sailors general?—In my replies to Mr. Tait's questions on the matter of insobriety, I was speaking of my experience in Glasgow, where it may be there is a little more of that than in other ports. But I am sorry to say, you may take it from me generally, that that is one of the great evils we have to contend with, with seafaring men.

13,540. You stated that the captains and the officers' relations with you were very good, but not those of the engineers. What is the cause of it?—I am inclined to think, though some may not agree with me, that the captains and officers not belonging to any of the Unions I have been speaking about, are therefore left free agents to deal with their employers. On the other hand a great many of the engineers belong to a Union, and perhaps it will exemplify what I mean when I say that one of our very oldest engineers, who belonged to a Union, and who was asked to do a very reasonable thing, said it was against the rules of his Union to do it, and I felt very much inclined therefore to say, "Very well, I have paid you wages for 13 or 14 years, and treated you well, and now when I ask you to do a little thing out of the way, you object. You may go to your Union, I am done with you." Now, I have never had any trouble of that kind with masters and mates.

13,541. Does your objection to the engineers arise from the fact of their being members of a Trades Union?—It is not because they are members of a Trades Union. It is by their fruits that I know them.

13,542. Is the general character of the engineers inferior to that of the officers or captains?—I do not say so at all, certainly not.

13,543. If their general character is not inferior, then your objection to the engineers arises from the fact that they are a combined body?—That is the inference.

The witness withdrew.

16 February 1892.]

Mr. E. M. SHEPHERD.

[Continued.]

Mr. EDWARD MONTAGUE SHEPHERD called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

13,544. Were you late president of the Dock Labourers' Union at Barrow?—Yes.

13,545. Can you tell us the number of men employed about the docks in Barrow?—Yes. The work at the dock fluctuates so much that at one time there may be 150 men and at another 300. But about 150 men habitually go to the docks for the means of gaining a livelihood.

13,546. I need not ask you whether there is abundant dock accommodation at Barrow?—Yes, too much so. It is the large capital sunk there which makes the rates very heavy.

13,547. The docks are larger than the present business of the place requires?—Yes.

13,548. You had a strike in 1889?—Yes. Will your Lordship permit me to point out a circumstance which has a very material bearing upon my evidence? That is this: The Dock Company provides the cranes necessary for loading and discharging the boats. This circumstance gives them an exclusive right of working all ships requiring their use. Your Lordship will understand that it practically means a monopoly. The fact of their providing the cranes, which nearly all boats require, gives them the right of working those boats. This work they let to a contractor at a certain schedule of prices, and he provides the men to do the work, and pays them at so much per hour. Down to March 1889 the men employed by the contractor were on piece-work, being paid at so much per ton, according to the class of materials they had to deal with. During that month, March 1889, if I may be permitted to trace the cause of the dispute, the contractor gave these men notice to terminate the piece-work, offering them work at so much per hour—6d. during the day, and 8d. for overtime. To this the men objected on the ground that it would mean a very material reduction in their earnings, a fact fully confirmed by subsequent experience. Therefore, a strike occurred. The whole of the men left work, but having no funds or organisation to support them during the dispute, at the end of a fortnight they were compelled to accept the masters' terms. That was 6d. an hour during the day, and 8d. an hour during the overtime. There is no time to be paid for waiting for ships. They might be ordered out, say at midnight, to come and meet a certain boat. The Barrow works are situated about a mile and a half from the town, and men might have to walk a mile and a half and get nothing for it in many instances.

13,549. That strike of 1889 failed, as I understand?—Yes.

13,550. And you had another in 1890-91?—Yes.

13,551. Will you tell us the history of that?—Yes. I am tracing the cause of that strike. It was practically a consequence of the first strike. Work was resumed, and continued for about three months in 1889 upon those conditions. Then the contractor selected between

Earl of Derby—continued.

40 and 50 of the men, and placed them on regular work at 30s. per week for the men, and 35s. for the foreman. This arrangement gave great dissatisfaction to the remainder of the men, many of whom had been there for the whole of their lives, while some of those given regular employment had only been there a comparatively short period. On the 7th of June 1890 a branch of the National Union of Dock Labourers was formed. Eighty-six out of the 100 men generally recognised as old hands on the docks (an expression which is very common) joined, while 14 remained outside the organisation. In the following month a conference of the various branches of the dock labourers was held in Liverpool, where evidence was given of the numerical strength of the Association and its growing popularity, but at the same time revealing its financial position, which, at that time, was not very strong. That fact was given prominence to by a certain section of the press. Immediately following this the contractor insisted upon those men—guaranteed men as we call them—that is, these men having regular wages—he insisted upon their entering upon a monthly arrangement, whereby it would be necessary to give a month's notice before leaving. The majority of these men on regular work were Union men. The Society believed the object of this was (and subsequent events have proved that to be the case) to stamp out the organisation, or to so limit its sphere of action as to render it practically useless. Recognising this, and being anxious to secure a more equal division of the work among the men, upon the advice of their officials they declined to enter upon the arrangement, whereas the men outside the organisation did so, thus, in point of fact, giving the non-Union men permanent work, while the Union men were to take the casual work. That was the result, and I think that was the intended result. Now, to defeat this arrangement, the only method the Union had to adopt was to decline to work with non-Union men, unless the non-Union men were placed upon the same conditions as they were. It was no use men being in an organisation which kept them out of regular employment, so that they insisted that these 14 old hands should join the Union. This they declined to do. A strike occurred. That strike commenced in September, and extended until February 1891, a period of five months. The contractor, by increasing the rate of wages and reducing the hours of labour, and by means of a copious supply of liquor, had no difficulty in filling their places, and with the aid of these 14 old hands he carried on the work with a considerable degree of success. Now the dockers in the north have been taught that their ability to deal with the masters does not consist in a large fund to support them during the time they are out of work, or in the fact of being able to keep blacklegs, as they are called in the north, from taking their place, but in the fact of blocking

16 February 1892.]

Mr. E. M. SHEPHERD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

Perhaps your Lordship does not understand the term "blocking." It consists in this: We will take the case of a boat laden by blacklegs in Barrow, sailing for Liverpool. In Liverpool there is a branch organisation. When the boat arrives in Liverpool the men decline to discharge it. Having practised blocking in a manner and to a degree probably unparalleled in labour disputes, and having carefully examined the result of that working, I have no hesitation in condemning it as thoroughly unjust. If your Lordship will permit me I will first show its effect upon the party aimed at, the dock company, and its effect, in the second place, upon innocent parties, that is the shippers, the charterers, and the merchants, and, in the third place, its effect upon the organisation of the employees. Now Barrow is so situated geographically—the line running parallel north and south with the coast—that any suspension or interruption to seafaring traffic, coasting traffic particularly, would throw a corresponding increase on to the railway revenues, from which the company derive, perhaps, a larger profit than they do from the docks. So that in regard to any coasting trade we could not inflict any damage upon the company, for the dock company and the railway company are one, and in regard to foreign outgoing trade we have no branches there, and could not possibly affect it. Then as to its effect upon innocent parties. This is so immediate and so direct that it leads to my condemnation of it. Here is a boat loaded, say at Barrow, with steel rails for Liverpool. The moment she is loaded the railway company's responsibility ceases, and whether she gets to Liverpool or not is a matter of the utmost indifference to them. If the boat is under a charter, which many of them are, the loss would fall upon the charterer, who has no power whatever to influence the result. The fact of the dock company having this exclusive right of working all ships practically puts the ships entirely in their hands. Well, that is its effect upon innocent persons. Then as to the organisation itself. Although it has been advocated as a very powerful weapon by which the masters can be fought, it has proved to be a very disastrous one to the men themselves. I may say that we blocked one boat at Garston, and the result was that the London and North-Western Railway Company locked out the whole of our men, some 600 in number, at a very bad time of the year. In fact, public subscriptions had to be got up to send some of those men away and support some of their families for some time, and this was just about Christmas. Now, in this case, you will observe that there was no dispute between the Garston people and the London and North-Western—at least between the dockers at Garston and the London and North-Western. It was only that we had a grievance at Barrow, and for the purpose of assisting us they blocked a boat there. This led, as I have said, to the locking-out of 600 men, inflicting great distress, and even if they had been successful they could not

Earl of Derby—continued.

possibly have influenced the result of the strike at Barrow. The same sort of thing occurred in Londonderry, in Ireland, and it led to the suspension of Mr. Balfour's narrow gauge railway. That strike cost us directly about 1,000*l.*, and taking Garston and these places altogether about 2,000*l.*, and this resulted in breaking up our organisation in Londonderry, and also at Garston, and gave the Union a shock which it will take some long time to recover from.

13,552. I understand you to say that this system of blocking did not produce the effect it was intended to produce—did not affect the people whom you meant it to affect, but that it did a very considerable degree of injury to third parties, and injured some of your own men?—Quite so. My point is this, that instead of hitting the party that we aimed at, that was the company, we hurt innocent parties, and the injury we inflicted upon the third party did not re-act upon the original party—the railway company.

13,553. What was the result upon your Union?—The contractor laid down very peculiar conditions. We approached him on several occasions for a settlement, but he stated that he had arranged with what we call blacklegs that they should have a guarantee until the March of the next year. This is, he guaranteed them work from September 1890 to March 1891. When we approached him for a settlement, what we objected to was not to work with non-Union men, but that the non-Union men should have a preference of the regular work, while the Union men should have casual work. The only settlement we could get was this, that these men should go to the docks and take any casual work there might be, but that before they could be possibly employed, the blacklegs must have full work.

13,554. That is, from the employer's point of view, they thought that the men who stood by them were entitled to the first call?—Yes, that was their argument.

13,555. Can you tell us what difference there is in regard to wages and conditions of labour between the present time and, say, 10 years ago?—I did hope at one time to be able to give you those figures, but I have experienced great difficulty in getting at them, and I should not like to make any precise statement on that point.

13,556. Do you think that wages are better on an average than they were?—Yes, they are higher. I should like to point out, however, that though the wages are apparently very high in Barrow, the rents are also very high. It takes over a fourth of a man's wages for rent generally. From the evidence of a gentleman who gave evidence here, you would almost imagine that men were selected according to their moral principles. That at least was the impression conveyed to my mind. My experience, however, is quite different. They select men at the cheapest possible rate, and get the greatest possible amount of work out of them. That

16 February 1892.]

MR. E. M. SHEPHERD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

is the principle that governs rich or poor firms alike.

13,557. Have you much surplus unskilled labour in Barrow?—A pretty fair amount.

13,558. Have you any proposal for dealing with it?—No, but I should like to add that, although rents are so very high in Barrow—over a fourth of the men's wages going in rent, and, although the Barrow Corporation has had borrowing powers under the Artisans' Dwellings Act since 1872, no effort has been made to put those powers into operation.

13,559. Do you mean that a local borrowing would give employment, and so relieve the distress?—No, what I mean is this, that the Corporation having these powers in 1872 to borrow 10,000*l.* and expend it in erecting artisans' dwellings, would, if they had exercised those powers, have made the conditions of working men in Barrow much better, for they would have reduced the rents considerably. I have gone carefully through the figures of about 300 cases, and I may say that the rents equal over one-fourth of the whole wages. Yet the Corporation having these powers do not seem to be inclined to exercise them, probably owing to the fact that they are interested in keeping rents up.

13,560. Do you mean that they object to spending public money with the view of underbidding private enterprise?—No, I do not say that. I had a conversation, however, with one of the leading builders in Barrow about this subject, and he stated that it would ruin the building trade.

Duke of Devonshire.

13,561. What would?—The exercising of these powers. If that is so, I say the sooner the trade is ruined the better, if it keeps rents up, because in Barrow you can scarcely go into a house where you will not find two or three families living in one house in certain areas, the rents being, as I have said, excessively high.

Earl of Derby.

13,562. You say that there is a very considerable amount of surplus labour, and a considerable amount of distress?—I will not go so far as to say that the surplus labour in Barrow is as great, taking the year round, as it is in some other places. Owing to its peculiar geographical situation, we do not experience at Barrow the same amount of surplus labour that they do in places like Manchester and Liverpool, Barrow is practically an out-of-the-way place. Still, the Corporation have had on two occasions to my knowledge to provide work for all classes of labour.

13,563. You spoke of the dock accommodation in Barrow as being amply sufficient and more than sufficient for the actual traffic?—Yes, it is much more than sufficient. I understand there were about two millions of money sunk there. This, of course, has had an injurious effect upon the docks, because they certainly will have to pay a dividend upon their sunk capital, which is useless to a large extent.

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,564. Do you think any different mode of working the docks would be of benefit to the community?—I contend that when Parliament, by an Act of Parliament, creates and grants a monopoly, they have a right to insist in the Act granting such monopoly that the men employed shall work a reasonable number of hours, and shall be paid a fair rate of wages. Now the docks are practically a monopoly. As to nationalising the docks, I would commence with the land if I were going to nationalise anything, because I do not think that the advantages gained for the tremendous outlay would compensate for the outlay. I should like, if your Lordship will kindly permit me, to state how I think strikes could be prevented. I think, in the first place, if masters were to enter into more direct relations with the men, and dispense with the contractors, who are sometimes ignorant of all practical work, that would eliminate one prolific source of labour troubles. Here you have the presence of a man who contributes neither skill, labour, nor material, and who yet receives a large profit upon the actual workers, and this will always be a source of dispute. Take our case of Barrow. The moment that the contractor had increased the wages and reduced the hours of labour, then the railway company turned round and increased his prices. Now, we will assume, as a matter of fact, that a Society strong enough to beat him increases the rate of wages. This attracts a greater number of men from less paying occupations. The consequence is that, although these men receive larger wages for the actual time worked, they work less time. That is, you see, assuming that the Society wins and beats the contractor. But if, on the other hand, he beats the Society, he can just impose his own conditions, and this affords a very convenient opportunity, as in our case, of dispensing with men who have grown grey in the service, and also with those elements which combined might prove a rival to himself. The first thing is to dispense with the middleman, and at docks like Barrow, at any rate (it might not work here), the work should be piece-work.

13,565. You are aware that there is a strong opposition among the Unions to piece-work?—Yes, I am quite aware of it.

13,566. You do not think that is a reasonable objection?—No. I hold that dock work should be piece-work. That is, my experience at Barrow. A boat arrives, and in these days speed is an all-important matter. The moment a vessel arrives in the dock the shipowner is anxious to save the wages of his crew, and probably the charterers have what they call a rapid clearance. That is to say, a boat has a certain time to clear in, and if she clears under that time a very large commission is received. I have personal knowledge of a ship being cleared in three days, and the shipper's agents actually drew 50*l.* for three days' clearance. That being so, the captain is anxious to clear his ship to save the expense of the crew, and they do not care to permit a boat to be in dock on Sunday

16 February 1892.]

Mr. E. M. SHEPHERD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

if they can help it. The shipping agents, also, having, as I have said, a commission, it is their interest to get the boat away as quickly as possible. On the other hand, if the docker is paid by the hour, it is his duty to make the work spin out as long as he can, and hence a conflict of interest arises.

13,567. Is there anything else you wish to add?—I should like to add that dock companies and other companies, instead of frustrating the attempts of the men to organise, should encourage them. They would find it much better to deal with an organised body than with a disorganised mass. Their opinions and their grievances can then be focussed and placed before the employers. And I contend, in the case of monopolies, there should be a body which should attend to grievances, just as the Railway Commissioners deal with grievances between traders and the railway companies.

Professor Marshall.

13,568. Have the evils which you have referred to as attending the blocking of ships been much discussed?—I may say that about two years ago there was a great discussion in the "Times" about this subject under the head of "The Crisis in the Shipping Trade." I think this has done a great deal to accentuate the differences between the shipowners and the Seamen and Firemen's Union. Although we had no assistance in Barrow from the Seamen and Firemen's Union (their position not being strong enough, I think), I do believe that the effect of the block has been to prejudice the masters against unionism.

13,569. Have your views been much discussed among the working men themselves?—You see when an organisation is broken up you do not generally part on the best of terms. I had not an opportunity of discussing the question with many of them, for many of them, when they found the game was up, got back upon the easiest conditions they could, and, of course, I could not discuss it with them.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. JAMES SEXTON called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

13,573. We understand you are connected with the National Union of Dock Labourers, Liverpool?—Yes.

13,574. Do you hold any official capacity?—No.

13,575. You are only a member of it?—I am an individual member of the organisation.

13,576. How long has it existed?—The present Union, constituting the National Union of Dock Labourers, dates its existence from a few months previous to the 1889 strike. I am not exactly well up as to the dates of the creation of the Dock Union; but I know it dates its existence from a few months before that.

Professor Marshall—continued.

13,570. Have you reason to believe that your views are shared by many of the working men?—I believe my opinion reflects that of many others. I have got the opinion of several.

13,571. Has the analogy between blocking on the part of the men and black-listing on the part of the masters been considered?—Yes; I believe that has been thoroughly threshed out.

13,572. Would you say that the two are open to a somewhat similar objection?—Yes. When I have been discussing the point, this objection is raised against it. Barrow is so situated geographically as to represent perhaps an isolated case. In some other places the dock company is not the railway company as at Barrow. Even then, however, the interests of a dock company and of the contiguous railways are always so interlaced that you cannot attack one without being resisted by both. I would like to say, with regard to going back on these terms, had as they were—that is, that our men should have the casual labour, and that these "blacklegs" who had stood by them during the strike should have the preference of all the permanent employment, while our Union men were to have the casual labour—even that was not applicable to six of the men who took an active part in the organisation—the secretary, the treasurer, and four others. The contractor declined to have these upon any consideration, although the men had worked there all their lifetime almost; this was simply because of the part they took in the organisation. I would like to say one thing that had something to do with the cause of the strike was this—that sometimes the men had to go out at one o'clock in the morning, come back, and take their food with them. It is a very exposed place; and yet these men have come back and received only one hour's pay for it, and still have been expected to turn up at six o'clock in the morning. This certainly was a grievance. Since the strike occurred no man is employed under half a day. They get 7d. and 8d., and some of them as high as 9d., an hour, and double time after nine on Saturdays.

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,577. What is the average weekly wage at the docks now?—At present the average weekly wage, I should say, taking the whole number of dock labourers into consideration, does not exceed 15s.

13,578. Is the payment weekly or daily?—In some cases daily, in some cases weekly. In the majority of cases I should say weekly.

13,579. Is the employment regular or irregular?—Very irregular. If your Lordship will permit me I should like to go into the reasons why I make this statement. The employment is very irregular. You must understand that in the first instance, it is supposed that a man

16 February 1892.]

Mr. J. SEXTON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

commences a day's work at seven o'clock in the morning. Now, as a matter of fact, in order for a man to obtain a day or half a day's work, he has to appear on the stand when the men are employed, at very little after six o'clock in the morning; and, in order to enable him to do so, it is necessary for a man to get up at about five o'clock in the morning. But between six and twelve o'clock there is no interval. In the majority of cases the men get, not better pay, but better conditions and more favourable recognition from the employer direct than they do who are employed by the contractor, who stands between the employer and the labourer. I may say it is the general system all along the line of docks at present to employ a contractor; and in order to keep as many men around the employers as possible, in order that the employers may always have a sufficient supply to pick from, the system has been adopted that the first half day is worked by one set of men, and that set of men is sent home at twelve o'clock, and another set of men put on. The men who come on at twelve o'clock are worked till five, when the men who were discharged at twelve o'clock are ordered on, and perhaps work till eleven o'clock, while the men who have been working in the afternoon rest on from six o'clock to eleven, and then, perhaps, at eleven they are ordered out to work on till whatever time in the morning the employer thinks it is necessary to stop them. Owing to this, although the wages of the Liverpool Dock Labourers at first sight may seem to be very large, thus causing an overplus of dock labourers in Liverpool at the present time, for men are attracted from other neighbourhoods on account of the proffered 5s. a day. This has no value except an artificial one, because when you come to consider, you find that although a dock labourer may commence on Monday morning, so irregular is the nature of the employment that he may work, practically speaking, day and night from one end of the week to another and not be able to earn a week's wages. I speak from practical knowledge and experience, because what with going to sea and with working in the docks, I may say the largest portion of my life has been in that particular capacity, and I think the chief cause of all the difficulties is that the men are not in more direct touch with the employers—that the employers should employ the men themselves and not leave it to any men to stand between themselves and the men; because I know for a fact in some cases the employer—that is, the shipowner who loads and discharges his own ships—would employ three men, where the contractor only employs two. Now it stands to reason that if the employer thinks it is necessary for three men to do a job and the contractor takes one man off that, it is the working man who suffers. If he does not suffer in being in receipt of less wages he has to exert more physical energy in order to get that week's wage or that day's wage. There are other elements besides these which go to make up the necessity of altogether doing away with the contractor. In more than one firm at

Earl of Derby—continued.

Liverpool there is a systematic filching of time from the working men carried on week after week and month after month from one year's end to another. I speak with a full sense of what my words may carry, and I am prepared to stand by it. In two or three firms which I know of it is a system that when a ship is going to knock off, or when a gang of men is going to knock off, say it is dinner-time, the men are never called up till after twelve o'clock strikes, and when they are called from out of the ships' holds, or off the quay if the ship is going into the dry dock, there are shoots and stages and hatches, and fore and afts to put on, and this work takes from twelve o'clock until 25 minutes past. It is a recognised system along the line of the docks—not by all employers I am very happy to say. There are instances in which such work is discountenanced by the employers; but it is a system in many firms that if a man only works to half-past twelve he gets nothing for the half-hour, and if he works over the half-hour he gets paid the full hour; but they take very good care that the men do not get an opportunity of working over the half-an-hour. I have never to my knowledge—and I have worked at the docks for a considerable time—known, in the case of those firms which I speak of, that they knocked off at the right time. At five o'clock in the evening I have seen the employer come down and take his watch out of his pocket and stand and look at it when the clock in the tower was striking five o'clock, and it was twenty minutes past five before we got permission to go, and yet we only get paid up to five o'clock. Now there is another element which goes to cause the accidents which we hear of everyday—and that is the employment of boy labour. In many cases I know boys are kept working for a spell of 30 hours. I have known cases where boys have been working in the river on ships when it was necessary to unload and discharge in the river, and they have been placed in positions in which it was necessary that a man should be placed with all his wits and faculties about him. I have known these boys to be kept there and to be kept on double time. That is, they go out in the morning; they would stay over night and they would work the next day as well, because the boys being able to do his work, which should be done by men, were so much cheaper than the men themselves. I have been standing alongside of boys when the lives of 6 or 8 or 10 men in the square of the hatch were dependent upon them to lower a sling or a box of tin or a case when the men were making up the hatch—I have known these boys sleeping at the winches, although the lives of the men below were dependent upon them. I have known also cases of this description where boys and men have been kept in the river for nearly 40 hours without food.

(The Duke of Devonshire here took the chair)

I have had experience of occasions when we have worked on the river for 36 hours without a bit to eat, and then the food that was offered

[6 February 1892.]

Mr. J. SEXTON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

at the end of that time was in such a filthy condition and the quality so bad, and the surroundings so unnatural, and the manner in which the food was offered so inhuman and unchristian that, hungry as I was, my very nature revolted against accepting anything that was in such a condition. I have seen men on board these ships in the river have offered to them what I suppose they call soup, in big troughs, put before us like a lot of pigs instead of human beings, without anything either to ladle it up with or to drink it with, and you might take your chance whether you would get any or not. I was rather amused at the evidence of the gentleman who preceded Mr. Shepherd (Mr. Raeburn). He drew a harrowing tale of the miseries and difficulties of employers of labour. There are two sides to that question, and I think that the labourer has just as harrowing a picture to draw, if not a more harrowing one, than the employers themselves. Now the way in which this food was dished up to the labouring men in the river would disgust anybody. Not only was the condition, as I have said before, filthy, but the quality of the food was bad. I do not say that has always been the case. I have not, of course, worked with every firm in Liverpool, but unfortunately the firms for whom I did work always seemed to vie with each other in doing all they could to crush the labouring men of Liverpool. Then there is another element which goes to make up the bad conditions of dock labour, and that is the quality of the plant and machinery. Now in some firms there is nothing to be questioned in that respect. But I find that the firms that this will not apply to are the very firms who supply their own plant and machinery. Wherever a shipowner supplies his plant and machinery it is always found to be better and more favourable to the conditions of dock labour than when they are supplied by middlemen and contractors.

Duke of Devonshire.

13,580. Who is the contractor you speak of?—The contractor is the man who contracts with the employer to discharge and load the ship—the stevedores. Because in my experience, and I speak from practical experience because, unfortunately, I have had my head smashed, into a mummy almost, when acting in my capacity of dock labourer. I find that the majority of the accidents which happen at the docks are the fault of the contractors in employing boy labour to do men's work, and not employing sufficient plant and machinery, or not properly looking after the plant and machinery, necessary for the safety of dock labourers. One particular case I wish to draw your attention to, is my own, in which it was necessary, in the capacity in which I was acting, to put what is called a clip-hook on the end of the rope which hauls bulk grain out of the ship. That is a system which has been recognised all along the line of docks, as any practical man will admit. Now in my particular case no such thing was done, although there were sufficient hooks lying about the

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

shed and sufficient hooks in the store-room to place on the end of the rope. An open hook was placed on instead, and the result was that when the bags were hoisted up they fell on top of me and knocked me down below, smashing both jaws, and knocking one of my eyes out. I think in a case like that the Employers' Liability Act should allow more time for the dock labourer who receives a hurt in his employment to take action, and should give him more facilities for taking action, and should see that justice is done.

13,581. Did the Employers' Liability Act not apply in this case?—In cases of accident no doubt it does, under certain conditions.

13,582. Did it not apply in your case?—It would have applied had I not been unconscious beyond the limit of time which is allowed.

13,583. What was the limit?—I believe it was six weeks. At that time the Employers' Liability Act had only just come into operation, and I was given to understand, when I regained consciousness, when I was able to stand erect again, that I was just three days too late—that it was three days over the six weeks in which I should have given notice to the employer. That was the legal advice I received. But I think some protection should be afforded a man in the position that I was in, and I think that it is necessary that the Government should take this question up; and that they should enforce a law that no employer should be allowed to contract himself out of this Act by subsidising or bribing a man not to take action where he thought he had a good case.

13,584. Take your own case, had you contracted yourself out of the Act?—No, I did not get the opportunity I am sorry to say; because not only was the few shillings lent to my wife unknown to me (for I would not have accepted it) stopped out of my wages when I commenced to work, but the half-crown paid for the cab to take me to the hospital was also stopped out of my wages.

Mr. Ismay.

13,585. Was that a contractor or a shipowner?—A contractor. These are positive facts. When I visited the employer with the half of my head hanging off—for it was hanging off there was no question about it—I asked him for some compensation; but the only reply I got was I could do my best and my worst, that the limit was gone, but that if I came down he would give me good work. I consider a labourer is worthy of his hire, and I must confess that I got a pretty good show of work for some considerable time afterwards; but as soon as ever he found out that the thing had smoothed itself over, it was found that my services could be dispensed with. I also think that there should be a clause inserted in the Employers' Liability Act to meet such cases as this. It should be made penal for a man to accept anything from an employer before the case goes before a court of justice, and that it should be made penal for the employer to offer it.

16 February 1892.]

Mr. J. SEXTON.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire.

13,586. You wish to say something about the cause of strikes?—The cause of strikes in my opinion is that the employer and employed are wasting valuable time in fighting one another when they ought to go to the root of the evil.

13,587. In the first place have you had strikes in Liverpool?—Yes, we have had strikes.

13,588. Lately?—Yes, in 1889.

13,589. What was the cause of that?—The cause of that was the dissatisfaction among the men at their conditions only. I might say, as a positive proof of the necessity of combination among the men, the statistics of accidents show that there were nearly 50 per cent. more accidents before the existence of the combination than there have been since.

13,590. Can you tell us what the demand was which was made by the men which was not granted?—I may say I have not worked at the docks since the commencement of the strike, and I have no practical knowledge of the strike itself, or of the conditions of dock work, except from hearsay, since the strike ended. I am not now in the position of a dock labourer, though I am still a member of the Union.

13,591. Can you tell us what the demand of the men who went out on strike?—The demand so far as I can learn was—

13,592. Were you not employed at that time?—No, not since, previous to the strike.

13,593. Then you cannot speak from personal knowledge?—No; but the demand, so far as I can learn, was that the men were dissatisfied with their surroundings and conditions, and, naturally, under the circumstances, when the employers refused to meet the men and recognise their officials, the men were justified in taking up a dignified attitude.

13,594. Do you know from your personal knowledge that the employers did refuse to meet the men?—Yes, they absolutely refused.

13,595. But you cannot tell us what the demands were which were refused by the masters?—Only from hearsay—only from reports which were from time to time circulated in the branch office which I attended.

13,596. Then I think you cannot tell us anything specific about the Liverpool strike?—Except that being amongst the men and mixing with them I took as much interest in the strike as if I was a dock labourer. I was in no official capacity, however.

13,597. Then you do not know of your own knowledge what the cause of it was?—Well, I have an opinion.

13,598. You do not know what the demand of the men was?—Yes, I know what the demand of the men was.

13,599. I understood you before to say that you did not?—The demand was for more regularity of hours—no advance of wages except in the case of the grain men who worked at the grain, and they, I consider, were worthy of an advance; because the nature of the employment is a little more arduous and a little more wearing

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

upon the physical energy of the men than any other employment along the line of docks.

13,600. Can you tell us what was the result of the strike?—The result of the strike was that the men went back under very favourable conditions—I should say 40 per cent. better than before it.

13,601. Do you mean as to regularity of employment?—As to regularity of employment and regularity of hours.

13,602. Was the strike conducted by a Union or was it a strike of disorganised men?—It was by the National Union of Dock Labourers.

13,603. And the dispute, whatever it was, was ultimately compromised?—Yes.

13,604. On favourable terms to the men?—Yes, both parties giving way a little, that is, as far as I can remember.

13,605. Have you anything else to say on strikes?—As to the remedies, I would like to go into that. I should say, if it were possible, that arbitration should be a leading feature in case of disputes between employers and employed, a Government department for such matters should be created. The whole of the docks should be municipalised, the contractor should be dispensed with, and there should be an abolition of systematic overtime. Government inspectors should be appointed, who should be notified whenever a ship was going to load or to discharge, and the plant and machinery of that ship should be thoroughly inspected.

13,606. Is there any inspection now?—No, not at present—not to my knowledge. I would also suggest the regulation of the hours and the introduction of an eight hours' shift—not an eight hours' day. The time should be divided into eight hours between the hours of six in the morning and twelve at night. This would, I think, regulate employment, and give the ships an opportunity to load and discharge in time to meet the tides, so that no time would be lost; and there would be a continual employment of men; no one would be overworked, and every one would have sufficient leisure to look after their intellectual improvement, &c., and I think there would be no complaint, or very little anyhow, if this system were adopted. I would prohibit any youth under 18 years of age doing what I consider is men's work, that is, putting him into most dangerous positions, where the lives of men below in the hatches are dependent upon his whim, or his capabilities, or his fitness for the job. I find youths are sometimes working alongside one another, and they lark and carry on, and so neglect their task to the danger of the men whose lives are dependent upon them. I also wish to point out that the majority of the accidents which happen to youths are due to the unguarded positions and the dangerous positions in which these youths are put on account of their smallness of stature. Some boats in Liverpool are so constructed that what is called the body of the winch—the barrel of the winch between the two drum ends—is generally utilised for two men or boys to work upon—to lower cargo into the ship. In

16 February 1892.]

Mr. J. SEXTON.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

addition to that there are four drums, there are six men or boys working at the one winch at the same time, and I have known the straining of the winch to be so severe that the boys on the winch were unable to hold it, and the consequence was, they were dragged around the body of the winch till they were crushed or their arms were broken. One poor fellow before my very eyes had the four fingers of his hand taken off in that way. All these matters ought, I think, to be inquired into, and we should get a Government enquiry; the only reliable inquiry in my opinion.

13,607. Is the National Union of Dock Labourers, of which you have spoken, in existence now?—Yes.

13,608. Is that unable to settle these questions with the employers?—Unfortunately I am sorry to say it is at present, because the employers refuse absolutely to recognise it.

13,609. In what way?—They refuse any recognition of the men's Union.

13,610. Or to hold any communication with its representatives?—Yes.

13,611. Still you say that an improvement was brought about by the strike?—A decided improvement; but I am sorry to say they are gradually going back to the old conditions, gradually drifting back into the irregularity of hours, and the dangerous nature of the employment is still being carried on, especially by the contractors. The ropes which are used in lowering and discharging cargo are used for lashings when worn out, and I have known cases where these lashings were incapable of holding the weight attached to them and gave way, and the men and the cargo that was on the truck were thrown into the dock.

13,612. If you got rid of a contractor, who would superintend the work?—The work is done in many cases by the foreman of the shipowners themselves. There are two systems of work in the docks. There is the contractor system, and the system of the shipowner employing his own men direct.

13,613. And you have no complaint to make of the conditions under which the work is carried on in the latter case?—Speaking from my own personal experience, I found that when I went to work for a shipowner direct, I always received more justice and better conditions. This at least I have to say, that where shipowners do their own work the men are never filched out of their time—they are knocked off at the legitimate time—the hatches are on at five o'clock and the men are away from the ship, whereas the contractor keeps them till 25 minutes past, and does not pay them for it.

13,614. And the employment is safer?—Considerably safer in my opinion. The plant is better. The provision of plant, except in some cases, which I am sorry to say have occurred lately (and I am sure this has not got to the knowledge of the employer), is better. The plant is there, but the foreman has been a little bit neglectful in using it.

Mr. Iemay.

13,615. May I take it that what you complain of chiefly is the contractor, the insufficient plant, and the employment of boy labour in dangerous positions where men ought to be?—Yes, and the irregularity of hours.

13,616. You have given us your views as to how that can be met?—Yes, but I have not given you them all.

13,617. What other point have you to make?—The further remedies I would suggest would be the municipalisation of the docks. The only other remedy I would be prepared to advance would be that the enormous value created by the docks upon the land about it should contribute towards some of the local taxation of the people who created that value.

13,618. Are you aware that the docks in Liverpool are managed by a trust?—I am aware that there is a so-called public trust.

13,619. And that there is no profit beyond the payment of interest?—I did not speak of the profit that was derived by the Dock Board. I spoke of the value created by the demand for the land upon which the docks are built and the profit of the landowner. The land upon which the present docks are built before the docks were built was valueless for agricultural purposes.

Duke of Devonshire.

13,620. We have nothing to do with questions of that sort, except so far as they bear upon the conditions of employment, how would the condition of the labourers be improved by what you suggest?—If you will allow me, I will point out. It affects the labourers employed in this way. In the immediate vicinity of the docks the value of the land before the docks came there was something like 5*l.* an acre, but the very fact of the people going to reside in that vicinity raised the value of that land from 5*l.* to nearly 2,000*l.* The people that created that value by their industry are now paying a rateable value of 4*s.* 6*d.* in the £ for local purposes, which goes to still further improve the condition of that property, and the man who reaps all the benefit of the industry of the labourer is the ground landlord. He reaps all the benefit of the people's industry, and pays not one single farthing towards local purposes.

13,621. But you have not explained how that would affect the condition of the labourers employed in the dock?—It would affect the condition of the labourer because the man who has built property on that land would be able to build better property than he does now. He would be able to build houses instead of shadows, such as have been put up. The people would have cheaper houses and more substantially-built houses. The present harbour dues would be less and more favourable to shipowners, enabling them to grant better conditions to their men.

13,622. I think this is rather beyond the scope of our inquiry. We want to know what are the conditions of the employment of the men who are actually employed?—I have gone into the conditions, and I do not wish to travel

16 February 1892.]

Mr. J. SEXTON.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

beyond them. But I contend that this is one of the things which create difficulties, and if employers and employed, instead of fighting amongst themselves, would only settle down to consider where the evil really lies, that the mental and physical labourers are working from morning to night to keep those who do nothing, I think the remedy would be found.

13,623. Have you anything else to suggest?—There is another question which, with your permission, I should like to refer to, if I should not be trespassing on your time. In case of disputes the employers should be more willing to recognise the combinations of the men, because where employers combine surely there is nothing wrong in men combining. Then let the two combinations settle down to discuss the points of grievance in an amicable manner, and see if some remedy cannot be arrived at, instead of those unfortunate features which are no good to anybody concerned, namely, strikes.

13,624. You spoke of the food supplied, who supplies that food?—The food supplied is generally supplied by the ships.

13,625. It is part of the contract?—It is, I suppose, arranged between the shipowner and the contractor. I know nothing as to how the arrangement occurs, but I do know the conditions under which that food is served, and that it is filthy in the extreme.

13,626. Is this food supplied on board the ships?—On board the ships in the river.

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

13,627. Can you state the terms upon which the men go to work?—They go to work at so much per hour.

13,628. Is anything understood as to food?—No, nothing is understood except that they get something. Where a ship is ordered off to the river the dock labourer gets no intimation that he has to go to the river, and the result is that when he goes he finds himself suddenly drafted out into the river without having time to go home to get sufficient food to serve him while he is in the river. Of course, when the employer undertakes to so interfere with the action of the men in getting food, it is his duty to supply it, but he should supply it in a manner which would at least commend itself to the hungriest man who knows the taste of food.

13,629. You are referring to people who are working for very long hours?—Very long hours. In fact, in my own case, I have worked for 40 hours, and when I asked for relief the consequence was the very fact of my asking to be relieved was the cause of my being what they called "drilled" for a month—that is, refused employment for a month until such time as I came, as the employer says, to my senses.

13,630. Your complaint is that you must either work the employers' hours or not at all?—Not at all—exactly—that is just it.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

17 February 1892.]

Mr. ALBERT ANLABY BIRD,

TWENTY-SIXTH DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Wednesday, 17th February 1892.

PRESENT:

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE.

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF DERBY, K.G. (CHAIRMAN).

The Right Hon. Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH,
Bart., M.P.
Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, M.P.
Mr. T. H. ISMAY.
Professor MARSHALL.
Mr. S. PLIMSOLL.
Mr. H. TAIT.

Mr. W. ABRAHAM, M.P., Mr. T. BURT, M.P.,
and Mr. E. TROW (Group A.), The
Right Hon. Sir JOHN E. GORST, Q.C., M.P.,
The Right Hon. LEONARD COURNEY,
M.P., Mr. M. AUSTIN, and Mr. G. LIVESEY
(Group C.) also attended.

Mr. GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Mr. ALBERT ANLABY BIRD called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

13,631. We understand you are secretary to the Unions of the Lightermen and Watermen of the River Humber; is that so?—I am.

13,632. Are they two independent unions, or are they one?—One union. I should like to say also previous to being connected with the Lightermen's Society, I was at sea for between nine and ten years.

13,633. Now I think you have something to tell us as to a demand made by the lightermen for an increase of pay. When was that demand made?—The demand was made in September, 1890. I should like to say previous to that from January the 6th in 1872, there used to be a society in existence till the year 1885. The wages up to that time were very fair, but they turned the Society from a protection society into a sick society and after they did that it collapsed. After the Society fell through the wages went gradually down and the employment of lightermen as a rule was something shocking. In engaging these men, if they had a cargo, we will say of 20 tons, they engaged these men by piece, and where they could only make about 6s. 8d., and they may be two or three days over it; and if it was a cargo of 100 tons they would engage them by day, and they practically had them just as they liked. The men were in a disorganised state, and they really could not remedy the grievance at all. The present Society of which I am secretary, was established on January 6th, 1890. In September of the same year, we sent in a revised scale of wages to the lighter owners, which was utterly ignored, till the 26th September, when the lighter owners sent a revised scale back again to the lightermen. After

Earl of Derby—continued.

having two meetings, and going through the scale, we found out that the scale they sent to us was even less than we were getting at that time. We wrote to them that we could not accept that scale, but we offered to discuss the question *pro* and *con*, with the lighter owners, seeing that there was only a week before the scale was supposed to come into operation. The lighter owners agreed to that. We had a joint deputation of four lighter owners and four lightermen and the two secretaries, and we threshed this scale out for six hours, and we came amicably to an understanding. The chairman of the Lighter Owners' Association was the chairman of the joint committee, and he remarked that he was pleased with the fair manner the men had discussed the scale, and agreed to alterations, and the deputation parted and shook hands with the idea that the dispute was settled, and that a serious strike had been averted; also that the men would continue their work as usual and there would be no stoppage of work. But on the following day at a general meeting of the lighter owners they appeared to disagree with the action that the deputation had taken. They almost unanimously agreed not to accept the scale as agreed upon by the joint committees. We called a special meeting of the men, the letter from the lighter owners was read, and the men agreed that the lighter owners had broken faith with the men, and that it was useless to negotiate any further with them. So they decided that they would stand by their original demands, and that they would cease work on the Saturday night, which I may say they did with one exception. There was only one lighter-

17 February 1892.]

MR. ALBERT ANLABY BIRD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

man out of the whole members of our Union who did not cease work on the Saturday night. On the Monday, at a mass meeting, a fresh scale of wages was submitted to the men for their approval. I may say it was with persuasion that the men were advised to carry a resolution that they should send this scale, and failing the lighter owners accepting it we were willing to submit the case to arbitration. On the 8th we received a letter from the lighter owners that they were willing to submit to arbitration and they appointed Captain Hill, who is in connexion with the shipping and the Board of Trade in Hull, and we appointed a Mr. Welch, of the Tyne Watermen's Society, to arbitrate for us. I may say that the arbitrator's award, of which I have a copy here if you would like to see it, granted us more by arbitration than we agreed to go in for with the joint deputations. I may say that we were on strike four days; the traffic was stopped, and if the strike had continued it would have fetched about 1,500 oil millers out of work, as the Society which I represent feed all the mills with seed for making cake. We say that it was the whole blame of the lighter owners that that strike occurred at all. We met them as amicably as it was possible to meet them. We gave way a long way so that there should not be a strike, but in face of all this it seemed that they intended to force a strike upon us. I can only say that the ship-owners were inconvenienced, the merchants were inconvenienced, and the men were also inconvenienced by being out of work and losing money. We estimate that the men lost 10s. per man, which there was no necessity to if the lighter owners had only met us and stood by the joint committee that met.

13,634. Now, let us understand when did this strike begin?—The strike began really on the 6th October 1890.

13,635. When did it end?—It ended on the 10th.

13,636. Then it lasted in all four days?—Yes.

13,637. And the end of it was that you got by arbitration as much as you had originally asked, is that so?—No, more than we agreed to go in for at the joint deputations.

13,638. Has that state of things continued?—Up to the present.

13,639. Therefore, in point of fact, the stoppage of work and the inconvenience you speak of was only for four days?—Only for four days.

13,640. Has there been any strike since that date?—We have had small strikes, strikes on a small scale of two or three men, but nothing to mention. I may say that we were not satisfied with the scale. There was a witness here yesterday who said he did not believe in arbitration and conciliation boards, that the men were not satisfied if it did not happen to go the right way. I may say that there is a lot of things that we should have liked to have had, but seeing that we agreed to arbitration we were quite willing to abide by the decision come to by the arbitrators so far as the lighter owners

Earl of Derby—continued.

did. We work up to that scale up to the present time. Each member of the Society has the award given him by the Society in book form, so that when he is employed by a lighter owner, if it is something that he does not quite understand on the face of it, he has the book to go by.

13,641. Then you have nothing to complain of I presume inasmuch as you and those who acted with you got their own terms in the settlement, and inasmuch as the settlement has lasted for more than 12 months?—We have nothing to complain of as regards wages, nothing at all. We have something to say farther on about the lighters, as working on them.

13,642. Now I see in the summary which you have put before me you speak of lock-outs?—Yes.

13,643. When have they taken place—lately?—That occurred in December.

13,644. Of the same year?—1890. Those were the men belonging to the Trent Navigation Company. There were about 80 of them who were members of our Union. Previous to the scale going in to the Trent Navigation Company the captains of those boats were receiving 24s. per week and the mates were receiving 16s. per week. I am not quite certain of those figures that I am going to give now—I cannot find the paper but I believe that they had voyage money; it was 1*l.* to Newark, and 25s. to Nottingham, every round voyage that they made from Newark and Nottingham to Hull and back again, from Hull to Newark and Nottingham in addition to the 16s. and the 24s. per week. They averaged their hours and they alleged that they have between 80 and 90 hours per week for this amount of money, and that the vessel leaving Hull on an afternoon tide would get up to Newark to-morrow morning, and they would practically be at work all night. He would barely get time to even coil his ropes down and wash the decks of his own vessel, but he had to go aboard of another vessel and work cargo the whole of the day so that that vessel may be got away to Hull again, and the men really had no sleep at all. We went in as much for altering the conditions and the hours as we did for wages. There was a very little increase in wages but there was a slight increase. We sent a letter on the 20th November 1890, with a revised scale in wages to the manager of the Trent Navigation Company. We offered at the same time to send a deputation if he would receive one to discuss the scale, and if there were any grievances on his side we would remedy them, and if there was any on ours we should like them remedied also. In answer to it he sent a letter saying that he declined to meet any committee or any deputation connected with any officials of the Union. As a counter move he gave every man in the employ a week's notice to leave the employment. But at the same time he had an agreement drawn up and if every man would sign this agreement he

17 February 1892.]

MR. ALBERT ANLABY BIRD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

would be willing to take them back again. The men alleged that this agreement was never read to them, and they were never allowed to read it. The Society advised them not to sign any agreement unless some officials of the Society saw it. They refused to do so, and, therefore, the Trent Navigation Company locked them out. I may say that I tried by all means to get a deputation to the Trent Navigation Company. Sir Albert Rollit is one of the directors. I may say that he received us very kindly in London; he received a deputation and he blamed the directors and he also blamed the manager for the way in which they had treated us, and he said he would do all he could to try and get the dispute settled. But I suppose that Sir Albert Rollit when he went over to Nottingham to a directors' meeting was by himself; he was the only director who agreed to any conciliatory means to settle the dispute. Failing him we tried the Nottingham Trades Council. The directors, perhaps, thought that we were obnoxious persons as agitators—people of that class think that agitators are—and we tried to get the Trades Council to get a deputation to the Trent Navigation Company. That deputation that was going to be sent to them was refused a hearing with the Trent Navigation Company, the same as we were. After the men had been out a month, we persuaded the men, if possible, to try and get in at some terms or other. The men eventually got a hearing. I believe it was with the chairman, and the chairman told them that the strike would have been settled long ago, and he would have received the men long ago, if there had not been a stumbling block in the way, and that stumbling block was the secretary of the Union, who had sent a very insulting letter to the manager. The men sent me a letter informing me of what the chairman had said, and I went over to Newark, and took the copies of the letters and the letters sent by the Trent Navigation Company to me, and I also went to the Mayor of Newark and asked the Mayor of Newark if he would kindly attend our meeting, as we had something very important on, and I should really like him to be there, and he consented to come. I told him what it was, and I read the whole of the correspondence, which I have here if it is required to read it. I read the whole of the correspondence to the men in front of the Mayor of Newark, and the Mayor of Newark agreed that there was no insulting language in any of the correspondence that had been sent to the Trent Navigation Company. But, I may say here that while the men were locked out there was a severe frost, and the frost lasted for 10 or 11 weeks, and that is the sole reason that the Trent Navigation Company kept these men locked out. In other years they paid these men 1*l.* per week when they were frozen up, but in this instance with the men being locked out they were saving all this money. To that we attribute the fact that they kept them locked out so long. They were locked out about 17 weeks. I did hear,

Earl of Derby—continued

afterwards, that the Trent Navigation Company was bankrupt, and that they really could not afford the scale that was sent in. But I may say that if anything of that kind had been put before us, and we had had it proved to us conclusively that they could not afford to alter the conditions of the men we should have been quite willing to assist them in the adversity, and wait till prosperity came before we asked for an increase at all. I may say that it was a sorrowful affair for the men; the men were out altogether about 17 weeks, and there was practically no work for them to do in Newark. We assisted them with the funds of the Union as far as ever they would go, and we had to get employment for them the best way we could. I may say that they are all at work at present, and the Company is going on as usual. The only thing that we complain of here is the way that the Company treated the men, and the way they tried to cast reflections upon the officials of the Union, and more particularly myself, by lying to the men, which we think it was nothing else but lying to the men, and trying to get the men to have nothing to do with the officials of the Union; and we think it was taking a mean advantage to say that they had received insulting letters, when if that question was brought to the light of day it could not be proved in the slightest.

13,645. I suppose that only proves that their opinion and your opinion as to what constitutes an insulting letter were not the same?—I have the letters here if you would like to hear them.

13,646. No, I do not think we can go into that. This lock-out apparently ended of itself, the men and the employers came to terms?—Yes, they came to terms when the frost had gone. As soon as ever the frost had gone they came to terms. They wanted the trade to go on, and I may say that the conditions of the men are really better, and instead of having to turn to work at 6 o'clock in the morning after being up all night they have so many hours' rest and they have a standing wage of so much per week, I believe they have 30*s.* and 25*s.* per week now, 30*s.* to the captain and 25*s.* to the mate. They have a standing wage and the conditions are really better than they were before.

13,647. Their general condition is improved?—Yes, their general condition is improved to what it was before.

13,648. Since these labour difficulties began?—Yes.

13,649. As a matter of fact there is no difficulty going on now, is there?—No; everything is working amicably at the present time.

13,650. I see in your summary you say that strikes have been caused by the action of the Shipping Federation. Can you show us that that is the case?—We find it so. At the end of December in the year 1890 there was a steamer came to Hull called the "Mary Anning" She had a union crew on board, and up to this time there had been little disputes with ships and

17 February¹1892.]

Mr. ALBERT ANLABY BIRD.

[Continued]

Earl of Derby—continued.

shipowners, but nothing to mean anything. The men who were in the "Mary Anning" were all union men, and they all got "V.G." discharges. The captain told one of the officials of the Seamen's Union that they were good men, but he had orders from the Shipping Federation that he was not to ship union men, but he was to take a federation crew. As soon as ever the federation crew was put on board of him the Dockers' Union refused to have anything to do with the "Mary Anning." I was away in London at the time seeing Sir Albert Rollit. Our men would not cease working until they knew what they were going to do. The Shipping Federation fetched 70 men from Liverpool to work the cargo of the "Mary Anning" into the lighters. I believe some of the lighters got a part of the cargo but not all of them. We have a resolution in our Society that we refuse to work with any non-union men.

13,651. That is a rule of your Society?—Yes; and the lightermen withdrew from the "Mary Anning," and they refused to take any cargo into the lighters at all. The "Mary Anning" was partly discharged into another steamer; they could not get any craft to discharge the "Mary Anning" into, and they put it into a steamer I believe called the "Westello." I advised the representatives of the Seamen's Union to try and see the committee of the Shipping Federation to see if we could not come to some understanding. They went and saw them and I went with them, and we asked them if the dispute could not be settled in some way; the captain had no complaint against these men and we thought it was very wrong to discharge them without some reason. I asked the chairman if the captain was satisfied with the crew that they had on board the "Mary Anning;" the captain was in the room but the chairman would not allow the captain to answer the question. He said it had nothing to do with the question at all. They had decided that they should ship whom they liked. We admitted that they had a perfect right to ship whom they liked, but at the same time we had a perfect right to work with whom we liked. That was the beginning of a lot of serious disputes occurring in Hull between the Shipping Federation and the unions connected with the carrying industry in Hull. I know for a fact that the men, good men, have been discharged for no other reason than that they belonged to the Union. Now the Shipping Federation complained very bitterly of the action, and there was a gentleman here yesterday said the same, that the union men would not ship with anybody who was not a union man. I always say that two wrongs do not make one right. The Shipping Federation, although they complained of the arbitrary power that the unions used, practically go and practise the same thing, which they do up to to-day; they carry federation crews and it has been proved beyond a doubt, time after time, that a man with a federation ticket has a preference. They say the preference clause has been withdrawn, but I can relate a case where four men were sent direct from the Shipping Federation Office

Earl of Derby—continued.

to the captain and the captain did not want the men, and one of those men was sent up aloft, he was a foreigner, he was sent up aloft to unshackle the span of a derrick and instead of going to unshackle the span of the derrick he went out on the gaff, he had a heaving line in his hand and he did not know what he was going to do there; the captain remarked to me himself, he said "This is the sort of crews we get from the Shipping Federation, if they would allow us to ship our own men we should be able to get better men." I distinctly say here that they do give a preference. I refer to a case further. The captain of the steamship "Hampstead," it was in the first week in this year, had two men aboard, that were obnoxious to the Seamen's Union; they were a long way in arrears, I believe, with that Union, and the delegate went to the captain and told him he should like him to speak to these men so that there should be no disturbance; and the captain asked him who he was, and as soon as he told him the captain began to curse and swear and told him that his ship was a federation ship and that he should not have any union men on board of his ship, and he ordered that man ashore, and he scandalised him and called him everything. I may say that I was there the whole of the time, and as soon as ever I spoke to him, I tried to speak quietly and told him, well, we did not wish to cause any disturbance, he began to blackguard me too and sent for a policeman to have us put off at the dock. I may say that the strikes went on for about six months. I myself lay the blame in the majority of cases on the Federation. I will not say that the unions were always right, but in the majority of cases the strikes were caused simply by the local officials of the Shipping Federation and the action that they took. A gentleman, a shipowner I believe, who was giving evidence yesterday spoke about British seamen and about their being drunkards and failing to turn up on board ships. I should not have mentioned this but I think it is only right in fairness to British seamen that it should be mentioned. About nine years ago I was on board of a New York liner.

13,652. You came here to give evidence as regards the lightermen and watermen?—Yes, but I want to point out here that these disputes that we have been in have been caused by the action of the Shipping Federation, and although we, as lightermen have been drawn into these disputes, we never should have been in the disputes if it had not been for them. I will give way.

13,653. I do not think we want to hear anything that happened outside your own particular business. You say, as I understand you, that the Shipping Federation have caused these strikes by refusing to employ men who belong to your Union. We understand from other witnesses that the principle of the Federation is not to exclude any man who is willing to work either with union or non-union men? Now you, as I understand you, say that the principle of your Union

17 February 1892.]

Mr. ALBERT ANLABY BIRD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

is to work with none but union men?—None but union men.

13,654. Then, if you have a right to lay down that rule, which is not disputed, does it not occur to you that the Shipping Federation has the same right?—Yes, it has so far; but I should like to point out here that the lightermen belong to a union; they pay a contribution to that union of so much per week; say they pay for a year, they pay the 3d. per week regularly for a year and that union decides that it shall go in for an increase of wages, which we did, and we got really an advance and we bettered the condition of the men all round. If we do that we do it for non-union men alike as we do for union men, and although these non-union men do not pay any contributions, they do not pay any money for these benefits, we cannot hinder them, they get the benefits just the same as we do who pay regularly every week. That is where the grievance comes in with us. A man is a man and he has a right to have work, but if we benefit that man he has a right to pay his fair share towards receiving the benefits as we do.

13,655. Then practically you carry your theory to this length, that no man has a right to work at a trade unless he belongs to a union, does it not come to that?—No, I do not exactly say that; I say if there is a union, and that union benefits him, he has a right to assist the men who get that benefit, and pay as much towards it as they do.

13,656. In other words they have a right to exclude him if he does not assist?—If he does not do so.

13,657. That is your view?—It is my opinion.

13,658. It is not the view of the Shipping Federation?—Quite so.

13,659. And both parties are within their rights?—Well, they may think so, but we do not.

13,660. You wish to enforce your rule and they have an equal right, I suppose, to enforce theirs?—We enforce our rule where it is possible.

13,661. Now about the safety of navigation of lighters, I believe you have something to tell us upon that subject?—Yes. With the exception of some lighters which belong to the railway companies the lighters are very unsafe to navigate, especially in rough and frosty and foggy weather. The lighters have no bow ropes, no man ropes, and no rails, and in a tidal way they have no small boat nor any life-saving appliances, so that if any accident occurs to them there are no means of saving life, and they often cause the lives of men to be in very great danger and sometimes lost. I have a photo of a lighter here, which is one of the latest that is built, and I should like you to see it (*producing photograph*). I will just give you one or two cases illustrating the danger. Charles Scarborough, a lighterman, was drowned off Mr. Simpson's lighter (Mr. Simpson is a lighter owner at Hull), on May 4th, 1890, while on duty. He was supposed to have gone to pump his lighter and

Earl of Derby—continued.

never was seen alive again. He was picked up just under the lighter's bows. The lighter in question was similar to that shown in the photograph; she had no bow ropes and no man ropes or rails. I may say that these lighters have only about 15 inches of deck at each side to walk along, and they have no rail round aft and no bow ropes foreward. Any one who knows the Humber knows that sometimes there is a very nasty sea on in the Humber, especially with a southerly gale. These men go rolling out into the Humber, and if the tiller does happen to knock them they may go overboard, because there is nothing to prevent them going overboard; there is no rail nor anything of that sort. Thomas Briggs was drowned from a lighter in the creek at Hull. This man was at the stern of the lighter, and his mate, although the lighters are only about 60 or 70 feet long as a rule, who was forward and was pulling the lighter along with his hook, shouted to him to put the helm over, but he got no reply, and so he walked aft and found the man missing. Where he lost his mate he does not know; it was night time. That man was drowned, and how he was drowned no one can tell; although the man was so near to him forward he did not know that he had left the lighter or how he left it. We surmise again that if there had been a rail at the after part of that ship that man would not have been drowned. Albert Lomax, on the 20th November 1891 aged 16, fell overboard from one of Mr. Walker's lighters, belonging to Hull, which was loaded with seed and working at a mill. The foreman he was the foreman's son, had sent him on board this lighter to do some work; the lighterman was away at the time, and the lighter had a list over into the river, and through some unknown reason the boy fell overboard and was drowned. That is a case again where we say if there had been rails, probably that boy would never have been drowned. The greater number of our lighters are all about the same way rigged; there are a few exceptions, but they are all rigged similar to that. Some of the old lighters, which are open lighters, have a plank about 12 inches wide, which is really the deck. The tide runs very heavy in the river, and these men, if they want to go foreward to push her off or anywhere to pull her to, they have to walk on this plank; it is immaterial what the weather is. We think that there ought to be some better protection for the lives of these lightermen when they are aboard of these lighters.

13,662. Would you say that on the whole a man employed upon a lighter was exposed to anything like the same amount of danger as a regular sailor, I mean a man who goes to sea in a vessel?—No; I would not say that.

13,663. As a matter of fact are lighters often employed in rough water?—When there is rough weather the lighters get their share of it they are continually going backwards and forwards, and continually in the river, and they have to put up with all the weathers that come the same as ships have to do at sea.

17 February 1892.]

Mr. ALBERT ANLABY BIRD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

13,664. But, I suppose there is seldom much sea in a river, is there?—There is a very big sea sometimes in the Humber.

13,665. Now, I believe you have something to say also as to the sanitary arrangements?—The same lighters that I have been speaking about, with a few exceptions, are very unsanitary; that is caused by not having proper ventilation, light, heat, and cleanliness. What I mean by that is this that they have no skylights to admit any light, no stoves to heat or dry the places, and in many instances they have no cabins; they are practically dark holes with no ceilings, floors, or bed berths, lockers, or anything, but simply places where they throw down tow ropes and coil tow ropes, and different gear away. As regards cleanliness I can mention lighters myself which I have cleaned out, and bucket full after bucket full of putrid seed, and other matter I have taken away till I have really had to leave it and go on deck to get fresh air. The lighters are not properly cleaned out, they are left year after year till they really get a nuisance to the docks.

13,666. Is it not the business of the men employed upon them to see that they are kept clean?—I think it is the canal-boat inspector's business. I should like to say further that there are cases where lighters have been ordered out of the dock by the local inspector as being a nuisance to the dock and the public. Further, that, with one or two exceptions, there is no accommodation for men to get their food or to take shelter from the inclemency of the weather, although being aboard 60 or 70 hours per week, night and day, they practically live aboard with the exception of sleeping. I should like to read this from the Canal Boats Act of 1877, "The expression 'canal' includes any river, inland navigation, lake, or water being within the body of a county, whether it is or not within the ebb and flow of the tide; the expression 'canal boat' means any vessel, however propelled, which is used for the conveyance of goods along a canal as above defined, and which is not a ship duly registered under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, and the Acts amending the same." That clause has been amended a little by the Act of 1884 as follows:—"If it shall at any time appear to the Local Government Board on the representation of any registration or sanitary authority, or of any inspector appointed under this Act, that the principal Act and this Act ought to apply to any vessel or class of vessels which would be within the definition of canal boat, contained in section 14 of the principal Act; if such vessel or class of vessels were not registered under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, and the Acts amending the same, the Local Government Board may declare that the principal Act and this Act shall apply to such vessel or class of vessels, although the same may be registered as aforesaid, and thereupon the same shall be deemed to be a canal boat or canal boats within the meaning of the principal Act and this Act

Earl of Derby—continued.

"and the definition contained in section 14 of the principal Act shall be amended accordingly." As we interpret these two Acts we think that lighters come under the expression "canal boat," and that they should be dealt with just the same as canal boats are, with the exception of sleeping berths. I will give you one case here. This is a report of the Hull and Goole Port Sanitary Authority for November and December 1891, on "foul lighters." In the inspector's report he says "The lighters lying in the Queen's Dock have been inspected, and in three cases a serious nuisance was caused by the accumulation of the foul water in the holds. The owner was written to, and the lighters were disinfected, and pumped out." I may say, sir, that I have had these reports every two months or most, but they have been mislaid, otherwise I could have shown you that in nearly every report the inspector makes the same report on these unsanitary lighters. We have to be aboard of these lighters from year in to year out, and we really think that they ought to be kept more clean, and that we ought to have some different accommodation from what we have at the present time. I have been myself eight years aboard of a lighter, and I have been moving from one dock to another and it has taken me that amount of time in the middle of the night, and I have finished about 4 o'clock in the morning, and I have just got the lighter in dock then, and had to commence work again at 6 o'clock. I was about three miles from home at that time so that it was impossible for me to go home, and the only thing that I could do was to walk about the quay or go anywhere. I could not go down in the lighter's cabin because she had none. There is no accommodation, no stove nor anything. It is by the same rule that we have to get our food aboard of them, we have no accommodation to get it, and we have to get it the best way we can. We do not know how it is, we only think that they ought to apply the same rule to lighters as to canal boats.

13,667. What is it that you propose; that every lighter should be provided with a cabin?—Yes, we say that every lighter should be provided with a cabin, but not on the same scale as canal boats, for the simple reason that they have to provide sleeping accommodation. We do not wish to have sleeping accommodation, although I can refer to cases where they have been made sleeping places till I drew the inspector's attention to it. As an alternative scheme the lighter owner allowed them 6d. a night to get a bed ashore. Practically now those men sometimes of necessity are compelled to stop aboard; of course they will say they do not sleep there, but they have to be aboard there, because they are in the middle of a river, and they cannot get ashore sometimes, and they have to stop aboard until the next tide comes. We think that they should provide some accommodation for us, seeing that we practically live aboard of them.

13,668. Does the Canal Boat Act of 1877 apply to lighters?—That is the point that we are

17 February 1892.]

Mr. ALBERT ANLABY BIRD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

arguing; we say that it does, but the inspectors say that it does not. I have read the two Acts, and that is how we interpret the Acts.

13,669. Then you want to obtain an authoritative decision as to whether that Act does apply or not?—Yes, that is what we wish.

13,670. Have you ever written to the Home Office or the Board of Trade about it?—We should say the Board of Trade.

13,671. Apparently the first thing to do is to find out what the state of the law actually is before you propose any alteration of it?—We say the Local Government Board have the authority at the present time, but they do not use the authority.

13,672. Now you have a complaint here, I see, as to what you call undue preference shown by canal companies to certain boats over other boats; will you explain that?—There is only one company about which I have got any evidence to lay before the Commission, and that is the Aire and Calder Navigation Company. The Aire and Calder Navigation Company have a lot of flyboats, I could not tell you the exact number, but they have many flyboats, and they trade from Hull to Leeds and Wakefield. We say that they give undue preference to their own boats over boats of private traders; that is to say, if there are any flyboats approaching a lock or a train of compartment boats, which is composed sometimes of 16 iron boats—boxes they are really, and they tow them in train—if any of these flyboats or compartment boats are near a lock, and I as a private trader am nearer the lock than they are, I get orders to stand on one side and allow these boats to go. I have cases that I could quote, where they have given this undue preference time after time, and I should have had some of recent date, only that the flyboatmen have been out on strike. I may say that we opposed a Bill last year, the Aire and Calder and River Don Navigation Junction Canal Bill. The manager of the company, in answer to counsel who represented us, and who asked, "Are these the byelaws by which the Board of Trade approved of your canal?" said, "They have not approved of these; those are the navigation byelaws." Then he was asked, "Were those submitted to the Board of Trade?" and the answer to that was "No." I believe these byelaws, the manager said, were to come before the Board of Trade last August, but it says in them, "Who shall attempt to pass a vessel approaching and being within 150 yards of a lock, bridgeway, aqueduct, or stop-gate, or have charge of an ordinary vessel, whether light or loaded, and shall not lower his line and give way to a flyboat, who, when he sees or has noticed that a flyboat is within 50 yards from a lock bridge, or aqueduct or stop-gate, shall not give way and let it pass first." I, as a private trader, may invest my money in a little vessel, give 400*l.* or 500*l.* for that vessel, and may go and apply for a cargo from a broker to take to Leeds, and if it is a matter of despatch he will not give it to me, for the simple reason—

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

13,673. This is not a question for us at all; it is a question of preference between different classes of traders; it has nothing to do with labour?—It is a question for us; our men suffer very materially under it, and it is a very serious question to us.

13,674. It is a question of preference between different classes of traders, not between labourers and employers at all?—Our men are labourers.

Earl of Derby.

13,675. Do you say that the men whom you represent are mainly employed by the small private traders, and not by the company?—Yes, they employ men by the voyage and by thirds and all that, and we say it is a serious thing to these men.

13,676. I am not quite sure that I understand you. Do you say that this preference so given, assuming the fact to be so, to one class of boats over another is contrary to any existing law or only that it ought to be made contrary to law?—I do not know whether those byelaws have been passed by the Board of Trade, I cannot get to know.

13,677. Then I think you say that the men employed on the river suffer under the Common Carriers Act through not having bills of lading; will you explain that?—I think that question will apply the same as the other; it is no good going into that.

13,678. Do I understand that you wish masters of lighters and river craft generally to hold certificates of competency when navigating in tidal waters?—I have a question I have put on the summary of evidence about enforcing the Canal Boats Act.

13,679. Very well, what have you got to say about it?—We believe that the Canal Boats Act should be strictly enforced, but with this exception that canal boat inspectors should not go direct into any canal boat's cabin without first giving, say, 10 or 15 minutes notice to the master that such was his intention. I may say that at the present time they do not ask for any authority. I believe they have the authority, but we think it common decency that they should ask whether the way was clear for them to go below into the cabin of the canal boat. Instead of doing that they go direct down; perhaps the captain may be ashore, or he may be working in the hold, and they go direct down into the canal boat's cabin without saying anything, and there are cases that we could relate where the wives of canal boatmen have been put about, &c. with the necessities of life. Therefore we do not think it is right that the inspectors should do this without giving some warning. We believe that the Canal Boats Act should be very strictly enforced in cases of cleanliness. The Act provides that the cabins of canal boats should be painted every three years. I can give you a case of a keel called the "Humber Witch," which was built 26 years ago, and which was painted when she was built and has never been painted since. I can give you

17 February 1892.]

Mr. ALBERT ANLABY BIRD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

cases, half a dozen of them, of canal boats which have not been painted for over five years. We do not blame any particular authority, because we do not know where the blame lies exactly, because there are inspectors all over, but we do say that someone has neglected it in allowing them to go such a length of time without being painted.

13,680. In any of those cases that you have mentioned was the inspector's notice called to the fact?—I can only refer to one where the inspector had his attention drawn to it. That was a keel called the "Alice." I cannot tell you where she hails from exactly, I believe she hails from Hull. The cabin of this keel was painted red, and the inspector's attention was called to it and he said it would last some time yet, he would not bother with it yet. That is the only case which I can point to where an inspector had his attention called to it.

13,681. Now we will go on to the other question you have raised as to the expediency of masters of canal boats and other river craft holding certificates of competency when navigating tidal waters. Do you think that in the absence of such certificates of competency men are placed in charge of boats who are unfit to manage them?—Sometimes. We believe that all masters of lighters, keels, or river craft, should hold certificates of competency when navigating any tidal waters of any kind or description, as under existing circumstances there are some in charge who do not even know how to steer properly, who do not know even the rules of the road. Seeing that there are many steamers trading to the port of Hull and the other Humber ports who carry passengers on board, we think in the interests of life and property there should be qualified men on the first-mentioned craft. In the majority of cases the masters on the steamers and sailing vessels are compelled to hold certificates of competency, also the engineer in the engine-room, but still with craft which are on the same waters sailing and driving on a tidal way, there is no such person on board. We think for the reasons I have stated there ought to be some change in the mode of manning river craft. Last year the coasting sailing vessels entering Hull and the Humber numbered 1,025, the coasting steam vessels 1,334, making a total of the coasting trade of 2,359. Of the foreign trade there were 594 sailing, 3,412 steam vessels, total 4,006, making a grand total of vessels entering Hull of 6,365. I have a letter here from the secretary of the Dock Company at Kingston-upon-Hull from which it appears that the average river craft, canal boats, &c. entering the Hull Docks for 1891 was 83,000 in and out. I may say here that many of those craft of course would come many times over. Then there is the trade to Goole, which has to pass Hull. I could not get the statistics of that. I got the first ones from the Customs House, and I wrote to the Customs House at Goole to ask them to send me the same information, but they would not send the same information without we paid a fee of 5s., and that we refused to pay, so we could not

Earl of Derby—continued.

get the same information from there. I may say that last year there was a deputation to the Board of Trade on the same question. I believe Sir Michael Hicks-Beach at that time said the statements which were made were general statements. I believe they were general statements, but I have one or two cases here. John Fines, the captain of the keel "Elizabeth." She was loaded with a general cargo from Hull to Lincoln. This man had only been two or three voyages as captain; he had been a boy before really, and he lost his vessel and almost lost his life at Trent Bridge, his vessel was lost altogether and the valuable cargo that she had on board of her was lost also. William Harrison and William Rowland were with a lighter going from the Albert Dock to the Alexandra Dock, the facts here will answer your question as to whether there could not be much sea on, there was sufficient sea to fill this lighter and sink her. The lighter was lost altogether and both the men on board of her were drowned. One of the men was not a lighterman, he was a labourer really, but he had been doing what we call a shift at tide work from one dock to the other with this man. He was drowned, but we think that if he had been a competent man he would not have been drowned for the simple reason that he was very nearly saved; we think he could have clipped hold of a tow rope but he did not seem to have the presence of mind and he was drowned. Then George Knight, captain of a keel called the "Eleanor." He was on three voyages in this keel and previously had been engaged for a short time as mate. Previous to his being engaged as mate he was in a coasting vessel. He went foul of the same bridge as Captain Fines did and he was knocked overboard, and he was drowned. It was really an error of judgment on his part; he ought to have lowered his mast to go under the bridge, and he did not lower his mast in time, and the mast fell on him and knocked him overboard and drowned him. We think that if there were certificates of competency there would not have been so many lives lost as there have been. I have several other cases but I could not get the dates of them, and without the dates I would not bring them. There was a vessel only lost the week before last, and there was a vessel lost about a fortnight ago on the Witton Sands; the captain of that vessel was a competent man though, but still they were lost. That only shows as far as we are concerned on the Humber that they ought to be competent men.

13,682. What you ask is that certificates of competency should be granted by the Board of Trade to all persons engaged as masters of lighters and river craft?—Yes, they go in tidal ways. If the Board of Trade had the granting of such certificates we should have representation on the local marine boards in the interests of the men.

13,683. On what ground do you ask that; I mean have you any reason to suppose that if you had not representation on the local marine boards the certificates would be unfairly given?—They think there would be no fear of that if

17 February 1892.]

Mr. ALBERT ANLABY BIRD.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

we had a practical man on the marine board which had the granting of these certificates.

13,684. Now you have something to say as to disused navigations, I think?—I was going to give evidence upon that, but I understand that Mr. Gady, of Liverpool, has arranged with a gentleman at Hull, named Mr. Hewson, a shipbroker, who is really the champion of this cause, and I prefer to leave that to him, if he comes before the Commission.

Mr. Tait.

13,685. How long have you been a seaman?—I was at sea between nine and ten years.

13,686. How long have you been a lighterman?—About seven years on and off among the lighters.

13,687. How long have you been secretary of the Union?—Two years.

13,688. How long has your Union been in existence?—Two years.

13,689. Are you federated with any of the other unions?—We are federated with the federated unions of trades in the shipping, carrying, and other industries.

13,690. That is under the London Federation of which Mr. Clem Edwards is the secretary?—Yes, he is the general secretary.

13,691. Can you tell us the reason why the lighter owners refused to carry out the agreement of the joint conference which you had which resulted in all your members with the exception of one going out on strike?—I cannot, only that the scale did not appear to suit them. I do not know the reason. I suppose they felt it very severely amongst themselves.

13,692. You got no official information, as the secretary of the Union, of their reasons?—Only on the question of dust money; they said that they could not agree to give the dust money as applied for.

13,693. As the result of the strike you agreed to submit the question to arbitration?—Yes.

13,694. You said that you had a copy of the award?—Yes.

13,695. Would you kindly put a copy in?—Yes (see Appendix 83).

13,696. Now you never got any settlement in the case of the lock-out of the Trent Navigation Company did you?—None, whatever.

13,697. Even up to the present day?—Up to the present time.

13,698. How many men were out altogether?—Eighty.

13,699. You state that the men have now all found work?—Yes.

13,700. May I take it that they have all found work in lighterman's employment, or is it in various employments throughout the country?—Many of them have gone back to the same employ.

13,701. Can you tell us the cost of that lock-out to your Union?—I can only say this, that it cost us all we had; every penny.

13,702. When you talk of those in charge of lighters having certificates of competency have you, as a practical man, thought out the questions

Mr. Tait—continued.

which you would request the Board of Trade to put to the persons aspiring to get a certificate?—We have not thought that out because we could not get much encouragement from the Board of Trade. I may say there were 15,000 lightermen represented on a deputation to the Board of Trade and we did not get any satisfaction there to warrant us to formulate any scheme.

13,703. But if you were to formulate a scheme of what you thought should be the qualifications, do you not think there would be a possibility of its forwarding your interests at the Board of Trade?—Yes.

Mr. Ismay.

13,704. You have told us that 83,000 river craft enter the port or the docks at Hull?—Yes.

13,705. Are those craft all commanded by members of your Union?—No.

13,706. They are not?—No.

13,707. Have you any members of your Union who neither can steer nor know the rules of the road?—Possibly we may have.

13,708. You may have?—Yes.

13,709. How would you propose to examine these men in order to ascertain their efficiency to take charge of these lighters; what would be their qualifications?—To see if they knew what "port" or "starboard" was, to be able to splice ropes and steer, and to see that they had good eyesight.

13,710. Now, as a matter of fact, are not all these men capable of doing that; are they not trained up on board these vessels?—Some of them are, but there are many who are not. We find it so in Hull; they come from anywhere almost.

13,711. Having regard to the large number of vessels employed does that not rather speak for the efficiency of the men when there are only the few accidents that you have told us of?—I may say that there are a lot more accidents than I have told you of, what you might term petty accidents; there have been many drowning cases that I could not get the particulars of. I may say here that I have not brought any particulars of any drowning cases unless I have known the man's name, the lighter he was aboard of, and the date.

13,712. As secretary for the last two years would not all these cases come under your notice?—What has come under my notice I have taken notes of. I have given you the cases which have come under my notice.

13,713. And you have taken notes of all cases?—If I hear of them.

13,714. Either through the public press or in some way you would hear of them?—Yes.

13,715. And these are all the cases you can tell us of in two years out of all the number of people who are employed on these vessels?—Yes, they are all the cases that I can speak of with authority.

13,716. And yet you come and tell us that these men are not efficient. Now just think?—

17 February 1892.]

Mr. ALBERT ANLABY BIRD.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ismay—continued.

Yes, I do say so for the simple reason that I can quote cases where a man has come direct from a warehouse on board of a lighter.

13,717. He may have been on board of a lighter as a boy?—He may have, but I know this particular man very well and I never knew him as anything else but as a warehouseman.

13,718. All the boys about the riverside are more or less accustomed to boating and gradually pick it up?—We have very few boys who work at our trade. I do not think we have half a dozen.

13,719. No, but they grow up into men, do they not?—The boys get used to knocking about the docks and harbours, and in boats, &c. I quite admit that, but that does not qualify them to take charge of a lighter.

13,720. Are there many men who would not join the Union?—No, I do not think there are a dozen lightermen in Hull but what belong to the Union.

13,721. How many does the Union consist of?—We have only about 500 lightermen; the Dockers' Union has about 300 lightermen.

13,722. Why do they belong to different unions?—That I cannot explain. We both started about the same time, and these lightermen—they are railway lightermen—joined the Dockers' Union, and they have been there ever since. We have not tried to get them away from the dockers.

13,723. Then you make it a close borough as far as you can?—Yes, we work it as near as possible with one another.

13,724. You object to outside men?—We object to outside men.

13,725. And you would leave off work if there were any outside men employed?—Yes.

13,726. You would bring all the pressure you could to bear?—All legal pressure, we should.

13,727. And yet you object to the Federation giving a preference?—No; I only object thus far that they objected first, and now they ought to set us a better example if they think they are right, but they are doing the very self same thing that they condemned the unions for doing.

Mr. Austin.

13,728. Could you give us some evidence as regards the hours of labour of lightermen?—The lightermen work from 6 to 6 as a rule. We have a great grievance there, but we think we can remedy it by the Union. For instance, if I am ordered to the Alexandra Dock from where I live at the present time I should have to be up

Mr. Austin—continued.

at half-past 4 in the morning to be on board that lighter. I work at a steamer till 6 o'clock at night. I have to leave that lighter and go to the office every night for orders to see whether I am to go to that lighter. We have no fixed lighter. We are aboard No. 1 to-day and No. 14 to-morrow. This is very obnoxious to us; nearly every night, as a rule, the lightermen do not get their teas till half-past 7 or 8, and by the same rule on a Saturday night it is that time before they get their wages.

13,729. So anything as regards reducing the hours of labour you think you can manage yourselves?—Yes, we think we can do that.

13,730. By the efforts of your organisation?—Yes. We are in favour of reducing the hours of labour.

13,731. But reducing them by your own efforts?—I may say we are divided on that question. Some of them believe in Government interference. We are about evenly divided. I think the Union could do it myself, as far as we are concerned.

13,732. Have you ever made any application to the owners to have rails put on the lighters?—We have, but not collectively.

13,733. In any case has it been granted?—No, none.

Mr. Trow.

13,734. You say yours is a close corporation, you would not have outsiders introduced?—That is so.

13,735. Is there full employment for those men you have now employed?—No, only seasonal employment for four months in the year; our men are very badly employed.

13,736. If you reduce the hours and keep your close corporation how are you going to meet these seasonal fluctuations?—We think we have plenty of men at the present time.

13,737. You said the Federation first raised the objection to union men, or gave preference to men with federation tickets?—Yes.

13,738. Is that correct?—It is, as I found it.

13,739. Is it not a fact that the Federation came into existence because you first objected to work with non-union men?—The Federation may say so. I believe the main object of the Federation is to reduce wages.

13,740. Never mind what the main object is, is it not the fact that your Union objecting to work with non-union men brought the Federation into existence?—I do not think so.

13,741. Had your Union objected to work with them before the Federation was formed?—Yes.

The witness withdrew.

17 February 1892.]

Captain RALPH POMEROY.

[Continued.]

Captain RALPH POMEROY called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

13,742. You are the dock master, we understand at the Bute Docks?—I am.

13,743. You have had 20 years' service at sea?—Yes.

13,744. You have been eight years and more dock master and superintendent at the Avonmouth Dock?—Yes.

13,745. And seven years dock master where you are now at the Bute Docks?—Yes.

13,746. Are you a younger brother of the Trinity House?—Yes.

13,747. And nautical assessor of the port of Bristol?—Yes.

13,748. And pilot commissioner for the Bristol Channel?—Yes.

13,749. And a member of the local marine board, Cardiff?—Yes.

13,750. Now you wish to tell us something about the strike at the Bute Docks on the 3rd February 1891. You had better tell it in your own way?—On the 3rd February last year Wilson's Union brought about a state of things with us which landed us in an enormous expense and great difficulty. On the 3rd February a steamer called the "Glen Gelder" was under No. 3 tip eastside the East Dock, and the official of the Seamen and Firemen's Union went to the men and told them to upshoot as this vessel had on board Federation men. They carried out the instructions they received under a certain amount of pressure of which they verbally informed myself and the traffic manager in the afternoon when we called for them to come and give an account of their proceedings. All we could get from them was this point, that they had determined to enforce the employment of union men at the tips. They told us that if we as a company would turn out this steamer and put in another with a unionist crew on board they would go on to work. The difficulty we had to face then was this: We had our duty to carry out to our customers the shipowners, and, having taken their vessel into our docks, we had to use the best means to carry out the undertaking. It did not lay with us to say that we could turn an owner's steamer out simply because this Union had coerced our men into stopping the work, and therefore we determined to keep the vessel there. That brought about this state of things that on that night the "Iolo Morganwg" and the "Mary Thomas" were both served the same way. The Seamen's Union enforced our men to upshoot and they were stopped. They sent this ultimatum to us, that unless we turned these vessels out from under the tips and put in vessels with unionist crews they would bring the whole dock to a standstill. This threat was carried out. I should like to read the notices we issued to our customers the shipowners and also to our men. The notice to our customers was as follows:—"Dear Sir,—A strike having unfortunately commenced through which the shipment of coal at the Bute Docks Company's tips is at present suspended, the company desire to inform you that they are prepared to offer you

Earl of Derby—continued.

" every facility in their power for carrying out shipments in which you may be interested, by means of your own men. The company think it right to make this offer in order to reduce as far as they can the inconvenience arising under the circumstances; but, desire to add that they do not admit any liability in connexion with such shipment or otherwise, on account of losses caused by the strike. It is thought desirable to add, in order to prevent misapprehension, that the strike has been occasioned, not by any difference between the company and their workmen, but through certain men declining to load a particular ship, and requiring her to be turned out of berth, for some reason which has not been definitely assigned, but which is believed to be connected with the manning of the ship" (*handing in letter*). That was issued on the 5th February 1891, to the customers of the company that I serve. To our men we issued the following notice. "Certain coal-tippers and others in the employ of the Bute Docks Company having ceased work without assigning any reason or giving any notice the company hereby give notice to their workmen that they require all persons in their employ to give due notice before terminating their engagement, and that any workman leaving without the notice which he ought to give may be proceeded against for damages; and further, as indicated by notice, dated 1st August 1890, all labour at the Bute Docks must be regarded as absolutely free, and that no preference will be given either to unionists or non-unionists, and particularly that the company cannot directly or indirectly recognise any attempt to put pressure upon other employers or workmen as to the terms upon which they are to carry on their business" (*handing in circular*). We at once determined to carry out as far as we could what was due from us as a dock company to the shipowners. We therefore set about obtaining men. I may say this of the men whom we put on, that, not a single one did we bring into the town; the labour we obtained was obtained in Cardiff, although we had offers of labour from all parts of the country. We housed them and fed them, and protected them as far as we could, and we made it known to them that all men coming to our service would be sure of continuous employment. The men came in, and on the Thursday, in the afternoon, the manager gave orders to cease signing on, and to have conveyed to the tippers who had struck that we were desirous, in spite of the trouble, inconvenience, expense, and loss sustained, that they or as many of them as we could give employment to should have until Monday at 10 a.m. to reconsider their position. The result was that about 20 presented themselves, but the terrorism of the others kept the men back, and only two on the Monday morning presented themselves for work. The men that we had in reserve were then signed on, with the result that

17 February 1892.]

Captain RALPH POMEROY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

at 11 a.m., on the 16th February, the list was complete and the tips fully manned, and as I say not a stranger was brought into the town. The point I wish to make is, that it was a most uncalled for strike as regards our-elves. We had no difference with our men as regards wages, and therefore when I think that this trouble was brought about by what they are pleased to call sympathetic strikes, I do protest most strongly that it is most unfair to such a company as I serve. After we were in full work on the 16th February the strike leaders still kept up the farce of the strike to the great detriment and loss, not only of the dock owners by keeping back tonnage from the port, but to the wage earners as well.

13,751. I think you have something to tell us about the intimidation practised upon non-unionists?—Yes. I do most clearly state that from that five weeks' experience that I had that there should be an alteration in the law of picketing. I do say that as long as the magistrates of the town have control of the police jointly with the corporation there is a great reluctance on the part of the latter body—many of whose members as public men having promised this, that, and the other to their constituents—to bring police into a town to preserve the peace. A great amount of the terrorism is brought about simply because of inadequate police protection. In our case police were brought into the town. I am sure if you had seen what I saw during the five weeks, if you had seen innocent men beaten, simply because they were endeavouring to obtain work, you would think that something should be done to clearly lay down what is picketing. I allude not only to gangs of men posted about in semi-military style, armed with sticks and other missiles, guarding the entrance to the docks, but also to cases where between 50 and 60 men move about to different places, such as railway stations, steamboat landings, and like places. I have in my mind one such case, where a large body of men attempted to intercept and capture a train coming from Liverpool loaded with seamen not belonging to Wilson's Union. These men went and got a ticket—it must have been known to the police authorities—to go to a place called Rhymney Bridge, to intercept this train at the point where they knew the North Western Company handed over the train to the Rhymney. Their idea was clearly by all manner of means to hinder these men in coming to the port. But as it happened, we had decided not to bring them by that route that time, consequently these poor fellows were up in that miserable place the whole of that night in the bitter cold, just such a night as we had last night. In the case of some of them I know, as a fact, that their constitution has been nearly ruined through it. To my mind the law should give the police power at such a time to turn back a body of men banded together to interfere with the liberty of other men.

13,752. When you say they should have power to turn these men back, do you mean that they should turn them back by a display or a threat of force or only by advising them to go back?—

Earl of Derby—continued.

In the case which I allude to now we brought the train in by the Great Western route *via* Pontypool Road, so that they did not have their chance at all at the train, but they went there determined by all and any means to capture the train. It was away in a mountainous district. I do not suppose there was a policeman for many miles round, and they would have had the train at their mercy. Another instance: my company claim roads adjacent to, but not really in, the docks, one of which runs past the dock office. On the Monday morning to which I allude, when we, out of, I do not say any charitable purpose, I do not put down labour as charity, but simply out of regard for our men who had served us for many years, and whom we did not care to part with, we held our hands from shipping these strangers. That very morning on the step of my office there was the leader of these men with a stick under his arm, to such a pass had they got; and they closely picketed every door and entrance, so that those men could not enter. I would like to read the notice that was sent to the men who had signed on, but who had to come on Monday to complete their contract. This is what it says: "We have been informed that you and a few others have been to the coal shipping office and signed on to go to work on Monday morning. If you do go, I beg to inform you that you will be prosecuted by the Union. You have received moneys from the Union although you were not in compliance; that is, 2s. 7d. If you are not at head-quarters on Monday to report yourself, you will be considered at work." That is mild enough; I do not object to that; but what I do object to is following that up by a display of semi-military men round one's own office. I have letters here from men coming into our docks. I do not know whether I should weary you by reading them all. During the whole of that five weeks I may say this generally, that we had the greatest difficulty to get into our docks people who had really legitimate business there. I could show you a statement giving a census of the number of men passing on to our docks, from which you will see the great difficulty we must have had during that time. This census which I will hand in shows that we have over 30,000 workmen passing in and out of the Cardiff Dock in 24 hours, so that to think that 300 men should bring about such a state of things as existed is certainly very hard upon the dock company (*handing in census*). I think that not only for the sake of the company, but for the sake of the men themselves, there ought to be some definition of this picketing.

13,753. What I understand you to mean is this. You do not object to picketing in the sense of men being posted to give notice of a strike or to warn and advise the men, but you say that as at present practised it is practically intimidation?—It is.

13,754. Men are threatened?—They are.

13,755. That is the way you put it?—I do, and I can prove it. I should just like to say this before I close that point—that with us in

17 February 1892.]

Captain RALPH POMEROY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

our neighbourhood the strikes have been more frequent since they have been increasing the wage. The wages have been increasing all round, but the strikes seem to go on.

13,756. Now I believe you wish to tell us something about a system of co-operation on the part of employers and men in the shape of a voluntary savings or insurance for old age?—Yes.

13,757. We shall be glad to hear anything you have to say upon that point?—I would like to say that the people I serve are most desirous that something should be done in this matter, and a scheme was thought out very carefully and handed to the men for their consideration; it was also handed to the Chamber of Commerce who, in the beginning of these troubles, thought that we like other places should have a conciliation board. I should like to read this over, as it will not take me a great while. This is a scheme for the Bristol Channel Docks Association of Employers and Workmen. (I.) "This Association is established for promoting harmony between employers and workmen, preventing strikes and lock-outs, securing freedom of contract and general co-operation in the best interests of all connected with the trade of the docks, by arrangements for regulating the labour and the rates of wages in relation thereto, for the services performed in connexion with the trade at the several docks. (II.) The Association shall consist of directors and managers of the several docks, and any company or person directly employing labour at the docks, herein-after called the 'employers' and of the workmen engaged by them at the several docks who are herein-after called the 'workmen.' (III.) The employers shall nominate a committee of their body who shall appoint the section of the joint committee representing the employers consisting of [] persons. And the workmen shall nominate an equal number of members to be their section of the joint committee. (IV.) The joint committee shall consist of [] persons, one of the members representing the employers shall be the chairman, and one of the members representing the workmen, shall be vice-chairman. (V.) An equal number of the employers and of the workmen on the joint committee shall constitute a quorum. (VI.) The joint committee shall from time to time make regulations for the conduct of the duties of the joint committee. (VII.) The joint committee shall from time to time declare the classes of workmen whose wages and labour arrangements shall be regulated by them, and shall also from time to time determine or vary the several scales or rates of wages payable to, and the arrangements to be observed and the duties to be performed by each of such classes. (VIII.) All questions as to such arrangements, duties, or rates of wages, shall be submitted by the employers or by the workmen, as the case may be, for consideration and for the decision of the joint committee. (IX.) Forms of contract shall be agreed upon by the joint committee, applicable to the several descrip-

Earl of Derby—continued.

tions of labour, and no cessation of work, nor any alterations in the conditions of work to be performed by any class of workmen, nor in the wages payable to them, either at the instance of the employer or the workmen, shall take place until the questions in case of difference have been submitted and disposed of by the joint committee. (X.) Every employer and every workman embraced in the Association, shall strictly comply with the recommendations and decisions of the joint committee. (XI.) The employers shall be free to engage the services of any workman at any time who may become members of the Association. (XII.) No entrance fee will be required from workmen on their becoming members of the Association, but with the object of providing a fund for the aid of workmen in case of accident or illness, every workman shall pay a weekly subscription of [] per cent. on his earnings towards the funds of the Association. (XIII.) Every employer shall contribute towards the funds of the Association [] per cent. upon the wages paid by him to the workmen in the Association during the previous [] months. (XIV.) All workmen being members of the Association, and having contributed their subscription for not less than [] shall be entitled in case of sickness or accident during the performance of their duties, to sick payment upon a scale to be agreed upon by the joint committee. (XV.) In order to provide a nest-egg, or nucleus of a fund, each employer upon becoming a member of the Association shall pay into the fund of the Association [] per workmen employed by him and intended to become members of the Association. (XVI.) The funds of the Association shall be vested in two trustees appointed by the joint committee, and all cheques shall be drawn and signed by one of such trustees and countersigned by the secretary of the Association. (XVII.) The funds of the Association shall be wholly applied to make provision for the benefit of the workmen, and for the expenses of carrying on the duties of the Association" (*handing in Draft of Rules.*) That was handed to the workmen, but at that time really they were in such an excited state, that they did not give the thing due consideration. It was also sent to the sub-committee of the Cardiff Incorporated Chamber of Commerce, consisting of four of the clearest-headed gentlemen in that Chamber, and they accepted it, and things seemed coming round to a right conclusion, but on November the 15th, the Trades Union of Cardiff sent the following letter to the secretary of the sub-committee of the Chamber—"Dear Sir, I am desired to inform you that the council having fully considered the question of the formation of a conciliation board, have finally decided not to take any part in such board which would be composed of unionists and non-unionists, as they feel they cannot concede to that

17 February 1892.]

Captain RALPH POMEROY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

"principle. I remain, yours faithfully, "J. Richards, Secretary." So the scheme broke down. We have still hopes that something may be done, but for the present, things are at a standstill. I may say that that scheme was well thought out by the general manager, Sir William Thomas Lewis, who gave a lot of time to it, and we thought something might come out of it, and I hope it will yet.

13,758. But the scheme broke down, as you put it, upon the refusal of the unionists to have anything to do with a plan which would cause them and non-unionists to be placed on the same footing?—Exactly. The unionists would not allow the non-unionists to be represented on the committee of conciliation.

13,759. In the Cardiff Docks are the wages generally good?—Yes.

13,760. Of course they vary for each particular division?—They do. For instance, our trimmers are getting a wage now which the mouths of half the clerks in London would water at. I mean the trimmers of the coal. I do not say that our tippers get an extraordinary wage. Our tippers' average wage is 26s. per week, when we ship at the Bute Docks up to 130,000 tons of coal at our staites. I do not mean to say that that is an extreme wage, but the trimmers certainly get very well paid. The iron-ore men get well paid; the fuel men get very well paid, and they have a very close corporation, not from any union, but simply from their nationality; every man there who works at the fuel is an Irishman.

13,761. What are the highest wages given in any of these classes?—Most of the trimming, as you are aware, no doubt, is done by the piece. I think I am speaking within bounds when I say that there are very few of the trimmers of what they call the No. 1 gangs who do not earn an average of about 3*l.* a week, that is, the preference gangs, which are always in work.

13,762. Does that employment last through the year?—Yes, for those gangs.

Mr. Ismay.

13,763. What rate per ton do these trimmers get?—The rate is determined by the build of the boat, three-deckers, or two-deckers, or well-deckers, as the case may be. There is a regular trimming scale, but I have not provided myself with it.

13,764. But you are within the mark when you say they earn between 3*l.* and 4*l.* per week?—Yes. These are the preference gangs. The freighters of coal at the Bute Docks employ their own trimmers, and they have one, two, and three gangs, it may be more. The preferential gang gets an extremely high wage.

13,765. Why do not the tip men go into the trimming?—That is a matter which has occupied our time and attention a great deal. We should like to have the two brought together. I wish, and we all wish, to strike something more like

Mr. Ismay—continued.

an average. But one is represented by the dock owner and the other is represented by the freighter, who holds the trimming very tightly and will not allow the shipowner to trim his coal. The freighters trim it themselves. They say they are their coals, and it is their business to carry that coal to the other end of the world in as good a condition as possible, and therefore they hold the trimming, the handling of the coal, and the putting of it into the ship.

13,766. Do they limit the number of men employed as trimmers?—Yes, as far as I understand it. The Dock Company have nothing to do with the trimming. The reason of this high wage is that a certain number of men will take a boat and keep her under our tips an undue length of time. I should like, while we are mentioning that, to read a letter that I had from a man.—"Sir, I hope you will excuse my bad writing. I am taking an opportunity of letting you know how things are going on. I do feel most glad and thankful to see in the 'Echo' that you, Captain, are looking into the trimmers. It is time that some gentleman like you took the thing in hand. We are a few hundreds of coal-trimming hobbler, who have got to walk the docks week after week, looking for work and cannot get it. They keep the money all between the men and the boss, and keep the tip for days more than need be. The way it is done is when a boat is coming in." This is an answer to your question. "The foreman will ask how many of his men can triu that; say six men will do for a boat 1,800 tons cargo, 100 tons of bunkers. That boat will pay 2*l.* for trimming, 3*l.* a man and 3*l.* for the boss. Only last Monday evening a boat went under the tip, called the s.s. 'Climene,' a double-decked boat, plenty of space for 12 men to work, but only six were on the main hatch and eight on the after hatch; and that boat under the tip from Monday evening till Thursday evening working short-handed."

13,767. Trimming is rather dusty work, is it not?—Yes; it is very dry work.

13,768. With reference to these men who went out to Rhymney Bridge on picket duty, were they members of Wilson's Union?—Yes, undoubtedly.

13,769. Then all they got for their pains was that they had to remain there all night?—It was, and I was very sorry for them; it was a winter's night.

13,770. I do not suppose you had any reason to complain of that, had you?—No; I had nothing to complain of only this way: the feeling even extended to the railway companies, and it was with difficulty that the Great Western Company would run that train down through the Long Dyke siding. A guarantee had to be given that that train would be safe over our roads, and I myself walked those roads, and kept everything to myself until an hour before I expected the train to come when I sent to the houses for the signalmen, so that nothing could leak out,

17 February 1892.]

Captain RALPH POMEROY.

[Continued

Mr. *Ismay*—continued.

and we brought her in over the Great Western roads. I complain that we should have to be put to such things as that. I mean to say that it is not right. These men were entitled to get employment. It was no question of wage.

13,771. It was at your suggestion then that that train was diverted?—Yes.

13,772. In view of the safety of the men whom you were bringing into the town?—Yes.

13,773. They were sailors, were they not?—Yes.

13,774. Did they get shipped off all right?—Yes.

13,775. Without any molestation or injury?—We put them on board the depôt ship and undocked her at once and sent her out into the Roads, and a good set of men they were too. I have never seen men pick up their bags so smartly as they did. It has been stated in this room that they were drunk, but that is an untruth. These men went to the baggage waggons, picked up their bags and went away in the most orderly manner.

13,776. Sober and fit for their duty?—Yes.

Mr. *Tait*.

13,777. Have you seen the clauses in the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, which regulates picketing?—I may say that I leave that to our solicitor; we have a solicitor whose duty it is—

13,778. You have complained that there is not sufficient power under the Act to prevent intimidation?—I speak from practical knowledge, and I do say as a loyal subject that the terrorism, whether it was defined in the Acts or no, almost paralysed the arm of our police, in fact our superintendent was hauled before the Watch Committee for clearing the shipping office, and nearly lost his situation.

13,779. But it is not the fault of the Act of Parliament if the police do not put it into operation?—It is an act of cowardice brought about then by political men dealing with these things, not by the police.

13,780. I will read to you the clause which I think appertains to the case which you illustrated. According to section 7 of the Act, subsection 4, the person can be brought up and punished and get three months' imprisonment with or without hard labour for the following:—If he "watches or besets a house or other place where such other person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, or the approach to such house or place." What further power do you want conferred on the police authorities than that?—I want them to carry it out then.

13,781. Your complaint then is not that there should be any alteration in the law so much as that the fault has been with your local officials, who have not carried out the Act of Parliament?—I should like to study that clause quietly, and not just take it from you at this moment.

13,782. You may take it from me that that is the law?—I do not doubt your word for a

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

moment, but you can read a thing once or twice over and then you get the gist of it better.

13,783. Did you attempt to get apprehended the person who stood at the entrance to your dock office with a stick in his hand and who was picketing?—We should have had to apprehend about 500.

13,784. Had they all sticks?—Some of them.

13,785. And the police authorities did not interfere?—No, the police accompanied gangs of them about, one ahead and another astern all over the town.

13,786. I much admire the proposals which you have made here to bring the workmen and employers together, but do not you think you have made one mistake, or at least the parties who have suggested this scheme, in so far that you have asked the trades unionists of Cardiff to take command over those who are not in their associations?—No, I think you are misunderstanding that point. The point is this: that a conciliation board was sought to be formed; this was handed to them for their consideration, the conciliation board did not break down on account of their not accepting or rejecting that, but the conciliation board broke down because they would not allow non-unionists to be represented on that board.

13,787. Do you not think that their reason for not committing themselves as to regulating the labour of non-union men arose from the fact that their unions would have no control over them—a trades union cannot have control over a man who is not a member of a trades union, while it can have, individually and collectively, the control over its members?—Yes, I quite see the point.

13,788. You see that there is a difficulty there?—I see there is a difficulty there.

13,789. It might be worthy of consideration in again approaching any of the trades unions, that you should not just at once say that they are not desirous of having a conciliation board so much perhaps as that they see they cannot regulate it to their own satisfaction?—I have here a very able report by the committee of the Cardiff Incorporated Chamber of Commerce on the whole thing, and I will put that in. Perhaps that would be of interest to you (*see Appendix 84*).

13,790. How many casual men have you in Cardiff?—We have very few. As regards the port of Cardiff I may say that we are very well circumstanced as to casual labour; we have very little casual labour.

13,791. May I take it that about 90 per cent. are permanent men?—I would not take it that so many are permanent men, but I should say that quite 80 per cent. of the labouring population are employed.

Professor *Marshall*.

13,792. When it was proposed that a conciliation board should be formed with employers on the one side and representatives of the men on the other, how was it supposed that the representatives of the men would be elected?—

17 February 1892.]

Captain RALPH POMEROY.

[Continued.]

Professor Marshall—continued.

Elected from their own bodies. That is why in the fifth clause of the summary of my evidence I showed the different sections of employment at the dock. The iron-ore men would elect their man, the trimmers would elect their man, the tippers would elect their man, the timbermen would elect theirs, and so on.

13,793. Those who had been in the employment of the company, or working at the dock for a certain time in any trade, would hold a general meeting and elect their representatives?—Yes.

13,794. A unionist and a non-unionist having an equal vote?—Decidedly.

13,795. Were the unions requested to undertake any responsibility for the fulfilment of the terms settled by the board of conciliation on the part of the non-unionists?—I think not.

13,796. So that, perhaps, the difficulty raised by Mr. Tait hardly existed?—It was a matter I think that could be threshed out and settled.

13,797. But still does this difficulty remain that if any union did not conform to the terms settled by the board of conciliation there would be no power of making them conform?—I am afraid not, not under this scheme.

13,798. So that its effective working, so far as the non-unionists went, would depend entirely upon the sustaining of good feeling?—Yes, but I may tell you that there is a number of employers in Cardiff who I should think have a large majority of non-unionist workmen, and it would be the employer who would have to be the guarantee for his workmen. Perhaps you have not had an opportunity of looking through the scheme.

13,799. I am afraid I do not understand how the employer can give a guarantee for his workman?—The employer would pay so much and the workman would pay so much. Shall I read over one or two of these clauses. "Forms of contract shall be agreed upon by the joint committee applicable to the several descriptions of labour." Then the scheme goes on to say, "no entrance fee will be required from workmen on their becoming members of the Association." But if they break away from this agreement I take it that they would lose their privilege under it.

13,800. Do you think that the chance of their breaking away would not be very serious in practice?—I do not think so.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

18,801. Has your attention been called to some evidence which was given before us as to the want of ventilation and the consequent danger to persons employed in loading coal ships in Cardiff?—Yes.

13,802. Have you anything to say on that matter?—I think now that the freighters, I was going to put it very strongly and say have their foot so down on the shipowner, but perhaps I had better not put it so strongly as that, as the boat is now completely on the freighter's foot, anything that is required for the ventilation of the cargo, or for the safety of the men employed

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

in stowing that cargo I think the shipowner would be practically compelled to give.

13,803. Have any accidents, due to the want of ventilation, come under your notice?—During the seven years I have been in charge of the docks we have had several fires, but considering we handle about 8,000,000 tons of coal a year I think they are comparatively few. We have been very strong lately as regards naked lights. We are not strong enough, as a dock company, to put our foot down and say a ship shall not have naked lights when she is loading this coal, but we do our level best, and during these last 18 months we have only had one slight fire, that was on board a ship which had carried petroleum, no doubt the stabber which the trimmers put against the ship's side with a candle in it took the fumes off some of the timbers of the vessel, which had been saturated with petroleum.

13,804. It is not an increasing danger, at any rate?—No.

13,805. Do you think anything could be done or is required to be done to check it by legislation?—No, I think we are strong enough without. I should like to say before I leave the chair, as a sailor and a very old sailor, that really I do not agree with the statements which I had the privilege of hearing yesterday as regards the drunkenness of crews. Having been on the pier head now for 14 years, I do think as a class that the seamen are improving. I do not think that we should go away with the idea that our men are getting worse and worse. I should like, if I might just take a few minutes of your time—I have prepared nothing, it is simply what has passed in my mind about this matter—to say that during the last few years a class of men has sprung up in the merchant service, firemen, in larger numbers *pro rata* than seamen. They are a class of men who have not the remotest idea of discipline, they are not brought into discipline, discipline is like medicine, it is nasty but it is necessary. From the nature of their occupation they are thirsty souls and they go on board these ships the worse for liquor. So strong have I felt about the matter at our docks, and I suppose we deal with more ships than any port in the kingdom, for dead weight certainly, that I have instructed the pier masters to take away spirits from men, but finding that I was bringing myself within the lash of the law I got a by-law passed which the Board of Trade sanctioned, giving us authority to take away these spirits from them. I say again that the best of the seamen find employment ashore. It was a seaman who was sitting in this chair before me, he has found a job to suit him better. They get employment in the telephonic and telegraphic services, fire brigades, and water police, and they are the best of the fellows, so that we must put up with some of the worst of them. I do think that on the whole our men are better. I am sorry that they are not so good as the Scandinavians. There is one other point, if you would kindly bear with me. We were speaking about

17 February 1892.]

Captain RALPH POMEROY.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

unions. A gentleman in Cardiff, when I left the day before yesterday, gave me another side to this union business. He has obtained employment now on shore, but he said the last straw that broke his connexion between his employer, the owner of the ship, who is, I may say, a politician, and himself, the master, was

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued

the fact that he sent him imperative orders that he was to ship unionist men; he said, "to do that you take away from me my right-hand men, the boatswain, the steward, and the donkey mar, and therefore I will resign my ship," and he resigned the ship.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. JAMES BENJAMIN BUTCHER called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

13,806. I understand that you represent the Hull Seamen and Firemen's Association?—Yes.

13,807. In what sense do you represent it; are you secretary?—I am the secretary.

13,808. What number of members does that Association contain?—A thousand.

13,809. I think you come here to tell us what is your opinion and I presume the opinion of your Association as to the manning of ships?—Yes.

13,810. Do you consider that at present ships in general are under-manned?—I do.

13,811. Do you apply that to all classes of ships?—No. I cannot go so far as that because I believe the principal liners out of Liverpool are pretty well manned. I only wish to speak from experience of the port of Hull. I consider that the question of compulsory manning is not only a question affecting seamen but it is a question which affects the country at large and also that it is one of the reasons for the many petty disputes which cause annoyance and expense to the shipowners, in fact which are of almost everyday occurrence. They are allowed to ship what they like and how many they like, and it oftentimes occurs that when a crew comes up to the shipping office to sign articles the men find out that they are going to take a hand less than they have taken the previous voyage, consequently the men refuse to sign. Probably that ship would leave harbour that night, but is detained sometimes; I have known them to be detained two or three days, not because the owners will not give way, because the owners know nothing about it, but because the superintendent and others concerned will not give way.

13,812. Do you apply this complaint of under-manning to both sailing ships and steamships?—We are not troubled with many sailing ships out of Hull.

13,813. You are speaking in general of seamen?—Yes, and principally of tramps in the Baltic and ships trading on the continent.

13,814. And that class of ship you consider is in general under-manned?—Yes, I can quote one or two instances if you wish.

13,815. Please do so?—Sometime ago a ship called the "Forest Queen" went into collision, happily without loss of life, but a law job ensued. I may state that that ship only carried four A.B.'s, that was two in each watch. At night there was the officer of the watch, one

Earl of Derby—continued.

hand at the wheel and one on the look out. Occasion arose when they had to take in sail; the man was relieved from the wheel by the officer of the watch; the man on the look out had to come and assist the man who had been at the wheel in taking in this sail, and while they were taking in this sail they collided with another ship. Other instances have occurred on dark stormy nights when the mast head light probably has gone out, it has been too much for one to do; consequently a man has had to be relieved at the wheel, also the man has had to come down from the look out. Therefore I consider that it is not only dangerous to property but what is of far more importance it is dangerous to life. I consider that ships being under-manned, and the terms of the Merchant Seamen's Act of 1880 referring to wages and rating not being put into force is the cause of our having so many inferior seamen and the necessity for inquiries why men do not join the naval reserve. One of the reasons why they do not join is because they cannot give the servitude. There are not sufficient men to give the servitude in to join the naval reserve.

13,816. Then you propose that there should be a considerable increase in the number of men employed on board ship?—Yes.

13,817. Can you say in what sort of proportion?—There have been one or two scales drawn up. The principal cause of complaint is that there is no reliable source from whence we can get our seamen in the future. So far as Hull is concerned I only know of one firm which carries ordinary seamen, consequently if there are not ordinary seamen I do not know in the near future how we are going to get able seamen. There are plenty of ordinary seamen and they are very ordinary.

13,818. Do I understand you to say that it is because too few are employed that men are not willing to serve, and so you do not get so many capable men as you might?—They are willing enough to serve but the restrictions are too heavy for them. I believe a man has to be at sea eight years before he can join the reserve, and he has to be so many years an able seaman. I have been 25 years in the naval reserve myself.

13,819. I do not see how the question of under-manning bears upon that?—Not so much the question of under-manning as of carrying out

17 February 1892.]

Mr. JAMES BENJAMIN BUTCHER.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

the Merchant Seamen (Payment of Wages and Rating) Act, 1880.

13,820. You had better explain in your own way what it is that you think objectionable in regard to that Act?—Roughly speaking, I complain that oftentimes in the case of the Shipping Federation wanting a lot of men they can ship whom they like. I believe some time ago the superintendents of the mercantile marine offices had instructions from the President of the Board of Trade to question people signing on board ships, and get from them the number of years they have been at sea. That is very good so far as it goes, but if they have only been one year or six months at sea they do not hinder the captains from shipping these men as able seamen, and I contend that a man should be compelled as this Act states, to go a certain number of years to sea before he can be an able seaman. It says, "A seaman shall not be entitled to the rating of A.B., that is to say, of an able-bodied seaman, unless he has served at sea four years before the mast, but the employment of fishermen in registered decked fishing vessels shall only count as sea service up to the period of three years of such employment, and the rating of A.B. shall only be granted after at least one year's service in a trading vessel in addition to three or more years' service on board of registered decked fishing vessels."

13,821. You require a certain number of able seamen on board a ship?—Yes.

13,822. Then you do not, as I understand, complain of the state of the law, you complain of the law not being enforced?—That is it.

13,823. You say that many men are employed as seamen who are not at all fit for that work?—I do say so.

13,824. Now, presumably the shipowner would employ competent men in preference if he could get them?—There is no question about that. I do not think the shipowners are so much to blame as their officers. I think that there would be a far better state of things if instead of allowing the officers to ship men they shipped them direct from the firm the same as is done in the Steam Navigation Company in London. I believe that works satisfactorily. I do not mean to say that they should not go to the marine officers to sign articles, but that they should be shipped direct by the firm. I should like to state here that when the Shipping Federation first came into existence I could see no reason why we should go against it, as we have a perfect right to concede the same right to them as we wish for ourselves, that they should employ men or that they should combine to defend themselves, but after I saw the sample that came to man and work the "Mary Anning," a set of men from Liverpool, that it would be a disgrace to engage, I thought if they could not find better men than that it was time to put a stop to it altogether.

13,825. But is not the shipowner himself the greatest sufferer if he has his ships manned with incompetent hands?—There is not the least doubt about that. So far as Hull is concerned

Earl of Derby—continued.

we are troubled very little with the Shipping Federation. One of the largest shipowners in the kingdom, I believe, Mr. Wilson, will not have anything to do with the Federation. He said that he would rather treat direct with the men in any case; that he neither believes in the Federation nor the board of conciliation, although we have one in Hull.

13,826. What I understand you to suggest is that there should be some fixed scale, that a certain number of men should be employed according to the tonnage of the vessel?—Exactly.

13,827-8. And also that a certain proportion of them should be able seamen?—Yes. I take it that there would be a better chance of getting more reliable men if that was done. For instance, if a ship carried so many able seamen and so many ordinary seamen, in course of time those ordinary seamen would become able seamen, and therefore I think by that we should get a supply of men sufficient to man our ships in time of war by joining the naval reserve. I am of opinion that it would be far more patriotic on the part of the shipowners instead of subsidising foreigners if they would subsidise Englishmen, so that when they were out of employment they could go on board those drill ships and drill in times of peace so that they could defend them and the country in times of war.

13,829. What do you mean by employers subsidising foreigners, do you mean employing foreigners?—No, they have got a benefit scheme up for the members of the Shipping Federation, and I say without fear of contradiction that the great majority of men who join this Federation are foreigners and worthless men.

13,830. Do you mean by that, that they are incompetent men, or do you mean that they are non-unionists?—I do not mean that they are non-unionists, I mean that they are incompetent. We do not go as far as some unions, we say that a man should please himself, whether he joins a union or not, but I do say of seamen or any other class of men, men who do not sow should not reap, and men who have paid their contributions for years to defend themselves in trade unions, I think have a perfect right to refuse to sail with men who will not pay, but who are quite eager to reap the benefits of other men's money and labour.

13,831. I understood you to say just now, that you do not go so far as to decline to work with non-unionists?—I do not, for the simple reason that we have always found, so far as we are concerned, that moral suasion has been the means of men joining the Union, and so far as Hull is concerned, we are not troubled with many non-unionists.

13,832. Now you have something to tell us about the desertion of seamen, and I understand you think there is a special cause to be assigned for it?—Yes.

13,833. Will you tell us what that is?—One of the causes is, that in a great many cases, I do not say in all, but as I am going my rounds

17 February 1892.]

Mr. JAMES BENJAMIN BUTCHER.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

I see on the articles signed by the men, that a man if he wishes to leave the ship, has to give 24 hours' notice, but the master reserves to himself the right of discharging a man at a moment's notice. I think that is very unfair. If it is fair for a man to give a master 24 hours notice, I think it is also fair for a master to give a seaman 24 hours' notice.

13,834. Which way would you wish to have it, that there should be no notice on either side?—24 hours' notice on either side. Another cause of the desertion of men is that they leave it until almost the last moment, perhaps within a few hours of the ships sailing, before they sign articles. If they were in all instances, or where possible, to sign 48 hours before the ship went away, then if a man went on board a ship and found that she did not suit him, he would have plenty of time to give the master notice, or the master give the man notice.

13,835. Then I think you say that it is not the fact that the men have gained as much as is supposed by the proceedings of the Union, because though the shipowners have been compelled to give higher wages, they have not given them so continuously?—I am sorry to have to admit that.

13,836. Will you explain what you mean by that?—Yes. Previous to 1888, men when they signed on in a ship were generally kept on when the ship arrived in the port of Hull. Since we have received a higher rate of wages, the shipowners are in the habit of discharging the men directly the ship arrives in port, and they are not taken on again until, as I say, a few hours before the ship leaves. We have no complaint to make about the wages in Hull, providing the men were kept on all the year round, but I have known instances last year where men in one ship were discharged six and seven times during the summer, or the season when the Baltic was open, simply because the ship was going to lie a week. Another bad thing which Mr. Wilson has is a shore gang. These men who are in his shore gang do the work that the seamen on board the ships ought to do. I contend that men who take these ships to sea, summer and winter, and have all the rough weather to go through, have a perfect right to work by the ships when the ships are in port.

13,837. How do you make that out; what right can there be in the case?—To give the men justice; they have to employ men on board these ships, and they ought to give the preference to men who are taking the ship the voyage.

13,838. I suppose there would be no objection to employ these men instead of the shore gangs if they found the work of the shore gangs was not more efficient or cost less?—That is it. I will tell you one reason why that is only where Britishers are concerned. We are troubled with a lot of foreigners in Hull; I daresay as many or more than in any other port. When the crew is paid off these foreigners are allowed to live on board the ship. When the ship wants shift-

Earl of Derby—continued.

ing these men will shift the ship without payment, simply because they are allowed to live on board the ship. Of course it is cheaper for the owners to do that, and I daresay that is one great reason why they prefer foreigners to Englishmen.

13,839. Then it comes to this, that as the employers have been compelled to pay more in the way of wages, they look more sharply after matters and study economy more than they did; is not that what it comes to?—No, I do not say they are compelled to pay more money; they give the same money to the shore gang that they would to the seamen. No doubt they have a perfect right to look after their own interests, but I think they would be looking more to their own interests by looking after the interests of the men.

13,840. But if they paid the same to the shore gang that they do to the seamen, what advantage is it to them to employ the shore gang?—I cannot understand where the advantage comes in; the fact remains that they do it, and I think it is a great injustice on the men who take their ships to sea. As far as Mr. Wilson is concerned, he says he is quite willing that the men should be employed, but in a great many instances I am sorry to say that the officers of the ships discharge the men without receiving any instructions from the firm at all. If a ship comes up on Saturday, I have known instances where their accounts of wages have been given to them at sea, and they will rush them up to the shipping office on Saturday afternoons to save Sunday's pay.

13,841. I think you say that the officers are allowed to make out the overtime and pay for it, and that you think that might be done by the firm?—Where possible.

13,842. What difference would that make?—It would make this difference, that many a man would get money in his pocket which is put into the officers' pockets.

13,843. Do you mean the officers detain the pay?—That is it.

Mr. Tait.

13,844. Have you seen the manning scale which Mr. Wilson, the seamen's secretary, submitted to the Commission?—Yes.

13,845. Could you approve of it?—Yes, I could approve of it.

13,846. Do you think it would be an improvement upon the present conditions?—It would be a great improvement. Of course we should not expect to get all that is put down on that scale.

13,847. But you approve of that scale?—Yes, I approve of it.

13,848. Is there a working agreement between your Union and the Seamen and Firemen's Union?—We belong to the National Federation, of which Mr. Clem Edwards is the secretary. We have not worked very well together, not us and the National Union, I am sorry to say, but I do not blame Mr. Wilson altogether for that.

17 February 1892.]

MR. JAMES BENJAMIN BUTCHER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

13,849. In answer to the last question put by Lord Derby, you said that the officers detained certain moneys?—Yes.

13,850. Do you know that as a matter of fact?—Yes.

13,851. Have you reported these things to the owners of the ships?—Yes, time after time.

13,852. And have they taken no steps with the officers?—No; they have told me they could not believe it, although I have brought facts to their knowledge. For instance, men have to shift ship on a night; it is not only Mr. Wilson's firm, but others. I have seen the owners on the subject, and we have made an agreement—

13,853. I would rather you would not mention any particular firm?—I am not going to mention any firm.

13,854. You have mentioned one?—I say I do not mention Mr. Wilson's firm.

13,855. You were telling us about the men shifting the ship at night?—Men oftentimes shift the ship at night, and there has been an agreement occasionally. For instance, a man may be ordered down at 8 o'clock at night; probably he gets done by 10, he is ordered home again and told to come down at 2 o'clock, and perhaps he gets shifted by 3 and has to come down by 6 o'clock. We maintain if a man is kept out all night like that, he has a right to be paid from the time he commences work until the time he finishes. Instead of that, in many cases they simply pay the men at 6d. an hour for the time really worked. We think that is an injustice. We have found out in many instances that officers have received money for it which has never been paid to the men.

13,856. Therefore if it occupies three hours to do the work which you have said, and which has been carried over a period of 12 hours or 10 hours, instead of the men getting 5s. as you think they ought to do, they only get 1s. 6d.?—That is it.

13,857. You say that foreign crews are kept on board the vessels, and are allowed to live on board, do I take it that under no conditions would a British seamen be allowed to live on board while the ship is there?—As a rule the men sailing out of Hull live in Hull. I merely wish to point out that in the case of foreigners they are allowed to live on board the ship, and instead of having so many men down to shift the ship at night, these men shift the ship and get nothing for it.

13,858. Has your Union made any approach to the Government for the purpose of altering the Employers' Liability Act, with the object of bringing seamen within its provisions?—Yes, I attended deputations in 1888, in conjunction with Mr. Wilson and Mr. Friend, of the North of England Association. I believe in the Bill brought forward by the Home Secretary, they did us the favour to acknowledge us in the Bill, and that is about all they did, for it was of no earthly use to us at all.

13,859. You want yourselves placed the same?—As an ordinary workman within the meaning of the Act.

Mr. Tait—continued.

13,860. Have you had any strikes in connexion with your Union?—I have not had a strike since I have been there.

13,861. How long have you been secretary?—Since June 1886.

13,862. Have all disputes been settled by this conciliation board of which you spoke?—No.

13,863. By what means then?—By amicable agreement with the shipowners.

13,864. Do the shipowners recognise your Union?—Yes.

13,865. Do they accept through you, as representing the men, any statements from your Union?—Yes.

13,866. You have found that to be beneficial to both?—Yes; of course when we work on our own account we work in the interest of the National Union and of the seamen generally.

13,867. Have wages in Hull gone up very much since your secretaryship?—Yes.

13,868. What were they in 1886?—26s. per week when I first went there and now they are getting 30s. 4d.

13,869. Is that for weekly or monthly boats?—For weekly boats, the monthly wages have gone up from 3l. 5s. to 4l. 10s.

13,870. The terms of reference from Parliament to this Commission were to see whether any means could be devised for preventing disputes, or to see in what way the Legislature should interfere between capital and labour, have you any suggestion to make?—I think boards of conciliation and arbitration if properly followed up would meet the case.

13,871. How is the board composed at Hull?—Of an equal number of men representing the different unions, and an equal number of employers.

13,872. Supposing that you fail to agree, how do you settle it?—We have never had a case yet.

13,873. Have they any provision supposing it was to take place?—I believe they have, but I am not well acquainted with it. I am not on the board.

13,874. Do you know whether there is an umpire?—Yes, I believe there is.

13,875. Do you know whether his decision would be final?—Yes, final.

Professor Marshall.

13,876. Are wages at Hull higher than on the West Coast?—I do not think there is much difference anywhere. In fact, I believe, that now some of the superior liners out of Liverpool pay a little more. I believe the firemen get 5l. per month.

13,877. Some evidence was given on the subject of the wages of the east and west coast. Have you seen that?—No.

Mr. Austin.

13,878. When was your Union formed?—Under its present title it was formed on the 1st January 1887, but I have been connected with different unions for this last 20 years; but I am sorry to state they have been formed for the benefit of one man, for he has generally cleared out with the funds.

17 February 1892.]

Mr. JAMES BENJAMIN BUTCHER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Austin—continued.

13,879. What are the wages out of Hull to the westward at present?—A.B.'s 4*l.* 5*s.*, firemen 4*l.* 10*s.*

13,880. Is that lower than at other ports of the United Kingdom?—No, I think not. It is higher than in some places.

13,881. The wages at most of the ports to the westward are 5*l.* and 4*l.* 15*s.*?—Only from Liverpool, I believe; the large liners.

13,882. Out of Cardiff?—Well, I am very glad of it.

13,883. Are you aware of the weekly wages that are paid in other ports?—Yes.

13,884. What are they?—They are 32*s.* 8*d.* I believe in one or two ports, and only one or two. I believe that the wages generally run to about 30*s.* 4*d.* per week, and 4*l.* 5*s.* and 4*l.* 10*s.* per month.

13,885. Are there any deductions from the wages of the seamen in Hull towards a provident fund?—No, nothing.

Mr. Tait.

13,886. Did you hear the evidence given yesterday by Captain Hatfield?—Yes.

13,887. Did you pay any particular attention to the propositions he made for the employers, the employes, and the State, between the three, to raise a sum equal to 900,000*l.*—300,000*l.* each—for provident and other purposes?—Yes, but I am not in favour of it.

13,888. Might I ask you if you can inform

The witness withdrew.

Mr. JAMES TOOKEY called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

13,892. You represent the United Bargemen and Watermen's Protection Society?—Yes.

13,893. How long has that Society been in existence?—It came into existence in October 1889.

13,894. How many members does it consist of in round numbers?—At the present time our members are about 800.

13,895. You belong to what district?—To the district comprised in the Medway, from Tonbridge down to Faversham in the Kentish district, and we have likewise a few members in Essex, extending from Vange as far as Burnham.

13,896. Are the majority of persons employed in this industry members of your Society?—Unfortunately not, at the present time. This past year our membership has decreased very considerably.

13,897. To what do you ascribe that?—I ascribe it to the pressure brought to bear by the employers upon the men in various ways, and likewise to the apathy of the men themselves. After gaining a substantial advantage by our movement in 1890, they have fallen away, and to a certain extent it is to be attributed to this fact.

13,898. You say they gained a substantial advantage by your movement in 1890. What was that movement, and what was the advantage they gained?—Our movement in 1890 was

Mr. Tait—continued.

the Commission what would be the opinion of your 1,000 members at Hull as to any such proposition?—My opinion is, and I know their opinion is, that they would scout the idea. We were the first to take action against the proposed scale of Colonel Hill, I believe, in 1888. I should just like to state here that I am very sorry for the shipowners in Glasgow, and also the seamen in Glasgow, that it appears to me that all the bad seamen and probably the bad shipowners have migrated to Glasgow. I should just like to say as a protest, that British seamen are not the debased creatures that he wished to make out. I can show that there are hundreds of seamen in Hull who have been in ships 5, 10, and even 20 years, and if they were such drunken scum as he would make us believe, I do not think they would be in the ships that length of time. I quite agree that there is a very small minority of firemen at times get rather more than they should get, but I think that if their work was less laborious it would stop the tendency to drink.

13,889. You would reduce their hours of labour?—Yes.

13,890. From what to what?—To the eight hours.

13,891. Would you do that by the interference of the State?—Yes, because I am afraid we should have to wait till the crack of doom before we could do it ourselves. In fact amongst the firemen the eight hours is practically given in a great many instances.

Earl of Derby—continued.

a strike in the brick manufacturing districts. For some time wages had decreased to a very considerable extent, and there was an inclination it seemed to us, on the part of the employers to further reduce freights, and in consequence we formed this union, and in February 1890 we sent a circular together with a revised list of freights to all the employers in the district. They took no notice of the requisition sent in, and they let it alone till within a few days of the termination of the notice, when they gave their employes notice that they were either to give up their union tickets or tie their barges up. They came out to a man. I might say at this time we had more than two-thirds of the men engaged in the whole industry in the Union, and to a man these men came out and they remained out for eight weeks. They gained an advantage in the brick district of about 10 per cent. rise in wages all round, besides other advantages, and these they are continuing to get in some cases, but in other cases the freights have been reduced.

13,899. What are the wages usually paid to men in this industry?—The men engaged in this industry sail by the share. They are paid at per thousand of bricks, at per ton of cement, and at per chaldron for coke, and have half the freight of the barge. For instance, if a barge makes 6*l.* freight to London the owner takes 3*l.*

17 February 1922.]

Mr. J. TOOKEY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

out of the six. The captain takes the other 3*l*. and pays his mate out of it. The working expenses are deducted from the freight, which is then shared, and the captain pays half and the employer pays half. It is extremely difficult to get a general average, for we can divide the wage-earning class in barges into three sections. These are the barges which are employed in firms where there is a good run of work. There are barges that are employed in firms where there is not a great deal, and there are the chance-work barges. The men engaged in the better firms will earn perhaps 2*l*. per week of unlimited hours. There are others, and a very large number who earn about 30*s*., and we have calculated that the men engaged in the chance work do not earn 1*l*. a week. I might say here that the share system, while it has its advantages, seems likewise to have a great many disadvantages. For instance, the employers runs no risk of having to pay wages while his barge is lying still, and it gives a very great incentive to the men who are in these low paid barges that are earning small wages, to endeavour to get the other men out, and to undercut work in every possible way. It is my opinion, and the opinion of a great many, that it would be better were the men paid a regular weekly wage or a regular monthly wage.

13,900. I suppose that they would not work quite so hard if the amount of their wage did not depend upon the amount of the work done?—It has been my experience that the men who are paid by the week in the hoy barges and in the powder barges work harder in fact than the men who work by the share. Those men have a certain amount to do in a manner for their week's wages. They have a certain time to keep as a rule, and they keep it unless stress of weather or other causes that are unavoidable prevent them.

13,901. You mean they work harder when they are paid at a fixed rate than when they have, so to speak, to fix the amount of their own wages, because it is dependent upon the quantity of work they do?—That has been my experience. For instance, we have two or three hoy barges running from Faversham to the wharves below London Bridge. These men make a voyage a week regularly. They have to work their cargo in and they have to work it out, and they have to keep a certain time to be in time with their goods at Faversham, and the same at Sittingbourne. The men in the share barges are persevering men as a rule, but still they are not compelled always to work freights at a certain time, though the more they do of course the better they are looked upon in the firm. But one evil connected with this share system is this, that a man who is in a chance-work barge, and who is only earning 1*l*. a week may be equally as persevering, equally as respectable, and equally as capable as the man who is earning 2*l*. a week. And yet he has not the same chance, and yet at the same time he has to be about to look after his craft and take every possible care of her. There are

Earl of Derby—continued.

several things in connexion with this sailing by share that the men wish remedied.

13,902. Will you state what they are?—There is a great deal of detention in the work when building material is brought up from Kent. This is the staple industry. The manufacturers' note states that if two clear days from arrival the barge shall be paid 1*l*. a day for demurrage. In the event of the barge being paid 1*l*. a day the captain takes 10*s*. out of the 1*l*., and he shares it with his mate. But it is very seldom that this demurrage claim is pushed, for the simple reason that the captain must sue the shipper, and the shipper is generally his employer, and if he attempts to obtain the demurrage without his employer's sanction he would most likely lose his situation. I have a case here which, with your permission, I will bring forward, bearing upon this. It is a case that we have in hand at the present time. "The case of Charles Macpherson, master of the barge 'Cobham,' owned by Mr. John Wood." This man was told he could remain in his situation if he would forego his claim for demurrage which was for a number of days' detention with a cargo of bricks and several days on manure, 8*l*.. The man at present is out of a situation. We have taken the matter up, and we shall try to compel the owner to pay the demurrage, as it is a just claim. I give this as an instance in which a man claims his demurrage and is refused. In the event of his pushing his claim he loses his situation, and this has been almost invariably the case in connexion with the brick manufacturing trade, and the work in the sailing barges. Bricks are paid freight per thousand; cement, coals, and heavy goods per ton; and in many instances the barges have had to carry from 21 to 25 cwts. to the ton dead weight. When they carry coke they have had to carry from 40 to 48 bushels to the chaldron. They are now carrying coke at 12 cwts. to the chaldron, and the men object to carrying coke in this way. They think that the fairest way is by the standard measurement of 36 bushels to the chaldron. Of course, in carrying coke, if the coke is of a heavy description the tally comes about right, but if the coke is light they carry a great deal more than they get paid for. Bricks range from 3*s*. per thousand at London Bridge to about 6*s*. 6*d*. per thousand at Kingston. Cement ranges from 1*s*. 7*d*. per ton at London Bridge to 3*s*. 4*d*. at Hampton Court. London refuse, that is ashes and manure, is paid for at from 4*l*. to 5*l*. 10*s*. for freight. I may say that the bargemen in the event of their carrying these filthy cargoes have to trim it and carry it down to wherever they have to discharge it, and very often for a week or 10 days they have the filthy stuff in the barge, and they have to live in a cabin with only a thin bulkhead between them and the stuff they are carrying, and, as I have said, 4*l*. 10*s*. to 5*l*. 10*s*. for freight is what is paid for that. Hops are paid 1*s*. per pocket, and a barge carrying 200 pockets will make 10*l*. freight for carrying the hops, and they will have a cargo of goods the value of which will be

17 February 1892.]

Mr. J. TOOKEY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

about 2,400*l.* I may say, in passing, these rates are less than half what are charged by the railway companies.

13,903. You have told us that you dislike the principle of payment by share; is there anything else in the system of employment to which you have an objection?—We have deductions from the freights by reason of damaged cargo, short tally of goods, per-centage on share of freight, amounting in one firm to 10 per cent., clearance at customs, breaking of agreements, and other ways. Before the strike one firm used to make their men find the barge in everything needed for keeping her clean—mops, brooms, brushes, &c. I can quote a case in which a barge recently, and the case is now in abeyance, damaged a portion of the cargo of cement. The barge was loaded with cement and was ordered for shipping. The vessel was expected and the man was told that he would have to drive and save the ship in order to deliver his cargo. He sailed, and he got caught with bad weather, and the barge started leaking, and in spite of all he could do to keep the cargo dry, the barge wet a considerable quantity of his cargo. Of this damaged cargo he had to bring down about 30 tons, and had to bring it back to the cement works; he got nothing for bringing it back, and in addition to this his freight has been stopped for the short freight that he discharged, and he has been told that he will have to pay his share of the damaged cement in addition to the loss of freight. This is decidedly unjust, because it was through no fault of his that the barge wet her cargo, and we hold that these men having done all they can, ought not to have their cargo stopped or their freight stopped because of these accidents. This is very often done. In fact, the bargeman sailing with only a consignment note and not a charter party, the owner places himself in a position in which if the cargo is damaged he has to pay the whole value of the damaged cargo, whereas a large sailing under the Merchant Shipping Act with a proper charter party, the charter party would exonerate the owner and captain from all blame in these matters.

13,904. Besides what you allege to be unfair deductions, have you any grievance arising out of truck, or payment in kind?—There is one little matter I overlooked in reference to these deductions, and that is the matter of per-centage. We have in our trade a great deal of the sweating system going on in the form of taking commission on freight by people other than authorised brokers. We have men who go upon the market and who act as middlemen between the merchant and the bargeman, and they claim a per-centage. I have one case in point where the members of one lodge in our Union agreed to pay a certain coal broker in London 5 per cent. for commission on the freights. But not satisfied with this, last July he sent in a claim or a notice that he should charge 5 per cent. in addition to the previous one, making in all 10 per cent. The men refused to do this at the further reduction, and he immediately got a firm of brick manufacturers to take the matter over, and they are compelling their servants to do this

Earl of Derby—continued.

work at a 7½ per cent. reduction. The other 2½ per cent. is allowed to the firm in consideration of their paying the freights for three months. So that these men, without any voice or any option of their own, are obliged to submit to a 7½ per cent. reduction off their freight. This was done under a threat of discharge from their craft. We have one man at present out of a barge for refusing to do this on the 10 per cent. commission, after being in the firm's employ something like 30 years.

13,905. Do you see any remedy for that state of things?—The remedy really lies in the men's own hands if they will stick to their Union and act straight according to its instructions. The remedy is really in their own hands, and I cannot see where legislation can step in to help us in this matter unless it would make it illegal for anyone except sworn brokers to charge a per-centage on freight.

13,906. What length of notice is given before terminating an engagement?—In barges sailing by the week there is generally a week's notice given on either side. When men sail by the share it is more often than not a case of summary dismissal. Generally if a man has been in a firm some little time and he sees a chance of bettering his condition he gives his employer a voyage's notice; but in the event of the owner wishing to discharge his men he discharges them at once on the termination of a freight. We have had instances in which men have been discharged actually after commencing a fresh engagement, that is after commencing to load their barge they have been discharged, and they have no remedy for this. I may say that we took a case into court a few weeks ago, and we tried two cases where the men had been discharged after loading their craft; but for want of sufficient evidence we lost our point.

13,907. Is labour in this industry irregular or otherwise?—The labour in this industry is irregular through many causes. One is that at many places where these barges work they work at out-of-the-way creeks and corners where there is not much water when the tides are at the neap, and on many occasions they will get beneaped and will lie from 2 to 10 days. I myself as a practical bargeman have lost as much as three months in a year through no fault of my own, simply being neaped when the neap tides came along, and for attending tide each night and day we get no compensation at all. We have to look after the barge and attend tide in the event of a good tide coming off. So we get nothing for that and it is all lost time to us. If we were sailing by the week or the month we should not have to suffer that loss. Then, again, there are the hindrances connecting with the weather. Very often we lay from seven to eight days bound from Faversham to London by reason of stress of weather. The barge has been loaded very deep, not fit to go to sea. Then, again, we have these different detentions that I have informed you of, owing to the neglect of builders and others to unload their craft when once they run alongside.

17 February 1892.]

Mr. J. TOOKEY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued

13,908. I see you say something in the summary of your evidence about risk incurred by sailing with defective appliances, or by collisions, or by neglect of employers to provide life-saving apparatus. As a matter of fact are accidents common?—Accidents are common. We have lost several men in the past 12 months by reason of the risky nature of the barge work. Barges are loaded down with bricks and cement till they are level with the water, and they only want a touch from the stem of a steambot or the slightest collision to put them under water. Men have been washed overboard by reason of a heavy sea breaking over them, and they have been knocked overboard by the tiller and the sail, and there are other ways in which men have lost their lives. I do not suppose 2 per cent. of the barges employed in the district are provided with life-buoys or with life-saving apparatus. I have been myself on a large something like 13 years and I have never had a life-buoy on board my barge yet. We know there is an Act which compels employers to put life-buoys on board, but if the men stir in this matter they are liable to be discharged from their craft, and therefore their mouths are closed. In many cases the boats that are furnished to the barges are old and worn out, and in many cases there is not even a boat found. Then in the case of a collision or a barge capsizing the men lose their lives for want of a boat to get into.

13,909. Is compensation given for accidents?—There is no compensation at all. Where a man either has lost his life or has had a limb broken or any injury sustained in the course of his employment, I have never heard yet of an employer giving him anything in the way of recompense for the same. I have known a case where a barge has been run down by a steambot and the master and the mate have lost all their clothes, and the steambot company have settled the claim, and they have given a certain amount in recompense for the loss of clothes. I know that the two men have not had the whole of that amount paid over to them. In one instance which I call to mind the man in charge of the barge, knowing the amount that was paid to his owner as compensation, insisted on having the whole of it given to him. Then his employer gave him the option either to leave his barge or to submit to a reduction even in this. The man chose to leave his barge sooner than he would accept a sum of money less than that which was refunded by the steamship company.

13,910. Have you had any difficulties as between unionists and non-unionists?—We have got nothing in our rules to prohibit any of our members from working with non-unionists. With your permission I will read the rule in our book bearing upon that. "Any member of this society working at any time with a non-society man should use his best endeavours to induce him by all that is fair and legitimate to join this bond of brotherhood; but should the brother coerce, intimidate, or threaten such person he shall in no wise receive the support of this society." That is the rule bearing upon it. But, of course, we give any moral support

Earl of Derby—continued.

to another union if we think it necessary to carry our point, but we do not strictly prohibit our men from working with a non-unionist. We are put to a great deal of trouble by reason of these non-unionists, and people slide out of the society, and it is our experience that when they give up their Union they have not got principle sufficient to refuse to take the extra wages that have been gained by the movement. If at the time they leave the society they would waive their claim to any right they had gained by our movement it would be a different matter. But we always find them eager enough to take anything that we can gain by combination without having to pay for it. This causes a lot of friction between our men. We do not use a black list because our men are so well known up and down the river through long service, that it is practically not needed and they very soon show themselves as to what they really are. Our men show a ticket. A quarterly ticket is issued by our society of a different colour each quarter, and anyone challenging a bargeman for his ticket can tell immediately by the colour of the ticket whether the man is a paid-up member or not so that we really have no need to issue a black list. The attitude of the majority of the brick manufacturers is decidedly hostile to us. They have not recognised the Union in any way in the brick manufacturing districts, and they have done all they possibly could to break us up, either by bringing pressure to bear upon the men by discharging them from their barges or by bribing them with the promise of a bigger and a better barge. Unfortunately in many cases the men have given way and so they have gradually weakened us.

13,911. What strikes or lock-outs have you had in your trade?—In 1890 there was one strike of our members in the brick-carrying trade in the districts of Rainham, Rochester, Sittingbourne, and Faversham. There was one in 1891 in which the crews of six barges and two lighters (14 men) were called out, and another with a firm of cement manufacturers on the Medway: this dispute commenced in September last.

13,912. Is that still continuing?—It is not. We cannot actually call it a strike. We called the members out and they responded; but after being out a few days all of them but one went back to their work and this man is still out. In reference to the strike of March 1890 the members of the society engaged in the brick trade drew up a list of rates of freight to be paid after March 1st. This was sent in to all employers and agents one month previous to that. The brick manufacturers relied on the starvation process to do the work.

13,913. That dispute is now terminated?—That was in 1890. That terminated in April, 1890 or in May 1890. It lasted eight weeks.

13,914. And how did it end?—It ended at last by the men withdrawing their demand and asking the employers to issue an alternative list. This was done, and the following letter was received.—"Belvidere Road, Lambeth, London,

17 February 1892.]

Mr. J. TOOKEY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

" S.E., April 10, 1890. Dear Sir, I have submitted your letter of the 9th to my Committee. My committee are glad that the Bargemen's Protection Society have at last absolutely and unreservedly withdrawn their lists. As the Bargemen's Protection Society wish it, my committee after consideration have agreed that they will issue their lists to the men; this, however, will take some time. As you are aware it took the Bargemen's Protection Society a fortnight to settle the lists now withdrawn, and the masters, from their different interests, the different conditions of their work, and the varied positions of their fields, will require some time to agree upon a uniform list. They will, however, use the utmost despatch. The masters wish it to be understood that their lists to be issued will not be submitted to discussion, arbitration, or conciliation. The fields will not be opened until the bargemen are at work. I am desirous to express the masters' regret that this delay will cause a continuance of the present suffering. This however is in consequence of the bargemen refusing to go to work until the lists are issued. Your obedient servant, Henry J. Byrne, secretary.—Mr. Jas. Tookey" (*handing in letter.*) The cause of the second dispute in 1890 was through this circular, which I will read, being issued to the captains of six barges in one firm: "181, Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C., 24th April 1891. To the captains of the barges 'Olivette,' 'Hope,' 'Mary Agnes,' 'Robert,' 'Jane,' and 'The World.'—As you have been before informed, that unless you abide by Messrs. Lawrence & Co.'s orders, you will be discharged,"—I may point out that Messrs. Lawrence were a firm of middlemen or sweaters—as they have my authority to act as they think advisable. It is my intention, if you are to remain in the barges, to make you pay half help, and half oil bills, also half expenses of every description, including clearance. You are hereby forbidden in the future from drawing any freights without Messrs. Lawrence & Co.'s special permission, and if you do this you lie yourselves open to prosecution. Yours, &c., (Signed) G. Gibbens, owner" (*handing in circular.*) That letter was practically tying the men's hands. If they could pick up a chance freight upon the market they were not allowed to do so. If they did it, if carrying for the trade they were not allowed to draw it, but it had to be drawn through this firm of Lawrence & Company, and he took his commission of 5 per cent. off that. We called the men out and the men were out about a fortnight, and ultimately the employers gave way and the men resumed work. Then with regard to the last dispute, which is still unsettled, and where we have got one man out, the cause was the action of the head of the firm in discharging one of our members, because he refused to take a part freight of cement from the works to London at the tonnage rates, the tonnage rate being 1s. 7d. per ton, the rate as agreed to by the employers at the London Chamber of Commerce being, for a part cargo of any kind, 5l. 10s. The employers had been to the

Earl of Derby—continued.

London Chamber of Commerce, and there had drawn up a list and agreed to it, and they agreed to pay for any portion of the freight, not amounting to a full one, the lump sum 5l. 10s. The employer in this instance broke away from the terms of his agreement and wished the men to do it at 1s. 7d. per ton. 1s. 7d. per ton for the 30 tons would have amounted to 2l. 7s. 6d., and at the full freight, as agreed at the Chamber of Commerce, it would have amounted to 5l. 10s., thus making the serious deficiency of 3l. 2s. 6d. The man refused to do this and he was discharged from his craft.

13,915. As a matter of fact do you think that since the formation of your Union the position of the men has improved?—The position of the men with the firms has improved; the condition of the men in the chance work barges has not been so good on the whole for this reason. The members of the Brickmasters' Association previous to the Union being formed used to give their chance work away, but since the strike in 1890 they worked into one another's hands, and if one firm has a barge or two to spare they simply send it to another firm, and so they drive the chance men out of it.

13,916. In other words the masters have organised on their side as you have done on yours?—The masters have, yes. Since receiving this letter which I have just read, bearing upon the price list, we have received no communication officially from the Brickmasters' Association in any shape at all in reference to any dispute. They have totally ignored the Society and its officers, and they will not meet one of us or receive one of our cards, if we go to any employer and present one with a view to avert a dispute in any way. The cement manufacturers of the Medway after meeting the representatives of our men in 1890, and settling the first price list, allowed their committee to fall through. But they led the general secretary of my society to believe that the committee was still intact, and we knew nothing to the contrary, till by-and-by a case cropped up in which we wanted to meet the representatives of the employers, when to our surprise, we found that the committee was entirely disorganised, and that body no longer existed.

Professor Marshall.

13,917. With regard to these men that fell overboard and were drowned, in consequence of the want of proper safeguards on the barges, were there inquests held?—We have only been able to recover two bodies up to the present time, and there was no sufficient evidence in one of those cases to prove that the life-buoy would have been of any service, because the man went overboard, and he was not seen to go overboard. He did go overboard, but he was not seen to go. His body was picked up something like 10 days after the accident.

13,918. Does your Union put in an appearance at these inquests?—No; it has not done so only in one case. In one case of a man who

17 February 1892.]

Mr. J. TOOKEY.

[Continued.]

Professor Marshall—continued.

was drowned called McLeod, I think our Society was represented on that inquest.

13,919. Would it not be an efficient remedy for any imperfect provision for the safety of your men if your Union were to put in an appearance at the inquest?—Yes, I believe it would be. I believe it would be a remedy so far; but the employment in barges is such that the men are afraid to speak, because of losing their situations. The work is paid so poorly for that the men are very poor; they have nothing to fall back on, and the very fear of a threat of losing their berth is sufficient to deter them from doing anything that would injure their prospects in getting a berth or holding one.

13,920. That I understand; that is why I asked why the Union does not put in an appearance?—The Union has only been in existence since 1889, and we have really only had two or three cases to deal with, and in one of those cases it was proved that the man went overboard and they did not know he was overboard till he was missed.

13,921. Do you not think that a sufficient remedy in the future could be found, simply by the Union putting in an appearance at the inquest?—I think so. I think it could be done in this way. I think that if the barges were inspected at certain times by the Board of Trade inspectors, or the Custom House officer in going his rounds was to take notice that these things were not found, if they would send in a requisition to the employer to put them on board the vessel, then if they were not put, the barge should be detained until such time as they were put. I think the pressure could very well come from that quarter. In fact the Custom House officer at Faversham to-day is taking action in that direction. The consequence is two or three barges have been fitted with life-buoys, but still the fact remains that the great bulk of the barges are not provided with anything except the boat. I have been overboard myself twice, and in both cases my life could have been saved by a life-buoy if I had been in actual peril, but there was no life-buoy when needed. I was saved by the rope's end or boat-hook. There was no life-buoy to throw to me, and therefore there is a great amount of risk through the lack of life-buoys.

Mr. Courtney.

13,922. You mentioned the case of a barge-owner who received compensation, when a barge was run down, for the wearing apparel and things of the men on the barge, as well as of the barge, and did not pay the bargeman all he received. The bargeman consequently quitted his employment?—That is quite right.

13,923. Did that man, when he quitted his employment, county court the barge owner?—He paid him the full amount that he had received from the shipping company, and discharged him. If he had consented to accept a reduction of about 4l. he would have allowed him to remain in the barge.

Mr. Courtney—continued.

13,924. I thought you told us he declined to pay the full amount, and the man discharged himself?—No, you misunderstood me.

Mr. Tait.

13,925. How much have the wages advanced since your Union was formed?—In the brick manufacturing districts we gained an advance of about 10 per cent., but previous to this, the freights had diminished. In about 10 years the freights had been continually diminishing, till at last it had suffered something like 25 per cent. reduction, and we have gained an advantage of about 10 per cent. in the brick manufacturing districts, and of course we have still got to make a great deal of way before we fetch it to what it used originally to be. In the cement manufacturing districts in the River Medway, the men have gained an advantage of something like between 15 and 20 per cent.

13,926. Have you reduced the hours of labour?—As regards the hours of labour, we cannot see how it is possible to reduce the hours of labour in barges. We have to sail according to the wind, tide, and weather, and at all times the men take advantage of a fair tide, and the hours are necessarily very long.

13,927. And they are quite satisfied so far as the hours are concerned?—So far as the hours are concerned we hear no complain's.

13,928. Are you paid for overtime beyond a certain limit?—We are paid nothing, only a share of freight. If we are a fortnight over a freight we get no more. If we are four days over a freight we get the same.

13,929. How are you paid for Sunday labour?—We get nothing at all for Sunday labour. It all goes into the freight. There is just a certain amount paid, and that is all we receive.

13,930. Did I understand you aright when you stated that the barges were supposed to have life-buoys on them?—Yes.

13,931. Is it by Act of Parliament?—Yes, I believe an Act was passed that compels barge and shipowners to place life-buoys for each man on board. If the master of the barge neglects to have these life-buoys, where they are available, he is subject to a fine.

13,932. And has your Union never taken any action to see that that is done?—We have not taken it up as yet.

13,933. You have never even reported it to your general secretary, so that he might report it to the Government officials?—I think the fact of the matter is this, that the men are ignorant of this Act of Parliament being passed. The men have not gone into the matter, and it was simply through going to the Custom House that I got the information necessary, and we have made up our mind to go further into it in future. We are informing the members, and telling them that an Act of Parliament is passed in reference to this matter, and when it is known that the Act is passed the men will co-operate heartily with us in the matter.

17 February 1892.]

Mr. J. TOOKEY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

13,934. You stated that sometimes the barges were loaded down near to the water's edge?—Yes.

13,935. Do I understand from that that you think the barge is overloaded?—Yes, barges do overload. Unfortunately it is the share system that compels the bargemen to overload his craft. In many instances they are compelled to overload them. The masters will make them do it in every case. Possibly the master might be able to make a reduction, but the wages are so small they are obliged to carry all they possibly can to make a living. Hence they load very deep. On the other hand when they bring coke, deals, and light goods, they will bring the deck cargo so high that they cannot see over it, and in this way there is a great risk. A few weeks ago a barge turned over in Sea Reach. Her name was the "Anglo-Dane." She had a large deck load of coke, about two hatches high, and the barge turned over in a squall, and drowned both the master and the mate. In addition to this there is a risk in carrying these deck cargoes that you cannot see fore and aft. You cannot see anything that is coming, or anything that is near to you, and so there is a great danger of collision. Another matter in reference to the risk incurred with barges is the fact that there are only two hands on board. In the best of the barges there are only two men; in the middle class barges there is only a man and a boy, and in the very worst description of barge there is sometimes an old man and a small boy, and sometimes a man and a woman. Well, they have to work their tide, and when they bring up for a foul tide they go to sleep. It is impossible for a man to be about for a long period of hours, and then, when the barge is brought up to sit up and keep an anchor watch. So that we have cases of collision, in which, while the men are asleep, they are run down and the men risk being drowned.

13,936. Have you ever reported such a condition of things to the inspector?—In all my experience as a barge master I have never seen a Government inspector near a barge, and I have got a case in point here where a barge was run into and sunk, under the circumstances I am describing to you at the present time, when two men were asleep. The barge was run down and sunk. She has been got up and repaired, and when the repairing was finished she was to be inspected by a Board of Trade inspector. The mate was in attendance, but the captain was suffering from an injury he received in the collision and was not able to be there.

(Sir Michael Hicks-Beach here took the Chair.)

The mate attended and he reported to me that the inspector had not been on board the barge, that he simply came down to the wharf and went up into the employer's office, and the barge was sent away without the inspection that I contend was necessary.

13,937. Is there any restriction of the tonnage of freight in barges?—No, there is no restriction. The employers build barges as large as they like and as small as they like. They put

Mr. Tait—continued.

whom they like into them, and they take their own risk. This is a matter in regard to which we should like to have the assistance of the Board of Trade, that they should not allow barges of over 90 tons to sail with less than three hands, and that all barges that are in constant work in the hay and straw trade should be compelled to carry three hands. That would give one man forward to look out, and the other two men aft to look after the sail and the tiller; because it is impossible for two men to handle these crafts that go about with these large stacks upon them. I would further urge in favour of three hands that when barges carry three hands they would most likely carry two hands and a boy. This boy would grow up to be a bargeman, and he would be likely to serve his apprenticeship, and bye-and-bye he would get rated as a mate, and then he would get further rated till he attained a master's position. We should then have *bond fide* bargemen, but at the present time in the event of any dispute our employers fetch men out of the brickfields and place them on board the barges. At the close of our strike in 1890 three men were brought out from the brickfields of Faversham and placed in charge of crafts. These men, I need hardly say, were incompetent, and they constitute a source of very grave danger to life and property in a crowded waterway. They also are a great hindrance to practical men, because the fleets of barges that navigate the River Thames are very large at times, especially after a period of being wind bound. Incompetent men are mixed up with those who are fully able to carry out their work, and in many instances they are the cause of the competent men doing damage which they would otherwise avoid. Then we have got cases where one man in particular in a firm at Sittingbourne who has been in collision two freights in succession, a young man placed on board the barge to supersede a better man, a man who had been in the employ of the firm some years; and he was in two collisions in less than two months. This, I think, calls for some action on the part of the Board of Trade, or other body which has the control of these matters.

13,938. I understand that what you suggest is that the Board of Trade should regulate the number of men upon barges of a certain tonnage, and also that they should exercise supervision as to the competency of men who are engaged upon barges as to their suitability and knowledge?—Yes.

13,939. You said that in your Society you had no black-list?—Yes, I did.

13,940. Do you know, on the other hand, if the employers have?—I do not know whether they have got a regular list. I can quote one case, the case of our secretary at Southend. He was the master and owner of his own barge, and had been in good employment previous to the strike, and he informed me that after the strike he was unable to get a living, because as soon as he went to an office and asked for freight they would simply look up behind the door at some note or document they had there, and would tell

17 February 1892.]

Mr. J. TOOKEY.

[Continued.]

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

him to call again, which was equivalent to telling him he was not wanted.

13,941. With regard to the three strikes of 1890 and 1891, did you offer the employers arbitration before you struck?—No, we did not offer arbitration or conciliation previously. We had been in the habit of approaching our employers, perhaps three or four members of a firm, or perhaps singly, and in every instance where we have asked for better conditions we have simply been told if we did not like it there were plenty more who would do the work, and we could leave it. We then combined and drew up these lists, and we had a circular printed on the outside asking them to look into the matter and meet us, but in every instance they refused in the brick manufacturing districts. In the cement manufacturing districts the trade was very brisk, and it was not to the interests of the employers to force on a strike. A few days previous to the expiration of the time on the notice they asked our executive to send a deputation to meet them. They did this. The employers agreed to give our men the rates demanded for one month prior to settling it at the conciliation board of the London Chamber of Commerce. This was done, and it worked very satisfactorily for very nearly two years, and in the meantime the cement trade fell off a little bit. The trade was not quite so brisk, and the employers seized upon the opportunity of sending in a three months' notice to our Society for a reduction of freights without any reference whatever to conciliation or arbitration at the London Chamber of Commerce. I may inform you that we had a great difficulty in getting them there. As a Society we are in favour of the principle of conciliation and arbitration, but we feel unless some pressure is brought to bear so as to make the decision or agreement arrived at binding upon both parties, conciliation fails in its object.

13,942. How would you make them binding?—I can hardly say what way we would take to bind them to it. That would have to be a question to be determined after the principle was adopted. If we adopt the principle we would find perhaps ways and means of carrying it out. It seems to me that on a rising market the employers are glad to avert a strike in order to serve their own interests by getting us before a conciliation board; but, on the other hand, when it suits their own interests, they will quietly ignore the agreement arrived at. I may say that from the time the agreement was first formed at the London Chamber of Commerce our men have acted honourably in every instance. They have not tried to enforce more under certain circumstances than the list has agreed they should have. But, on the other hand, the employers have raised every point that they possibly could, and have sometimes made the paltry excuse of a line of demarcation for a certain district, in order to get out of the agreement in every possible way they could do.

13,943. Are you, as an organisation, still prepared to settle all your disputes by the same method?—We are. We are represented on the conciliation board of the London Chamber of

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

Commerce at the present time, and are included in the shipping trades industry.

Mr. *Abraham*.

13,944. Did I understand you to say that the practice referred to by Mr. Courtney was prevalent, that is, if the master of the barge would accept less compensation than was due he was allowed to stop on, but, on the other hand, if he exacted all that was paid on his account he was discharged?—That is so.

13,945. That practice is prevalent?—Two cases have come under my notice of that kind. A case came under my notice where a barge was run down and sunk, and the master and his mate lost their clothes. The barge was so old and so worn out that the employer did not think it worth his while to go to the expense of getting her up, and he gave her to the Whitstable divers. They got the barge up, and when the man and his mate went on board to get their clothes and effects they were driven off her, and not allowed to take their clothes away, the divers saying that the barge was given to them with everything that was on board her. These men, up to the present day, have received no compensation whatever. The employer gave their effects away when he gave his own property away, and did not recompense the men for the loss that they sustained.

Sir *Michael Hicks-Beach*.

13,946. Do you wish to make any suggestion to us?—I would suggest, as a means of settling trade and labour disputes, that wherever trade societies or unions exist in whatever industries, employers should form associations, and from that body form district committees to meet at stated intervals with representatives of the societies interested in connexion with the navigation in all tidal rivers, and that the men should sail under proper charter parties. Those are all the suggestions I have to make in reference to the barge work so far as legislation is concerned. I think a great deal of it rests in the men's own hands, if they get a powerful union and bring pressure to bear in the right direction. I believe they could then redress a great many grievances which they labour under. But there are other grievances where I think it is necessary that the Board of Trade should step in. I may say that the last barge I took charge of had three pumps broken out of four, and in riding a gale of wind out I had to pay away a lot of extra chain to what I had on deck, and I could not get it up out of the chain locker, and when I broke the back of the chain locker out the first opportunity, I found that the chain had been stowed away, and it had never been shifted for years. Now I contend that the inspector should see that the chain cables and such things are in proper working order. There is a system of inspection which obtains at present in the district. The employers have formed themselves into insurance societies, and they appoint their surveyors. These surveyors are barge builders, but they, having craft of their own, and that not of the best description, are afraid to make a proper survey because

17 February 1892.]

Mr. J. TOOKEY.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

of the chance of losing their work, and I have never yet been asked in the whole of my experience to pull up a chain out of a locker or to show any lamps or other gear connected with the safe working of the barge. I have never been asked to unfurl the sail to see whether the sail was in proper condition. I have never been asked to unroll a tarpaulin to see whether it was fit to go to sea with. So that the employers simply take their own risk, and they put whom they choose in the barge and the craft, much to the detriment of those who are competent. They likewise use these men against our interest, inasmuch as having these men to fall back upon, and not having any restriction placed upon them, they put them in charge of a craft, to the danger of life and property on the river.

Professor Marshall.

13,947. With regard to that barge that was sunk, with the men's clothes on it, did the

The witness withdrew.

Mr. JAMES HILL called and examined.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

13,949. You are a steamship owner and coal merchant at Plymouth?—Yes.

13,950. Do you represent any association?—No.

13,951. You merely come to speak for yourself?—For ourselves. I see there is a mistake in the printing of this summary of my evidence. I do not represent the steamship owners and coal merchants of Plymouth. I only represent my own firm. Of course we are really opposed to the coal merchants of Plymouth. We are supporters of union labour; we employ union labour, and they employ free labour.

13,952. You have had contracts for the carrying of coal for use at Devonport, Portsmouth, and Chatham Dockyards, for a period extending over 20 years, I understand?—Yes.

13,953. During that time you have employed large numbers of men through your stevedore, whom you believe to have been union men?—Yes.

13,954. What has been your experience?—We have always found they do our work satisfactorily, and we have never had any difficulties with them. Of course, when we came to Plymouth in November 1890, there was the coal porters' strike on, and the coal merchants were fighting the Union at that time. Of course when we came to Plymouth we employed the men that we had always employed at Devonport, men whom we had employed for over 20 years. This the coal merchants did not really like. They were getting the best of the fight, and would have crushed the Union if we had not come at that time, though our coming to Plymouth had nothing whatever to do with the strike.

13,955. You did not join the Plymouth coal merchants?—No. They had been formed into a sort of coal merchants' association, which was really nothing more or less than a coal ring formed for the purpose of regulating the price of coal. When we came to Plymouth we refused

Professor Marshall—continued.

employer receive payment for the right to raise that barge?—No. In the case which I mentioned the barge was an old one, and the employer thought she would not pay him to raise, and so he gave her away. The men's clothing and effects were in the cabin, and when the barge was raised by the Whitstable divers, and they went on board and demanded their clothes they were driven off the barge and not allowed to take them, the divers saying that the clothes had been given to them with the barge, and they should not therefore give them up.

13,948. Your complaint is that the employer should have said, "I give the barge, except such things on the barge as do not belong to me"?—These men got no compensation at all for their clothes. Their clothes were simply given away with the barge, and they never got any compensation.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

to join them, because it would not have done for us to be regulated, as to the price of coal, by the prices which they charged, as we had advantages which they did not possess, we being steamship owners. They then wanted us to join their free labour movement, but as these men had served us so well ever since we had this Devonport contract, we did not see any reason why we should join in the strike, with which we had nothing whatever to do. At this they took umbrage, and we have been opposed to them ever since we have been established in connexion with the house coal trade in Plymouth. Mr. Treleaven and Mr. Varnier, coal merchants, of Plymouth, gave their evidence before the Commission some time ago, and they seemed to say that the strike was brought about by the union men, whereas it was not so.

13,956. How do you consider it was brought about?—By the aggressiveness of the coal merchants.

13,957. In what way?—They wanted to crush the Union, for one thing. It had been the custom for a great number of years for the store weighers of the port to weigh out vessels, and they objected to them, and wanted their own men to weigh out the vessels, which was altogether unfair. It was not fair to the shipowner, it was not fair to the colliery owner, and I think it was not fair to the coal porter.

13,958. Have you anything further to tell us about the strike?—Of course the coal porters in Plymouth would not allow house coal to be worked by steam, which was altogether unjust; but I do not think that had anything to do with bringing about the strike. However, when we brought our first steamer to Plymouth, we worked the steamer by steam, and they did not object. Of course at that time the Union men were in rather bad straits, and if they had objected, of course, we should have shown a different attitude to that which we took up.

17 February 1892.]

Mr. JAMES HILL.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

13,959. Do the Plymouth coal merchants use steam now?—No, they do not. They could if they wished. They have the free labourers and they have the steam winches, but they never seem to use steam. I think the free labourers are not able to manage the steam winches, or rather to discharge by steam.

13,960. Your firm really went to Plymouth in opposition to the existing association?—No. We had entertained the idea of going there for a good many years, but we happened to go to Plymouth at the time that this strike was on, and when this Coal Merchants' Association was in full swing. We did not see our way to join any coal merchants' association, because we went to compete with the coal merchants, and we were therefore not going to allow them to tell us what price we should ask for our coal. If we had not had certain advantages to offer to the inhabitants of Plymouth of course we should not have been wanted there at all.

13,961. Have you competed with them successfully?—Yes. In the 12 months we have been there we have sold more coal than any firm in the three towns. That is, of course, owing in a great measure to the sympathy of the inhabitants of Plymouth, because coal was sold at such a very exorbitant price before we went there. The coal merchants allowed the public to think that the high price of the coal was due to the exorbitant wages that they were paying to the coal porters. Since we have been there they have been paying the same wages, coal is dearer at the collieries, and yet coal is sold at six shillings or seven shillings a ton less than it was before we went there.

13,962. Do you wish to say anything further on that subject?—No, I do not think I have anything further to say on that subject. Of course the coal merchants had made up their mind to bring a battle about with the Union, and they filled their own stores with coal to the utmost capacity, and they got the country merchants to fill their stores too, as well as the private consumers in the three towns, and then they knew very well if they had their own men to weigh out the coal, they would bring about the disagreement which they wanted, that the bringing out their own men would cause the union men to strike. The coal merchants did not expect that we were going to Plymouth at the time as we did.

13,963. Do you own many ships?—We have about nine colliers ranging from 900 to 1,200 tons. It is principally a coasting trade.

13,964. Do you wish to say anything to us in reference to that business?—We do not employ federation men, we employ any men who happen to come along; we do not bind ourselves to union men or non-union men.

13,965. Do you employ foreigners on board your ships?—That matter is left a good deal to the captains. I do not think they do; I have not seen many. If men were scarce, I daresay they would take foreigners on, but they do not make a practice of it. Those vessels that trade from Cardiff generally take Welshmen, and

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

those from the north of England take north country men.

13,966. Yours is a coasting trade?—Yes; a coasting trade.

Mr. Tait.

13,967. You say that the price of coal since you went into Plymouth is how much cheaper per ton?—About 6s. a ton cheaper than it was before we went there.

13,968. And the wages are the same as when you went there?—Yes.

Mr. Burt.

13,969. The high price of coal was by the coal merchants attributed to the high wage they paid to the men?—Yes.

13,970. You say that that was a mere bogey, that it was not so?—It was certainly not so.

Mr. Courtney.

13,971. The coal merchants at Plymouth must have made large profits before you went there?—They seemed to do very well, I think, before we went there. They are not making very large profits now. Of course we are cutting the price. At the same time we are doing a fairly profitable business. Of course we have special advantages which they have not, as we have our own steamships. I daresay they were making 10s. a ton profit, whereas they are now only making 3s. or 4s. There is no doubt the Coal Merchants' Association was nothing more than a coal ring, formed for the purpose of regulating the price of coal, and they had things so much their own way that they thought they would also regulate the wages of the coal porters and grind them down as much as they possibly could.

13,972. At the time of the strike were not the coal merchants employing union and non-union men?—No; they were employing union men.

13,973. Solely?—Solely before the strike, and then when the strike took place, of course they got these free labourers.

13,974. What was the motive of the strike?—I really do not know what the coal merchants had in view, but I believe they wished to reduce the wages.

13,975. Was it not proved in court that someone went to Mr. Treleven and said, "Unless you discharge that man we will call our men out"?—Yes.

13,976. Does not that show that Treleven was employing both union and non-union men?—He commenced to employ these free labourers, and the union men objected. It was since he commenced to employ these free labourers that they objected.

13,977. He was employing both?—Yes; but that was not the cause of the strike.

13,978. Is it not historically true it was that which precipitated the strike?—I suppose it is.

13,979. Treleven was employing both union men and non-union men, and the Union representatives said to him, "Unless you discharge certain non-union men we will take our men out"?—Yes.

13,980. He refused, and they did take their own men out?—Yes.

17 February 1892.]

Mr. JAMES HILL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Courtney—continued.

13,981. How can you reconcile that with what you have just told us, that the strike was brought on by the coal merchants, that it was due to their employing non-union men exclusively?—What I said was that the strike was brought about by their employing their own storemen to weigh out the vessels, instead of having the store weighers of the port. That was the commencement of the strike. Then Treleaven took these free labourers or non-union men, and this the union men objected to. This was after the row as to the employers having their own men instead of having the store weighers.

Mr. Trow.

13,982. Had the refusal of the men to allow steam to be used anything to do with bringing about the strike?—No; I do not think so because although the union men objected to having house coal worked by steam; the merchants

Mr. Trow—continued.

never attempted to work by steam. They represented it was a loss to them of 4d. a ton in the discharging. But now that they have their free labourers they do not use steam. With the first steamer that came to Plymouth we used steam.

13,983. There was no objection then?—The union men did not object simply because they were getting the worst of the fight, and if they had objected that would only have caused a rupture with us, which they did not want.

13,984. If they had objected to your using steam, should you have joined in with the other employers?—We should not have joined the other employers. We should have got labour elsewhere.

13,985. You would have fought the men?—Yes; but we knew beforehand that they were not going to object to our using steam.

13,986. Because they were not in a position to do so?—Because they were not in a position to do so.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. MICHAEL CARROLL called and examined.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

13,987. What is your occupation?—My occupation is a corn porter and likewise a general labourer. I am not confined to any class of labour, or to one particular labour only.

13,988. Where?—In the season of the year in the Surrey Commercial Docks.

13,989. I think you wish to tell us something about contract sweating in the Surrey Commercial Docks?—Yes.

13,990. Will you explain what you mean?—To my mind's view there are two sorts of sweating, or three, as the case may be. I can understand a man working and giving a fair day's sweat for a fair day's money; but I cannot understand a man working for a certain per-centage, and then being reduced by the company out of that per-centage after working for it.

13,991. What is the practice of which you complain; will you explain it?—I complain in this way. The Surrey Commercial Dock Company for a number of years have sweated their men in piece-working out of all outside gangs, that is casual labour, 5 per cent.; by hiring the contractors, and do not pay them one single farthing for their services.

13,992. You mean that the contractor engages the men and superintends them, and is paid, not by the company, but by a deduction of 5 per cent. from the earnings of the men?—All outside. That is in the Grain Department.

13,993. Have I described what you complain of accurately?—Yes. In the Surrey Commercial Docks I will mention the warehouses; that will very likely give you gentlemen a better impression. Of course, I am rather hurried now, because I do not want to lose three or four weeks' work after to-day; the result is I am

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

hurried, and, of course, I cannot explain it nicely. In the Surrey Commercial Docks at this moment there are granaries, numbering No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, and another in addition, A. and E. warehouse; that is nine, I think, in number. The grain is deposited, or formerly used to be deposited before machinery got so numerous by manual labour, into these granaries, by backing in sacks from floor to floor, and having pitches for a man to raise and deposit that grain in the floor; now the machinery has altered that so much that it takes it up in a kind of a self-trimmer, and self-filler bucket, and reduces the men's earnings, which I will prove presently. But in the sweating system there is one contractor wholly and solely in the Surrey Commercial Docks, only one contractor in that department, and that is in the whole of the Grain Department. He has, in busy times, about 70 or 80 gangs at work during the day, and, as an average, these men do from 250 to 300 quarters of grain during the day, landing and delivering. Out of that complement he used to have nine standing gangs, what they call "regular" gangs; and he deducted from those nine gangs half a man's money on each gang's earnings. If they earned 10s. each man he would deduct 5s. out of 10s. That is the contractor. Then all outside, what I call casual men coming in and doing the delivery when they are required, it is 5 per cent., which is deducted against their will in the Grain Department. There is no man who would like, when he gives his sweat in the labour, to be reduced out of his wages; and it is causing irritation day after day and week after week. The men have not got the pluck to come here and denounce it. I am here to-day as an

17 February 1892.]

Mr. M. CARROLL.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

independent witness, not delegated by any labour union whatever, although I belong to a labour union. I come here to-day to denounce this system of sweating.

13,994. Are the men paid by the piece or by the day?—By the piece.

13,995. And your complaint is that from that payment the contractor takes what you have described?—Yes; we are supposed to get for delivering grain 12s. 6d. per hundred quarters for delivery if it is not in the run; but if it is in the run we get 14s. 7d.; that would be another farthing added. Now, it is a singular thing that for the delivery in craft they pay when in run, but for the delivery into waggons, they do not pay extra when in run, let them bring it ever so far. The men run it from one end of the warehouse to another into waggons and do not get any extra pay; do not make any extra charge. In fact, they would not get it if they did.

13,996. The price is the same for both?—The price is the same for both, 12s. 6d. a hundred.

13,997. The contractor engages the men, I suppose, does not he?—Not at all times. The warehouse foreman engages them.

13,998. Is the warehouse foreman an officer of the Dock Company?—Yes.

13,999. Not under the contractor at all?—No, he is a paid official of the company.

14,000. Then, what power has the contractor over the men if he does not engage them. Do not they work for him?—He has the power that he has got authority from the dock company, and the contractor places 200l. as a bond in the company's hands.

14,001. He contracts to do the work?—He contracts to do the work.

14,002. Does not he engage the men to do it?—He engages the men to do it.

14,003. Is it a condition of the bond given by the contractor or is there any condition in the bond given by the contractor to which you have just alluded which necessitates the men using certain public-houses?—With regard to the public-houses I will explain. When these contractors, some of them want 100l. bond, some of them less, some 200l., according to the rule they follow in the Deal Department, which they have to lay in the company's hands, they must go to the publican and guarantee that the beer that is used by the men shall be got out of that public-house or else the publican would not advance them that 100l. to lay in the company's hands.

14,004. Do you wish to state anything else to us?—Yes. Not only in the Grain Department but in the Deal Department, out of every standard of deals that goes in and out of the dock, that is landed and housed away, there is 1d. the standard deducted out of the men's wages, that is piece-work. I believe there are 14 yards in the Surrey Commercial Dock, and in

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

one yard I think is the Russia yard. They are served with two contractors; it is a big yard, and all other yards have, I think, one contractor. In each yard there is a contractor, so-called contractor, and he deducts 1d. a standard out of every standard of deals that is landed and delivered out of the men's wages that they earn. Now, sir, Mr. Griffin, when he gave his evidence here, said before this Commission that the men received all they earned and no reduction whatever was made out of the men's wages. You will remember that was his evidence. But I will prove to the contrary. Here are these sweating contractors taking a reduction out of the piece-work that the men actually earn. They are reduced. Now I want to know from you, gentlemen, in the name of common sense, who is answerable for this sweating, the men or the company?

14,005. Who fixes the price?—Why, the company. And the men have to abide by the price. If they do not like it, of course they have to go.

14,006. They need not work for it?—They need not work for it.

14,007. That is their remedy, is it not?—Yes; but then, still, for all that, the sweating system I should think ought to be abolished. According to the agreement of the Mansion House Committee I think you will find it was signed and sealed that all sweating should be abolished, that was after the strike in 1889.

14,008. Does the contractor get anything so far as you know besides this deduction that he makes from the men's wages?—No.

14,009. Then, if he does not get that deduction what object would he have in doing anything in the matter; what object would he have in contracting for the job?—He would have to tackle the work the same as any other men. The contractor does not do any work whatever.

14,010. He superintends the men?—He walks about the dockhead as he likes and then he comes and deducts this amount of money. It is enormous in the Corn Department, and it is enormous in the Deal Department.

14,011. Does not the contractor superintend the men at work?—No.

14,012. You told us he engaged them?—They are as a rule union men and they superintend their own work; simply because they are piece-work. There is no occasion to be superintended by anybody, because a man who is on piece-work will do as much as he can and do it as well as he can.

14,013. The contractor is responsible to the company for the work to be done?—That is a question; I do not know.

14,014. What does he give them a bond for?—That is it; that is the question.

The witness withdrew.

17 February 1892.]

Mr. H. WEBB.

[Continued.]

(The Duke of Devonshire here took the Chair.)

Mr. HENRY WEBB called and examined.

Duke of Devonshire.

14,015. You represent the Thames Steamship Workers' Union?—Yes.

14,016. What subject do you wish to give evidence upon?—I wish to point out accidents, their causes and remedies; how far they may be contributed to by employers or the representatives in charge; the excessively long hours that they are employed, with suggestions as to how the same may be remedied, and the desirability of Government inspection.

14,017. What have you to say about accidents?—I will first point out to you that through excessive numbers of hours of working (I myself as a practical man have worked 40, 44, 48, 50, 52, and up to 56, hours at a stretch), personal injuries are according to my personal opinion done to men who work for that number of hours without an intermission of rest. I have no doubt you will see there an accident which I met with under circumstances relating to working so many hours.

14,018. You state that you met with an accident through a mistake made by a crane man?—Just so.

14,019. Who also had been working continuously for a great number of hours?—Yes.

14,020. Are these accidents frequent?—I cannot say they are always occurring, but we never know one day from another that these things may not happen.

14,021. Can you state what are the reasons for these excessive hours of employment?—The reason of the excessive hours has been through the weather delaying ships in getting to their destination, that they have had to work them right through to get them away at their time or to get them as near their time as possible. That is to say, if a ship is expected in London on Sunday ready to start on Monday morning, and she met with bad weather or some other cause which delayed her for a couple of days, the consequence would be that when she did arrive we would have to work her right away through to get her away at the right time.

14,022. Under whose directions do you work these hours?—Under my employer's direction.

14,023. Who is the employer?—Am I bound to give names?

14,024. Is it a dock company or is it a contractor, or is it a shipowner?—A shipowner, or a managing man for a wharf.

14,025. Can you state why a gang was employed for these excessive hours instead of a succession of gangs?—That I am not prepared to state. I do not know what is their motive of keeping men on for an excessive number of hours.

14,026. Is it at the desire of the men?—No, greatly against the will of the men.

14,027. I presume they earn very large wages for long work of this kind?—Their pay is 7d. per hour day work and 9d. per hour overtime,

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

night work. That is from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. 7d. an hour, and from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. 9d. per hour.

14,028. Would the men be willing to be taken off a job and have others put on?—That is a point we want to come to. We want to go a stretch of not longer than 24 hours and then to let fresh men be taken on in our place or in the place of these who have been out for 24 hours.

14,029. Then is it because you would not get employment at all unless you consented to work these long hours?—The question has never been put to us.

14,030. Have you ever put it to the employer?—No; no more than it has been a demur among the men as a body and it has gone to masters' ears, and I may state that for this last two months that when there has been a case of ships working all night or they have been behind with the employers, they put fresh men on in the morning. That is to say, if the men started at 6 o'clock in the morning they have let them carry on work till 6 o'clock the next morning, and then they have put fresh men on. They have found that system work very well I am very pleased to say; but we do not know how long that may continue with the employers.

14,031. Have you any reason to suppose there would be any difficulty if you wished it in getting the men to agree to it?—No, I do not suppose there would be any difficulty in getting the 24-hours' principle admitted by the employers.

14,032. Is not that the simplest course to adopt, to represent to the employers that you do not wish to work longer hours than that?—Just so. We are prepared to do that, but the men whom I represent they consider it should be done by legislative means; that is to say, that then the employers, whether they chose to give way on that point or not, would be compelled not to keep men on longer than 24 hours by law.

14,033. If you have not tried all that you can do now, what case have you for an alteration of the law?—I must certainly give way to you there, that we have not tried, that is to say, that we have not approached the employers on this subject.

14,034. Do you not think that is the first thing to do?—It is, I think, speaking personally, right that we should approach them first; but, of course, in this evidence, as you will see, owing to the accidents that have occurred through excessively long hours, &c. I was instructed to make it known.

14,035. Then you came here chiefly to ask that a legislative limit on the hours of labour may be imposed?—Yes.

14,036. Is there anything else you wish to state?—Well, in respect to the Government inspectors, there is an omission on my copy of the summary of the evidence; but I think it is notified there in respect of exhaust steam pipes

17 February 1892.]

Mr. H. WEBB.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire--continued.

projecting out of the sides of the ships. I know the case of a man that was walking along the gunwale of a barge alongside a ship, he was mooring the barge under the gangway, and to get this barge further along he took the hook that is attached to the winch to hook on to the barge to heave her along. The consequence was that the man walked along the gunwale of the barge, and when passing the steam pipe, the man on the winch turning on the exhaust steam, the steam came full in his face and scalded the side of his face. Not only that case, but I have often seen men walking along the gunwale of a barge and being blinded with the steam, and in two cases men have during the night been thrown overboard through it, not seeing where they were going. So that I should suggest that the steam pipes should go in a direction otherwise than over the side of the ship. They should be taken up the funnel. In many ships, such as the General Steam Navigation boats, also the Leith boats, also the Middlesbrough boats, the exhaust steam is carried up the funnel, so that there is no steam to in any way cause injury to any man working over the side of the barge.

14,037. You want inspection?—Yes.

14,038. Of the machinery and all the other arrangements?—Yes.

14,039. Is there any inspection now?—No, until there is something breaks in the winch, or other gear, and then there is an overhauling of the winch, or something of that sort.

14,040. Have you yourself, or have any other of the men obtained compensation for injury through accident?—Yes; I have obtained compensation for injury, and also a man that I have here notified had his three fingers and thumb taken off his right hand. He was driving a winch, and his hand slipped off the exhaust steam-pipe on to the cog, and it took part of his hand off, and he obtained 100% compensation for that accident. The judge ruled that the winch was not properly fitted out to be worked on account of having no guard gear over it.

14,041. Is it not the interest of the employers to take all proper precautions?—In my opinion it is to their interest.

14,042. Do you think that any inspection would make them more careful?—Yes, I believe it would. I know of a case, as I have notified in my summary, of a gaff coming down from up aloft and striking a man on the top of the head. That gaff was used on that particular occasion for helping to discharge the ship of stones; and the basket when it was being heaved up out of the hatch full of stones caught under the combing, which caused a sudden jerk, and brought the whole lot down, and struck this man on the head. Now, if that gaff had been in anything like good condition it would never have broken away with the small pressure of weight that there was hanging on to it.

14,043. Would it be possible for any inspection to secure that the machinery was always in proper order?—Yes. I have seen winches myself which, if they got in any way loose during the working would be screwed up again

Duke of Devon-hire--continued.

and a bit of rope yarn tied round to keep the nuts from coming off.

14,044. How often do you suggest the Government inspector should inspect the ship?—I would let him be the judge of his own time. That is to say, if I was appointed by the Board of Trade as an inspector to go on board any ship to inspect the gearing I might go on board a ship at London Bridge to-day and I might go on board of one at the West India Docks to-morrow. I also wish to state with respect to men being taken to and from their work to vessels lying in the river by unlicensed watermen. I myself have been taken off the ship during fine and foggy weather, and there have been 15, 16, and sometimes 17 men in the ship's boat, and the boat is forced through the water with one oar, they commonly call it sculling. Now, if it was a licensed waterman that was going to take the men off to a ship, or to fetch them from a ship, he would only be allowed to carry eight persons. On one particular night it was rather foggy, we were about to work all night, and a man could not see his way properly to the ship it being so dark, and instead of us reaching the ship where she was then lying we found ourselves outside the London Dock entrance. It would have been all the same if there had been a tier of barges lying in the river, and we might have got into the swim of those barges, and the boat might have been upset and all drowned. Therefore, I maintain that there should be licensed watermen to take the men to and from their work at the ships.

14,045. Is an unlicensed waterman allowed to carry passengers on the river?—The ship's crew is allowed to take men backwards and forwards to the ship in the ship's boat, but it is not specified as to how many men the boat should accommodate. At least I have never seen it notified on the boats.

14,046. You were being conveyed by the men of the ship's crew?—Yes.

14,047. You would make that illegal?—Yes, I do not consider that sailors are fit persons to bring men backwards and forwards to their ship.

14,048. Is there anything else?—There is a request I have to make known in respect of an extra span of wire rope to derricks used for discharging and loading ships. I have worked on board ships, and that only recently, where they have had some very heavy lifts, such as 3 tons 15 cwt., and 4 tons, and I do not think men should have their lives trusted to one span of wire that holds the derrick up to lift that weight, that there should be a spare span as well as the one that is in use, because it may be that though the span that is in use may have been tested to lift 10 tons, there may be a flaw in that wire.

14,049. Do you think that could be provided for by law?—Yes; it should be compulsory.

14,050. Who is to enforce the law?—I should say that the Board of Trade should enforce shipowners to take these necessary precautions.

14,051. Do not all these complaints amount to this, that you want to have a Government

17 February 1892.]

Mr. H. WEBB.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

inspector?—Yes; it comes really under that. The inspector should in my opinion be nominated by the Board of Trade as the Board of Trade rules the manner and the way in which ships are loaded or to what depth they are loaded. Therefore I consider they should be appointed to see that the gear is in proper order for loading and discharging vessel.

Mr. Tait.

14,052. What class of labour do you represent here; is it the men who unload ships?—The men who discharge and load these steamers in the coasting trade.

14,053. Are they dock labourers?—No; not dock labourers. We do not work in the docks, but in the River Thames, that is to say, from London Bridge down as far as North Woolwich.

14,054. You work upon ships that have their cargoes brought to them by barges?—Yes; though some of the ships come to wharves.

14,055. Are you officially connected with your organisation?—Yes; I am the secretary.

14,056. What is the number in membership?—In our branch we have 350 members. There are something like 800 or 900 members in the three branches.

14,057. Are you representing your own branch here or the three branches?—I may say that I am representing only the one branch. I believe Mr. Quelch represented the steamship workers some little time back here.

14,058. That was the South Side Federation?—Yes.

14,059. You are not federated with them?—No, we are not federated with that body; we are federated with the Federation of Trade and Labour Unions.

14,060. What is your particular reason for asking that notwithstanding the fact that you are working sometimes for 40 or 50 hours, you would suggest to the Commission that they should ask Parliament to limit your hours to 24 per day?—My own personal opinion is that (I do not say it is the opinion of all the members as a body) that if it was not done by law the employers would encroach upon us even if we got it; that is to say, that supposing the Society sent in a particular rule saying that the men on and after such a date would not work more than 24 hours at a stretch, they might abide by that for a time, and then there might be a time when they would think fit to let it fall through.

14,061. Do you think that in your particular employment you can give an honest day's work to your employer, and work 24 consecutive hours?—Yes; I do, under circumstances.

14,062. Are you aware of the fact that most of the workers upon the Thames have suggested to the Commission that either by trade union effort or by legislation the hours should be reduced to eight per day?—I do not agree with that. I cannot see how it can be done in the coasting trade. I take it in this way, that a ship in the coasting trade is very different to a railway train. They can be timed from London

Mr. Tait—continued.

to Bristol or to Manchester, or wherever it may be, within say 10 minutes. A ship cannot.

14,063. Yes; but in answer to the Duke of Devonshire you said that instead of working 50 hours and 52 hours, you would limit it to 24?—Yes.

14,064. Could the same process not be applied to limiting the hours of labour below 24?—Yes; it can be done. I do not say it cannot be done.

14,065. What power would you wish to give the Government inspector?—He should inspect all gear used for the working of vessels.

14,066. Your complaint just now is that you think it would be a prevention of many accidents were the barges more perfectly inspected?—Yes.

14,067. You have no inspector at the present time?—No.

14,068. Are you acquainted with the Employers' Liability Bill?—No.

14,069. You have not read the Bill of the present Government, or the Bills which have been printed by the parliamentary committee of the Trades' Union Congress, or any of these Bills?—No; I have not.

Professor Marshall.

14,070. You said that the hours for overtime were only from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m.?—Yes.

14,071. Would that apply to a gang, if the gang worked at 6 a.m., and went right on to the next day; would they only get ordinary time for the next day?—If they start at 6 o'clock in the morning and work till 6 o'clock in the morning, they get from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. 7d. an hour, and then they go from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m., and they get 9d. an hour; that would be 16s. altogether.

14,072. So that they would get overtime for all work after the first 12 hours?—Yes.

14,073. It has been urged by the employers that they already had in that heavy charge for overtime, a sufficient inducement to get a new gang if they could, and that, therefore, if they did not, it was because there was some inherent difficulty, or that the men themselves were unwilling to be taken off the job?—It often happens that the employers are pinched for time for putting the goods into a ship, and they prefer to keep the gang of men in to finish the ship. Supposing the men have been out 24 hours, come 6 o'clock in the morning, and that ship could be finished at 9 or 10 o'clock in the morning, we are quite willing to stop, so as not to put the employer to any inconvenience, because I have known it to be the case that when the ships have come up one after another, many men have been engaged, and then the next morning they are pinched for men. So that we are quite willing to give way so as to suit the employer, and not put him to any inconvenience.

14,074. It has been stated that the men themselves often prefer to finish the job, and

17 February 1892.]

Mr. H WEBB.

[Continued.]

Professor *Marshall*—continued.

would resent being turned off at the end of the 24 hours, and a new gang being taken on. Do you think that is so?—No, I do not think that is so.

Mr. *Tait*.

14,075. Seeing that you are requesting the Government to interfere to restrict the maximum number of hours to 24, if the Government were to suggest that to carry that out there should be no overtime paid during the 24 hours, what would be the feeling of your men?—They would not give way to that at all. At least when I say they would not give way, of course if it came to be a matter of law they must.

14,076. But you would resent it?—Yes.

14,077. They want the overtime to commence from the 12 hours as now?—Yes.

14,078. And to be paid at the higher percentage between the ordinary day of 12 hours,

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

and the extraordinary day of 24?—Yes, just in the same way as we are being paid now, that is to say, 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., 7*s.*, or 7*d.* an hour (as we are paid for all meal times), and after that, 9*d.* per hour.

14,079. How long as your Association been in existence?—A little over two years, since August 26, 1889.

14,080. Then your organisation approves of the principle of perpetrating overtime?—No, we want to abolish overtime as much as we possibly can. None of our men are in favour of working overtime. If they could get done at 6 o'clock at night they would feel more satisfied than working overtime. There is one particular firm that works overtime week after week, and every morning they have a 4 o'clock start, and work till 8 o'clock at night, that is a 16 hour day. They do that day after day. It is a constant occurrence with few exceptions.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

18 February 1892.]

MR. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Thursday, 18th February 1892.

PRESENT :

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE.

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF DERBY, K.G. (CHAIRMAN).

The Right Hon. Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH,
Bart., M.P.
Mr. J. C. BOLTON, M.P.
Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, M.P.
Mr. T. H. ISMAY.
Professor MARSHALL.

Mr. S. PLIMSOLL.

Mr. H. TAIT.

Mr. T. BURT, M.P., and Mr. E. TROW (Group A)
and the Right Hon. LEONARD H. COURTNEY,
M.P., Mr. M. AUSTIN and Mr. G. LIVESEY
(Group C.) also attended.

Mr. GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,081. We understand that you represent the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, is that so?—Yes. I appear at the desire of the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, an institution comprising 24 affiliated ship-owners' associations, and representing every important seaport in the United Kingdom, in consequence of the statements made by Mr. Plimsoll in his evidence given on the 26th January 1892 before the Labour Commission.

14,082. I understand you have on a previous occasion given evidence on behalf of the ship-owners?—Yes, before the Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea, I prepared the main statistical evidence placed before that Commission.

14,083. In what year was that?—1884, I think.

14,084. You are also a member of the Local Marine Board for London?—Yes, I have acted for many years as chairman of that body.

14,085. Now will you tell us what are the particular subjects to which you wish to direct our attention?—Yes. Before doing so I would like to point out the great inconvenience of dealing with evidence of the very general character found in Mr. Plimsoll's statements. It would only be reasonable to ask that assertions which reflect on the proceedings of so important a body as the shipowners of the United Kingdom should be supported at the time by at least a certain amount of detailed evidence, and that evidence should be of the most recent procurable date. The special subjects to which I wish to call attention are the following: Loss of life in British *versus* foreign vessels; deck-loading; water-tight compartments; provisions for seamen; sleeping accommodation for seamen; and administration of justice in seaport towns. I shall ask

Earl of Derby—continued.

permission to be allowed to first complete my statement, and afterwards I shall be willing to give any further information that may be desired so far as may be in my power.

14,086. We shall be very happy to hear your statement made in your own way?—I will take the points in the order in which they are dealt with in the evidence given by Mr. Plimsoll.

14,087. Evidence given where?—Before this Labour Commission on the 26th January 1892. The first statement to which I call attention is contained in replies to questions 11,246 to 11,249 inclusive. I do not know that I need trouble the Commission by reading the statements unless it is desired. The first remark I have to make is this: that Mr. Plimsoll speaks of the figures which he placed before the Commission as if they were the figures of to-day. He says it is a fraction over four times as much—that is, the loss of English against foreign shipping; and then at the last he says the average of the figures is one in 66 for the English loss; and then in reply to a question, "How long ago?" he answers, "It was during the time when Mr. Chamberlain was President of the Board of Trade; that is some years ago," but I apprehend there is not much difference "since." Now I will first draw your attention to the words which Mr. Chamberlain actually did use. We have special advantages in connexion with these remarks, because they were not only the subject of a very important speech in the House of Commons, but they were afterwards printed in pamphlet form. The pamphlet was called "Our Sailors," and the part to which I refer reads as follows: Mr. Chamberlain says, "I have endeavoured to find out the loss of life

18 February 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

" in the sea service of other countries, and I have obtained from the Foreign Office certain figures, but I am not sure that implicit reliance can be placed upon them." Then he gives the figures, and he goes on, " I really am not justified in asking the House to rely on these figures, but so far as they go they would seem to show that loss of life is less in foreign sea service than in our own." (*Handing in pamphlet.*) Now I have tried to find out where these figures came from, but I have only been successful in connexion with one country, and that is Italy, and I think I can make that part of the matter clear. Italy is put down in question 11,249 as showing a loss of life of one in 454, and that is contrasted against what is represented as the loss of life in the United Kingdom of one in 66. Now, everything depends upon the basis upon which these figures start. The Italian Government appears to divide its sea-facing population into two categories—those specially employed at sea and those in connexion with naval matters employed on shore, and it makes the number for the year 1888, under the first category, 119,000. Then when you turn to the mercantile marine of Italy you get that set out in an elaborate table to this extent: that the total marine tonnage of Italy is rather over 800,000 tons for the year 1888. Of that 175,000 is steam, and the balance is sail. Now, the loss of life in 1888 is 242. They divide their loss of life into two classes, loss of life from natural causes and loss of life from violence, and the number for 1888, as I have said, is 242. Now, if you turn the 242 into the 119,000 you will get one in 492, and I have no doubt for the time it was taken that that is where the figure 454 came from. Now look for a minute at what that means. The English fleet of mercantile marine is manned on the principle of allowing three men for every 100 tons, both for sail and steam, for the year 1890. The three on the 100 tons is the number over which our life loss is divided. The tonnage of Italy, by their own statement, is a little over 800,000. Man that fleet at three to 100 tons you get about 25,000 men. The figures of 242 are not compared with what they would be in England, three to the 100 tons, but they are compared with 119,000, or seven to the 100 tons. They appear to sweep into their category No. 1 everybody who in any way whatever gets a living on the water. And, therefore, you will see at once that to compare the figures derived from such very different sources is not a matter to which it is possible to pay any attention. That must be my observation with regard to these figures which I adduce. Now then, with regard to one in 66. The history of one in 66 is very easily traced. It appears in Mr. Chamberlain's speech. Mr. Chamberlain produced a table in connexion with this speech which he thus describes: " I now refer to a return presented on the first day of the session numbered C. 3875. It is a return which I may describe as the most complete of any ever presented to Parliament." Then it takes the life loss for 12 years; it divides it into four periods—three years each; and it is

Earl of Derby—continued.

worth noticing that only by dividing it into four periods of three years each can you get any justification for the statement which he makes in the speech, that the loss of life on the whole is tending to increase rather than decrease. If you take those twelve years and put them into six periods of two years each, you can get nothing of the kind. If you put them into two periods of six years each you are no better off. If you put them into three periods of four years each you are no better off. You can only get the justification by dividing them into four periods of three years each. Now, Mr. Chamberlain takes the very worst of those periods. I will not trouble the Commission with the exact figures, but he makes it for the three years 9,553, and then casting that out he gets his one in 66. That is the history. So that it is taken for a period of three years, and it is so constructed in connexion with the table that you can only get it by making that division. I do not know that I need carry that matter any further than this. I hope I am not out of order in using the statement, but it is an extract from a speech made by the President of the Board of Trade before the Chamber of Shipping on a very recent occasion. The representation is " I think it is a subject of great congratulation to everybody, and to shipowners more than to anyone else, that in the year ending June last those same figures"—he was dealing with the one in 66—" show a loss of no more than one in 256, and that the five years last past show a progressive and satisfactory improvement in that direction, which I believe shipowners will welcome more than anyone else," and there I leave that point. The next is on the question of deck-loading, and that commences with the answer to question 11,252. Now, the special point is this: the Act of 1876 prohibits all deck-loading whatever in this country between the 1st of November and the 16th April, with this exception—that we may bring on deck up to three feet deals, battens, and light cargo, but all heavy wood is absolutely forbidden in British ships coming into this kingdom. It is sought in a proposed Act—I do not know whether it has been read a first time, but it has been printed—to make deck-loading of any kind in the winter time absolutely prohibited, and to limit the summer loading to three feet above the main deck, and it is upon a justification or not of this alteration in the law in connexion with the evidence given by Mr. Plimsoll that I wish it to be understood that all my remarks have a bearing. Now we are first introduced to figures which go back to 1836, and we are told that in the three years 1836, 1837, and 1838, compared with 1840, 1841, and 1842, there was a difference between 318 and 918 of life loss; and we are also told previously in question 11,252 that there had been a loss in one year of 200 lives. Now we are further told in question 11,264 of a life loss in connexion with vessels from Quebec. I have the letters which allude to that report, but they refer to a tabular statement, and I have not been able to get the tabular statement, so

18 February 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

that I cannot make any remark upon it. But I make this general remark upon these ancient figures, that they are really nothing whatever to do with the question, the trade is so absolutely altered. In order to assist the Commission I would ask them to turn to the second paper on the set that I have put before them. They will see there in a very condensed form the immense change which has gone on even from 1860. This takes the account of the British and foreign sail and steam vessels that have come into the ports of the United Kingdom, and left outwards in three separate periods divided by 15 years. Now, if you take the first line, you get the British steam. See how that per-centage has run up, 19, 47, 67; and see what has become of the sailing tonnage, 39, 22, 7. And then if you take the steam you will find, to a certain extent in the case of the foreign tonnage, it is doing the same. The steam is 3, 8, 16, and the sail 38, 22, 9, so that any figures going back to an ancient date for the purpose of legislating to-day are absolutely valueless. The one gratifying feature in this is, that notwithstanding all the opposition we are keeping our position as a nation admirably. I leave the paper with the Commission. (*See end of question 14, 198, Table I.*) Now, what is the answer that I have with regard to deck-loading? It is this: there was a return published in 1890, it is headed "Timber-laden ships," it is an exceedingly complete return because it deals with all British vessels, that is, vessels not only connected with the United Kingdom but connected with the British possessions, and it deals also with British vessels in all trades, vessels coming to this country, vessels in our own coasting trade, vessels travelling between ports abroad, say, Pensacola, to Rio and foreign countries, and vessels trading in the colonies locally, so that it really covers the whole of the ground, and that for a period of 17 years. It was prepared by the Board of Trade; it is an exceedingly full document so far as particulars are concerned; it runs to 1889. If you will kindly turn to the next paper I have prepared you will find it dealt with under two forms. First, I deal with it under the numbers of the ships, and on the next page I deal with it as to the loss of life. I would ask the Commission kindly to bear in mind the point I have before me; what does deck-loading prove to the disadvantage of the trade. Now, you will start with 502 vessels; that is the total number, of which I hope you will notice at once that there are only 14 steamers and 488 sailing vessels. Then without reading the whole of the figures for the next dozen lines, which can be looked at afterwards, I point out how some of those vessels foundered; some of them were missing, and in regard to some of them we have no information as to deck cargo, and I also point out how many of them had deck cargo and how many had not. Coming to the line, "Ships bound to ports in U. K.," I there again take 502 in the following way: 205 of them were engaged in trading between ports abroad and in the local trades, and my contention is that no Act of Parliament passed

Earl of Derby—continued.

by the English House of Commons could possibly have touched those vessels; no influence that we could have could be brought to bear upon them. Therefore I excluded them, and that leaves me 297. Of those there was no loss of life in 117, because it is quite possible for a vessel to come to grief without a single life being lost in connexion with it; 86 of the vessels were safe, but there was a casualty on board in 63 cases leading to the loss of one life each; a man fell from aloft, or a man was washed over, or something of that kind. They are all detailed in this Blue Book. That leaves me only 94 in 17 years foundered or missing, and of these 94, 48 had no deck cargo at all. I have included in the vessels carrying deck cargo every vessel that had even four or five logs on; I have given every possible allowance to the deck-loading, and not made a single exception. That is really what we come to look at so far as the ships are concerned—that to deal with deck cargo for 17 years you have to deal with the difference between 48 and 94. But if you turn to the next page and get into the life loss, the figures are more remarkable still. The total life loss is 1,834, of which I ask you to notice again that for the 17 years in steamers the life loss was only 54—recollect that in connexion with the paper I presented to you as to the way in which we are working into steam and away from sail—and the sailing vessel life loss was 1,780. Now the life loss in the 205 vessels travelling abroad that I excluded on the other paper was 503, so that that brings us down to 1,331 lives lost trading to the United Kingdom and round the coast of the United Kingdom in 17 years. Now when you come to look at that what does it tell you? Vessels that carry a deck load lost 554 lives; vessels that had no deck load lost 642; and vessels of which I have no information about a deck load (the record in the Blue Book is "Not stated whether a deck load was carried"—that is the form in which it appears in the report) were 135. Now follow that through—take it with the ships foundered:—The loss of life with a deck load was 94, without a deck load 121. Take it with the ships missing—of course there is a very much heavier loss of life here—carrying a deck load 380; no deck load 494. Take casualties only, carrying a deck load 80; without a deck load 27—and so you get your balance. (*See end of question 14, 198, Table II.*) Now the argument that I draw from that is this, which is the same argument which Mr. Milner Gibson drew in 1862. The first paper in the packet gives you the extract from Mr. Milner Gibson's speech, and is as follows:—"Hansard," vol. 165 (column 1,933). Mr. Milner Gibson (then President of the Board of Trade) said, in introducing the Merchant Shipping Amendment Bill, 1862, in a speech which occupies four columns of "Hansard," and was delivered on March 21st, 1862, *inter alia*, "It was also proposed to repeal other clauses in the Customs Consolidation Act prohibiting the carrying of deck loads in timber ships, which were found to be perfectly nugatory, and to interfere with the fair competition of

18 February 1892.]

MR. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

“ the British with the foreign shipowner.” How it could be said at question 11,259 that without a word of explanation in Parliament this matter was revealed so that neither Parliament, the press, nor the public knew anything at all about it, is marvellous in connexion with the statement of Mr. Milner Gibson that they took off the clauses simply because they found that they were “totally nugatory.” And that is the deduction which I draw from this return made up to the year 1889 by the Board of Trade, and dealing with every ship of every kind which was entitled to a British name, I think the figures are worth studying. With that observation I leave that particular point. The next point upon my list will be the watertight compartments. There we deal with question 11,286. “Is the legislation of which you speak still in force?—” (A.) No, it was swept away in the same manner “as the other.” Now what is the history of this? The Merchant Shipping Act of 1854, which is our great Act, was largely a consolidating Act, and clause 300 contains this instruction, that no steamer is to be allowed to clear unless she has an iron bulkhead before the engine-room and an iron bulkhead abaft it. That was the law. In 1855, the very next year, Lloyd’s Registry of Shipping came out with their new rules for iron vessels, and instead of being satisfied with two bulkheads in the steamers they insisted upon four. The words of the rule I have here: “In addition to the engine-room bulkheads of steamers, all vessels to have two watertight bulkheads, built at a reasonable distance from the ends, to extend from the keel to the upper deck in vessels of two decks, and to the middle deck in vessels of three decks.” That was in the next year. They asked what the Board of Trade did not ask for, in the case of sailing vessels, two bulkheads, and when the Board of Trade asked for two bulkheads for steamers they insisted upon four; and without that they would not give their class. Now we class at Lloyd’s nine-tenths of the shipping. So that when you come to 1862, and have another Act, it can easily be understood why clause 300, in the Act of 1854, was put on one side and repealed, simply because the shipowners and Lloyd’s had gone far ahead of what the Government required. No shipowner would ever think of building an iron or steel vessel without having a collision bulkhead, and without having a bulkhead aft; therefore the necessity having disappeared the clause disappeared. That is just the history of clause 300. The next subject that I take is with regard to provisions. The statements in the evidence are something wonderful. One of them is made in answer to question 11,295: “There is no examination of the food for seamen, but there is a great improvement in the quality, owing to the action that Lord George Hamilton took a year ago.” Then in question 11,299: “Do you think that, taking the merchant service through, there is generally reason to complain of the character of the provisions supplied?” “That is certain,” is the answer; and then comes the statement about the Government

Earl of Derby—continued.

selling the putrid meat, and the men being poisoned by scores and by hundreds. But happily, in answer to question 11,302 that is all qualified by this remark, “I should mislead your Lordship if I wanted you to suppose that that is in existence now.” Now what is Jack’s protection with regard to provisions? When he is shipped before a shipping master, the articles are read over, and to each of those articles is attached the bill of fare for the provisions. This is not done in a perfunctory manner. Being chairman of the local marine board I had one of our officers up the other day, and I said, “Is it a fact that the articles are always read at the table?” He said, “Always, in every case.” Then you start on the voyage. It is quite true there is no inspection, but just think what it means. The vessels that come to the ports in the United Kingdom every year are 350,000 odd, and the vessels that come up our river Thames every 24 hours in the whole year through are 150, and 150 go down, 55,000 in the year. What is Jack’s protection? When he goes to a port there is the consul. When he comes home he is paid off before the shipping master. Then is his time to make any complaint. And I had up before me the gentleman who has charge of that for London, and I said, “During last year, how many complaints did you have?” “Well, sir,” he said, “I should think I had six; two of them, so far as my memory serves me, were complaints finding fault with the provisions; four of them were because they had run short of some particular article.” The usual plan then is to make the sailor a small allowance of a few shillings; they may run short of raisins, or they may run short of some little thing or other, and he is entitled to compensation. That is as far as I can take the question of provisions; it is left with every owner; but I cannot help thinking that if there was any ground whatever for a complaint, which is called here “incessant,” in some way Jack would find out a plan of making his complaint heard. The next point is the accommodation for seamen. Now this, we are told in the answer to question 11,307, “is simply not fit for dogs.” He means a steamer, because he says, “the firemen and engineers will be on one side, and the seamen on the other.” Now it will be noticed there is no time given, no vessel given, nothing by which the thing can be traced. Now what is the position of the shipowner in this matter? Before he can get a register for his ship he has to produce a certificate from the Board of Trade that the accommodation for the seamen is suitable, and the shipowner has this great inducement to make it suitable, that the space so set apart is deducted from his tonnage if it is suitable, and, therefore, he gets a distinct advantage every time he pays dock dues, or light dues, or anything of the kind; and, therefore, it is his interest distinctly to start fair. Now, if you will kindly turn to the last paper, I think you will find what is done after the vessel started. These (*handing in extracts*) are absolute extracts from the report of the port of London sanitary authority for the half-year

18 February 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

ending 30th June 1891: "During the period 7,608 vessels were inspected; 1,985 of these were lying in the river, 1,395 in the Gravesend or lower district, and the remainder in the various docks. Of the whole number only 213, equal to 2·7 per cent., required cleansing in any form." Then he makes this exceedingly important statement: "This is an extremely small per-centage, and moreover a diminishing one, a satisfactory indication of the value of the steady and continuous pressure by the officers of the various port sanitary authorities of the kingdom." Then the report goes on to say that out of the whole number 87·73 per cent. were British. Then it gives a list of the whole number of vessels inspected since the Acts were started. The Acts were started in 1872 and 1875. In London alone they had inspected 331,845 vessels, and they had ordered cleansing in 19,084, that is a little over 5 per cent.; so you see you get a justification for the statement that it is a diminishing one. I happen to have been able to get hold of the report for the Hartlepoons, an important seaport town as you know. There I simply give you the figures showing that this work of inspection is thoroughly taken in hand by the port sanitary authorities. (See end of question 14,198, Table III.) If you see a vessel that you think is not creditable, all that you have to do is to go to the port sanitary authority and let them know, and the business will be attended to at once. I do not know that I can carry any explanation of that point further. That only leaves me one other subject to deal with, and that is the statement made in the answer to question 11,310; it is the question of the administration of justice in seaport towns. You have these words four or five lines down in the answer: "The business of the boards is to hear complaints, very often against seamen." If those words had read "never against seamen," that would have been true, because no seamen is ever brought before a local marine board. The local marine boards are only established to deal with the certificates of officers and engineers, and never sailors. Therefore, whatever may be the constitution Jack is not injured by it, because he is never brought before it. Now, question 11,312 will be my last statement. There we are told: "I was down at Goole a little while ago; there were eleven magistrates, every one of them shipowners." On the 1st of February the "Times" contained this letter from the chairman of the Goole bench of magistrates: "The value of Mr. Plimsoll's evidence may be estimated when I say that three only of the eleven magistrates connected with the Goole court are in any way interested in shipowning; the remaining eight have no interest direct or indirect in the merchant marine." That closes what I have to say in the first instance.

Mr. Ismay.

14,088. I suppose, as a matter of fact, the loss of life at sea is very much less now owing to the introduction of steam?—Immensely; the reduction is a continuing figure throughout every return.

Mr. Ismay—continued.

14,089. And the accommodation is improving?—The accommodation is fixed by the Act at 72 cubic feet per man.

14,090. Beyond that it is improving on the part of owners voluntarily?—I should say distinctly so—there is a tendency distinctly in that direction.

Mr. Tait.

14,091. In quoting Mr. Chamberlain's statement that the loss has been 1 in 66 you made some statements of your own, but you did not give us the outcome of them; would you give us the result of the six periods of two years over the 12 years there taken?—I am reading now from a paper that I prepared and read before the statistical society on "Preventible Loss of Life at Sea." The figures are these: "The Parliamentary Paper (C. 3875) (see end of question 14,198, Table IV.), which has been described by Mr. Chamberlain himself as probably the most complete return of any ever presented to Parliament, will show what can be done if grouping is attempted. The total loss of seamen in 12 years was 35,660. Group it into two periods of six years and you have 18,495 in the first period, and 17,165 in the second"——

14,092. Before you go into the other periods, can you give me the per-centage of the loss upon the whole in those two periods?—No; I could work it out, but I have not got it here.

14,093. Therefore, while you are simply prepared to put them into periods, you are not prepared to question the aggregate statement that the loss was one in 66?—For the particular period which Mr. Chamberlain states it I challenge it, as I challenged it before the Royal Commission, because I showed distinctly that in their second column there was an error. You know they have three columns—"Loss by wreck and casualty," "Drowning when there was no wreck," "Accident when there was no drowning." Now, the second column we found to contain a vital error. The year that we pitched upon was 1881, that was a very bad year, and on the second column the loss appeared as 1,123. That struck some of our Glasgow friends as a tremendous loss, and so they persisted until they got a copy of the way in which that 1,123 was made up. Then we found out that that table was made out by the Registrar-General of Seamen, because I remember rightly, whereas the other table was made out by the Marine Department of the Board of Trade, and, therefore, when you came to compare the two, there was a great over-lapping, a number of duplicates. I have here a paper which shows the correction which was made:—1881, uncorrected, 1,123 seamen lost whose vessel was not damaged; 1881, corrected, 732, and the third column, which stood at 273, was, when it was corrected, brought down to 194. Now my objection to the one in 66 is that the figures that were included in that included the larger figures, the 1,123 and the 273; and therefore, 66 is not a right figure; it has to be corrected by the alterations which were made.

18 February 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait.

Your Lordship, Mr. Scrutton has not come prepared to give us the per-centage of loss according to his own figures; he has only come prepared to state that if you take them over certain periods of two, four, and six years, there is a possibility of Mr. Chamberlain's figures which have been quoted here by Mr. Plimsoll being wrong. He has offered to put in the per-centage based upon the statements which he has just now submitted, and I presume you will give him the opportunity, and that the per-centages upon the aggregate can be put in in contradistinction to the evidence given by Mr. Plimsoll.

Earl of Derby.

Certainly, there can be no objection to that.

The Witness.

I think, perhaps, my Lord, that if Mr. Tait would look at this return, which is an official paper on loss of life at sea, if he would allow me to hand it to him, he would be able to say whether it meets with his requirements; if not, I will prepare it in any form he likes.

Mr. Tait.

I think, under the circumstances, seeing that this witness has come here to controvert statements which have been made by another witness, we may as well have the facts tabulated in the record.

Earl of Derby.

Very well.

The Witness.

That I will take care to do.*

* In fulfilment of this promise Mr. Scrutton, in a letter to the Secretary dated February 23rd, 1892, states as follows:—

"Mr. Chamberlain remarks in the corrected report of his speech in the House of Commons of May 19th, 1884, which he reprinted under the title of 'Our Sailors' (page 10, 1st col.), 'The total loss in the last three years is 9,553, which is the 'highest figure in the series.' The three years in the series named are 1880, 1881, and 1882. On the same page (next column) Mr. Chamberlain says, 'One in 66 for the last three years.'

"The figures 9,553 are made up by the addition of three columns of figures (Return C.—3875).

1. Loss of life by wrecks and casualties.

2. " " drowning, other than wrecks.

3. " " accidents other than drowning.

"The return (296 of July 24th, 1884) which I tendered to Mr. Tait shows that objection being taken by the shipowners to the Returns under columns 2 and 3 as excessive, the Board of Trade consented to the same being printed, and on further examination the Board of Trade reduced the figures 1,123 to 732, and 273 to 194 (see Return 150 of March 17th, 1891.) for reasons which I explained, but they have never performed the same service for the other two years, 1880 and 1882 (of the series of three years, 1880-1-2) although the same errors existed.

"Having now official evidence that the 1881 Return under columns 2 and 3 is erroneous, and knowing that similar errors are contained in the same columns for 1880 and 1882, I successfully assert that the conclusions founded on the first Return are erroneous; and when the Board of Trade (who alone can give the corrected figures for the years 1880 and 1882) supply the necessary information, I will say to what precise extent one in 66 is in error."—G.D.

Mr. Tait.

14,094. Now, I should like to ask you whether you have put the figures mentioned by the present President of the Board of Trade, namely, that the loss now is only one in 256, through a similar analysis to that to which you have put Mr. Chamberlain's figures?—No, for this reason, that we shall not get the return for June 1891, I have no doubt, for six months. The President of the Board of Trade, you see, gets the figures out in his office, but they are not published, and it is impossible at present to check them by any published document.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

Those figures, one in 256, referred to the loss of life by wrecks and casualties.

Mr. Tait.

By wrecks and casualties alone?

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

Yes.

The Witness.

That is the first column.

Mr. Tait.

14,095. Might I ask you as an experienced person whether you consider that three feet of deck-loading is dangerous or not?—I say no, distinctly not.

14,096. In your opinion could there be an advance made upon that with safety?—In summer time, distinctly.

14,097. You think then that in winter time the three feet is sufficient?—I think the three feet is. It is perfectly arguable that three feet makes a safer ship. We bring home a great deal of mahogany on the deck of our ships according as provided by the Act, and I very often say to the captain, "Well, how has the ship been?" and he has said, "As easy as an old shoe, all the better for the load." A sailor will understand me when I say that it gives a nice easy motion to the vessel. We carry two heights of logs of mahogany from Honduras.

14,098. Now, let me refer to Mr. Plimsoll's answer to question 11,295, part of which you quoted, where he said, "there is no examination of the food for seamen, but there is a great improvement in the quality owing to the action that Lord George Hamilton took a year ago." In continuance of your statement upon that you came to question 11,299, and you quoted the words, "That is certain," in reply to a question put by Lord Derby, and then you also quoted Mr. Plimsoll's statement at question 11,302, "I should mislead your Lordship if I wanted you to suppose that, that is in exist-
"ence now." Do you deny that it was certainly proven by those who took an interest in the matter that carrion was being sold by the Government for the British seamen at one period?—I have seen no evidence that justifies that "that carrion was sold by the British Government for seamen." I have seen no evidence for that.

18 February 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

14,099. In the answer to question 11,302, Mr. Plimsoll says, "I should mislead your Lordship " if I wanted you to suppose that that is in " existence now." That was in special reference to carrion?—I know, but you ask me if I admit the thing; "carrion sold by the British Government for seamen." No, I say, certainly not.

14,100. Yes, but the reply of Mr. Plimsoll to Lord Derby was that that was not in existence now, that it was not done now?—Was it ever done?

14,101. Mr. Plimsoll has stated it?—That does not prove it.

14,102. Can you deny it?—I think I may reasonably ask you to show me some evidence of it.

14,103. We have had the evidence from a witness here. It is not for me to prove his evidence, that would be for the witness himself. Now, I wish to know whether the evidence is correct, whether you can deny it?—I have no evidence.

14,104. Therefore you cannot deny it?—No, I do not say that at all. The mere statement that Mr. Plimsoll made it is no evidence to me. I should require to go far beyond that.

14,105. Yes, but naturally when any gentleman gives evidence here, and another gentleman comes here to combat that evidence, we expect, at least I do, I speak for myself, that if you are not able to say that it is not correct we are entitled to take the evidence as being correct?—Certainly not. A gentleman who makes a statement here must be prepared to prove it. The statement is nothing unless there is the proof at the back.

14,106. The Commission, when Mr. Plimsoll gave his evidence, had accepted his statement as being correct, or else in all likelihood they would have attempted to have proved its defect.

Mr. Bolton.

No.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

Mr. Plimsoll did not state it, even.

Earl of Derby.

I think this is a matter of argument.

Mr. Tait.

I just wish to put the question.

Earl of Derby.

Would you not alter the form of that question?

Mr. Tait.

I am in your Lordship's hands. If you suggest any different form to put it I will accept it. I just wish to get to know whether the witness can deny the statement made by Mr. Plimsoll as a matter of fact.

Earl of Derby.

You ask whether he is prepared to deny those statements.

Mr. Tait.

Yes, that is so.

Earl of Derby.

And he says the statements have not been proved, and it is for those who make them to prove them, rather than for those who deny them. That, I think, is it.

The Witness.

Distinctly.

Mr. Tait.

If that is satisfactory to your Lordship it will be so to me. I will not put any further question.

Mr. Bolton.

I think the witness is asked to prove a negative, and I do not see how it is possible that he can do it.

Earl of Derby.

It does come to that.

Mr. Plimsoll.

14,107. You stated in your evidence just now that if the figures included in that return which was quoted by Mr. Chamberlain had been grouped in various ways in which they had not been grouped, they would have given results which would have surprised one, or that they might not have sustained the contention. Are you aware that in that speech of Mr. Chamberlain, and in close contact with what you quote, he said that taking the average for the whole period of 12 years, it was one in 72, which is not so very wide of one in 66. That one in 66 is held up to reprobation, and therefore I ask you whether you read that Mr. Chamberlain said taking the whole period the loss was one in 72?—That is quite true, the words were these—"Well, sir, the proportion of seamen lost to the " total number employed was one in 72 during " the whole period named, and one in 66 for the " last three years."

14,108. But, unfortunately, you did not give the Committee the whole of those words?—I was only dealing with the figure 66.

14,109. I see that the one in 66 was the average for three years, and the one in 72 was the average for the whole period covered by the return?—12 years.

14,110. You speak of the average of the men that are supplied for manning ships as being three for every 100 tons. Do you still say that there are three men put on board for every 100 tons?—Yes, and I can give it you in a very exact form, I think. I have taken it out this morning. You will find it in the 1890 report of the annual statement of shipping. This figure is very valuable when you remember the way in which it is made up. The Board of Trade, in order to get the number of men who are employed, take the number shipped on the first articles when the vessel goes to sea, and

18 February 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Plimsoll—continued.

then as long as that ship remains afloat that number is fixed against her name, so that the figure of the men employed, so far as that particular bit of information is concerned, is an exceedingly reliable figure. Now, the tonnage of the merchant shipping for sail for vessels employed in 1890 is 2,893,573, and the number of men is 84,218, that comes just barely to 3—really 2.91. Then if you turn to steam, the tonnage there is 5,021,764, and the number of men employed 151,890, which is as near three as it is possible to get at.

14,111. I do not dispute at all the accuracy of what you state, only my impression is that I have seen a return recently which gives it at much less than three per 100 tons, but that may be for a particular class of ships, because, of course, the large and fine ships have plenty of men. Then did you see a statement made last week to the effect that the loss of life had been so greatly reduced that it was only one in 256?—I made that statement this morning.

Mr. Plimsoll.

I think that is wrong, because the very last year, the previous year to that, it was in a return moved for last session, it was shown as one in 126. I cannot see how it can have gone down so far, but unfortunately I am not only at issue with the speech in which that occurred, but also with the secretary of the Chamber of Shipping on the point, and I am content to wait for a time to show which is right. I do not think it has been reduced to so large a proportion, though I am glad to believe it has been reduced.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

We are speaking of different matters—the one in 256 as I said to the witness just now applied only to the loss of life by wrecks and casualties.

Mr. Plimsoll.

Then it is not in continuation of the paper.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

No, it is not in continuation of the paper. That paper included all loss of life from causes of all kinds.

Mr. Plimsoll.

14,112. You spoke with incredulity of the loss of life from deck-loading as having been reduced in the three years following deck-loading legislation from 918 to 318?—No, excuse me.

14,113. You did not say so?—Excuse me, I did not throw the slightest doubt upon the correctness of those figures. I said they are so ancient—they go back to 1836.

14,114. They were reported by a Select Committee of the House of Commons appointed in 1843?—I do not question them for a moment.

14,115. When I say that Mr. Milner Gibson said not a single word in Parliament in explana-

U 73293.

Mr. Plimsoll—continued.

tion of the legislation which they were passing through the Act I was speaking from a perusal of "Hansard." I am not aware whether "Hansard" says all that a member says?—The extract which I have read is a quotation from "Hansard."

14,116. In moving for leave to bring in the Bill, which is a stage at which no discussion whatever is taken, I have got those words—those are well in my memory; but then, when moving for leave to bring in a Bill no discussion takes place, and no further reference is made to the subject at any one of the times that it appeared on the agenda paper of the House of Commons?—It was unnecessary after the minister had said that the regulation was totally nugatory. What more was necessary; that was surely sufficient?

14,117. Yes, if you accept that statement as conclusive, but you are aware perhaps that a report was made by Messrs. Janson and Wakefield 10 years afterwards, in which they stated that the effect of that repeal was to quadruple the loss of life from deck-loading?—I have not been able to get that tabulated statement. I have asked Mr. Janson for it. I saw him yesterday. Until I have looked at it I shall not be able to pronounce an opinion upon it.

14,118. I shall be very happy to furnish you with a copy of it. I will bring it up to the city one day when I am there?—Thank you, I am very much obliged to you.

14,119. I am astonished to find that it was never presented to Parliament. It was included in the report of the Commission on Unseaworthy Ships, but it was not presented to Parliament as a parliamentary paper, which I should have thought would have been done with a paper of that great importance. You speak of clause 300 in the Customs Clauses Consolidation Act as having been swept away, or rather you quote me as speaking of it as having been swept away, and you say it was not necessary, because Lloyd's not only required the two bulkheads which the Act of Parliament provided, but that it required four. Well, so far I think Lloyd's have been far ahead and done well, but then I suppose you would admit that a rule at Lloyd's is not so conclusive as an Act of Parliament?—Very nearly. You cannot get the class without it.

14,120. I put it to you like this, then; you said a little while ago that you have nine-tenths of the shipping under your classification. That I believe to be quite true, but what about the tenth which is not; under your classification there is nothing to prevent a shipowner building those ships without any bulkheads whatever, is there?—Except his own common sense.

14,121. I mean there is no law at any rate?—No, it is not necessary; the shipowner does not want a law; you cannot find a ship without a collision bulkhead.

14,122. I cannot tell anything about that, and I question whether anybody can without a more exhaustive survey than has been attempted, but at any rate there is one-tenth not provided for, and that appears to me to be a very large pro-

E e

18 February 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Plimsoll—continued.

portion?—No, one-tenth not classed at Lloyd's, that is all.

14,123. And, therefore, not subject to Lloyd's rules?—Quite so, but it does not say that they have no bulkheads.

14,124. You quote Lloyd's rules as sufficient to act upon, but I want to point out to the Commission that Lloyd's rules leave outside their operation one-tenth according to your own statement, that is all. When you speak of 300,000 ships coming into our ports per annum, and 150 coming up the Thames daily, I suppose you are quite aware that a vast number of those would not need any examination or survey in the matter of food?—Why not?

14,125. Why, they are coasting vessels, and so on, and vessels below 100 tons?—But why not?

14,126. I do not know; I must ask in common sense why should they?—Their lives are just as valuable—they are men.

14,127. Yes, but the necessity is not so great; it would never be attempted to survey all vessels under 100 tons, would it?—Sometimes they are a month at sea, those sailing ships.

14,128. If they are a month at sea I should think it would be desirable. Are you aware that there is a very careful inspection of food at our gaols, and our asylums, and our prisons, and in the store supplied to the army, and the stores supplied to the Royal Navy; are you aware that those provisions are all very carefully inspected?—Yes.

14,129. And that there is an inspection at all our markets; the Corporation of London, for instance, condemn, I believe, between 100 and 200 tons of meat per annum as unfit for food?—Yes.

14,130. Do you not think that it is quite as important that a sailor's food should be inspected as yours should, or mine, because we could go to another market next week if we were dissatisfied with this?—The sailor's food is inspected because his fresh meat comes from the market.

14,131. It is not inspected as it is put on board ship. Should you be surprised to hear that I have been on board ship where an officer has been carefully inspecting every single carcass of mutton in a cargo of over 20,000, and at the same time they are taking in salt meat for the sailors in barrels without any inspection?—Our fresh meat for the sailors is brought direct from the market, so that that meat, whether it goes to my house or on board ship, is inspected.

14,132. I am not talking of fresh meat, I am talking of the salt provisions which are put on board ships. Is it not more important that the sailors' food should be inspected than that the food of the people of London should be inspected?—(No answer.)

14,133. You said something about the sanitary authorities and about the excellence of the work which is being done. There is a great deal of good work being done, I am very thankful to say, but are you aware that the port sanitary authorities are themselves complaining that they have not sufficient legal power, and that they

Mr. Plimsoll—continued.

are asking the Board of Trade to give them more power, and that they say that the allowance of 72 or 75 cubic feet per man is not sufficient for breathing purposes?—I think to ask for more power is what you generally find to be the case with all people in that position. I know there is a question of whether the 72 feet ought to be increased. It must be borne in mind that there has been very little legislation since 1854, and I should say personally it is quite an open matter for discussion now with the improved requirements of trade whether the 72 cubic feet might be wisely added to.

14,134. Would you like to take it from me that the port sanitary authorities are complaining that they are insufficiently equipped for the work that they have to do, and that they are asking for further powers?—Yes, very likely they are.

14,135. You said with considerable oratorical effect that "the British Government sell carrion for sailors"?—I beg your pardon, I did not catch the question.

14,136. You spoke of the British Government selling carrion for sailors?—I took Mr. Tait's words.

14,137. I did not say that they sold it for sailors, but that they sold it I prove. A return of such sales was moved for by me and granted, which showed that scores, and for aught I know the return went to hundreds of tons, were sold, 14 lots of which were sold at Cardiff; at North Shields 6 I think; 14 at Plymouth, I fancy, but I will not put the figures to you just now; there were lots sold in such towns as Plymouth, Cardiff, Bristol, Portsea, Portsmouth, North Shields, and so on. That meat all went to the ports, and was all bought by people who were ships' husbands. Now, although they did not give enough for it to be good meat, they gave enough, you know, to make it quite impossible that they could sell it for manure, they gave too much money for that. Are you aware what the Corporation of London get for the condemned meat which they dispose of?—No.

14,138. Will you take it from me that they get 1½d. a stone of 8 lbs.; they extract the fat for candles and soap, and the rest is made into manure at the rate of 1½d. for 8 lbs. None of the meat which is in that return which I moved for in the House of Commons produced less than 1d. a lb., and some of it as much as 1½d., which you see is a great deal more than the price got by the Corporation of London. The buyers of that meat could not afford to sell it for manure at that rate. It was bought at these ports, and by ships' husbands, and I think the inference is irresistible. Would you be surprised to hear that the chief storekeeper at Deptford admitted to me on one occasion that they had sold meat which had been in barrel 20 years?—If you say so I will take it from you.

14,139. I say it?—That that went on board a merchant ship?

14,140. No, I do not say that, because they do not know what becomes of it. That is the important part I think that they took no

18 February 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

Mr. *Plimsoll*—continued.

measures to prevent fraudulent people from foisting these goods off on board ship. I do not imagine for a moment that the Government did sell them to go on board ship?—Do you imagine that that 20-year barrel did go on board of a ship?

14,141. I beg your pardon?—Do you imagine that that barrel which had not been opened for 20 years did go on board ship?

14,142. I should not imagine it would. I only quoted that to show that some of the meat is sold which at any rate has been in the barrels for very many years. Would you be surprised to hear that the Government some years ago tried to prevent this meat going on board ship, which I suppose they would not have done unless they had pretty good evidence that it did go on board ship. Many of the barrels were stamped with a stencil mark when sold "unfit for food," and others were sold without any such qualification. That I have seen myself. I should have been glad to have produced a witness who went down once to buy all this bad meat for me. I meant to have sent a portion of it to every one of Her Majesty's Ministers?—But you did not sell it to a shipowner.

14,143. No, I could not, it was withdrawn when they found whom he came from?—That is what I am jealous of—that it goes on board ship—that is what I have got no evidence of up to the present moment.

14,144. Evidence! Well, when it is sold to people at Cardiff, and Bristol, and Plymouth, and Shields, and so on, who are engaged in provisioning ships, you may call it evidence or reject it as evidence, but it seems to me very strong evidence. Have you seen a paper issued by Parliament called "Health of Crews"?—No, I have not seen that.

Mr. *Plimsoll*.

All the cases which you took exception to and many more deplorable cases are there, and certified for, not by outside people, but by officers of the Board of Trade, writing to the Board of Trade, such as Dr. Spooner and many other names like that. I think I have asked as many questions as have occurred to me while you were talking.

Professor *Marshall*.

14,145. In comparing the loss of life among sailors belonging to different nations has any allowance been made for the difference in character of the seas which they traverse. Is the Mediterranean, for instance, less tempestuous than the seas which the British sailors generally traverse?—I should not think that there was much in that. You get heavy weather in the Mediterranean, not such heavy weather, of course, as you do in the North Atlantic, still you do get heavy weather. But I have no data upon which these other figures were made, excepting this Italian statement, and that I have endeavoured to unearth as far as I could. The basis of calculation is altogether different, and therefore I do not attach any practical importance to the figures which are the result of it. I

Professor *Marshall*—continued.

think you must compare things that are equal, or as nearly equal as possible.

14,146. With reference to your special remarks about the Italian sailors, I was thinking of experiences during a winter in Sicily. Would you say that there was anything like as much bad sea on the coast of Sicily, say, in the winter, as on the coast of Great Britain?—My trade is only with the West Indies. I never have anything going to the Mediterranean, and, therefore, my opinion would not be worth much, it would be merely a general opinion.

14,147. You have given us the number of ships which have foundered, ships missing, &c., carrying deck load, and without deck load, and I noticed that the number without deck load is always a little larger than that with deck load, but what per-centage of the total number carrying deck load foundered, can you tell me that?—It is very quickly worked out:—foundered with deck load 163 out of about 387.

14,148. My point is, can you give me the total number of timber-laden ships which leave English ports with deck loads, and the total number that leave without?—No.

14,149. Then these figures do not show that the per-centage of deck-laden ships which are lost is not greater than the per-centage of those which are not deck laden?—No, I have no information. You see it is a very large trade, and I do not know how I could get the number of ships.

14,150. Should you think that nearly a half carried deck loads?—I would not venture an opinion. This Blue Book does not give the whole loss over a very large trade for 17 years.

14,151. My point is that the aggregate loss in deck-laden ships is of no statistical value by itself for your argument. What we want is the per-centage of deck-laden ships which are lost compared with the per-centage of non-deck-laden ships which are lost?—If you will allow me I will see if I can get that, and if I can I will forward it to the secretary. It is not very easily obtainable.*

Sir *Michael Hicks-Beach*.

14,152. What is the interpretation of the word "ship" in this return?—The word used at the heading of the table is "British."

14,153. What is the interpretation of the word, how small a vessel?—Anything.

14,154. A barge?—No, a barge would not appear.

14,155. A lighter?—No, a lighter would not appear, but a small sloop would appear, for instance, with four or five men in her, particularly with reference to the ports abroad. I see there are a lot of little vessels of that kind. It takes everything evidently.

14,156. Are there many small vessels employed in our coasting trade which carry deck loads?—Yes, I should say so. I see them constantly.

* In reply to a letter (dated June 3rd, 1892) from the Secretary requesting this information, the witness states, "I found it quite impossible to obtain the table indicated."—G. D.

18 February 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued

14,157. Would any large proportion of the losses given in this return be found among those vessels?—No, because the loss in the coasting trade is very small out of the whole figure.

14,158. Now, the return only applies to British timber-laden ships, I think?—That is all, understanding "British Possessions" by "British," as well as the United Kingdom.

14,159. Ships subject to our laws?—No, vessels belonging to the colonies.

14,160. In dealing with this return you excluded ships trading between ports abroad, and ships in local trades abroad, amounting in all to 205?—Yes.

14,161. You did that as being impossible to be dealt with under any law passed by the British Parliament. Why did you do that? They are all British ships?—Yes, but I fail to see how the British Parliament can deal with a vessel, say, going from Pensacola to Rio.

14,162. Being a British vessel would not that vessel have to get a clearance from the British consul?—I never go to Pensacola, therefore I could not say.

14,163. But it is so, is it not?—I do not know what the American law is.

14,164. Has not a British vessel sailing from a foreign port to get a clearance from the British consul?—It does not come before me, very likely. I am very ignorant on that.

14,165. Assuming it to be so?—Yes, I am quite ready to assume it.

14,166. Is it not obvious that if the law passed by the British Parliament forbade the British consul to give a clearance to a deck-laden ship, that that ship could not clear with a deck load?—On the facts as stated there must be an inspector to see about it.

14,167. Therefore, on the facts as stated, British law could apply to such ships as you have exempted from this return?—I am not sure whether it could be practically worked. Take St. John's to Monte Video, a British law as against a Canadian law, that would never do.

14,168. I was speaking of a foreign port?—Exactly.

14,169. Where there are British consuls?—Then this question occurs, supposing it is an American cargo, and they have to pay a higher rate of freight, would not the Americans be up in arms? It is very difficult.

14,170. Do you consider that there would be any great difficulty in inspecting the provisions served out to the crews on board of ocean-going ships only?—There would be this difficulty, we get our stores on board within the last 24 hours, and it would be absolutely essential that you should have a staff to do the work without any delay to the steamers. Many of the stores are exceedingly minute. Our own steamers go away for two months with 20 hands. What is it? a mere bagatelle, you know, and unless we had a man almost at our beck and call our ship would be delayed and there would be constant difficulty. My own impression is, that the operations of the natural law, and the captain's

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

superintendence, and the paying off of the men before the shipping master, and the absence of complaints, is as far as one is called upon to go.

14,171. Have you any figures that would show the total number of ocean-going ships clearing from London or from British ports in the course of the year?—Yes, I could give that. That will be found in the annual statement.

14,172. You have not got those figures with you?—No, I have not got them here.

14,173. Of course they are a very small number as compared with the 300,000 that you spoke of?—I would not say that, London stands for 55,000.

14,174. 55,000 including everything, including all foreign and coasting trade?—Yes.

14,175. The ocean-going ships are very few, and must be very few, must they not, as compared with the others?—If you limit it. For instance, many of the large steamers go across to Antwerp. You would not call that, on the face of it, an ocean-going trade, but it is an increasing trade; several of the large steamers go across there now and to Hamburg. We go to Hamburg every month.

14,176. Do you mean that you start from London to go to Hamburg, and then you go an ocean voyage?—No, I come back here.

14,177. That is not an ocean-going ship?—Yes, for the purpose she is the same ship.

14,178. She does not clear for an ocean voyage?—No, but she has exactly the same crew, and exactly the same food; the circumstances are precisely the same.

14,179. Excepting that the time is very short?—Except that the time is very short, but then she always has surplus stores on board. All that we do is to put a little fresh meat on. She would certainly have some surplus stores.

14,180. Then you would contend that there would be the same reason, whatever reason there may be, for inspecting provisions on board the smallest coaster going the shortest voyage, as there would be for a sailing vessel leaving for a voyage to Australia?—I do not see how you can escape from it, they are men, and they have to be fed.

Mr. Ismay.

14,181. As regards this food question, you consider that as there are so few complaints that satisfaction must exist?—Certainly.

14,182. Take a sailing ship, which is going to a foreign port; they very often make an intermediate voyage, for instance, a vessel goes to Australia, from Australia she goes up to San Francisco, and may come home or may not; it is not usual to supply such a ship for the entire round, is it? They take in supplies abroad, do they not?—Yes.

14,183. There would be a difficulty about inspection there?—Yes, but there is always the consul of the port. Jack can appeal to the consul if he has any complaint.

18 February 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ismay—continued.

14,184. They take on fresh supplies in a foreign port?—Yes, always.

14,185. There is no inspection there?—No.

Mr. Bolton.

14,185a. With respect to that tenth of the shipping not registered at Lloyd's, do you know to what class of shipping that tenth appertains?—No. I have heard the statement made officially. I should imagine small tonnage.

14,186. Is it not the fact that some of the large steam lines are not registered at Lloyd's?—They generally register to begin with, so as to get the advantage of the special survey, and then when the first examination comes, when they are four years old, they drop it. All the P. and O. boats are built under inspection, and take it for the four years.

Earl of Derby.

14,187. I think I understand you to say that whatever the loss of life may have been in former times, it is now rapidly diminishing, in consequence of the substitution of steam for sailing ships?—Precisely.

14,188. As a rule, they are larger and safer?—Precisely.

14,189. I understand you also to say that, as far as your figures go, there appears to be no evidence to show that deck-loading is especially dangerous?—That is my contention.

14,190. You, of course, admit that there may be an immoderate amount of deck-loading?—Yes.

14,191. But that moderately done it is not a dangerous practice?—Exactly.

14,192. As regards watertight compartments I understood you to say that the provision which shipowners voluntarily make is larger than anything which the law has required of them?—Exactly.

14,193. Therefore you think there is no necessity for enforcing what they are quite willing to do, and habitually do of their own accord?—Exactly.

14,194. Now, with regard to the question of provisions. I do not understand you to object in principle to an inspection of the provisions which are put on board for the crews, but only to suggest some practical difficulties in the way of working it?—Exactly.

14,195. In regard to the sleeping accommodation, I think you have said that it seems to you to be an open question whether as ships are built larger now, and fewer hands are required in comparison with the tonnage, larger space might not be required for each man?—Yes, whether the 72 cubic feet might not be extended to a little more. I have no doubt many owners do give more than 72 cubic feet per man.

Mr. Austin.

14,196. Have you had any practical knowledge of navigating a ship?—No, none whatever.

Mr. Austin—continued.

14,197. Therefore you can give no opinion as to whether 3 feet of deck-loading would interfere with the navigation or endanger the safety of a ship in rough weather?—In this way, that I am the registered managing owner of all my vessels, and that I am in constant communication with the captains, and I get their opinions; that is the extent of my knowledge.

14,198. Are you aware that there are captains, masters of vessels, who have stated that it is dangerous to the navigation of ships?—I have not seen the statement.

(I.)

TABLE showing VARIATION in SAIL and STEAM TONNAGE by comparing the years 1860, 1875, and 1890.

Compiled from "Progress of British Merchant Shipping," 1890, issued with the authority of the Board of Trade, page 8, Tables 3 and 4.

UNITED KINGDOM. FOREIGN TRADE.			
Per-centages of British and Foreign Sailing and Steam Vessels entered and cleared with cargoes only at ports in the United Kingdom in each of the years 1860, 1875, 1890.—			
	1860.	1875.	1890.
British—Steam	19·08	47·13	67·04
Sail	89·08	22·08	6·81
Total	58·16	69·21	73·85
Foreign—Steam	8·49	8·64	16·44
Sail	38·85	22·15	9·71
Total	41·84	30·79	26·15
	100	100	100

The result is to show the rapid change which is taking place from the old sailing tonnage to steam tonnage as a mode of conveyance.

All statistics of loss of life show the greatly increased safety of steam over sail.

(II.)

RETURN OF BRITISH TIMBER LADY SHIPS, 1873 to 1889 inclusive (17 years), arranged under the following heads—

Foundered, missing, or meeting with casualties attended with loss of life or otherwise.

And further classified as follows.—

Bound to ports in the United Kingdom.
In the United Kingdom coasting trade.
Bound between ports abroad.
In the Foreign and Colonial local trades.

TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS (Steam, 14; sail, 488)	503
Foundered	283
Missing	103
Casualties (no loss of vessel)	116
	503
WITH DECK CARGO:	
Foundered	163
Missing	46
Casualties (no loss of vessel)	75
	284
WITH NO DECK CARGO:	
Foundered	76
Missing	36
Casualties (no loss of vessel)	28
	140
NO INFORMATION AS TO DECK CARGO:	
Foundered	44
Missing	21
Casualties (no loss of vessel)	13
	78
	283 103 116 508

18 February 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SCRUTTON.

[Continued.]

SHIPS BOUND TO PORTS IN U.K.	-	284	
In U.K. coasting trade	-	13	
		297	
Trading between ports abroad	-	124	
In local trades, abroad	-	81	
		205	
		502	

SHIPS MISSING: LOSS OF LIFE:			
Carrying deck load	-	380	
Without deck load	-		494
No information as to deck load.	-		86

205 ships would therefore have been outside the operation of any Act of Parliament passed in England.

Of the remainder, 297, trading to ports in the U.K. or in the U.K. coasting trade—

In	-	117 vessels there was not any loss of life.
In	-	86 the vessels were safe, but there was a loss of life by casualty (in 63 cases of 1 life each).
Leaving	-	94 foundered or missing in 17 years, of which 48 had no deck cargo.

LOSS OF LIFE IN CASUALTIES ONLY:			
Carrying deck load	-	80	
Without deck load	-		27
No information as to deck load.	-		20

Total—With deck load	-	554	
Without deck load	-		642
No information as to deck load.	-		135
			1,331

The argument to be drawn from the above table is that ships without deck loads have as large a life loss as ships with deck loads, thus confirming the opinion expressed by Mr. Milner-Gibson in 1862.

The above table includes every ship having anything that might be claimed as deck cargo, say 4 or 5 logs of wood.

The loss of life for the 17 years amounts to	-	1,834
Of which steam shows a loss of life of	-	54
Sailing vessels	-	1,780

Loss of life in ships outside of English control	-	503
" trading to U.K. and coastwise	-	1,331
" in ships carrying deck load	-	554
Without deck load	-	642
No information as to deck load.	-	135

(III.)
EXTRACTS FROM REPORT OF THE HARTLEPOOLS PORT SANITARY AUTHORITY.

Inspected during 1891—British	-	973
Foreign	-	669
Re-visits	-	366
Total	-	2,008
Ordered to be cleansed—British	-	67
Foreign	-	40
Total	-	107

SHIPS FOUNDERED: LOSS OF LIFE:		
Carrying deck load	-	94
Without deck load	-	121
No information as to deck load.	-	29

(IV.)

LOSS OF LIFE FROM BRITISH SHIPS.

LIVES LOST by DROWNING or other ACCIDENT in BRITISH MERCHANT SHIPS registered in the UNITED KINGDOM. Lives of Passengers lost are distinguished from Lives of Crews lost.

Calendar Years 1871 to 1882 inclusive.

YEAR.	Masters and Seamen employed.	Lives lost.					Per-centages and Proportions.		Lives lost in Merchant Ships registered in United Kingdom.		
		Drowned.			Seamen lost by Accident other than Drowning.	Total Number lost by Drowning and other Accidents.	Lives lost by Drowning of Persons employed.	Lives lost by Drowning and other Accident of Persons employed.	Crew.	Passengers.	Total.
		Masters and Seamen lost in Wrecks and Casualties.	Seamen lost when Vessel was not damaged.	Total.							
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	
1871	218,592	1,465	978	2,461	279	2,740	1'13 or 1 in 80	1'25 or 1 in 80	2,740	18	2,758
1872	222,838	2,163	973	3,135	327	3,462	1'41 or 1 in 71	1'56 or 1 in 64	3,462	71	3,533
1873	220,362	1,789	1,032	2,821	291	3,112	1'28 or 1 in 78	1'41 or 1 in 71	3,112	1,167	4,279
1874	220,963	2,277	1,040	3,317	222	3,539	1'50 or 1 in 67	1'63 or 1 in 61	3,539	572	4,111
1875	216,420	1,209	987	2,286	306	2,592	1'06 or 1 in 95	1'2 or 1 in 83	2,592	195	2,787
1876	215,670	1,650	1,033	2,683	307	2,990	1'24 or 1 in 80	1'39 or 1 in 72	2,990	178	3,168
1877	215,327	1,233	1,077	2,310	340	2,650	1'08 or 1 in 92	1'24 or 1 in 81	2,650	208	2,858
1878	212,534	1,151	922	2,083	279	2,352	'97 or 1 in 104	1'1 or 1 in 91	2,352	60	2,392
1879	210,476	1,238	1,023	2,261	269	2,530	1'13 or 1 in 89	1'25 or 1 in 80	2,530	213	2,743
1880	210,020	1,021	1,001	2,022	291	2,273	1'28 or 1 in 78	1'42 or 1 in 71	2,273	98	2,371
1881	200,461	2,358	1,123	3,475	273	3,748	1'66 or 1 in 60	1'79 or 1 in 56	3,748	231	3,979
1882	212,312	1,810	1,036	2,846	286	3,132	1'2 or 1 in 83	1'33 or 1 in 75	3,132	63	3,195
Total lives lost in } 12 years		10,907	12,233	23,180	3,630	26,810	—	—	26,810	3,022	29,832

Note.—The Returns from which column 1 is compiled include a number of men employed in fishing vessels; and the Returns on which columns 8 and 9 are founded include some duplicate entries, and a number of deaths in fishing vessels. A detailed examination shows that these errors balance each other and that the proportions given in columns 7 and 8 are therefore accurate.

Board of Trade, Marine Department,
5th February 1884.

T. H. FARRER.

The witness withdrew.

18 February 1892.]

Mr. WILLIAM JAMES BRETT.

[Continued.]

Mr. WILLIAM JAMES BRETT called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,199. You are connected with the South Side Labour Protection League, are you not?—Yes.

14,200. Are you an official of that body?—I am the president.

14,201. That association, I think, represents the men employed in the grain department of the Surrey Commercial Docks?—Yes.

14,202. I suppose not all of them are members of the League?—The whole of the men employed in the grain department are members of the League, except 100 trimmers who belong to the Union.

14,203. How many men are there engaged in this department?—There are about 600 men who follow the work for a living.

14,204. Corn porters?—Corn porters, trimmers, weekly men, weighers (warehousemen), and men engaged on the company's craft doing the duties of lightermen in the docks.

14,205. And in addition to those there is a certain number of casual hands employed?—Yes.

14,206. How many?—On an average about 70 ticket men taken on daily.

14,207. Now, do the corn porters earn good wages?—Some of them.

14,208. What makes the difference; are they paid by the job?—By the piece, per 100 quarters.

14,209. Is the work regular or irregular?—Very irregular.

14,210. And is there a good deal of competition to get it?—Quite so.

14,211. What are the weekly men paid?—The weekly men are paid 2*s.* per week, and 6*d.* per hour overtime.

14,212. And the trimmers and casual men?—They are paid 6*d.* per hour, and 8*d.* per hour overtime.

14,213. The crane drivers?—27*s.* per week.

14,214. The quay corn porters?—By the piece, per 100 quarters.

14,215. Is there a fund for assistance in case of sickness?—Yes.

14,216. By whom is that managed?—By the officials of the dock company.

14,217. Do the men contribute to it?—Only the minority of the whole of the employes belong to it; between 700 and 800 all told.

14,218. And is there a superannuation scheme also?—Yes, but that does not apply to others than the head officials, the department officials, clerks, and foremen.

14,219. What are the hours?—In discharging vessels from 8 a.m. to dusk in winter, and from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. in summer. They are the normal hours. The warehouse work carried on by the weekly men is sometimes prolonged.

14,220. Overtime, you say, has been reduced?—Greatly reduced since the dock strike.

14,221. From what cause?—From the disposition on the part of the piece-workers, the persistent refusal in some cases on the part of the piece-workers to perform it.

Earl of Derby—continued.

14,222. Are accidents frequent?—They are unfortunately too frequent, but comparatively not so frequent as elsewhere.

14,223. Now in March 1889 were the wages of the corn porters lowered?—In March 1889 the wages of both sections of the corn porters were lowered.

14,224. Then as we know there followed a strike; did the men regain the former rate of wages?—The former rate with one exception.

14,225. What was that?—A deduction of 1*s.* per 100 quarters made by the company to compensate them for the extra wear and tear of runner caused by the friction of the steam barrel.

14,226. Now you have told us the number of men employed. Do you mean that that number of men get work all the year round, or only for a time?—They follow the work all the year round, but the work fluctuates. Sometimes there are 800 to 900 men employed in that department, at other times 100 including all.

14,227. What is the cause of this fluctuation?—A seasonal cause would be one, and in my opinion the rise and fall of markets, and the fact that competition is so keen that men can be regulated to the demands of the trade.

14,228. Have you anything to suggest as to the means of getting rid of this great irregularity of employment?—I would prohibit overtime. I would municipalise the docks and bring all docks under one control and spread the work thereby.

14,229. You have told us nothing about labour-saving machinery. Is that employed to any considerable extent?—Labour-saving machinery is employed to a very great extent in the Surrey Commercial Dock. There are times when in the grain department it might displace 100 men out of the section I am speaking for.

14,230. Has any objection been taken to that by the men?—Representations have been made to the officials of the company very recently that as they had to stand by all the year through some consideration might have been given to them, and the matter is now under consideration by the officials of the company.

14,231. What do you mean by some consideration being given to them? Do you mean that they should have some allowance when they are not at work?—That after a standing by for perhaps a week or a fortnight, and an order is given to the company to land a quantity of grain, they ask that they should have some share of it in recognition of their standing by and being liable to be called upon to do work which the machinery could not do, viz. the clearing of ships. There are instances in which the machinery could not be put into operation in clearing vessels.

14,232. Now, are all the men employed by the company members of the Union?—A majority of them are not.

14,233. Do union and non-union men work together?—There is still great bitterness. The union men have used every inducement, held out every inducement possible inviting the others

18 February 1892.]

Mr. WILLIAM JAMES BRETT.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

to join with them, but the non-union men reject all advances, and consequently friction, but not to any great extent, often occurs, not to any palpable extent, but the feeling is bitter, I think.

14,234. Does the company draw any distinction between unionists and non-unionists?—Not that I am aware of.

14,235. Do the members of the Union make any difficulty about working with non-union men?—No, they have faithfully kept the agreement of 1889.

Mr. Tait.

14,236. Were you in the great dock strike?—Yes.

14,237. Do I understand you aright, in answer to Lord Derby, to say that the Surrey Commercial Dock have rightly adhered to the Mansion House agreement?—I think so.

14,238. You say that accidents are frequent in the Surrey Commercial Dock. Have you any remedy to suggest for their prevention?—Yes, I would say on behalf of the company that the gear and tackle is all that can be desired, but the gangways placed by the ships might be greatly improved.

14,239. Do the gangways belong to the shipowner or to the dock company?—It is the ship's duty, I believe, to place the gangway—they usually do it.

14,240. Therefore your complaint would be against the shipowner, not against the dock company?—Yes. Again accidents have occurred through defective sacks having been sent by receivers of grain, which are not sufficiently strong to bear the weight in the ascent. I think accidents occur more frequently from that cause than from any other.

14,241. Who contracts for the supply of the sacks—the shipowner?—No, the receiver of the grain usually sends his sacks.

14,242. That is the consignee?—The consignee or the receiver—the buyer from the consignee.

14,243. You say that you would prohibit overtime. What means would you adopt to do so?—By Act of Parliament.

14,244. Would you penalise them?—Yes.

14,245. Put a penalty upon the master for working his men?—Yes, and if possible upon the man.

14,246. And a penalty upon the man for working?—If possible.

14,247. There is no impossibility about it; if you say Parliament shall penalise it, it will have to be done?—I would impose a penalty.

14,248. You spoke of municipalising the docks. Have you ever made a calculation what it would cost to do so?—No, I am not sufficiently commercialised, but I would in the first place take the water from the dock before a valuation was put upon the dock—I would value the dock without the water.

14,249. Would you put them under imperial or under local control?—That is a matter of detail. I would put docks under local control

Mr. Tait—continued.

as distinct from railways which travel through so many localities.

14,250. Where would you purpose raising the money from—by local rates or by loans from the Imperial Parliament?—That would depend upon the valuation—that would be the first consideration.

14,251. But irrespective of the valuation the money would have to be raised?—Yes.

14,252. Where would you get it from? Would you tax the people locally? Would you tax London, for instance, if you municipalised its docks?—For the municipalisation of the docks if a tax had to be imposed I would tax the people locally.

14,253. At one time were the men employed in the Surrey Commercial Dock a large majority of your Union?—Yes, as at present, the pieceworkers are nearly all union men. A great portion of the company's weekly servants like myself are not, because they were not out on strike.

14,254. Might I ask you whether you are a member of the Dockers' Union?—Not of the Dockers' Union—of the South Side Labour Protection League.

14,255. You say that there is a superannuation fund for the officers and the heads of departments which does not apply to the ordinary workers. Am I to understand that the ordinary worker is debarred from contributing to that superannuation fund?—Yes; not only the ordinary worker but weekly servants, who have been 30 years in the company's employ, in confidential positions, semi-clerical positions, such as corn weighers—I am a corn weigher myself—there are men who have been 20 years certainly as corn weighers, and 30 years in various grades of employment in the dock, and they are debarred.

14,256. From participating in this superannuation fund?—Yes.

14,257. Would the men be willing to contribute if they had the opportunity of doing so?—The non-union men would; but I am of opinion that the union men would decline contributing to a superannuation scheme put forward by any private firm.

14,258. Now, how long have you been a dock labourer?—All my life. My father was a corn porter.

14,259. Statements have been made here that one of the reasons for the intermittent employment in the docks is the intemperance of the men; might I ask you whether from your experience that is correct?—My experience is that the men who come and go are intemperate men; but the majority of the men employed in gangs at the Surrey Commercial Dock compare with any body of men favourably, and if you could stand outside of the dock gate from about 10 to 11 in the morning, as the allowance went in to the men, you would see in the majority of cases a large can of tea and a small can of beer going in.

14,260. Have you worked in any other docks than the Surrey Commercial Docks?—No; but I worked for a corn merchant once, and traveled

18 February 1892.]

Mr. WILLIAM JAMES BRETT.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

the country seeing to the discharge of grain cargoes.

14,261. Might I take your statement to be general?—General as applied to corn working in the docks.

Mr. Bolton.

14,262. By prohibiting overtime would you put a stop to the work, or would you use relays of workmen?—If occasion required I would work relays all the 24 hours.

14,263. So that you do not wish to shut out work, but merely that the same men should be prohibited from working more than a fixed number of hours?—Yes, just so.

14,264. You do not anticipate any other advantage from the municipalisation of the docks than that of relieving somewhat the irregularity of the employment?—Yes. I do. I think the docks have a great control over the provisioning of London. I would like to obviate the disasters that occurred, and to prevent the recurrence of the disasters that occurred in 1889. I would not allow private monopolists to have control over the provisioning of this great city.

14,265. What do you mean by the disasters of 1889?—The strike. I consider that the strike was a disaster. I believe strikes would be obviated also.

14,266. Do you mean municipalising the docks rather than that they should be managed by some public authority?—I would prefer municipalisation, but if that is not easily obtainable I would like a public trust—a public body to control it.

14,267. You are aware, of course, that many docks in the kingdom are already managed by public bodies?—Yes.

14,268. Is there not the same irregularity of employment there?—Yes; but I would submit from my meagre information that there are not the same number of docks in those municipalities that there are in London.

14,269. Then your remarks have reference to London?—Yes.

14,270. And to London alone?—To municipalisation generally, but to London particularly.

14,271. Have you any knowledge of the way in which the work is carried on in those places where the docks belong to public trusts, any personal knowledge at all?—No personal knowledge; superficial knowledge. I have been in some of them.

14,272. Which have you been in?—I find some irregularity there existing.

14,273. Really the concentration of management in one trust does not secure regularity of work?—I have never seen concentration of management in any outport; I have seen a municipality have control of a dock, but of a dock only, not docks.

Mr. Ismay.

14,274. In answer to Mr. Tait you said that many of the accidents occurred from the bad gangways that were put on the ships?—Yes.

Mr. Ismay—continued.

14,275. And I think you further said that the shipowners supplied those?—That is my experience in our docks.

14,276. Are you not wrong about that?—I think not.

14,277. You think the shipowners supply them?—I do not know whether it is the shipowners' place or not, but they do supply them. The ship, usually, in the majority of cases, supplies the ladder or the gangways.

14,278. I thought you were speaking of the gangways where the cargo is discharged from?—No, the means of access to the ship.

Mr. Livesey.

14,279. You said that the union men had made every effort to work amicably with the non-unionists?—Yes.

14,280. Can you explain that more fully, what sort of efforts have you made?—I must go back to the strike. There were a number of men who remained in, and assisted in carrying on the dock operations. When the strike ceased the agreement was that the men who were out should go back and work with those already in. That has been faithfully carried out, but the men who remained in are not getting the rate of wage that meets with the approval of the union men, and the union men have on principle, in order to obtain perhaps a better condition for the men, held out every inducement for them to come in with them and join, and let bygones be bygones. The non-union men seem to think, in fact, I have heard some such expression, that they are all right while they keep out of the Union, because they have the company at their side; I do not believe that. We have found every fairness from the company.

14,281. What is your objection to non-union men continuing at work under the conditions with which they are apparently quite satisfied; why should you wish to compel them to come into the Union if they do not wish it?—We do not wish to compel them, we wish to induce them.

14,282. And then you say that though you have made every effort to work amicably with them you have not succeeded, or something of that sort?—Succeeded in a very slight degree, but we hope yet to succeed.

14,283. The long and the short of it is, you want to force them all into the hands of the Union, is that not so?—We would have no pressed man in the Union.

14,284. You would have no pressed men?—No, rather have volunteers.

14,285. If these non-unionists are satisfied with their work cannot you leave them to do their work without any interference at all?—We are obliged to come in contact with them, working side by side, and we use nothing stronger than moral suasion.

14,286. Do they interfere with you at all?—Sometimes we get into a little argument about matters, and in principle they agree with us. I think many regret that they did not take the standpoint we did; I know it, for a fact.

18 February 1892.]

Mr. WILLIAM JAMES BRETT.

[Continued.]

Mr. Livesey—continued.

14,287. They are the men who stood by the company at the time of the strike?—Yes.

14,288. There was no quarrel so far as you were concerned, with the company at that time; you came out in sympathy, did you not?—No; there was a reduction in wage in March 1889, a reduction of about 8 per cent., 1s. out of 12s., made against the quay corn porters, and 1s. out of 15s. for the over-side corn porters. Discontent was felt, it was at a time of great depression. The men, to put it my way, had to knuckle down; they put up with it hoping for an opportunity of getting what they lost back. Three or four weeks before the great dock strike there was a great difficulty in getting a ship discharged because of the steam winches being defective. That ship lay all one day idle, all one Friday, and it was only by the advice given by some moderate men amongst the workers that the men abstained then from making a demand. However, they made a slight demand, and as the steam winches were not available, the company gave them back the shilling in all cases where steam was not available, so that they got a slight concession or a slight portion of what they lost.

14,289. That was about a month before the strike, was it not?—About three or four weeks before the strike. The men went out, and they formulated their demand to the dock officials. The secretary of the dock had a letter in the press about the 21st, or 22nd, or 23rd of August, and he explained in that letter that there was no grievance. I was the instrument through which the men wrote a letter to him, stating that the terms of his letter in the press led them to believe that their demands made to the departmental officials had not been laid before him. I must say to his credit that he answered the letter by return of post, and met a deputation of the men the next day. From that moment negotiations were going on for about three weeks and a half, and the difficulty was that we all wanted to go back together.

14,290. Did not the men go out at the time of the big strike before they made any demand for an increase of pay at this dock?—You must understand the men in these docks did not go out for some weeks, or perhaps a fortnight, after the men on the north side.

14,291. But they did go out?—They did go out.

14,292. And did they go out without making any demand or any request for any increase of wage?—When asked what they were going out for they met the departmental officials, and told them they wanted so and so.

14,293. But they went out first—they struck before they made any demand?—Well, it would only be a matter of minutes.

14,294. It does not matter whether it is minutes, they did do so at any rate; they left their work before they made any demand for an increase of pay?—Before they formulated a demand, but they had been making a demand for weeks—they made it informally by grumbling and discontent.

Mr. Livesey—continued.

14,295. Very well, a certain number of men stayed in?—Yes.

14,296. Would you say those men are paid lower rates of wages now than the unionists?—They are paid the same rate of wages that they have been paid for many years, but they are paid a lower rate of wages than the unionists.

14,297. Are they doing the same work?—No, they are not doing the same work, because the men doing that particular kind of work are almost exclusively non-union men.

14,298. You told me in answer to my first question that they were paid a different rate of wages to the unionists, and you wanted them to join you in order that they might have the same rates of pay. Now, it seems a very strange thing that the company should pay a less rate to the men who stayed in with them, if it is the same kind of work?—We think it very hard on some of our men who went out with us, and who for peace sake on the 14th of September consented to accept the advice of Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. Burns, and the Lord Mayor. We went back although we were prepared to prolong the strike. We think it very hard now. Take myself, for instance, the president of a Union numbering over 3,000. I am getting 24s. a week, and 6d. per hour overtime, and the rule all along the shore is 8d. per hour overtime, and something certainly more than 24s. per week. That is why it is we try to persuade the others to join us, believing that if we make a demand, if we formulate a petition, if the men were all union men, we could get our wages brought up to the recognised standard.

14,299. So then you want these men to join your Union in order that you may make now a demand for an increase of pay?—To make a respectful demand, which we have not the slightest doubt will be granted.

14,300. If you get all these men into the Union then you would make another demand for an increase of pay?—Not a strike nor a demand, we would petition.

14,301. Well, it is the same thing. That is your object. That is the reason why you want to get all these men into the Union?—No, that is not the sole object, that is one.

14,302. Well, what is the other?—Our sole object is believing that we could deal altogether as one man better than we do. We see these men suffer grievances, complaining that they have not the access to the officials of the company that we have through our representatives, and they come to us with complaints even.

14,303. Do you say the non-unionists come to you with complaints?—Yes.

14,304. And yet they will not join you?—We have had one or two, but they are considered amongst the non-union men as defections. There are two or three. If we could get a certain two or three in, I believe, like sheep, all the rest would follow.

14,305. And that would really make your Union a good deal stronger?—I beg your pardon.

18 February 1892.]

MR. WILLIAM JAMES BRETT.

[Continued.]

Mr. Livesey—continued.

14,306. Why will not the non-union men join you, what reason do they give?—I do not like to divine reasons.

14,307. No, and I do not want you to. But what reason do they give; do they give you any reason?—My belief is this, that they think by remaining outside the Union they retain the patronage or support of the company.

14,308. They are the men who stood by the company in their time of difficulty, when union men went out without notice, these men stood by the company then, and the men think that the company will stand by them now?—They think so.

Mr. Tait.

14,309. Before departing from the subject which Mr. Livesey has had before the witness, might I be allowed to ask whether the rate of 8d. per hour overtime was part of the Mansion House agreement?—I am almost certain it was.

14,310. You said to me that the Surrey Commercial Dock Company had carried out the Mansion House agreement, but so far as overtime was concerned they have not?—Let me qualify that. They have carried it out faithfully with those men on whose behalf the agreement was made.

14,311. Those are the men who were on strike?—Yes, always excepting the men like myself who made no demand because the majority of our fellows did not come out with us. Our demand was merely to be reinstated, and we went back to our former positions.

14,312. Do I understand you correctly when I put it this way, that notwithstanding there were a number of men who stood by the Surrey Commercial Dock Company during the strike and assisted that company when they were in difficulties, the company, even to these men, have not carried out the Mansion House agreement by paying 8d. per hour for overtime?—That is it.

14,313. And you are desirous of getting the non-union men into your Union, believing that if you had a majority of the men in the Union as against a minority at this time you would be able to press the hands of the company by the force of your organisation?—I may state, as the gentleman across the table wishes me to divine motives, or I should not say he wished me to divine motives, for I said I would not divine motives, but I will divine this motive, the majority of the men who stood by the company, the so-called loyal men, thought (they have told me so) that when the strike ceased, and the wages of the casual men and piece-work men were raised, they would participate in the benefit.

14,314. But they have not?—They have not.

Professor Marshall.

14,315. Did the Mansion House agreement say anything with regard to the overtime pay of the permanent men?—I am not sure, but I

Professor Marshall—continued.

think not. There were very few permanent men in my docks concerned in the strike.

14,316. Are the men who are only paid the 6d. per hour for overtime permanent men or not?—Permanent men only.

14,317. So that the Mansion House agreement has not been broken?—The letter has not been broken.

14,318. The wages are 24s. a week, and 6d. per hour for overtime?—Yes.

14,319. How much do they get, as a matter of fact, on the average for overtime worked per week?—I am thankful to say that since the strike there has been very little overtime.

14,320. So the wage has been about 24s.?—You will pardon me, but I would like to make a statement on that. Of the weighers, permanent men, there are some dozen so-called privilege men, and of the weighers, weekly men, there are some 30 or 40 second class privilege men or preference men. I am one of the privilege men: I am paid besides my 24s. a week a certain piece-work rate per 100 quarters, which brings my average wage, probably, from the dock company up to 30s. a week. There are about 12 of us like that. My wages are 24s. a week, but I am paid extra in consideration of keeping pace with the piece-work men in doing my weighing and clerical duties. That brings me an average of from 29s. to 30s.

14,321. You said that was for 12 men; out of a total of how many?—Out of a total of some 50.

Mr. Jesse Collings.

14,322. Who is the secretary of your Association?—Mr. Henry Quelch.

Mr. Burt.

14,323. I understood you to say, in answer to Mr. Bolton, that you thought strikes could be obviated, but you did not follow that up by making any suggestion as to what way strikes could be prevented?—One way that occurs to me is, that by the men belonging to unions consulting, going through a proper form, deputing their representatives to wait upon the employers' representatives and discuss matters, that is one way in which strikes might be obviated, in my opinion where good sense and moderation would prevail. In regard to the docks I believe that the municipalisation of the docks would also tend to obviate strikes along the river.

14,324. Then you would be in favour of the establishment of joint committees representing employers and employed?—On the surface I would, but I would rather not give any definite answer in detail. My experience of what I have read of committees has not inspired me with much confidence up to the present.

Mr. Troun.

14,325. Would you centralise as well as municipalise the docks?—I think one must necessarily follow the other. If docks are muni-

[18 February 1892.]

Mr. WILLIAM JAMES BRETT.

[Continued.]

Mr. Trow—continued.

cipalised they must, as a consequence, become centralised.

14,326. That is, you would lessen the area of the docks, and bring them closer together?—I would have one control, that would be centralisation. If the docks were municipalised that would be one control, and that would be centralisation.

14,327. Who would benefit by the scheme?—I think the worker in the first place, and I believe the shareholders by the fact that they would have a more easy conscience.

14,328. Is there nobody outside the workers in the docks and the shareholders to be considered?—I believe the public generally would.

14,329. Will you explain how the public would?—The workers would be benefited by the fact that they would have some heart in their work; they would be carrying on work for convenience, not altogether for the profit of private monopolists. The shareholders would see the justice of the case, I believe, after a little time. The public generally would benefit, because they would not be in jeopardy, as they are now, of monopolists stopping or hindering the importation of food stuffs, or the landing of such food stuffs after being imported. The public also would benefit, because the profit, should there be any, would go to the alleviation of the rates.

14,330. But if you municipalise the docks who are the shareholders that are to benefit?—I believe they would benefit morally, not pecu-

The witness withdrew.

Mr. LOUIS STEPHEN WHITE called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,335. I believe you represent the Watermen and Lightermen's Hall?—Yes, I do.

14,336. And you come here to give evidence chiefly I understand in reference to the evidence given by Mr. Fairbairn?—I do.

14,337. The first question to which you wish to call our attention as I understand is the question of apprenticeship?—Yes.

14,338. What have you got to tell us upon that?—With reference to apprenticeship, in answer to questions 7474 to 7480, the indentures of apprenticeship are in the form of a contract between the master and the lad, and the Watermen and Lightermen's Act, 1859, provides either party with remedies in the event of the terms thereof not being fulfilled. Mr. Fairbairn has always contended that the court should only permit an apprentice to work for his master, but the Act of 1859 specifically states in section 46 "that every freeman or widow of a freeman may take such apprentices as he or she thinks fit for the purpose of having them instructed," &c. In the case of "Smith v. Francis" (Court of Queen's Bench, 1891), which turned on the legality of an apprentice working with a man not his master, and which was taken up by Mr. Fairbairn and his Society as a test case, the judges heard the arguments of Mr. Fairbairn's

Mr. Trow—continued.

niarily, by the new order of things they would see around them.

14,331. Would you expect the workmen to have any control over the employment of themselves in the docks?—Through their municipality or board of control. They would have a voice in the election of the municipality, and the municipality would no doubt appoint the control board; therefore, the workers would really rule the docks, or the public generally.

14,332. Is the trade a seasonal one?—In a large measure.

14,333. Then would you have any control with regard to the number of men who should be employed in the docks?—Most decidedly. I would make a permanent staff always, with the stipulation that they should not work overtime. Statistics will very easily show the number of men required. I would have a permanent staff, no overtime, and the trade should be regulated to the staff. That could be done, in my opinion, and all the conditions would be much more comfortable than at present.

14,334. But if you introduce your eight hours and stipulate the number that are to be employed, when there is an influx of trade where are you going to get the casual men from?—You have mentioned the eight hours. I believe that with the general application of the eight hours we could so increase our staff, we could put so many men to work over and above those who are at work now, that we would need no casual men.

Earl of Derby—continued.

counsel, but dismissed the case without calling on the defendant's (Francis) counsel. The Act provides for the supply of skilled labour, not for its restriction.

14,339. Now you have something that you wish to put before us in regard to licences. Will you say what that is?—These are granted either to the master of an apprentice after a period of not less than two years' service on the part of an apprentice, or to the freeman on the completion of his apprenticeship. In either case the applicant has to pass through an examination, which is of such a character that nearly 10 per cent. of the applicants are refused the lighter-man's licence. The court would here mention that apprentices only do a very small proportion of their work in the docks.

14,340. Can you tell us anything as to the number of licences and also as to the casualties by drowning?—The present number of licensed lightermen (freemen) is under 5,500, and the number of apprentices is 1,493. There are also 275 contract lightermen (non-freemen). The per-centage of deaths by drowning is remarkably small considering the character of the work of a lighter-man, and the court is of opinion that this is due to the present system of apprenticeship, whereby a lad cannot work craft alone until he

18 February 1892.]

Mr. LOUIS STEPHEN WHITE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

has served two years at least; also to the fact that under the present system he learns his profession at an early age, and thereby attains a proficiency which he would not attain if he learnt it later in life. The court has obtained a report from each of its inspectors as to the number of deaths by drowning during the last five years, and the following is a summary of such reports:—

SUMMARY OF REPORTS.

Inspector	District.	Period.	Number of Freemen Drowned.	Number of Freemen in District.
Inspector Simmonds	Gravesend, &c.	5 years	6	835
" Showell	Greenwich, Poplar, &c.	"	8*	1,543
" Blackmore	Above London Bridge	"	6	1,107
" King	Eotherhithe, Deptford, &c.	"	7	1,317
" Faoy	Wapping, Limehouse, &c.	"	14	1,004
			38	5,856

* One whilst bathing.

The above may be taken as a correct record of the cases that have occurred during that period, as each inspector has to render a quarterly report with reference to the freemen on his district.

14,341. Now, I understand you wish to tell us something about the constitution of the court?—Yes, I have sent in a list of the members of the court, 23 of whom are or have been duly licensed lightermen and the remaining three have large interests in the lighterage trade of the port of London. In 1870 Mr. Fairbairn and the Thames Working Lightermen and Watermen's Protection Society presented a petition against the transfer of the powers of the court to the Thames Conservancy, in which petition they stated "that its board (i.e. the court of the company) consists principally of gentlemen of practical knowledge and ability who are at all times interested in the good regulation and government of the Thames." Again, "And the public at large are greatly benefited by such control being vested in the hands of practical men of whom the Watermen's Company consist." The court at the present day consists of the same class of men. In 1871 Mr. Fairbairn and the Society he then represented introduced a Bill to alter the mode

The witness withdrew.

Mr. JAMES STANBURY called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,345. I understand you represent the United Riggers' Association of London?—I am president of the London Riggers' Association—a practical sailor and rigger. I have been many years at sea and am now following the rigging work up.

14,346. Are you authorised to represent that Association here?—Yes. Besides the London

Earl of Derby—continued.

of electing the court by giving all the freemen the right of voting for the election of members, but such Bill, after both parties were heard before a Committee of the House of Commons, was unanimously thrown out. On that occasion Mr. Fairbairn's Society obtained the signatures of about 600 freemen in favour of the Bill, whereas the court obtained over 4,100 against. The recommendations of the Committee of the House of Commons on the Thames Watermen's Bill, 1890, with reference to the constitution of the court were made without any evidence being heard on the matter, as the question was not before the Committee, and the court at the time, through its agents, entered a strong protest against the injustice rendered to it by such report. Notice of a private Bill was given in November last by Mr. Fairbairn's Society of its intention to introduce a Bill to alter the constitution of the court, but such Bill has been dropped, owing, as the court understands, to the watermen and lightermen refusing to support it.

14,342. Now will you tell us how the accounts of the company are audited?—The accounts of the company are audited by an auditor appointed by the Thames Conservancy Board, and copies of the balance sheet are given to all freemen applying for the same in writing. A copy is also hung up in the public office so that all freemen may be able to examine the same. The amount of quarterage paid by the working lightermen amounts to an average of 900*l.* per annum.

14,343. I think you have some other comments to offer upon the evidence given by Mr. Fairbairn?—Mr. Fairbairn in answer to questions 8039 and 8226, states that his Society spent 1,000*l.* in legal expenses during 1890, whereas in his Society's balance sheet for that year the amount appears at 168*l.* 2*s.* With reference to answer to question 8045 the court has an inspectors' time-book kept, and such book shows that Mr. Fairbairn is entirely wrong.

14,344. Will you tell us before you go on what that question 8045 refers to?—He states that the inspectors were never doing their duty, that they were always in the office, and if he were on the court it would be otherwise. With reference to answer to question 8046, the court has not any jurisdiction in the question of lights on craft. With reference to answer to question 7997 the court can show by its register that there has not been at any time any registration as mentioned by Mr. Fairbairn.

Earl of Derby—continued.

Riggers' Association I also hold briefs for the Glasgow Ship Riggers' Protective Association, the Greenock Ship Riggers' Protective Association, the Liverpool Riggers and Mariners' Trade Society, and I may include the Riggers of Belfast and Londonderry, who are now federating with us.

18 February 1892.]

Mr. JAMES STANBURY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

14,347. What number of workmen are there engaged in your trade?—In my opinion the number of practical ship riggers employed in the ports I have named is only between 1,500 and 2,000, without counting boys and unskilled labour.

14,348. What wages do they receive?—On the Thames the wages are 6s. per day at ordinary work, but during the four winter months, viz., from the 1st day of November to the last day of February, 1s. per day extra is paid for all outdoor rigging work proper. On the Mersey the wages are 6s. all the year round, the hours, moreover, being shorter during the four winter months. On the Clyde at present the wages average 1*d.* per hour less than on the Thames and Mersey, but work is, as a rule, more constant. Outlying jobs are usually paid extra in all ports.

14,349. What hours are riggers employed?—On the Thames from 7 a.m. till 5 p.m. for riggers taken from their "place of call." In shipbuilders' yards, however, riggers work according to the rules of the yard in which they are employed. The working hours per week when fully employed averages 51, or 8½ per day.

14,350. Are there payments for overtime and for work done on holidays?—Yes, for ordinary overtime 1*s.* per hour, double-time and overtime for work done on Sundays, Good Fridays, and Christmas Day.

14,351. Is the work regular?—Rigging work is at times very irregular owing to the fluctuations in the amount of vessels being built or coming into port. There are of late years a large number of British vessels which used to come here for transhipments, taking their cargoes direct to the Continent, and the number of foreign-built vessels is also increasing. The tendency is also for vessels to carry as little top hamper or spars and rigging as possible, all of which causes lessen rigging work.

14,352. Have you any system of apprenticeship?—I regret to say that on the Thames the system of apprenticing boys to rigging lofts is dying out, and our ranks are now mostly recruited from the better class of seamen as vacancies occur. In the Clyde and Mersey, however, the riggers were recently compelled to take some action to limit the number of boys employed upon a job. We are, however, in favour of a proper apprentice system.

14,353. Have you anything to say in respect to the employment of foreigners in your trade?—Yes, our riggers are often handicapped by outsiders taking contracts for rigging work under the recognised master rigger's prices, and engaging foreign seamen and unskilled labour to do the work under working rigger's pay. This, however, does not apply to heavy jobs which they cannot undertake, but chiefly to bending and unbending sails and light work, which in common fairness should be given to us as well as the heavy work. We are also of opinion that all foreign vessels loading in British ports should be subject to a survey of spars and rigging equally with British vessels before leaving port.

Earl of Derby—continued.

14,354. I do not understand on what grounds you would say that the bending and unbending of sails and light work ought in common fairness to be given to you. On what ground do you say that?—Well, the bending and unbending of sails is the best of the work, or the lightest of the work. If they had a job to pull a ship to pieces and dismantle her, and take the three sticks out of her, and fit new rigging and run her on end again, they would let a master rigger or a practical rigger do that. They get foreign labour or unskilled labour to do the bending, which in common justice ought to belong to us.

14,355. That is what I do not quite understand; how does the injustice come in?—Because they would not get the outsiders who do this light work to do the heavy work; they are not practical enough to do the heavy work.

14,356. You are skilled workmen?—Yes.

14,357. And you do the heavy and comparatively difficult jobs?—We take the ship from the builder, step her masts, and get the ship ready for sea.

14,358. Quite right, but I do not see what claim that gives you to do the other work, which an apparently unskilled man or less skilled man could do equally well?—They cannot do it equally well. They apparently do it, and fault is found on a ship getting in a breeze when going down Channel, and getting her sails blown adrift before she gets half-way down, and losing her canvas through having men who do not know how to do the work.

14,359. Then your complaint is not on the ground that you ought to have the work assigned to you, but on the ground that the people to whom it is assigned cannot do it properly?—Yes.

14,360. You have spoken of unskilled labour being employed; does that interfere with you?—Yes, in this way, that besides the light work spoken of in my previous answer unskilled labour is being largely employed now in builders' yards in putting up derricks and shears, putting machinery and other gear on board, shifting ships, and many other things requiring both skill and care, and which used to be done by riggers. A certain class of contractors also contract for taking vessels, especially steamers, by the run from one port to another considerably under the recognised scales of prices. This they are enabled to do by employing for the most part unskilled labour, and many accidents might be traced to this cause. We are also of opinion that the surveyors of spars and rigging appointed by the Board of Trade and Lloyd's should be practical riggers.

14,361. What do you mean by practical riggers, men who have done the work themselves?—Yes, men who have some experience when they go on board a ship to overhaul the rigging and who would know whether it is fit to go to sea or not.

14,362. Are riggers required to carry a licence in all ports, and if not in all ports in what ports?—Yes, they are on the Mersey. We have

18 February 1892.]

Mr. JAMES STANBURY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

reason to complain of the manner in which the "Mersey Dock and Harbour Board" grant licenses to any hobble-de-hoy or sea labourer, who, after having been a trip or two in steamers, applies for and as a rule obtains a licence without any proof or test of qualification on payment of a fee of 1s. The board possesses the right, granted by the Board of Trade, of issuing such riggers' licences. We maintain that every applicant for a rigger's licence should produce undeniable proof of competency as a rigger or of at least four years' service in sailing vessels, or should be approved by the local Riggers' Society. It is not the licensing system of which we complain, but the loose and unbusinesslike manner in which the licences are granted.

14,363. You do not wish that everybody who has a licence should be free to act as a rigger, do you?—Yes, provided that it was a general rule and that a man could get people to employ him as a rigger. But what we object to is the inexperienced man coming, and by paying 1s. getting a licence, and then competing against the practical man who has practical experience and skill to do the work which the other man is not fit to do.

14,364. But if there are no licences at all he would equally be free to compete, would he not?—Certainly.

14,365. You would not object to that?—Certainly not. But then the license is some sort of an introduction. The master of a ship or a stranger coming to this port, on an unqualified man going aboard of the ship and producing his license, that master being a stranger to the port would naturally think he was a qualified man and would employ him, and he gets taken in very often.

14,366. You do not object to a man having a licence, and you would not object to a man working without a licence; but you object to licences being granted as an apparent proof of competency to men who are not competent?—Yes.

14,367. You wish either that they should be more strictly limited, or that they should be done away with?—Yes. I think that would give all hands a far better chance.

14,368. Which would you prefer?—I should prefer them to be done away with, and let the best man take the preference.

14,369. Now, do the members of your Union work with non-unionists?—In rigging work we naturally give the preference of employment to our own members, and the next preference to the members of the Stevedores' Society, many of whom are practical seamen and riggers, but when union men are not obtainable we work amicably with non-union men. In going runs, trial trips, and transporting ships, or doing tides, we work with anyone engaged by the master of the ship, and in every case we work with the *bona fide* crew of a vessel.

14,370. What are the mutual relations between your unions and the employers?—I may say extremely friendly, master riggers and foremen being admitted to membership of our

Earl of Derby—continued.

Association, and we are also on good terms with the shipowners and the shipbuilders.

14,371. Have you had any strikes?—No. Excepting an occasional dispute with an individual employer over a breach of our rules, we have not had any dispute with, or strikes against, our employers for the last 20 years. In 1872 our members obtained an increase of pay and shorter hours, without any agitation worth calling a strike. The masters usually come to any reasonable terms asked for by the men from time to time.

Mr. Tait.

14,372. Have you a copy of your rules?—Yes (see *Tabulated Rules*).

Earl of Derby.

14,373. Did your Association take part in the recent strike directed against some of the principal shipping firms?—No; and for the following reasons. Being at that time affiliated with the United Labour Council of the port of London, our members were ordered to cease work on December 6th, 1890, and not to work for these firms. The manifesto to which I now refer was known as the "Wade's Arms" manifesto (see *Appendix 85*), and it only appeared in public on the evening of the 5th of December. Our members attending the place of call as usual on the morning of the 6th were surprised at this abrupt manifesto appearing so unceremoniously and unexpectedly, and they held a meeting at once, and another in the evening, at both of which meetings the contents of the manifesto and the extraordinary demands of the National Seamen and Firemen's Union were discussed by a body of riggers, who were sailors to a man, with the result that we sent a letter to the United Labour Council of the port of London, giving our reasons, as practical men, for not ceasing work. This letter, being ignored by the Council, we afterwards issued as a counter manifesto. I hand in a copy of the riggers' manifesto of December the 6th, 1890 (see *Appendix 85*).

14,374. Now, in the riggers' letter to the United Labour Council, which, as you say, was afterwards issued as a counter manifesto, did they give their reasons for not obeying the "Wade's Arms" manifesto?—Yes, the Seamen and Firemen's Union having generally been antagonistic to the riggers, we naturally looked with suspicion on every move by which it sought to strengthen its power at the expense or to the disadvantage of other workmen. We therefore strongly objected to the invalid reasons for a strike set forth in the "Wade's Arms" manifesto of December 5th, 1890, and the autocratic demands of the Seamen's Union, principally that insisting upon the shipowners guaranteeing that none but members of the National Seamen and Firemen's Union should be shipped.

14,375. How do you say that the Seamen and Firemen's Union was antagonistic to the riggers; how was the antagonism shown?—The

18 February 1892.]

Mr. JAMES STANBURY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

Seamen and Firemen's Union supplied men to do riggers' work, under riggers' price, being members of the same council. I will explain further in my evidence with regard to the antagonism of the Seamen's Union.

14,376. Why did you think it necessary to object to their demand?—Because we were fully aware that many of the best sailors, principally *bond fide* sailing ship men, were not members of the Seamen and Firemen's Union, and because such an edict, if carried out, would debar our members and the members of all kindred societies from going to sea, or from transporting ships and going runs, privileges which riggers have held ever since I can recollect.

14,377. Will you explain a little further your reasons for coming to the conclusion that you did come to?—The best of all reasons, past experience. Very shortly after the great dock strike, when the Seamen and Firemen's Union had grown to some proportions, it became aggressive in accordance with its abnormal growth, and commenced to interfere with the smaller unions. Both on the Thames and on the Clyde delegates wearing the uniform badges of the National Amalgamated Seamen's and Firemen's Union were in the habit of boarding ships and demanding the production of the ticket or card of that particular Union from the men working on the vessel. The riggers would at times produce the Riggers' Union cards, which, however, were hardly ever recognised by these gentlemen, and in many instances our members were treated as so-called blacklegs, and lost work thereby. Some riggers actually were compelled to join the National Amalgamated Seamen and Firemen's Union to be permitted to do their legitimate work unmolested. On the Clyde the riggers were actually intimidated under false pretences to join the Seamen and Firemen's Union, on the understanding that they should pay 2s. 6d. entrance fee, with a nominal subscription of 1½d. per week per member, but shortly after they had joined, the executive of the Seamen and Firemen's Union demanded 5d. per week contributions per member. This demand was naturally resisted by the Clyde riggers, who seceded from that Union and re-organised their local riggers' associations. The Seamen and Firemen's Union then decreed a strike against them, which lasted some time, but the employers taking sides with the riggers, who had justice on their side, the Seamen and Firemen's Union strike met with an ignominious defeat.

14,378. Have you given us all your reasons, or were there any others?—Yes, it was reported to our Association by our accredited delegate upon the "United Labour Council of the port of London" that two of the delegates representing the Seamen and Firemen's Union upon that Council had taunted him with stating "that their Union would not tolerate smaller unions to dictate to them, but would wipe them out of existence, as the spittle on the ground" (*illustrating this by a motion of the foot*), that

Earl of Derby—continued.

they would rub us right out. They also gave it out "that they would never rest satisfied till every man who worked on board ships, at sea or in harbour, were compelled to take out a ticket from the National Amalgamated Seamen and Firemen's Union." They tried this on with the engineers' labourers of the Hammermen's Union, in the s.s. "Almora," of the British India Line, but were defeated.

14,379. Then you did not see any advantage to be gained by joining this Union?—No. First, because we looked upon it as of mushroom growth, and too domineering to last; and, secondly, we found members of the Seamen and Firemen's Union were actually cutting down the prices for runs and for light rigging work, purposely to get the work into their hands so as to starve us out.

14,380. Did your members take any action with a view to protesting against this treatment?—Yes, we remonstrated with the Seamen and Firemen's Union through the legitimate channel, then supposed to be a board of arbitration to settle such matters, viz., the United Labour Council of the port of London, and we endeavoured to arrange matters amicably, but our communications were ignored and treated with contempt, and we found it impossible to meet Wilson's Union delegates to even discuss matters. On the Clyde the same efforts were made through their local trades councils with equal non-success and contemptible treatment of the riggers by Wilson's Union representatives there. I beg, therefore, to hand in a copy of the letter that we sent to the Labour Council (*see Appendix 86*).

14,381. Had you any reply to that letter?—No, we did not succeed, owing to the overbearing demeanour of Wilson's Union and its utter disregard of the interests of trades unions and organisations numerically weaker than itself.

14,382. And you then proceeded to take independent action?—We did.

14,383. Does your cause of complaint against this Union continue?—Not at present; we hear very little of it now, except through the reports of the proceedings of this Commission.

14,384. Is there any other matter which you wish to bring to the notice of the Commission?—I think not. I contemplated saying something on behalf of the riggers employed in Her Majesty's Dockyards, but I am informed that the Commission has been good enough to agree to hear the direct evidence of witnesses from Her Majesty's Dockyards before group A., and among them that of a practical dockyard rigger. Under these circumstances it will be unnecessary to go into evidence which will doubtless be more ably and fully dealt with by a practical witness before Group A. I, therefore, merely beg to hand in copies of the rules of the Glasgow, Greenock, Liverpool, and London Ship Riggers' Associations (*see Tabulated Rules*). I also hand in a circular issued by the London riggers with regard to the increase of pay for the winter months (*see Appendix 87*).

18 February 1892.]

Mr. JAMES STANBURY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton.

14,385. You say that your work in London is somewhat reduced by the reduction in the transshipments in London?—Yes.

14,386. To what do you attribute that reduction?—I must say I think it is owing to the strikes.

14,387. You, I think, are in favour, you said so distinctly, of no licences at all being granted to riggers?—No, not in the light that they are made use of in Liverpool, on the Mersey.

14,388. You went a little further than that, you thought it might be done away with altogether?—Yes, I think so.

14,389. Would you prohibit the foreigners taking work under those circumstances?—Certainly.

14,390. How would you prohibit them?—By combination, the same as any local riggers' association.

14,391. Nothing more than that?—Nothing more than that.

14,392. Your principal trouble, in fact your only trouble, now appears to be the action of Wilson's Union?—Yes, that has been our greatest trouble.

14,393. And that you think you have overcome?—I cannot tell you that. I am afraid we might have a bitter fight with them yet.

14,394. But in the meantime, at all events?—In the meantime we shall fight them until he rubs us out as he said he would.

14,395. And he is not making any progress in rubbing you out?—Not at present.

Mr. Tait.

14,396. What are the hours of labour for the London riggers?—Seven to five, seven at the place of call.

14,397. What are the hours of labour in Glasgow?—I must refer to the books.

14,398. Does the book give it?—Yes, I have handed in a book of rules for the Glasgow and Greenock and also the Mersey rules.

14,399. Do the rules give the hours of labour?—It will give you everything.

14,400. I know yours do, but I am not so sure of the Glasgow one?—I will ascertain that. I think this is the revised rules. I have a copy that they sent me some time prior to this, but I have only received this lately (*after referring to print*). These are the late revised rules of the Clyde (*see Tabulated Rules*). On the Clyde and the Mersey they average 54 per week or nine hours per day.

14,401. The wages upon the Clyde are 1d. per hour less than the wages upon the Thames and Mersey?—Yes.

14,402. Can you account for that?—No, the only reason is that the further you go north the less pay the men get.

14,403. Is that usually the case?—Yes, I think it is.

14,404. Have the Glasgow riggers appointed you to speak in their interest?—Yes.

14,405. Did they say that that was the reason why the wages were less than here?—No, I do not think they complained about the wages,

Mr. Tait—continued.

it was merely to illustrate before the Commission the treatment that they had received from the National Amalgamated Seamen and Firemen's Union the same as ourselves.

14,406. But you cannot give us any definite reason why the wages are less than here, the work is the same?—No.

14,407. I suppose the wages you have given us for the Clyde would apply to Greenock; they would be 1d. per hour less?—I should think so.

14,408. How is the overtime paid at Greenock, you have given it us in London?—That I have no reference for.

14,409. If they have 1d. per hour less per day than you, certainly they will not be paid the same rate of overtime as you are, will they?—No; that I would speak for.

14,410. Can you tell us how they are paid for Sunday on the Clyde and at Greenock?—It says here in the scale of charges for the Greenock ship riggers that all members of the Riggers' Association shall not work for less than 7d. per hour, that being the uniform rate within the limits of four miles, a four-mile radius; beyond that four miles it is 1s. per day extra.

14,411. What do you get per hour?—We get, as a rule, 8d. per hour for the summer months.

14,412. You work 10 hours a day, and get 6s. per day?—No, we work from 7 to 5, and we are allowed an hour and a half out of that for our meals.

14,413. You complained about the friction between the two unions, between your own Society and that of a kindred organisation. Has it been brought about by there being a difference of opinion between the members as to the duties of riggers and the duties of seamen with new vessels, and vessels that have been under repair?—No, I do not think so. I think it is a general rule that they are simply antagonistic to every person who does not conform to their way of thinking, that is all.

14,414. Are you aware of the dispute between the Sailors' and Firemen's Union and Riggers' Union in Glasgow?—Yes.

14,415. What was it?—Of course this is merely correspondence that we received in a friendly way, in fact we are federated with them, and this is from one secretary to the other, or one president or chairman to the other.

14,416. I do not want you to read the whole of it; if you will just give us an idea of what was the cause of the dispute?—I will refer to my proof for that. I thought I had answered that question. On the Clyde the riggers were actually intimidated into joining Wilson's.

14,417. Are you aware that the initial difficulty between these two unions in Glasgow arose from the fact of the want of definition as to the members of which union had the control of the work?—I think it was laid down as a rule that the great almighty union should define the Riggers' Union; they wanted to define or to point out what a rigger should do, and no more. They said that the men on the Clyde should do nothing but new work, but that they would do

18 February 1892.]

Mr. JAMES STANBURY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

any other work except work which came direct from the builders.

14,418. Do you know this as a matter of fact from your own personal knowledge or from hearsay?—I do not know whether I can vouch for it by correspondence. I would not like to say that definitely.

14,419. That being so I will not press you further on the point. You suggested that there should be a different system of licensing in the Mersey than what presently exists, your complaint being that anyone could get a license at the present time?—Yes.

14,420. You afterwards said that you thought you were prepared to do away with licenses altogether?—No, I am not, it has nothing to do with me. I only said I should like to see them done away with.

14,421. You would like to see them done away with?—Yes.

14,422. Would you state your reasons for that?—Certainly. I think the best men would get the preference then. I will illustrate it to you in this way: You are a boy of mine, perhaps, and you have been at sea two or three voyages in a steamer, and now you know as much about the two ends of a ship as somebody. I will not mention any names at all. You go and you apply to the Mersey Board of Directors, and you get a licence for 1s. Now you know as much about taking a ship from one end of a dock as anybody else. They can go up and get a tram conductor.

14,423. Do I understand that no one in the Mersey is allowed to move a ship without having a licence?—I might have brought up that special rule of licences issued by the Mersey Board.

14,424. I see one of the rules in your books makes it a provision that "any member after finishing his day's work and arriving at the dock being kept without his money any time exceeding 15 minutes shall be paid as overtime 1s. per hour or part of an hour that he is kept waiting"?—Yes.

14,425. Are you able to carry that out?—Yes.

14,426. And the dock companies pay you?—We do not work for the dock company as a rule.

14,427. Any company that employs you?—Any master rigger has got to follow that rule out.

14,428. And your complaint has been that the Wilson's Union or the Seamer and Firemen's Union have tried to stamp you out as far as possible?—Evidently.

14,429. In fact, they have refused to work alongside of your men?—Yes, they have come and ordered our men out of the ship.

14,430. They have done so?—Yes, they have, and got very nearly thrown into the dock for doing so.

14,431. Now, in Rule 23 of your book I see "that no member shall work at rigging work with any person not able to produce the Society's working ticket while there is any member available." Take a man who is not a

Mr. Tait—continued.

member of your Union, but who is a practical rigger; do you, under this rule, prevent him from getting employment if you can find a member of your own Union to do the work?—We do not allow that man to work with us providing there is one of our members ready; but if that man can go and get a job at rigging work we do not stop him.

14,432. You would prevent him if you could?—No; how are we going to prevent him. We only say he shall not come into a gang with the men holding our ticket if we have got another man.

14,433. But if you get another man you would prevent him?—Yes.

14,434. That is on the same lines as the other?—Well, the masters follow that.

14,435. You have had no strikes, you say, since 1872?—No, nothing worth calling a strike.

14,436. What were your wages at that period?—At that period 5s. 6d. a day.

14,437. And you have now got up to 7s.?—We have now got up to 7s.

14,438. How did you get it?—In the winter months we simply called a general meeting.

14,439. Did you do it by overtures with the employers?—That is all. We called a special general meeting to discuss the question whether it was worth 7s. a day for a man to be stuck up in a ship's maintop such weather as this.

14,440. Do the other riggers meet you in a friendly manner?—The other riggers are members of the same Society, most of them.

14,441. Have the late disputes in the docks in London inconvenienced your members very much?—Certainly.

14,442. Has it actually cost your Society anything in money?—Certainly.

14,443. Have you any suggestion to make to the Commission how these disputes could be avoided for the future?—No, I do not think I can give the Commission any instruction as to that, any further than that I should like to see a board of arbitration, a board that might be formed on some sound basis where they would not ignore a small society, or drive it down in comparison with a little larger society, because the larger society would send so many more delegates to the Labour Council. The representatives of the larger societies in any question that affected a smaller one that was only represented by a small number of delegates should not be able to override the smaller ones in any matter that might be brought before the council.

14,444. Now you are speaking of representation on a trade and labour council. That would be an altogether different thing to representation on a board of arbitration?—Well, a board of arbitration, then.

14,445. Suppose you had such a board of arbitration adopted in London you would not suggest that the number of representatives or delegates to that board from the workmen should be corresponding to their numerical strength. You would rather say that each

18 February 1892.]

Mr. JAMES STANBURY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

society that is represented, however small in numbers, should have its fair and equitable representation?—That is just it.

14,446. Would you have that arbitration board upon the lines which have been carried out by the Durham and Northumberland Coal Miners, where they have a conciliation board equally composed numerically from the masters and men?—Certainly.

14,447. Would you have an umpire?—Certainly.

14,448. Would you give the umpire the finality of deciding any question which the board might not agree upon?—Certainly, if he was a fair and just man.

14,449. You think that is a much better way than any State control of arbitration?—Certainly. I do not think any of us want to be grandmotherly nursed by the State. We only want the thing managed fair, and surely it might be with a board of arbitration formed of partly men and partly of employers or masters.

14,450. Have your Society taken any notice of reduced hours?—No, I do not think we need to.

14,451. Are you content with the hours you are working?—Certainly, because virtually speaking, if I may answer your question, we do not leave the place of call until 7 in the morning, and as soon as you call a man out from the place of call that man has his pay, and you are supposed to find him a day's work for that pay, or pay him a day's pay whether you have a day's work for him or not, unless he is knocked off by bad weather; then you pay him the bare amount of his work.

14,452. Suppose a master rigger comes to your house of call and engages one rigger or 10 riggers in the morning, and only finds work for them for three or four hours, do they get a day's pay for that?—Not necessarily. You have the option of saying to the men as they stand at the place of call, "I want six of you, I have three 'hours' work. If you like come and have it, or 'go and leave it.'" If they like to go and work for that three hours it does away with all your rules.

14,453. But if the master rigger says he has a day's work?—If he calls you out and says nothing to you you may compel him to give you a day's work.

14,454. When he calls you out from your house, of call he must define the number of hours he wants you to work; or, on the other hand, he must pay your members a day's wages?—Certainly; it comes out in this way. If a gang of men are finishing a ship the men are paid their wages every night. Now, each man has to be re-employed again in the morning, so that he is virtually discharged in the evening as soon as he gets his money. As a matter of fact the men who are engaged on the ship know pretty well that there is only half a day's work left, and generally the master will say to the men, "There is only half a day's work to-

Mr. Tait—continued.

"morrow. If you do not like to come you need 'not have it.'"

14,455. We have had a lot of evidence here as to getting over the difficulties produced in the docks of London by municipalising the docks. Has your Society ever considered that proposal?—No, we do not want to have anything to do with that. You might make it a board of trust, something like that, I think.

Mr. Austin.

14,456. Is it a condition of apprenticeship that riggers must go to sea and acquire sailors' experience?—Not necessarily.

14,457. It is not?—No, you can make rigging in a rigging loft.

14,458. How is it then that you state that riggers are sailors to a man if they do not proceed to sea?—I do not suppose you could find a man who has been anything to the westward of Cape Clear but what has been to sea in our line, or, I may say, round the land. And another thing: the youngsters in the ordinary rigging lofts overhear the old sailors talk, and it is the old proverb that as the old go the young follow. One half of them, upon my word, are a great deal better than ever a lot of sailors now-a-days are. They go into the rigging loft before they go to sea. Then they go to sea, and when they come back after they have been a year or two at it and got tired of it they follow up the old thing and take to rigging again. They are virtually brought up in the rigging loft.

14,459. You object to members of the Seamen's Union working with you. Are you not aware that it is a condition of the articles that a seaman signs that he must obey the captain's orders?—I think if you listened to my evidence you will see in one part of it I say we at all times work with a *bond fide* crew of a vessel.

14,460. Will you work with members of the Seamen's Union?—Certainly, if they are *bond fide* members of that ship's crew—why not? You might as well turn the mates out and we take charge of the ship altogether.

14,461. I ask you, will you work with members of the Seamen's Union?—Not unless they are *bond fide* members of the vessel we are working.

Mr. Trow.

14,462. Are we to understand that the Seamen's and Firemen's Union attempted to coerce your men to leave your Society and join theirs?—Certainly.

14,463. And that failing that they were actually prepared to blackleg your men and take your work under price?—Certainly. They said they would rub us out like a spot of grease. That is what they said, that they would rub us out, or anybody else that interfered with them.

14,464. And you do not agree with coercion?—No. I will just illustrate to you how they interfered with us. Suppose we are working on

18 February 1892.]

MR. JAMES STANBURY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Trow—continued.

board a ship here that has come home to discharge. We go and unbend her and take charge of her and do what rigging work there is to do. By-and-bye that vessel is sent round land to load. The riggers naturally get the preference of going for the run in that ship. What have they done? They have turned our men out of the ship; they have even stopped ships here at the very dock gates simply because our men were on board of her because they did not hold the Seamen and Firemen's certificate.

14,465. And they wanted their men to do the work?—Certainly, they wanted their men to do the work.

14,466. That is coercion, is not it?—I should think so.

14,467. Assuming that a non-union man goes to work on board a ship before you know that one of your own men is out, when you find one of your own men is out do you stop the new man and put your own society man on?—We always take good care of that. We make it a rule to show tickets every morning before we go to work. Every man has to produce his working ticket.

14,468. Then you would replace a non-union man?—Most decidedly, and the foreman, or the leading hand, or whoever employed him, would get a talking to for employing that man.

14,469. You also ask that after an examination is passed the candidate shall be subject to the approval of the Riggers' Association?—Certainly. I do not think there is anybody that is more qualified to give an opinion as to a man's ability as a rigger.

14,470. Is not your object in that to keep men from getting licences?—Well, yes, it is.

The witness withdrew.

MR. EDWARD NEWMAN called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,475. On behalf of whom do you appear?—On behalf of myself and free labour. Understand me rightly, not a free labourers' association under the jurisdiction of the employers, nor yet a shipping federation—that does not represent free labour—entirely outside of either.

14,476. You represent the interests of free labour generally?—Yes.

14,477. Where do you live?—148, Brady Street Buildings, Mile End, Whitechapel.

14,478. What is your occupation?—That of pilot and general contractor, rigger, &c.

14,479. How long have you been at sea?—27 years.

14,480. Then I need not ask you if you have had a considerable experience of sailor's life?—A great deal.

14,481. Have you ever been a member of the Seamen's Union?—I have been a member of three or four seamen's unions.

14,482. Have you ever been connected with the Shipping Federation?—I was the outdoor officer of the Shipping Federation when they

Mr. Trow—continued.

14,471. To keep your trade in your own hands?—Certainly. We do not complain about the licences. The only thing that we complain about is, that they are granted to people who are not fit to carry them.

14,472. But will you point out the difference between Wilson's action in the first case and your action in the latter case?—Certainly I can. When the first Wilson's strike came on you must understand our Society amongst others came out and walked about with their banners and starved their men on principle to get the seamen and firemen what they wanted. Now where is the friction? Instead of trying to work amicably with us what did they do? When they found it was not to their advantage to have anything to say to us they tried to ride us down, and that is what we object to.

14,473. And that because they were the strongest?—Certainly.

14,474. Now, you want to control the examiners, and to say that every man to get a license must be subject to the approval of your Association?—I do not say our Association. I merely point out that any man who is put in trust as a rigger is in a responsible position. I can tell you there is responsibility at times. Suppose you were to go on board a ship, and have to take her down a tier in the dock, and your lines were to carry away, and you had no knowledge what the ship would be going to do, and it was blowing hard, and you got aboard another ship and did about 500l. or 600l. worth of damage to your own ship and a lot of damage to the other one, how would you be then as a non-experienced man?

Earl of Derby—continued.

first started. I provided the first crews for the Shipping Federation.

14,483. Have you ever shipped or taken part in shipping any men?—I have shipped some, I might say, thousands of men.

14,484. In your experience do you find that seamen have any objection to the federation ticket?—Yes, on one principal ground. That was because there was a special clause in it on the back of the federation ticket. They had a particular union that existed some years ago. That was very obnoxious to the palate of the men generally. It was entitled "The British Seamen's Mutual Protection Society."

14,485. Were those who objected to the federation ticket all unionists, or were there non-unionists who objected also?—There were unionists and non-unionists; both objected.

14,486. Are you now in the employment of the Federation?—No.

14,487. Why did you leave them?—I left them because I had a commission to ship a crew for the "Gothenburg City," and in the place of going

18 February 1892.]

MR. E. NEWMAN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

to one of the leading official's crimping houses I went where I thought proper, and got a crew from where I liked. For that simple reason I was discharged.

14,488. You were discharged because you preferred to engage men elsewhere than at the recognised offices?—Exactly so.

14,489. Did they tell you why they objected to your doing that?—They did not tell me why they objected to it, only they said there was plenty of men there. I knew this particular individual that was connected with the Shipping Federation; he styles himself general superintendent. I know he keeps a very large crimping house, and has done for many, many years. I thought very probably these men were waiting at the office there, so I went where I suited myself best.

14,490. I believe you have something to tell us as to crimping?—I have a great deal to tell you as regards crimping. I do not think crimping can be done away with unless the advance note is abolished altogether. That is the only way to do away with crimping. And as to what the Federation say about crimping, the Federation has only invented a new system of crimping.

14,491. Will you explain that a little. I do not quite understand?—Crimping is employing seamen without holding a licence to do the same, or without being a *bonâ fide* servant of the owner to whom the ship belongs. The officials of the Shipping Federation are in the constant employ of the Shipping Federation, which represents thousands of employers, and represents no individual employer. Therefore the officials of the Shipping Federation are as great crimpers as anybody else.

14,492. Do you contend that they do anything illegal?—I contend it is illegal to ship men without being in the constant employ. The Act says you shall be in the constant employ of an officer of a ship or an owner of a ship. For instance, suppose a ship comes from Liverpool here to London, these gentlemen of the Shipping Federation here cannot be in the employment of the owner in Liverpool. Therefore, if they ship a crew for that particular vessel, the owner being in Liverpool and not directly paying them, they are as much crimps as any other men.

14,493. If the action of the Federation is illegal why has no attempt been made to test the question in a court of law?—That is what I should like to know. I should like to know why the President of the Board of Trade has not taken it up. I believe the President of the Board of Trade, as far as my knowledge is concerned, has been challenged on that point.

14,494. Now is it the fact that British seamen are largely displaced by foreign seamen?—British seamen are displaced by foreign seamen for the simple reason that they answer many purposes. They answer the purposes of the shipowner, or of the master, or of the officers; for instance, they will never grumble what hours they work; they will never grumble what food they get, or what conditions they get. Suppose a ship had

Earl of Derby—continued.

been working all night, and that one of these particular foreigners has been driving the winch, it is very easy for the officer of that particular ship to put down overtime in the labour bill and pocket the overtime and give the foreigner nothing, and he says nothing about it.

14,495. It comes to this, they are willing to work harder and live cheaper?—Exactly.

14,496. And on that ground you object to them?—Certainly.

14,497. Do you think as a rule they are more amenable to discipline than British sailors?—Well, I think so.

14,498. Are they as a rule, do you think, more sober than the average British sailor?—Well, they are much about the same, I think. They all indulge freely at times.

14,499. We understand that you have some suggestion to offer which would put a stop to what is called crimping?—That is the suggestion I should make, to do away with the advance note. Whatever you invent, whatever you bring out, or whatever you pass by Act of Parliament to benefit the seamen and do away with crimping, it only invents crimping in another channel. The only way to prevent crimping now is to do away with the advance note and let the captain go to the shipping office and pick his men up the same as he is supposed to do. That will do away with crimping. It will not give the men who are termed crimps the privilege of going round the docks and supplying crews. The Shipping Federation have no more right than any individual man to go round the docks and supply crews. The master should go to the shipping office and pick his men out there as the Board of Trade require him to do.

14,500. From what you say I infer that you do not think the Shipping Federation has been beneficial to the interests of the sailors?—Not at all.

14,501. Have you had much to do with or been witness of any disputes between unionists and non-unionists?—I have seen a good many disputes between the two parties, I have seen some acts of violence, in fact I have received some myself; but at the same time I think that they might get on a little better together if this Shipping Federation was to do away with this particular ticket that they have got, because when they commence to put the screw on after this Commission is over, as they will do if Parliament does not interfere now and do away with it—as this is a question for the country—the consequence will be that Englishmen will be displaced of their employment and foreigners brought in, and consequently the Englishmen will become either paupers or criminals. They will have nothing else before them, because it will be a matter of impossibility for them to get employment without this particular federation ticket.

14,501a. But how does the necessity of obtaining the federation ticket favour the employment of foreigners?—In this way. A master of a ship, or an officer of a ship, or an owner of a

18 February 1892.]

Mr. E. NEWMAN.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

ship, may practise some injustice on a member of the crew. That member of the crew may take legal proceedings, and providing he gets the case the Shipping Federation will have it in their hands to take his federation ticket away or cancel it. Without this particular federation ticket he cannot get employment or go to sea, and consequently he has got to come on the ratepayer either directly or indirectly, and therefore it is a question for the taxpayers of the country whether the combination of the Shipping Federation shall exist or not.

14,502. Do you consider that the unionists have been aggressive in their action against free labour?—In some instances they have.

14,503. Have you yourself ever employed union labour?—I have.

14,504. Do you find that advantageous or otherwise?—Well, the unionists are better workmen as a rule, but they are rather aggressive in having strikes, and so forth.

14,505. You have suggested this question. Have you ever been assaulted by unionists?—Yes, I have.

14,506. On what occasion?—On one occasion about six weeks or eight weeks ago in providing a crew for one of the Wilson-Hill line of boats.

14,507. Did you prosecute anybody?—I could not find out who they were. They ran away too quick.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

14,508. You talk about your providing crews. Are you in the regular employment of any shipping owner?—I was at the time in the regular employment of Mr. Becket Hill of the Wilson-Hill line.

14,509. You were providing a crew for him?—I was providing crews for him.

14,510. Have you any knowledge of cases where the sailors have given money to persons employed by the Shipping Federation?—Not to my knowledge; only hearsay.

Mr. Tait.

14,511. When you say you represent free labour generally, do I understand that you have a mandate from any body of free labourers to represent them?—Not exactly. I represent nobody.

14,512. Did you simply come here to tell your own experience?—I come here simply myself, yes.

14,513. You say you were discharged from the Federation because you refused to go to some crimping house to get men, and preferred to go where you thought you would get the best men?—Well, I did not refuse, because I went.

14,514. It was because you did so?—Because I did so.

14,515. And you think that the ticket which the Federation puts forward to the seamen and firemen of the country is obnoxious?—I do.

14,516. And that the men only take advantage of it because it is a means of getting them employment?—It is a means of obtaining employment. There is no other way of getting employment.

Mr. Tait—continued.

14,517. While you were a member of the Federation did you ever consider it to be your duty to prefer non-union to union men?—Not at all; I took them as they came; those that were willing to go.

14,518. You made no preference?—No preference at all.

14,519. What are you doing just now?—I am piloting ships round the land, and taking contracts generally on my own behalf when I can get them, but I find that I am hunted from pillar to post by the Shipping Federation, and have been ever since I have left them.

14,520. When you were called upon by the Shipping Federation, or by any other body of employers, to supply men, was it ever suggested to you that you should supply them under the current rate of wages in the port?—Yes, I have got a proof of that here.

14,521. You say you can inform the Commission that the Federation, or firms that are members of the Federation, have suggested to you to supply crews under the current wage of the port?—Yes.

14,522. Will you give us the case in point?—It is the case of the s.s. "Tower Hill" (producing a letter).

Mr. Tait.

It has been stated here by members of the Federation that they have been no parties at all to the reduction of wages. This witness produces a letter from one of the principal firms who have given evidence here, a letter written to this man to engage men under the standard wage of the port. I think, my Lord, that should go upon the record.

Earl of Derby.

Very well.

The Witness.

I had provided two crews, one for the "Monte Video" and one for the s.s. "Rosario."

14,523. You had already provided two crews for this same firm?—For the Allan Line.

14,524. At reduced wages?—Yes, and when they asked me to provide crews for the boats going to New York, I could not do it from principle, ships going across the western ocean in the winter time.

Mr. Tait.

The letter is as follows:—"9th December 1891. We are signing the crew of the s.s. 'Tower Hill' for New York, on board 11 a.m., Friday, at reduced rates, and in all probability shall require you to furnish us with men, so please have some ready." This is from the Allan Line, Canada and United States Royal Mail steamers, and addressed to "Mr. Newman, Whitechapel."

18 February 1892.]

Mr. E. NEWMAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Fowler.

14,525. How long were you an officer of the Federation?—About two and a half months or three months.

14,526. You did not receive from the Federation itself any intimation or any notice of the cause of your dismissal, did you?—Well, I was told that I was discharged for crimping, but that I challenged them to prove.

14,527. Told by the Federation?—I was given to understand so by the secretary, Mr. Duffy.

14,528. Did the secretary tell you, "you are discharged in consequence of crimping"?—Exactly so.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

14,529. When were you discharged from the Federation?—January last twelvemonth.

14,530. Were you in the regular employment of the Allan Line when you had this letter?—I was. I have my agreement in my pocket.

14,531. For how long?—I was there until I suppose I refused to supply those men at the reduced rates, and I suppose I was not wanted any longer. There is the agreement (*see Appendix 88*).

14,532. This is dated the 30th November 1891, and that letter was dated the 8th December. When did you cease to be in their employment?—About a week or a fortnight ago; about a week ago, I think it was.

14,533. Are the Allan Line members of the Federation?—Mr. Becket Hill is a member of the Federation.

14,534. That is the Allan Line you are speaking of?—That is the Allan Line.

14,535. We had evidence here a few days ago that they were not members of the Federation from a member of the firm; do you deny that?—The representative in London is a member, and a committee-man on the district committee.

Mr. Trow.

14,536. During your connexion with the Shipping Federation were there any incompetent seamen employed?—Oh, hundreds; I may say, very near thousands.

14,537. And they are at present in the service of the Shipping Federation?—I could not say.

14,538. You supplied crews under the auspices of the Shipping Federation while you were an officer?—I supplied crews.

14,539. For the Federation while you were in their employ?—Yes.

14,540. In case of strikes?—In case of strikes.

14,541. Were they strikes by union men or otherwise?—Well, it was put down to them, but I do not know whether they were union men or whether they were not. I know there were men who did not belong to the Union that did strike in objection to the federation ticket, in consequence of the clause I have already mentioned being on the back of the ticket for this particular Union.

Mr. Trow—continued.

14,542. But that was before you were dismissed, I understood?—Exactly so.

14,543. Was the clause on the back of the ticket while you were in their service?—Yes.

14,544. You made no complaint, but you were dismissed?—Yes, I complained to a gentleman who is the general superintendent about his aggressive notices. He has been already here and I object to many of his statements. He says he is what he calls a moderate trade unionist. I am in a position to prove from the Trades Union he represented years ago that he is one of the most aggressive trades unionists.

14,545. I am not asking anything about a gentleman who has been here. I am referring to yourself. You say this clause was on the back of the federation ticket while you were a federation officer?—Exactly.

14,546. Did you raise any objection to the clause while you were being paid by the Federation?—I did.

14,547. And yet you engaged men under it?—I complained to Wilson, of the Seamen's Union, about it.

14,548. I am not talking about Wilson of the Seamen's Union?—I engaged men because it was my duty to engage men.

14,549. You say here that it is detrimental to the interests of the seamen, and the Government should interfere?—Exactly. Let me explain this matter away. When I was engaged by the Shipping Federation I was engaged before the Shipping Federation ticket came out. It was explained to me by Mr. Laws, the general manager of the Shipping Federation, that it was a very nice thing; men had only to go to the office and put their names down. I like to belong to anything that I think will benefit the masses of the people, and I thought this would benefit the masses, but when I saw the aggressive policy of it, I objected to the clause on the back of the ticket.

14,550. Did you dismiss yourself?—I did not.

14,551. You were dismissed?—I was dismissed.

14,552. You never complained of that ticket until you were dismissed?—Yes, I did.

14,553. Publicly?—I complained to the general secretary of the Seamen and Firemen's Union.

14,554. I have nothing to do with him; he has been here. Did you complain publicly before you were dismissed by the Federation?—I had nowhere to appear in public to complain.

Duke of Devonshire.

14,555. What is your objection to the advance note?—I have no objection to the advance note, but when gentlemen object to crimping, and say that crimping is so detrimental and so forth, I say that is the only way and the only means of stopping crimping. Whatever channel you invented or whatever you brought forward, you would only be making another channel for the crimping

18 February 1892.]

Mr. E. NEWMAN.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

policies of people who wanted to do it, and perhaps benefit another section of the community.

14,556. You suggest that the advance note should be done away with?—Exactly so, if they want to do away with crimping.

14,557. But I ask you what is your objection to the advance note?—I have got no particular objection at all, myself.

14,558. You suggest that it should be done away with, but you have no objection to it?—I have no objection to the advance note myself; the only thing is, if I am asked what will do away with crimping, I say, do away with the advance note.

14,559. But do you wish to do away with crimping?—I do not wish in particular to do away with it myself.

14,560. With crimping?—Well, it does not matter to me whether it is done away with or not.

14,561. Do you wish to do away with crimping?—I have no sympathy with it, either for or against it. The only objection I raise is, one party crying out about the other party when one is just as black as the other.

Mr. Trow.

14,562. When were you dismissed by the Federation?—A twelvemonth last January.

14,563. Did you apply on October 15, 1891, to be re-engaged by them, and to do some work for them?—I may have done.

14,564. Is this your letter (*handing a letter to witness*)?—That is my letter. I do not ask the Federation to employ me there, I think.

Mr. Trow—continued.

14,565. You say that people said you were afraid to work for the Federation?—I asked one particular gentleman, Mr. Devitt.

14,566. To do work for the Federation?—That is not asking the Federation.

14,567. That is your letter?—That is my letter.

14,568. It is appealing to do work for them?—I do every kind of work besides providing crews. I am not above doing rigging work or stowing cargo for any member of the Shipping Federation.

14,569. "The reason I ask you to let me do something for the Federation is because there is at this moment thousands saying that I am afraid to do any more for the Shipping Federation; so to prove to them and to all those that have said anything against me, let me prove myself what I profess to be, namely, a man, and the first that stood on a public platform in England to denounce the unions in general, with money and without price. I have worked against them before the Federation was formed, and since I have been out of it. Give me the chance and I will prove that I am no fool. Sir, will you kindly use your influences on my behalf. Yours respectfully, E. Newman." I want to know how that tallies with your principle. Here, on the 15th October, after declaiming so much against the Federation, you were appealing to be employed by them?—I do not ask the Federation as a body to employ me there. I ask one particular individual gentleman there to employ me.

14,570. But you say you would work for the Federation?—I am not above doing work for any member of the Federation now, but unfortunately they will not let me do much.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

19 February 1892.]

Mr. G. MILNE.

TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Friday, 19th February 1892.

PRESENT:

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE EARL OF DERBY, K.G. (CHAIRMAN).

The Right. Hon. SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH,
Bart., M.P.
Mr. J. C. BOLTON, M.P.
Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, M.P.
Mr. T. H. ISMAX.

Professor MARSHALL.
Mr. SAMUEL PLIMSOLL.
Mr. E. TROW (Group A.), the Right Hon.
LEONARD H. COURTNEY, M.P., and Mr. M.
AUSTIN (Group C.) also attended.

Mr. GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Mr. GEORGE MILNE called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,571. You are a shipowner at Aberdeen, we understand?—Yes.

14,572. You have come, as we understand, to answer certain charges which were made by Mr. Wilson, the secretary of the Seamen's Union, in his evidence before the Commission?—Exactly.

14,573. Perhaps you would state what you conceive those charges to be?—Perhaps I might be allowed to read you a letter which was written to the Commission first?

14,574. Yes?—When we saw those charges in the newspaper report of Mr. Wilson's evidence, we immediately caused our solicitors to write the following letter, which would perhaps summarise the charges:—"We are solicitors for Messrs. George Milne and Co., shipowners, of Aberdeen, who have observed that certain grave and totally unfounded charges have been made against them by Mr. J. H. Wilson, secretary of the Seamen's Union, while giving evidence before the Commission. Briefly, and divesting these charges of the abusive language which accompanied them, they seem to be:—(1.) That the owners wrongfully withheld the wages due to the representatives of deceased seamen who were lost in their vessels, the 'Rowena' and the 'Donegal.' (2.) That they charged against these representatives certain sums for tobacco, &c., which the seamen had not received, and which the owners appropriated. Both these charges are untrue. The vessels were, unfortunately, lost at sea, and the detailed particulars of the masters' payments were lost with them; but the masters in both instances had sent home their disbursement sheets to the owners by post from their last

U 73729.

Earl of Derby—continued.

"port of departure. These disbursement sheets show:—(1.) That considerable sums were paid by the masters by way of cash to the crews abroad. (2.) That these payments had nothing to do with advances to seamen shipped abroad, which advances are entered separately in the disbursement sheets. The owners made up accounts of wages due to the representatives of the seamen, and, with the sanction of the Board of Trade, charged the cash payments made abroad against the crew, according to their rating. The vouchers for these entries were also exhibited and examined by the Board of Trade. Certain allowances were charged against the crew for tobacco, &c., such as a master is in use to supply to the crew on his own account, but these allowances, while debited to the crew, were credited to the master's account, so that the owners had no interest beyond endeavouring to do the master's representatives justice, as well as the men's. These allowances, so charged, were also passed by the Board of Trade. The balances were then paid over to the Board of Trade's representative, viz., the shipping master at Aberdeen, and were by him paid over to the seamen's representatives. Then the Union came on the field. Their solicitor made inquiry of the owners, and were furnished with all the particulars and vouchers which had satisfied the Board of Trade. Mr. Wilson says the Union approached members of Parliament on the subject. If so, these members did not communicate with the owners. The Union then raised an action, in the case of the 'Donegal,' against the owners in name of the executors of certain of the seamen,

H h

19 February 1892.]

Mr. G. MILNE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

"claiming in effect to set aside the accounts approved by the Board of Trade, and demurring to the principle of apportionment which the latter had approved in these cases. The owners declined to litigate, but agreed to pay over again rather than take the invidious position of fighting for money in a case where men had lost their lives, and they paid accordingly. As regards the exaction of probate, it was our duty to get a final settlement, and there was no way in which that end could be obtained without the executors completing their title in usual form of law. Under payment to the Board of Trade probate is dispensed with, but these parties repudiated the settlement made by the Board of Trade on their behalf, and chose to stand on their rights at common law. In these circumstances probate was necessary, but, to save expense as far as possible, we paid the sums over to the union solicitor, on his undertaking to settle with the representatives. We would only add that the owners are prepared to substantiate their statements by production of documents, if the Commission shall desire to inspect them."

14,575. In regard to this latter question, the question of probate, you had absolutely nothing to gain or lose any way?—Nothing at all. We put it into the hands of the solicitors, and told them that they must get a proper discharge, so that we should not have to pay the money a third time at any rate.

14,576. You say, in regard to the first question, the question of the repayment to the men that the owners decline to litigate, but agree to pay over again rather than to take the invidious position of fighting for money in a case where men had lost their lives; now, did you take legal opinion as to whether you were legally liable to pay again?—No, I do not think we ever did.

14,577. Would you say that was simply a concession upon your part?—Simply a concession upon our part.

14,578. That it was made voluntarily, and not under pressure of any threat of legal proceedings, is that so?—I would hardly say that.

14,579. You thought you had a good case as against the Union, but you thought that under the circumstances it would be invidious to stand upon your rights?—We did exactly. I should like to hand in the documents in proof of my assertions.

14,580. I do not think we can go into this question. A statement was made no doubt affecting the character of your firm, and we thought it only fair to hear your contradiction. We understand that you entirely contradict the charge, and there we must leave it?—I would like to have done so more explicitly, having regard to the several statements Mr. Wilson makes.

14,581. If there are any other statements you wish to contradict, do so by all means?—One statement Mr. Wilson makes is, that we settled the case the day before the case was heard. We

Earl of Derby—continued.

never even entered the defences in the case, we never even went to law at all. Then there is another statement which Mr. Wilson makes. He says, the shipowner makes the account of the deductions up on his own authority, and again he says, we had no letter from the captain advising us of those advances from abroad. I have here distinct letters from the captain not stating what he advanced to every individual sailor, but I have it that he made certain advances to the sailors. He distinctly says that. Mr. Wilson says I have no evidence that money was given to the sailors beyond the mere fact that 200*l.* was sent to the captain, and no doubt he had disbursed this money amongst the crew; but we have actually statements from the captain here in which "cash to the crew" is explicitly stated. These accounts and vouchers were all submitted to the Board of Trade in the regular way, and passed and sanctioned by them.

14,582. And if there had been anything irregular about them the Board of Trade would have had power to interfere?—The Board of Trade acting for the sailors' interest. They would not have taken payment of the balances if they had not been satisfied that they were right and fair.

14,583. Is there anything else you wish to add?—He made a statement that the vessel was a very old ship. I do not know that that has anything to do with the question.

Mr. Ismay.

14,584. What age was she?—One of them was built in 1861, and she was rebuilt and re-classed in 1876. The other ship was of the highest class. Both were totally uninsured.

14,585. Both hull and freight?—600*l.* of one freight was insured; there was nothing on the other.

Mr. Bolton.

14,586. Nothing on the hulls at all?—Nothing on the hulls.

Mr. Austin.

14,587. In the case of the "Donegal," how much money was owing to seamen?—Do you mean to each individual seaman?

14,588. No, to the four seamen?—The total wages due to them?

14,589. I mean over and above what was lodged with the Board of Trade?—Nothing was due to them beyond what was lodged with the Board of Trade.

14,590. Was there not a sum of 63*l.* 18*s.* 3*d.* recovered after?—We paid that, but it was not due to them.

14,591. You paid it?—We paid it.

14,592. Did you offer a less sum than that?—We may have done so. I do not recollect having done so.

14,593. If it was not due to them do you think that you would pay it?—I had paid all that I was legally bound to do before, and I paid as little after that as I could.

19 February 1892.]

Mr. G. MILNE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Austin—continued.

14,594. Do you think you would pay the 63*l.* 18*s.* 3*d.* to those seamen unless it was due?—Yes, because if I had gone to law I would have spent twice as much as that. Though I had gained the case, though the whole thing had been decided in my favour, I would have spent twice 63*l.*

14,595. But you must have been under the impression when you offered them the less sum than 63*l.* 18*s.* 3*d.* that there was something due to them?—No, I was not under that impression.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. WILSON MILLS ROCHE called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,598. We understand that you are a solicitor practising at Sunderland, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and London?—Yes.

14,599. Are you firm the solicitors for the Shipping Federation?—They are.

14,600. Have you had considerable experience in matters connected with shipping?—Yes, for the past 15 years I have been almost exclusively engaged in shipping business.

14,601. Are you connected officially with any other shipping organisation?—My firm are now, and have been from its commencement in 1873, the solicitors for the British Shipmasters' and Officers' Protection Society, which numbers upwards of 2,000 members, and is, I believe, the largest organisation of that kind in the United Kingdom.

14,602. Have you followed the evidence given before this Commission?—I have read the evidence in a general way only, but my attention has been specially called to portions of the testimony of Mr. J. H. Wilson, Mr. M. E. Darby, Mr. Robert Pleasance, and Mr. W. A. Allison. Without desiring to give evidence at any great length upon the general questions which are engaging your attention, I wish to call attention to, and explain, correct, and contradict, certain matters referred to by those witnesses touching myself and my firm, which are evidently introduced to prejudice the Shipping Federation.

14,603. Do you appear on behalf of the Shipping Federation?—Not directly, but I appear here to answer those particular charges.

14,604. We may assume, I think, that from your position you are familiar with the recent labour disputes in the shipping trade?—I am. I am willing to give any evidence the Commission desire upon that point, but I do not appear for that purpose to-day.

14,605. Before you go into any specific allegations made against your firm, we understand there is some preliminary statement that you wish to make?—I do, because I do not think, unless I make a preliminary statement of the circumstances which led up to my connexion with these matters, that my evidence will be really valuable or intelligible.

14,606. Will you proceed to tell us what you wish to say?—In or about the year 1879 a

Mr. Austin—continued.

14,596. I believe you availed yourselves of the 199th section of the Merchant Shipping Act to get probate, did you not, to put these men to expense?—I do not know what section it was. I understand the cost of probate for an estate under 20*l.* is 5*s.*

Earl of Derby.

14,597. Is there anything else that you wish to put before us?—No, nothing else.

Earl of Derby—continued.

Sailors' Union was started in Sunderland, called shortly the North of England Society. It mainly comprised men engaged in the home and coasting trades, that is to say, in what are called weekly boats. I knew personally nothing of its work at that time, but I always understood that while carefully watching and guarding the interests of its members it so conducted its affairs as to secure the respect and co-operation of the shipowners with whom the officials had to deal. I have heard this frequently stated by the largest shipowners engaged in the home and coasting trades. There was no combination of shipowners organised to resist or defeat this Union. About the year 1883 a period of depression set in in the shipping trade, and hundreds of vessels were laid up in our ports, and consequently large numbers of seamen were discharged. As a necessary consequence of this depression shipowners were compelled to reduce the cost of working their boats in every way, and there was a considerable reduction in wages all round. The sailors were at that time only too glad to accept this reduction, and when possible get to sea again after an enforced period of idleness. There was no combination of owners whatever to secure this result; it was brought about, I believe, solely by the individual action of shipowners with their seamen in all cases.

14,607. In short, it arose from economical conditions?—It did, entirely.

14,608. And from the action of individuals?—It did.

14,609. How long did this period of depression last?—It lasted from about 1883 to about 1887, when freights began to improve gradually, and the idle vessels were again commissioned. Large numbers of seamen were re-engaged, but at the then prevailing low rate of wages.

14,610. Do you remember the commencement of the Seamen's Union, of which Mr. J. H. Wilson is secretary?—Yes, very well; in the year 1887, I believe, Mr. J. H. Wilson started a Union in Sunderland in opposition, as I always understood, to the old North of England Society of which I have spoken, and because of some difference he had had with them. Mr. Wilson then kept a coffee-house in the High Street of Sunderland, with a large room behind it where meetings could be held. I know that at first

19 February 1892.]

Mr. W. M. ROCHE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

many sailors looked, rightly or wrongly, with great suspicion upon this new organisation of Mr. Wilson; they considered it was largely started to advance the secretary's own interests in connexion with his business, and they held aloof from it. I am not in any way endorsing the above view, but simply mention the fact as a reason why this new Union was not at its commencement favoured either by shipowners or sailors. At this time Wilson was making very strong speeches against shipowners, and they considered he was endeavouring to foment troubles between them and their sailors at a time when the shipping trade was just emerging from one of the most prolonged and disastrous periods of depression ever known. For these reasons at first Mr. Wilson's Union made very little headway.

14,611. You told us that the shipping trade began to improve about the year 1887. Did that improvement continue?—Yes; freights steadily improved and shipping business became more remunerative, and as this fact became evident to the seamen they claimed (as I think very properly) an increase of their wages. This increase was bound to come as soon as the men seriously demanded it, because seamen were then fully employed, and there being no surplus labour to keep the wages at the then prevailing low rate, they were sure to rise.

14,612. Then we assume that in your opinion this rise was not the result of any strike or strong combination by the seamen?—It was not; there was no strike or strong combined effort on the part of the seamen which brought this about. It was simply the natural result of better trade and the fuller employment of the seafaring class. It was bound to come in any event. Mr. Wilson was very active at this time, indeed, and as the wages rose he claimed that this improvement was due to the action of his Union. A considerable number of the sailors believed this, and, as Mr. Wilson opened out branches in various ports, they joined his organisation in considerable numbers in the autumn of 1888. Although many hard and strong things were said at this time by Mr. Wilson against the shipowners as a body, and there was for this and the other reasons I have mentioned no disposition on the part of the shipowners to meet him or countenance his Union, yet his conduct was not at that time such as to compel owners to adopt any comprehensive scheme of combination for their mutual protection. In the year 1889, however, as the Union began to more rapidly increase in numbers, the tactics of the Union were greatly altered for the worse. A determined attempt was now made to compel all sailors sailing from British ports to become members of this Union. The shipping offices of the north-east coast were heavily picketed by men of Wilson's Union, and the non-union men attempting to enter were in many cases ill-used and threatened.

14,613. Were there any other forms of coercion besides what you speak of as ill-usage and threatening employed by the Union?—Yes.

Earl of Derby—continued.

Where a considerable portion of a crew had signed on, being union men (that is, Wilson's union) they would refuse to sail if any man was taken to complete the crew who was not a member of their Union, and in most instances masters, after a show of fight, gave way, and either refused to engage non-union men, or, when signed on, they discharged them, running the risk of proceedings by these men.

14,614. Will you give us any instances illustrating what you say?—Yes; I should like to mention the case of the steamship "Edmondsley" which occurred at Sunderland, and in which I was professionally engaged. In that case Mr. Wilson was summoned for having persuaded a seaman named Thomas Carfrae, who had signed articles to sail in the steamship "Edmondsley," to desert from his ship and break his engagement. This was in September 1889. The evidence proved that some few of the men on board the "Edmondsley"—old hands, I believe—were not members of Wilson's Union. A meeting was held of the Union in Sunderland, at Mr. Wilson's head office, and a resolution was passed that the union members of the "Edmondsley's" crew should not sail with the non-union seamen or they would be expelled from the Union. The A.B.'s of the "Edmondsley's" crew, some of whom were members of the Naval Reserve, refused to break their engagement, and a large body of persons, amongst others Mr. Wilson, came down to "persuade" the sailors not to proceed in the "Edmondsley." Carfrae's evidence— that was the man at whose instance he was summoned— as shortly reported in the "Sunderland Echo," is as follows:—"Thomas Carfrae deposed that he signed articles on the 25th April. As he was going on board on the 27th Wilson came up and asked if he was going in the vessel. He said he was, but offered to stay ashore if the Union would agree to pay him 1*l.* per week and take all consequences. Wilson replied, 'Do you think I am a fool?' Wilson tried to persuade him to leave, but he refused, and Wilson said that when he came back he would stop him from earning his bread." Cross-examined, witness said "Wilson did not speak to him in the presence of a man named Gibson." In the end the bench found Wilson guilty and fined him 5*l.* and costs.

14,615. Now we have heard remarks made as to the composition of the bench when these cases come to be tried. How is the bench composed in those cases?—I appear pretty often in these cases, and I should like to make a short statement to that point. It has often been charged against the magistracy by the union speakers that the shipowners sit on shipping cases, and act in a partial manner towards shipowners and unfairly towards the sailors. Now in this case the bench consisted of a solicitor having a large conveyancing practice, but no special connexion with shipping, a retired wholesale clothier, and a marine insurance secretary, who is admitted to be a most fair and impartial man by all sections and classes of the com-

19 February 1892.]

Mr. W. M. ROCHE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

munity. My experience, and I have had a good deal, is that shipowners get on much better when shipowners are not on the bench, and I never like to see them there in my cases. The reason is that the shipowner-magistrates, in consequence of this outcry against them, sometimes strain the "benefit of the doubt" too far and are too lenient in their punishment. As an illustration of this I would mention that my firm quite recently defended a wages claim which was brought by Mr. Wilson's Union against the owners of the Sunderland steamship "Galveston" on behalf of some sailors for balance of wages and damages. The Sunderland bench in that case consisted of two shipowners, and although, in my opinion, the men had no legal case, the magistrates found in their favour against their brother shipowner in the same town. I, however, appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench and the decision of the magistrates was reversed with costs. This outcry against the shipowning magistrates is most unfair.

14,616. Have you anything further to say about these union disputes?—I was consulted in a series of them all over the country, and I counselled the owners and masters to stand out at any hazard and cost against this union tyranny in trying to press them to take nothing but men of one particular Union. In most instances they were perfectly helpless, because when the trouble arose the ship was loaded with a more or less valuable cargo, and the owners were under contractual obligations which they did not dare to break by detaining their vessels pending a fight with the Union. Had they done so they would have been running very serious risk of heavy actions for damages. Again, the individual shipowner could not single-handed face the risk of a bitter fight with a growing and powerful Union. As to the captains, they were unfortunately involved in a dispute which had no pecuniary interest to them; there was the certainty of their owners being annoyed at the detention of their vessels; they had no means as the law stands of punishing the men who deserted after signing articles, and even if they could have prosecuted effectively it meant the detention of their valuable ship and cargo for that purpose. Lastly, if the masters sailed with a crew part union and part non-union there was sure to be constant disturbance and unpleasantness during the voyage. What wonder if, under these circumstances, the captains in nine cases out of ten gave way to the union demands. These cases were blazed abroad by the Union, and its organ "Seafaring," as great "victories" for the cause of the Union.

14,617. What was the effect of this state of things?—Of course it had a very great effect upon the non-union seamen. They saw that they were not supported by the shipowners or their servants, and were passed over or put out of their employment in favour of union men. If by any chance they obtained a berth they were abused, boycotted, and ridiculed by the union members of the crew, who of course did

Earl of Derby—continued.

not like to see these men getting employment without contribution to the Union, whilst they were paying a substantial weekly sum to that organisation. In addition, they were habitually called "blacklegs," "scabs," and similar opprobrious names. Altogether, the life of a non-union man was made a burthen to him so far as the union officials and sailors could do it, and it is no wonder that the men, rather than suffer this tyranny, joined what then appeared to be an apparently invincible Union.

14,618. Have you anything to say as to the relations of the Union to foreign sailors?—In my opinion the action of the Union towards foreigners was shameful. These men, many of them steady, sober, industrious fellows, who had been sailing for years in British ships, were blackmailed by the Union in sums varying from 5*l.* to 20*l.* ere they were allowed to follow their calling. No one can believe that a poor fellow like an A.B. would pay any such sum of money except under the direst compulsion.

14,619. Are you aware of your own knowledge that such sums are asked for and paid?—I am, by cases in many instances coming under my own notice, and I do not think it is denied at all, because there was a tariff put out. I have seen a printed tariff.

14,620. The matter was public?—The matter was perfectly public, and it cannot and will not be denied by anybody.

14,621. From what you say it seems that at this time the Sailors' Union had grown very rapidly. What do you allege to have been the cause of this?—Mr. Wilson has boasted of the rapid rise of his Union, and would have the world believe that it was a magnificent example of the voluntary co-operation of free men to advance the interests of their class. It was, in fact, mainly the result of the tyrannous and shameful system of oppression and coercion which I have described. Whilst I say this, I wish to state most distinctly that I am entirely in favour of the combination of sailors and all other classes of workmen as long as it is a matter of free and voluntary co-operation for mutual benefit; but such a system of terrorism and coercion as existed in 1889-90 in the shipping trade, and by which the Sailors' Union was strengthened, was an unmitigated curse to the sailors, and most detrimental to the cause of unionism, as the sailors will ultimately find out. This system was sure to bring about its own defeat by forcing the shipowners, shipmasters, and non-union men to make common cause and enter upon a decisive conflict for freedom of action and contract.

14,622. What was the further development of the dispute?—The last development to which I desire to call attention is this. Mr. Wilson established, I think, in the end of the year 1889 or the beginning of the year 1890 an association called the Masters and Officers of the British Mercantile Marine Association, and he sought to compel all certificated officers and masters of the United Kingdom to enter this Union. He himself got it up and he was the general manager

19 February 1892.]

Mr. W. M. ROCHE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

of the Association. Anything more destructive or subversive of discipline and the proper conduct and navigation of ships than that the masters and officers should be forced to become members of a Union which was originated with and was controlled by the secretary of a Seamen's Union cannot be conceived. Mr. Wilson's sea experience was confined to the position of cook or A.B., he had no professional training, skill, or knowledge whatever, and he would clearly be compelled, from his position on the Sailors' Union, to conduct this so-called Masters' and Officers' Union in the interests of the seamen. Imagine the effect upon a shipmaster of the knowledge that if he enforced discipline strictly or logged offences he might incur the dislike of some of his men belonging to the Seamen's Union, who might, and probably would, at the termination of the voyage, bring about an inquiry into his conduct by the secretary of their own Seamen's Union, with the strong probability of his condemnation and professional ruin. A great effort was made by the executive of the Sailors' Union to force all shipmasters and officers into this unnatural Union, and Mr. Wilson openly expressed his determination, and it is on record in the proceedings of this Commission, not to allow any of his seamen to sail with masters and officers who refused to join his new Union. Many ships were stopped on this account, and great loss was sustained by shipowners. Many captains and officers were thus compelled by stress of circumstances to join this obnoxious Union. In some cases which came under my own notice, owners who were completely nipped by their commercial engagements paid the fees for their captains and officers to join the Union in order to get their ships away.

14,623. What do you mean by being completely nipped by commercial engagements?—They had got their ships loaded with a valuable cargo; they had engagements in advance; they had chartered engagements to arrive at a certain date, and they could not stop the ships. They could not fight.

14,624. I suppose that position was one which could not continue?—It was. The position, as I describe it, had now become perfectly intolerable, and I was consulted both by the shipowners' and shipmasters' organisations as to the course they should adopt to rid themselves of this outrageous tyranny. I told them they must combine at once and completely to resist this powerful conspiracy against individual freedom, that they must establish and maintain, at whatever cost, the principle that a man, whether master or seaman, should be at liberty to join or refrain from joining any Union. In short to uphold the doctrine of absolute freedom of contract. I told them that I knew the seamen themselves were groaning under the arbitrary management of this Union, and that so soon as a firm stand was made the tyrannous power of this Union would be speedily broken. It has happened just as I advised.

14,625-6. Will you tell us what steps were taken to give effect to your opinion?—First,

Earl of Derby—continued.

an organisation called the Shipowners' Association of Great Britain was established on the north-east coast in the month of June 1889, of which I was appointed secretary *pro tem*, but before long a national scheme of organisation took the place of this more local Association, and the Shipping Federation was established in September, 1890, with Mr. G. A. Laws as general manager. This federation scheme included the payment of an indemnity to anyone who suffered in carrying out the policy and commands of the Federation, so that individual owners were now for the first time able to stand up to the Seamen's Union without fear of being overwhelmed with the consequences of the conflict.

14,627. It was a combination of shipowners to meet a combination of seamen?—It was; and the first one of the kind that I know of.

14627a. Now will you tell us what was the result of this new departure?—The effect of this combination of shipowners was almost magical. The insolent attempt to compel shipmasters and officers to join a Seamen's Union was abandoned after a very brief struggle. The claim for the exclusive employment of men of Wilson's Union was fought for more strenuously, but the strikes in Leith, London, Hull, and Cardiff, and elsewhere, in all of which the Seamen's Union failed, gave the death blow to this almost equally preposterous claim, and the federation ticket, which is simply a free labour pledge, was soon firmly established and almost universally adopted. Seamen now resumed the reasonable practice, which now prevails, of sailing with their shipmates whether they belonged to any Union or not.

14,628. Can you tell us what the effect of this was on the Sailors' Union?—The effect of what I have described was that whilst the power of the Union lasted, viz., in 1889-90, there was an enormous increase in the membership of Mr. Wilson's Union, which was due mainly to the circumstances I have described. This is conclusively proved by the admitted fact that so soon as the seamen found that they could freely obtain employment without being members of any Union they gave up contributing to Mr. Wilson's Union, and I believe there are not now regularly contributing to that Union one quarter of the members who paid into its coffers in the years 1890-1. If it were a fact that the members of Mr. Wilson's Union really believed in and approved of that organisation as managed by him, surely the members would have faithfully rallied round him in these contests. The fact that under these circumstances the members of this Union have steadily dwindled and declined, although wages have kept up and employment has been good, speaks for itself.

14,629. That is to say, it confirms you in the opinion which you entertained before that many men joined this Union merely from fear of what would happen if they failed to do so, and not from sympathising with its objects?—That is my view.

14,630. Now is there another Union called the North of England Seamen's Union, as to

19 February 1892.]

Mr. W. M. ROCHE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

which you can tell us something?—Yes, as I have already informed the Commission, there is a Seamen's Union in Sunderland, called shortly the North of England Union. Mr. Henry Friend is, and has been, for some years past, the secretary. There have been differences of opinion from time to time between that Union and the shipowners interested; but these differences have always been ultimately adjusted without any undue heat or temper on either side. I believe in the autumn of the year 1889 an attempt was made by Mr. Wilson to compel this smaller Union to amalgamate with his larger Society, and a determined attempt was made to boycott the North of England men to bring this about. This, however, proved unsuccessful, and the next move made by Mr. Wilson against the North of England Union was to induce the officials of the London Coal Porters' Union to refuse to discharge any north country coal-laden vessels in the Thames which were not manned by seamen of his (Wilson's) Union. This, if successful, meant ruin to the North of England Union, for their members were almost exclusively employed, or largely employed, in that trade. By reason of this unjust compact several north country coal steamers were detained in the Thames, and I was professionally consulted in the matter. I advised the owners strongly that they should support the North of England Union against this attempt of Mr. Wilson to coerce and bully the old Union into compulsory amalgamation, and I was instructed to act on these lines. In this way I, for the first time, became acquainted with Mr. Henry Friend, and so far as lay in my power assisted him in his fight.

14,631. What course did the North of England Union adopt?—The executive of the North of England deemed it the better policy to open out branches of their Union at this time in South Shields, West Hartlepool, and other places, and a seaman named Arthur Abbott was employed by the North of England Union, I believe, to organise at South Shields, and a Captain Lawrence, of Sunderland, also assisted at West Hartlepool and generally in the contest. It was in this way that I first became acquainted with these men.

14,632. Was this the first knowledge you had of Arthur Abbott, who has been mentioned in this inquiry?—Yes. Mr. Abbott was first introduced to me by Mr. Friend under the following circumstances. On the 20th December Mr. Friend received the following telegram from South Shields:—"To Friend, Sailors' Society, High Street, Sunderland. Send four sailors, two firemen; weekly; expenses paid; afternoon tide; steanship 'Advent' Manager." As Mr. Friend had never received such a message before he considered it was a trap to try and convict him of illegally supplying seamen, and he went therefore to the office of the manager of the "Advent," Mr. James Westoll, and soon found that no such telegram had been sent by him or anyone authorised on his behalf. Careful inquiry was made at South Shields telegraph

Earl of Derby—continued.

office, but no accurate description could be obtained of the sender beyond that he was apparently a sailor. There was a further object, it seemed to Mr. Friend, in the sending of this forged telegram. The "Advent" was loaded in the Tyne for the South Metropolitan Gas Company, and her crew of Wilson's union men had deserted her. If Friend's men had gone to the ship they would have been denounced as scabs and blacklegs, and a great attempt made thereby to damage the North of England Union. It was fully believed that this false telegram was sent by the officials of Mr. Wilson's Union at South Shields, and this was strongly confirmed, and practically proved, by the following incident:—On the 24th December Mr. Abbott received the following letter from Mr. R. Pleasance, the secretary of the Tower Hill branch of Mr. Wilson's Union:—"88, Nichol Square, Hackney Road, December 23rd, 1889. Mr. Abbott, 82, Bede Street, Tyne Dock. Dear Abbott,—I hope you are getting on all right. I enclose you a copy of the letter sent to me, word for word, but I may have some more correspondence which I shall take care of, so would advise you not to make use of it for the present. If they expect me to do any underhand work they never made a greater mistake. Trusting that all will come right in the end, I remain, yours faithfully, R. Pleasance." The following was the copy of the enclosure:—"National Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union of Great Britain and Ireland, South Shields, December 20th, 1889. Memorandum. From G. Cowie, South Shields, to R. Pleasance, 3, Mint Pavement, Tower Hill. Private. Sir,—Will you, as soon as you receive this letter, wire the under mentioned to A. R. Abbott? Meet directors of Donald Currie Company, Shipowners, London, Monday, December 23rd, noon. Business important. All reasonable expenses paid. (Signed) Blackburn." "Abbott's address is 82, Bede Street, Tyne Dock, South Shields. Be careful, as this depends on your tactics, which will be often repeated. Send the message away from office near Lombard Street, not written by any of the officials of this Union. You can understand all when I write again. Secret Department. G. Cowie, Assistant Secretary."

14,633. Who was this Mr. Cowie?—The George Cowie who sent this letter was the assistant manager of Mr. Wilson's Union at South Shields, a member of the chief executive council of the Union, and was, I am informed, a very important and influential man in the Union. Mr. Abbott went up to London and called on Mr. Pleasance, saw the original letter of Mr. Cowie, and also called and saw Messrs. Donald Currie and Co., who assured him that neither Mr. Cowie or anyone else had any authority to send any such telegrams in their name or in the name of any person representing them. The plain objects of this further false telegram were to watch Abbott into the office of Messrs. Donald Currie and Co. and then

19 February 1892.]

Mr. W. M. ROCHE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

denounce him, and also to give him the expense and trouble of a wild goose chase. I advised Mr. Friend that this was a criminal conspiracy, and that proceedings would lie. Mr. Friend and Mr. Abbott left me to consider what course they would adopt under the circumstances.

14,634. What farther was done in this matter?—Some short time after this Mr. Friend and Mr. Abbott called at my office, and informed me that Abbott had been summoned by Mr. Wilson for printing and circulating a libellous pamphlet about him (Wilson), and a copy of this document was produced to me. On reading it I at once saw that it was of a grossly libellous character. I expressed my very strong disapproval of the pamphlet, and condemned Abbott for having printed and issued it. He justified his conduct very vigorously, described how he had been unjustly turned out of his position as secretary of the Tower Hill branch of Wilson's Union, read me some very scurrilous remarks about him in speeches by Mr. Wilson, and in "Seafaring," the organ of Mr. Wilson's Union. I pointed out that two blacks did not make a white, and that his conduct was unjustifiable, although he had apparently acted after much provocation. Mr. Friend urged that, as Wilson's Union would supply the funds to prosecute Abbott, and seeing that he was chief agent of the North of England Union on the Tyne, he must be properly defended, and they both asked me to undertake the defence. I quite agreed that the man was entitled to a proper defence, and to have his case, with all the circumstances named to me, placed before the court; but I wholly declined to undertake the defence. I mentioned the name of the leading firm of criminal lawyers in the town to whom they might apply. Mr. Friend informed me that his Union intended to issue collecting cards to secure funds for Abbott's defence; but he did not think in so small a Union as theirs they could raise anything like the necessary amount, and he asked me to use my influence with shipowners to raise an adequate sum for the proper defence of Abbott, and this I promised to do. Messrs. William Bell and Son were engaged by Mr. Friend's Union for the defence of Abbott, and I was informed that it had been determined that in these proceedings the secret department telegram and letters of Cowie should be brought out and exposed, and also that the whole circumstances of Abbott's case should be laid before the court. Abbott was subsequently tried at Durham Assizes, convicted, and sentenced, I think, to six months' imprisonment. I collected a considerable proportion of the costs of the defence amongst shipowners and others, and handed it over to the solicitor for the defence; the balance was paid by Mr. Friend out of moneys collected or subscribed by his Union. This is all I know of and my whole connexion with the Abbott case. The Shipping Federation had nothing to do with it whatever, nor could they, for it occurred nine months before that body came into existence.

Earl of Derby—continued.

14,635. Will you now deal with the specific points in the evidence mentioned by you at the outset?—I will do so, and please first turn to answers 9272 to 9277. Mr. Wilson there alleges "that a man was sent to join the Tower Hill branch of our Union by the shipowners, "paid for by the shipowners, backed up financially by the shipowners, and one of those owners is Mr. Scrutton notably, and Mr. Roche of the firm of Botterell and Roche; they concocted plans to bring about the downfall of "our Union." Mr. Wilson then goes on to allege that in pursuance of those wicked plans that Hornsby and Abbott were sent to the Tower Hill branch to breed dissension, and were paid to do so, that they also libelled Mr. Wilson presumably with the knowledge and at the request of Mr. Scrutton and myself, and that ultimately we defended the men at the cost of the shipowners. Mr. Thomas Scrutton is well able to answer for himself, but so far as I am concerned this story is an absolute fabrication. I never saw or communicated with Hornsby in my life, nor knew that he was a member of the Tower Hill branch until a report of the proceedings taken against him by Mr. Wilson appeared in the public newspapers, and I never subscribed or provided directly or indirectly anything for his maintenance or defence. As to Abbott, I never saw or heard of the man until long after his expulsion from the Tower Hill branch, and he then was introduced to me by a Trades Union secretary, Mr. Friend, who is now federated with Mr. Wilson. I never saw or heard of the libellous pamphlet written by Mr. Abbott until long after its publication, when I wholly and strongly condemned it. I contributed towards the fund which was raised for Abbott's defence by the North of England Sailors' Union under the circumstances already fully and truly explained and not otherwise.

14,636. Have you anything to say as to Mr. Wilson's answers relating to a man named Fysh?—Yes, you will see that it is in these answers 9277 to 9288 asserted broadly that my firm, acting for shipowners, and by plain inference for the Shipping Federation, supported the prosecution of a man named Fysh for defrauding the Union. Personally I know nothing of this matter and never heard of it until I read it in Mr. Wilson's evidence before this Commission. I am now told by my London firm that they were informed by the proprietors of "Fairplay" that they (the proprietors) had determined to support the prosecution of the man Fysh on public grounds. The prosecutor's name was, I believe, Allison, and the case was then ripe for hearing, indeed expected daily to come on at the sessions in London. Allison I understand had seen the proprietor of "Fairplay," and represented that for want of funds the case could not be brought into court, and thereupon the assistance mentioned was promised to him. We were instructed, in our professional capacity, to communicate with the solicitor for the prosecution, Mr. H. H. Richardson, and if all was in

19 February 1892.]

Mr. W. M. ROCHE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

order pay towards the costs of the prosecution, within the limit of 20*l*. My firm had nothing whatever to do with the direction or management of the prosecution beyond what I have stated. We acted on these instructions. This was a transaction of my firm entirely in their professional capacity for private clients. The shipowners had nothing whatever to do with it. The Federation was not in existence or even thought of for months after.

14,637. What is the next point to which you wish to call our attention?—I wish to call attention to answers 9289 to 9291. Mr. Wilson alleges that there was a conspiracy of the shipowners to undermine, discredit, and ruin him, and again he gives the names of Mr. Scruton and myself as the agents through whom the shipowners attempted to work this end. Again answering for myself, I say it is wholly untrue, and I am willing to answer any questions upon the point which the Commission may think fit to put to me. And I would add that I think any such course of conduct as Mr. Wilson suggests would be as unwise and impolitic as it would be improper. Whilst upon this point I may say that whilst Mr. Wilson has been making the most violent statements about me personally on public platforms in the leading ports of the country, I have never once written or publicly uttered a word against him, or in any way calculated to injure him.

14,638. Do you wish to say anything about the Hornsby libel case at Liverpool?—I do. At the end of answer 9291, Mr. Wilson states that my firm paid the costs of defending Hornsby at Liverpool when he was prosecuted for libel by Mr. Wilson, and I desire to refer briefly to the facts and circumstances of that case. Hornsby was charged, as I understand, with libelling Mr. Wilson by publishing extracts from the union accounts with certain adverse comments printed thereon. Hornsby was arrested at Liverpool under warrant, and thrown into gaol, although there was no suggestion whatever that he was going to leave the country or evade justice. His private bag was seized, and although it contained papers essential for the man's proper defence it was withheld from him, and Mr. Wilson's counsel opposed the application made on Hornsby's behalf that the bag should be handed over to him. When the case came up before the judge at the assizes he severely condemned this conduct in withholding Hornsby's papers. I have a transcript of the whole proceedings before me, and can give you all particulars of the case.

14,639. Did you personally know anything of Hornsby before these proceedings in Liverpool?—I have never seen Hornsby to my knowledge in my life, and I knew nothing whatever of him before these proceedings at Liverpool; but I am now informed that he had been representing a sailors' union in Liverpool for some time before his arrest, and had worked in an amicable way with the shipowners there. When the man was arrested and treated in

Earl of Derby—continued.

the high-handed manner described, the local shipowners decided that he should be defended, and recommended and requested the Federation to do so. I was instructed to look into the matter on behalf of the Federation, and was placed in communication with Messrs. Collins and Robinson, the solicitors who had been engaged on behalf of Hornsby in the matter. These gentlemen satisfied me that Hornsby had a good defence and that it was a case of great hardship, and I therefore directed them to defend. The proceedings were left entirely in the hands of Messrs. Collins and Co., and they resulted in the complete acquittal of Mr. Hornsby, the prosecution being ordered to pay the costs of the defence. Without desiring to go into this case at any great length, I wish to point out that after Mr. Wilson had been under examination for a long time and failed to explain certain important discrepancies in the union's accounts, which had been signed and certified by him, the judge (Mr. Justice Cave) interposed as follows:—"These accounts are put forward as something that witness understands. It is startling that a man who puts his name to them cannot understand them." And further on: "It is for me to see what this witness can tell me about it, because if he cannot explain his own accounts, then how can you find fault with another man altogether because he cannot explain them or understand them." Again: "Aye, aye; but this is the account which is sent round to the sailors as a satisfactory account of how their money has been spent, and yet you say you cannot explain it without the books. . . . Accounts ought to be perfectly intelligible to those to whom they are addressed, otherwise they are simply a sham. To give a man an account that nobody can make either head or tail of is simply absurd, and then to call it an account. You do not suppose that a seaman who gets this account can afford to go to an accountant, and say, 'Please explain this to me,' and if he did the accountant would be obliged to say, 'I cannot, because I have not got the books.'" Mr. Maxwell, the accountant of the Union, was called, and he attempted—

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

14,640. What is the use of this? It is a fresh charge; it is not rebutting?—It is rebutting a charge that we supported a man Hornsby, or defended him, in a most improper manner. This was not a case which was discharged on technical grounds. It was tried on its merits; the man Hornsby had a good defence, and he was discharged on the merits, and not on technical grounds. Further, the remarks made by this man Hornsby upon the subject of these accounts were corroborated, as I was going on to show you, by other subsequent events which have transpired and which perfectly justified him in making these comments.

19 February 1892.]

Mr. W. M. ROCHE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby.

14,641. Now, there is some suggestion in Mr. Wilson's evidence that you supported a man named Darby?—There is. It is there suggested that in some way I supported a man named Darby. I never saw the man or communicated with him in my life. Mr. Lawrence, who I have already mentioned as living at Sunderland, recommended Darby strongly for some employment by the Federation at Glasgow. I told him I had nothing to do with the matter, but would write the central office of the Federation in London to place the man in communication with the Glasgow secretary, Mr. Neilson Bird, who would investigate the matter and act as the local circumstances required. This I did, and so informed Captain Lawrence. I never assisted Darby in any way, and the above is absolutely all I know of the matters mentioned by Mr. Wilson.

14,642. Is there any other matter mentioned by Mr. Wilson to which you desire to refer?—In answer No. 9504 Mr. Wilson makes the following very strong remarks about the conduct of Board of Trade inquiries:—"We do not trust very much to the Board of Trade inquiries; we have had some experience of them; we have attended courts of inquiry when the shipowners have been judges in the court, and we have had very little opportunities of putting our side of the question forward. In fact, I myself have been ordered out of a Board of Trade inquiry because I chose to put questions to the witness which did not quite suit the judge, who was a shipowner." I challenge the truth of that statement. I have probably attended as many of these inquiries as anyone in England during the last 15 years, and I follow these things very closely, and I am sure no such case as alleged by Mr. Wilson has ever happened. I believe him to refer to a case of the steamship "Ethel Gwendoline" at Sunderland, at which Mr. Wilson appeared, and the court allowed him to attend and put questions, although, in my judgment, that course is quite irregular. I was professionally engaged in the case, and I raised no objection to Mr. Wilson's presence; he, however, put such ridiculous and offensive questions that I objected when he proceeded to press the chief engineer as to the amount of wages he was paid. The court without any hesitation sustained my objection. Mr. Wilson was not turned out, but continued to take part in the investigation. The magistrate who, with the support of the nautical assessors, told Mr. Wilson that his questions were "ridiculous," was a doctor, and not a shipowner at all. If Mr. Wilson did not refer to the "Ethel Gwendoline" inquiry, I should like to know which one he did refer to. All that I can say is, that the Board of Trade inquiries are, on the whole, very fairly conducted indeed, and if anyone has a right to complain against them it is not the sailors.

14,643. I think that is all you have to say with reference to Mr. Wilson's evidence?—That is.

Earl of Derby—continued.

14,644. Will you now turn to that of Mr. Maurice Darby. I believe you have some comment to make upon that?—Yes, Mr. Darby says in answers 10,722 and 10,723, that my firm, and a Mr. Burnicle of Sunderland, and Mr. Laws acting for the Shipping Federation, promoted and financed a Union called the International Federation of Stewards, Seamen, and Firemen, with the view of damaging Mr. Wilson's Union. It is perfectly untrue. I never on behalf of the Federation, or otherwise, ever paid or advanced one penny to support this organisation, and I am quite sure no one on behalf of the Shipping Federation ever did so. Mr. Burnicle is a most respectable young solicitor, practising in Sunderland, but he has no connexion direct or indirect with the Shipping Federation. It is quite untrue that the above-named Seamen's Federation was in any way promoted or financed by the Shipping Federation. I never saw its rules, or knew anything of its constitution, and the statements of Mr. Darby in this matter are entirely untrue. Mr. Darby in answer 10,729 says "most undoubtedly it was the desire of the Federation to injure the Union. The spirit evinced since 1886 tends to prove that." Seeing that the Federation was not established until September 1890, it is difficult to understand how the spirit evinced in 1886 can prove as alleged. This allegation is also untrue.

14,645. Now I believe you wish to refer to the evidence given by a man named Robert Pleasance?—Yes. Personally I have never to my knowledge seen this man, or communicated with him in any way. I knew of him first through Friend and Abbott in connexion with the "Secret Service Department" telegram which I have already mentioned to the Commission. He first makes a statement in answers 10,756 to 10,760 about Hornsby's defence at Liverpool, which I have already fully described, and have nothing to add thereto. He next, in answer 10,774, alleges that the International Federation of Stewards, Seamen, and Firemen had been floated by shipowners or shipowners, representatives through me. This, as I have already stated, is in fact untrue. Personally, I know nothing of the matter alleged in answer 10,775. Mr. Laws, doubtless, can deal satisfactorily with this subject. Save as I have stated, I know nothing of the man Pleasance.

14,646. Now there is something that you wish to refer to in the evidence of Mr. William Alfred Allison?—This witness deals almost exclusively with the Fysh prosecution, which I have already described fully to the Commission. The Shipping Federation was not in existence at the time. The shipowners had nothing whatever to do with the matter. It was taken up by newspaper proprietors on public grounds, and we acted for them in our private capacity in handing over a portion of the costs of the prosecution. We did not in any way interfere with or control or know anything of the prosecution personally, which was in the hands of

19 February 1892.]

Mr. W. M. ROCHE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

an independent solicitor. Personally I never saw or communicated with Allison in my life, and know nothing of him.

14,647 Is there any other evidence that you wish to call our attention to bearing upon personal matters?—No. I think, so far as I am aware, I have dealt with every statement of a personal nature to myself or my firm which has been made before you. If I have omitted anything, I shall be very pleased to deal with it if any of the Commissioners will call my attention to it.

14,648. Is there anything you wish to add?—I simply wish in conclusion to say that the allegations which have been made or suggested before you, that I have conspired to libel and discredit Mr. Wilson and his Union, are absolutely untrue and without any shadow of a foundation. The reverse is the fact. I have during the last few years (owing solely to the prominent position in which circumstances have placed me in connexion with these matters) received a great many confidences and communications from various persons not at all of an advantageous character to Mr. Wilson. I have in all these cases declined to take any action on these matters, or to use them in any public way, and I have been the means in several instances of preventing violent attacks upon him. I do not approve of any personal attacks, and I further consider them most impolitic. I have criticised Mr. Wilson's public conduct in open court, but have never in a single instance attacked his private character. Any statement or suggestion to the contrary is wholly untrue. What I have said of myself is equally true of the shipowners with or for whom I have acted. I have simply now to thank the Commissioners for giving me the opportunity of making these statements and corrections.

Professor Marshall.

14,649. I should like to ask you some questions with regard to the extent to which the rise of wages in the shipping trade was caused by the Union's action. You hold, do you not, that the rise was due to causes chiefly outside?—Chiefly outside. I do not say that the Union had no effect upon it; the Union had this effect, that it called the attention of the men very distinctly to the rise of freights and showed them that they were entitled to it, and in so far as the Union did so, I think that its action was wise and advantageous.

14,650. Would you hold that the rise of wages began before the Union showed great activity?—No, I do not think there had been any material rise before the Union had been some time in existence.

14,651. But the causes?—The causes which produced the rise, and must have produced the rise, began before the Union, or just about the time the Union came into existence.

14,652. Has your attention been called to the statements put forward by Unions in this regard claiming to have got this benefit for the

Earl of Derby—continued.

men?—Yes, I have read on several occasions the fact that they had claimed to have brought about the rise of wages.

14,653. But there has been no systematic statement from the other side?—I do not know. I have not followed the evidence sufficiently closely to say that.

14,654. I do not mean the evidence before this Commission, but the side which you are briefly representing in your evidence has never been fully put forward?—That may be, I have not followed it.

14,655. I was only asking you whether it was put forward?—I do not know. As I say I have not followed the evidence before you except in a general way.

14,656. I mean, has a clear statement been put forward outside of the evidence before this Commission in support of the view that you advance, that the rise in wages was chiefly due to causes external to union action?—I believe it has been stated over and over again, but if you mean printed in any formal statement, I say not that I have ever seen.

14,657. Might it not be worth while to consider that?—Of course those are matters of policy which I do not direct.

Mr. Jesse Collings.

14,658. You said that the telegram alleged to have been forged and sent on behalf of Messrs. Donald Currie and Co. was signed by a Mr. Blackburn?—It was a purely fictitious name. I should have stated that Abbott told me (of course I must take it on his statement) that he inquired whether there was anybody named Blackburn in Donald Currie's office, and they told him there was not.

14,659. You stated that Wilson refused to allow officers to sail in a ship unless they joined his, Union's, Union?—That is so.

14,660. Is that the ordinary Union, the Firemen and Sailors' Union?—No, it was another Union, the so-called Certificated Masters' and Officers' Union, but it was controlled by Mr. Wilson, who was the general manager of the Union, and therefore I say it was simply nothing more nor less than a sailors' union into which masters and officers were to be compelled to enter.

14,661. Then when you say that he refused to allow the officers to sail in a ship, what steps do you mean that he took to prevent them?—He stopped the ship, the whole crew of the ship came out. I have got a list here of 20 ships.

14,662. By simply persuading them not to sail with the officers?—By simply telling them that they were to come out. Mr. Wilson has admitted before you that none of their sailors must sail or should sail in ships which were not officered and commanded by men who were in this Union.

14,663. Is that stated by Mr. Wilson himself?—That is so. He stated it, I think, in reply to a question by Mr. Livesey.

19 February 1892.]

Mr. W. M. ROCHE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton.

14,664. You said that in your opinion the advance in wages was somewhat due to the action of the Union when it took place?—In the sense that the Union prominently called the attention of the men to the fact that the freights warranted a larger wage than they were being paid at the time. I think I stated, and I repeat that in so far as the Union did that, it was doing a very useful work, and was in every way to be commended for it.

14,665. The question I want to put to you is this, you having expressed the opinion you have as to the cause of the rise of wages, do you imagine that if that improvement in the shipping trade which undoubtedly took place at that period had not taken place, the Union in the exercise of its power could have permanently advanced wages?—No, certainly not, undoubtedly not.

Mr. Austin.

14,666. Since 1887, and when this National Seamen's Union was established, were there not great difficulties with the shipowners in regard to an advance of wages to the seamen?—In 1887?

14,667. Yes, since the formation of the Union?—No, I do not think there were any difficulties. I do not know what you mean by difficulties. I know that they asked on several occasions for a rise of wages, and at first it was declined, I believe, upon the ground that ships were scarcely paying then; that they were being commissioned relying upon the existing state of wages, and that if wages and all other things rose the ships would have to be laid up again, and that it was in the interests of the men not to concede the advance at that time.

14,668. But since 1886 there has been an advance in the freights, and if in the latter portion of 1887 the freights warranted a rise of wages, and the shipowners declined, was the Union not justified in bringing pressure to bear upon the shipowners to give it?—I think that if the state of freights warranted a larger wage they were perfectly justified in bringing pressure to bear, and in so far as they did that legitimately, I quite agree that their action was wise.

14,669. You stated that the doctrine of the Shipping Federation was absolute freedom of contract?—It is so.

14,670. In the face of that, what is the reason that they have a preference clause in their ticket?—A preference clause?

14,671. Yes?—I do not know. Will you refer me to what you mean by a preference clause in their ticket? That is not so—not to my knowledge. I know this, that their ticket says that men will be employed, whether they are union or non-union men.

14,672. Are you aware that there is a preference given to men carrying the federation ticket?—I should think so, probably, but there is no compulsion to do it.

14,673. How can you call it free labour then?—Simply this, that if these men give credentials that they are good and reliable men, I have no

Mr. Austin—continued.

doubt that, if they produce evidence of that, they would get preference of employment, but, in my opinion, that is a preference of greater excellence proved to the shipowners who take the men.

14,674. But suppose a large body of men say we will not take the Shipping Federation ticket, we are competent seamen, and you decline to give them work, how can you call it free labour?—If those men say that they refuse to sign a document stating that they will sail whether the men are union men or not, if they refuse to do that, you, if you take those men, may find your ship loaded ready for sea and these men refusing to sail because you have got a cook or a steward who does not belong to their Union. Is it not a very reasonable thing to say you want a security against that, looking at what has passed?

14,675. But even in that case, why does the Shipping Federation insist upon preference, or at least give the preference if men are willing to sail with non-union men?—They do not. Have you any proofs of it?

14,676. Are you aware that it is so at present?—Of course, I am not at every shipping office, but I know that that is not the policy of the Federation. That I know—that I can tell you.

14,677. If it is not the policy, it has been carried out?—Then it has been carried out improperly by those who have been carrying it out. It is not the policy of the Federation, I can assure you that.

14,678. You have condemned Mr. Abbott for his libellous pamphlet?—I have.

14,679. At the same time you exerted yourself to collect money to defray the expenses?—Yes.

14,680. Now, Mr. Abbott was convicted and sentenced to six months' imprisonment?—True.

14,681. How are the two things compatible, your condemning him for issuing this libellous pamphlet, and at the same time collecting money to defray the expenses of the prosecution?—I say that that is very simple indeed. This man, Abbott, in my opinion has been very harshly and unfairly dealt with. He had been as grossly libelled at least as he had libelled, and I suppose when I saw that there was a strong Union, boasting some 30,000*l.* or 40,000*l.* at their back, and prosecuting, unfairly prosecuting, that man, having regard to the fact that they were libelling him themselves, I thought it was only fair and right that the man should be properly represented and defended.

14,682. Do you know that Mr. Abbott had the criminal law at his back if there was anything libellous said of him?—Had he got the funds of the Union to back him up?

14,683. He had the criminal law?—Had he got the funds at his disposal to apply that criminal law?

14,684. It requires very little money?—Indeed. I do not know.

14,685. As regards Mr. Hornsby. In this case are you aware that the case fell through, owing to the action being brought for libel instead of slander?—That is not the fact. I have

19 February 1892.]

Mr. W. M. ROCHE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Austin—continued.

got the shorthand notes here; if you wish to go into it, I will do so. There is no evidence of that; it is quite the contrary. I was stopped short there, and I think properly stopped; but I will go into it if you like, and I think I can show you that it was quite the contrary. The case was tried on its merits. The jury found that there were mistakes in the account, and for that reason they ordered the defendant to be discharged, and ordered the prosecution to pay the costs.

14,686. You said there was no money supplied by the Shipping Federation for the establishment of the International Federation of

The witness withdrew.

Mr. GEORGE JEROME HORNSBY called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,689. We understand that you represent the National Independent Seamen and Firemen's Association?—I do.

14,690. You have come here, as we are informed, to give evidence rebutting some charges made against you?—I have.

Earl of Derby.

We shall be happy to hear you on that point, but please understand you must confine yourself to that. We have heard a good deal of evidence, and we do not care to have further evidence on the general question.

Mr. Jesse Collings.

14,691. Are you from London, or where?—From Liverpool. Mr. Wilson has stated here that he has never advocated that violence of any description should be used. I have before me some statutory declarations made by persons who were present at his meetings in which he advocated in Liverpool the wrecking of a street, which subsequently was wrecked, or close to it, and the fact remains that the corporation paid compensation. If you wish it I will read the whole of the statements, but if not I will just take the extracts where they are applicable.

Earl of Derby.

14,692. How is that a statement in your own defence?—I shall come to that afterwards. If you will allow me I shall be much obliged, as I am rather uninitiated in this particular business, to put this right by giving you my connexion with the whole business.

14,693. We want you to confine yourself to anything that concerns your personal character, and the attacks made upon you?—Thank you. I am a sailor. I left a vessel on the 6th November 1889. On the 27th November I joined the Tower Hill branch as an honorary member. I was unanimously elected on December 3rd. I was elected president without opposition. On December 24th a letter was read suspending me from attending the meeting on the orders of the general secretary. The letter I will give from memory as far as possible: "I am informed an individual named Hornsby has joined the

Mr. Austin—continued.

Stewards and Seamen?—As far as I am aware, none whatever. I was the person who was said to have supplied the money, and I never supplied it.

14,687. If I said that Mr. Laws wrote a letter to Mr. Wilson saying that he had supplied some money, would it be untrue?—If you have got a letter from Mr. Laws saying that he supplied money, I should say it is true, but that you have got to prove. I was said to be the person who did it, and I am only contradicting the assertion that I did it.

14,688. That letter will be put in?—As I say, I can only speak for myself, that is quite enough for me to do.

Earl of Derby—continued.

"Tower Hill branch as honorary member, whose sole object is to breed seeds of dissension and injure the Union. I must therefore request you that at the next meeting you must suspend Mr. Hornsby, and it must be further understood that Mr. Hornsby cannot attend the meetings of the Tower Hill branch until the executive council meets on the 10th December. (Signed) Wilson." Now, I am prepared to say that at that time there really was no executive council—that none ever existed. I will prove that later on. On receipt of that letter it was resolved that a man named West should remain the chairman until the question of my legality was settled. I held, and the branch held also, that I had more right to be a chairman of a branch of the Sailors' Society than pawnbrokers and many other persons who had no connexion with seamen, and knew nothing whatever of it except that they were making a profit from the Union. That was the view taken by the branch. On December 21st, Allison, the man who has been here before you, and said that he objected to me, was the chairman. It was resolved on the 6th January, according to the meeting, by 14 votes to 7, that I should be admitted contrary to the instructions of the general secretary. That was the commencement of the dispute with the Tower Hill branch. On January 29th a letter was sent to the Tower Hill branch expelling the secretary and delegate and 51 members for supporting me in that. It was resolved that Wilson should attend a meeting of the Tower Hill branch, and substantiate the charges made against the branch officials—this was seconded by Allison—and that the officials retain office until further settlement. There were 200 members present at this meeting. Wilson attended the meeting of the Tower Hill branch at which I was present. He objected to my presence on the ground that I was an expelled member.

14,694. At what date was this?—This would be on the 28th January 1890. I objected to leave the meeting, as I held that I was expelled somewhat vague, and I at least demanded the right of a hearing. The branch upheld me in

19 February 1892.]

Mr. G. J. HORNSBY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

this. Upon some later date I wrote a letter to the president, Mr. Samuel Plimssoll, of which I have a copy here if my Lord would allow me to read it, and perhaps, that gentleman being present, there is not the slightest doubt he will remember it—but I will leave that over as I do not wish to be more personal than I can avoid. I shall show that these men (Allison and Pleasance) were going to the shipowners, and in the Fysh case Allison was instructed by the branch by a resolution passed to be the prosecutor in that case. I found that there was some trying to smother over this case, so to get at the truth I saw the man who instigated the prosecution, or it would never have been taken. I was prepared to pay the costs at my own expense of the whole trial from my own private means. As a matter of fact these men went to Mr. H. H. Champion, from whom they received 7*l.* They afterwards, as you heard this morning, went to "Fairplay"—wherever they saw a 5*l.* note, that was about what they wanted. As soon as I saw this, and found that I could not properly be connected with such an association, I sent in my resignation. I have a copy of the letter here which was sent by me and accepted, and a copy of the resolution, which I would like to read:—

"Fellow members,—I tender for your acceptance my resignation as president and honorary member of your branch. I also wish it to be understood that it was not with my consent that I was elected president, and I simply accepted the position as there was no one opposed to me. On charges being made by the general secretary that I was breeding seeds of dissension, I resigned the chair. As to the charges made against me by members of the branch that I am in communication with shipowners, or received any money from capitalists as president of your branch for my defence, or under any circumstances, I challenge anyone in or out of the Union to prove that I have received any money from anyone. Those who have been so kind to make these accusations in my absence on *ex parte* statements, without troubling themselves to produce any evidence as to their truth, these will I hope at once accept this challenge. I am satisfied I have done my duty to you regardless of expense, which is a reward in itself. I am very sorry if by my indiscreetness any action of mine should bring discredit on you; it has not been my wish. I ask you to continue your fight for your rights. You have right on your side and inevitably must win. My main reason for resigning is that my character has gained nothing through being connected with a Union which I am thoroughly convinced is a swindle and an imposition on the class it pretends to benefit. Any union which I see is for the benefit of the working class I will assist in its progress. Fellow seamen, while you are fighting your cause, which I maintain is right, you have my sincere sympathy,"—and signed by me. This is a copy of the resolution with Allison in the chair, who stated that he objected to me in the

Earl of Derby—continued.

meeting: "At a meeting of the Tower Hill branch, held on Tuesday, April the 29th, Mr. Allison in the chair, after the minutes of the previous meeting had been read and adopted, the secretary read the correspondence, amongst which was a letter from Mr. Hornsby tendering his resignation. It was proposed by Mr. F. Gerry, and seconded by Mr. Foy, that we should accept the resignation of Mr. Hornsby, and that this meeting returns a hearty vote of thanks to Mr. Hornsby for the services he had rendered on behalf of the Tower Hill branch. The resolution was carried unanimously." I afterwards went home and stayed some time. A copy of a bill which was being posted in London and signed by the secretary of the Tower Hill branch, was forwarded to me in Bettws-y-Coed, North Wales. I immediately on receipt of this sent a copy of it, together with the annual report of the Sailors' Union, to Mr. Plimssoll, the president. I registered the letter. I have an acknowledgment. I will read the letter.

14,695. What does this letter prove?—This letter proves that I was prosecuted after having done what I considered my duty in the matter by sending it to Mr. Plimssoll, the president of a large organisation, and no notice whatever was taken of it, and no investigation, made by him, and I was afterwards prosecuted for giving the same pamphlet to the seamen who were interested in the matter. I say that there has been a conspiracy to suppress this investigation, which really is in the interest of the whole body of seamen. "Bettws-y-Coed, North Wales, June 24th, 1890. Dear Sir, I take the liberty of forwarding a copy of the first annual report of the 'National Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union,' together with an extract of the same; also to draw your attention to the amount of litigation which has been brought about by the autocratic government and non-compliance of the rules by those responsible for the production of financial statements which the branches were legally entitled to, these statements being withheld causing the dispute with the Tower Hill branch. If I remember rightly, before their dispute became public, a deputation waited upon you at your residence asking you to move in the matter. Then I daresay the dispute could have been settled amicably had not the executive took the initiative and taken their dispute into a court of law, where it remains *sub judice*. It conveys the idea to me that they hoped to crush right with might; if so, like the candidature of Bristol, they are certain to be defeated; one thing is only too evident, they are succeeding in squandering the union funds, which is in reality blood-money, when I take into consideration the circumstances under which it is earned. I have communicated the 'home rule' of the Sailors' Union to the Bristol Trades' Council; also the character of the man who asked the working men of Bristol for their confidence at the expense of the sailors and firemen, and I

19 February 1892.]

Mr. G. J. HORNSBY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

"hope ere long to have the question of the Sailors' Union in the House of Commons, for I am determined sooner or later that the disgraceful management of the Union shall be unmasked. Hoping you will pardon me for my familiarity in writing you, as it is from a sailor on behalf of sailors," &c. I received a reply to say that my registered letter had been received, and no notice was taken of it. I afterwards gave a copy of this very pamphlet, in which I charged the union officials with having lost—if you care to take it as easy as I can put it—an amount of some thousand pounds. The direct charge was 463*l.* 5*s.* 1*d.*, but I hold that there was 1,628*l.*—I could go into almost 10,000*l.* or 12,000*l.*—but in regard to these accounts I was prosecuted, and, as I have heard to-day, the costs were guaranteed by the Shipping Federation, which is the first time of its coming to my knowledge; as the result of the trial Mr. Wilson was ordered to pay the costs of both sides; but they might have relied on this, had I never had a penny from anyone I should have been defended out of my own private means. I will take this opportunity of thanking those gentlemen who supported me when I was suppressed by 80,000 men, and 80,000*l.*, as Mr. Wilson told me. To be brief, I never have, under any circumstances, directly received a penny from any capitalist in this country, either shipowner or otherwise; it has been private means alone which supported me. When I was connected with the Sailors' Federation in Liverpool—I do not mean the Shipping Federation, but the Seamen's Federation—it must be understood that according to all dues, without a question of wages at all, they owe me to-day something like 100*l.*, which has never been paid.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. ARTHUR RICHARD ABBOTT called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,698. We understand that you consider that statements have been made before this Commission affecting your character, and that you wish to say something in reply to them?—Yes, but preliminarily I would like to state that if I am unable to go into a rebuttal of the statements which have been made by Mr. Wilson in connexion with his Union, an injustice will be done to the question of labour and to the interest of truth.

14,699. That, I think, is a matter for the Commission. What we have called you here for was to give you an opportunity of saying anything you might think necessary for the clearance of your own character, and we wish you to confine yourself to that. Let us know, in the first place, what are the statements affecting yourself personally of which you think you have to complain, and then you can give us the answer to them?—I have to complain, my Lord, against the evidence which has been given by Mr. Wilson at question 9272. That gentleman refers to the matter that I was engaged by shipowners to libel him. Now, at that time I did not know that truth was a libel, I have

Earl of Derby—continued.

to me. That is a matter which I wish to put right. You have heard something, I believe sufficient, of that case in Liverpool. I should just like to make this one remark, and we will allow that to drop. This is from the chartered accountants, and is a report on the whole of the accounts: "In accordance with your instructions we have examined the annual reports of the National Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union, together with the financial statements for the period ending 28th December 1889, and have to report that we find the same very badly drawn up, and the accounts so complicated that it is an impossibility to reconcile the synopsis of accounts at the end of the book with the detailed statements of the branches preceding them." This is the report of Messrs. Cochran and Walker, of Liverpool (*handing in report*).

14,696. We have heard that you were proceeded against at Liverpool?—Yes.

14,697. That the verdict was in your favour, and that the case was decided not upon technical grounds, but upon the merits?—Upon the merits.

The witness was proceeding to make a statement with reference to the finances of the Sailors and Firemen's Union when he was requested to withdraw, and the Committee deliberated. On the witness being re-called,

The Earl of Derby

informed him that the Commission had already received evidence to the effect that in the libel case his character had been cleared by the verdict of the jury in his favour, and that they could not go any further into the matter.

Earl of Derby—continued.

learned so since; but as it has already been stated here by a previous witness, I have myself been grossly libelled at the instigation of Mr. Wilson. Mr. Austin has referred to the question of my having a criminal law behind my back. I did not wish to put my opponents in prison, provided I could fight them in the open public. Therefore, I wrote a pamphlet without consulting either solicitor, shipowner, or any other man. I had a thousand copies published. I distributed the pamphlet. I may say another thousand were published at the instigation of Mr. —, well, I will not mention the name even, I will betray no one, but it was a trades unionist, and if you press me for the name I shall have to give it, a trades unionist in Sunderland. When I published that pamphlet I must admit that it was a libellous pamphlet, and could not possibly be justified, but still that does not certify that there was no truth in connexion with that libel. Now, Mr. Wilson has stated that shipowners contributed to my defence. As I went to prison for that libel I had no knowledge of who contributed to that defence until I came out, and I had no

19 February 1892.]

Mr. A. R. ABBOTT.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

knowledge until a week or two ago that any shipowner subscribed one penny towards that. Mr. Roche, I think, referred to cards that were issued. I have a card here if you would permit me to read it." This would clearly show that to the best of my knowledge I was not defended in any way by a shipowner. This is a card signed Henry Friend, honorary secretary of the North of England Association—"The Abbott Defence Fund.—To British Seamen and lovers of fair play.—Gentlemen, The committee of this defence fund respectfully solicit your assistance in raising funds to enable Mr. Arthur R. Abbott to secure a fair trial at the next Durham assizes. Defendant was formerly secretary for the London district of the National Union of Seamen and Firemen. He alleges that he was unfairly treated by Mr. J. H. Wilson, the general secretary, and he has done his best to have the facts fairly discussed on a public platform. Mr. Wilson has declined to meet Mr. Abbott, and the latter has published reflections on Mr. Wilson's character, which it is desirable to have thoroughly investigated. Mr. Wilson has practically unlimited funds at his disposal, while Mr. Abbott is practically without means. In the interests of truth and fair play the defence fund has been established, and the committee confidently appeals for assistance so that Mr. Abbott may have a fair chance to stand or fall by the serious charges he has made against the general secretary of the National Seamen and Firemen's Union." Now, after I came out of prison, and I would like to tell you how I got there, I noticed in "Seafaring" a letter signed "Toby at the wheel." This was on May the 3rd, 1890. This letter is criticising Mr. Butcher of the Hull Seamen's Union, and it says, "Another question I would like to ask Mr. Butcher and the members of his Society, why did they contribute 7l. 10s. 0d. to the Abbott defence fund." Then here is Mr. Butcher's reply: "But to answer your correspondent, the reason our members sent it was, because they thought if Mr. Wilson was the man that Abbott said he could prove him to be, it was only fair that he should have every facility to prove his assertions." Now, when a defence fund is opened we certainly cannot tell who is going to contribute to that. I was present with Mr. Friend in Mr. Roche's office at the time Mr. Roche has referred to here before this Commission. Mr. Friend did ask Mr. Roche whether he would get some of his friends to support the defence fund. Mr. Roche agreed to do so, as he stated. How much was collected, how much my defence cost, I do not know, but when Mr. Wilson says that anyone paid me to libel him it is an absolute fabrication. Had an intelligent man, a solicitor—you must remember that I am a seaman, and Mr. Wilson has respectfully requested you to make some allowance for a seaman, we are not talented like lawyers are supposed to be—but if I had had any consultation with any lawyer that pamphlet would

Earl of Derby—continued.

never have been published. But as Mr. Austin here has referred to my going down for six months, it is only fair for this Commission to know, as the public do not know it, that Mr. Wilson took the box at the preliminary hearing. I was there undefended. Before my trial I put some questions to him that would have proved certain things had he given replies to them. The solicitor, as you may be sure, me being undefended, had a good deal his own way. He was Mr. Brown, of the Union. He said, we must not introduce irrelevant matter. The result is the depositions go before the judge who is to try, where Mr. Wilson says it is an absolute falsehood the statement in this libellous pamphlet from beginning to end.

14,700. I think we cannot go into the merits of the case, it having been tried?—No, but would you permit me just to show that my trial was only five minutes. I wanted to show Mr. Austin how I was tried.

14,701. I do not think we can go into that, we must accept the verdict given by a competent court of justice. We cannot go into an argument to show that it is an unjust verdict, though very naturally you may think so?—I say that I was not tried, no evidence given against me by the prosecutor; and, my Lord, as you are in a position, some of you gentlemen, to make laws, I wanted to offer a suggestion.

14,702. We cannot go into the merits of your case, that has been decided by a competent court?—Well, I must bow to your will.

14,703. But what you come here, as I understand, to say, is that you were not employed by the shipowners to write this pamphlet, or to make charges against Mr. Wilson, and you did not ask any shipowner to conduct your defence, and that you did not know they had done so, is that not so?—No, I did not know they had done so till I came out, in fact till lately, that they had made any contribution at all towards my defence. Now, Mr. Wilson says at question 9295 that he questions whether we have any members in the International Federation of Stewards, Seamen, and Firemen. I may say he repeatedly states, and backs it up by the evidence he brings forward, that it was financed by the shipowners. To my knowledge there has never been one penny paid by the shipowners to finance that Society. This I shall be able to prove by letters in a short while, which show how wretchedly poor we were. But Mr. Wilson states that we have no members. Now, I claim that we could give the exact number of members if it had not been for the fact of plots. I wish to read this from "Seafaring." It is Mr. Wilson's address at the annual meeting (Mr. Plimsoll, I believe, was present) where he shows how he sets man against man.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

14,704. No, no, Mr. Wilson said you have got no members. Have you got members?—Certainly we have got members.

14,705. How many have you got?—Then I am not allowed to go into the Officers' Union

19 February 1892.]

Mr. A. R. ABBOTT.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

to repudiate the statements made there, as I protested vigorously, and was expelled for vigorously protesting, against Mr. Wilson using the money of our Society to promote this Masters and Officers' Union, which is now out of existence?

Earl of Derby.

14,706. I do not see that we have anything to do with that?—Mr. Wilson explains how he starts that Masters and Officers' Union at the request of the masters. I have protests against it from any number of the most respectable masters.

14,707. That is not an attack upon you, is it—to go on to your next point?—Mr. Wilson states that he never orders strikes. Here are official protests against his strike policy, if I might be allowed to go into them, but I leave them with you (*handing in printed official protests*). There are 13 from officers of his Union. Then at question 10,027 there is a charge which Mr. Wilson makes against me. He states that the reason he started war with Henry Friend's Union was because they had enrolled a member who was expelled from their Union, and had been paid by shipowners to libel him. I claim that Mr. Wilson issued an order in August to the secretaries of his Union to block all the members of the North of England Association, and that on the 9th December Mr. Wilson entered into a compact to put down the North of England Union by the aid of the coal porters.

14,708. I do not think we have anything to do with that?—Will you permit me to say this, I had no connexion whatever with the North of England Union until the compact was made?

14,709. Yes, that is the point?—I have here a circular to prove this. I would like to read this; it is from the Hull Seamen and Mariners' Amalgamation Association to show how the same crushing power was used there. I was not a member of that Association, but I had the misfortune of being born in Hull, and perhaps that was the reason why he wanted to crush that organisation.

14,710. You had better leave that point now?—Then I will go to Mr. Darby's evidence.

14,711. Let me say, in the first place, you may comment upon anything in Mr. Darby's evidence which you consider constitutes a charge against you or an attack upon you; but do not go into the question of his evidence generally?—At question 10,667 Mr. Darby states that he went to Liverpool after receiving a communication from Captain Lawrence to the effect that a committee of the Trades Congress which was sitting at that time were going to investigate the dispute between A. R. Abbott and J. H. Wilson, and that he did not know he was going to organise the International Federation of Stewards, Seamen, and Firemen. In the address that he makes in Liverpool—I quote from the press there—referring to the National Seamen's Union, Mr. Darby states that "The Union had ceased to be a trades union where one man took

Earl of Derby—continued.

the hand of his fellow, and it was being prostituted for political purposes. They seemed to have lost sight of the original objects of the Union, and it had drifted into the wrong channel. He found from the balance sheet that a sum of 26,000*l.* had been squandered instead of being set by to provide for superannuation and other purposes according to the constitution of the Union. The Union, in some of its present actions, he contended, was far more tyrannical than any capitalist he had ever come across. (Applause.) He had taken a prominent part in promoting the Union; he had helped to make the whip which was now so cruelly flogging men's backs; and he was sorry for it. If he had thought this was what trades unionism would come to, he would rather have been buried a thousand feet deep below the falls of Niagara than have helped it."

14,712. What has this to do with your character?—To show that his statement in connexion with coming to Liverpool was a fabrication—that he did not come there to investigate any dispute between Abbott and Wilson, but he came there for the express purpose of establishing the Union.

14,713. But how does this bear upon your personal conduct? You are allowed to come here to rebut certain charges against yourself and we are quite willing to hear you upon that point; but we cannot go into all those disputes?—Well, I must bow to your will. Am I not allowed to defend our Union as well as my own personal character?

Mr. Jesse Collings.

14,714. What is your Union?—The International Federation of Stewards, Seamen, and Firemen.

14,715. Where is that attacked by Mr. Darby?—At question 10,716 he states that it was financed by shipowners.

Earl of Derby.

14,716. That you deny?—I certainly deny it. To the best of my knowledge not one penny has ever been given by shipowners. I would like to put in the correspondence. Furthermore, Mr. Darby states in connexion with me that he first heard of that Union from Lawrence in Sunderland and Abbott in Shields. He is promoting this Union while I am in durance vile. This is a letter to prove that it is absolutely false. In answer to question 10,719, I wish to read this letter, which was sent to me in Durham Prison:—"80, Ingram Street, August 24th, 1890. "Dear Abbott,—Just a word of kindly greeting to you from Scotland to let you know that you have not been forgotten by me this last six months. We have talked of you by our fireside, and our little ones have asked about you with anxious looks. God grant that they in their future life may never have the wrong to suffer you have for daring to be a man, though not always acting the wisest course. "I write, old fellow, to welcome you, and tell you we shall be glad again to clasp your hand

19 February 1892.]

Mr. A. R. ABBOTT.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

“ and fight life's battle by your side, if God will it, for the love of right. I shall always admire your honesty and love of truth, and trust that we shall learn how to be discreet, and what the law demands of good citizens. Thank God, you will leave the prison as you went in—your character without a blemish, so far as your dealings amongst men are known. You need not be ashamed of the world, and we will always give you a welcome at our fireside. I should have written to you before, but I did not know whether you would be allowed to receive it or not. You know the prison officials have their duty to perform, and God knows that cannot at all times be the most pleasant; but I hope that they will kindly let you have this, my hearty word of greeting and welcome home. I am, dear Arthur, yours faithfully, (Signed) Maurice E. Darby.” Now note this postscript. “P.S.—We have launched the ship ‘Security’; we want you to take a berth in her as one of her officers.” I have the ship “Security” printed on this letter so that you can fully understand what it means. It is put on every stamp and letter-head in the International Federation of Stewards, Seamen, and Firemen. That clearly proves, I think, that Mr. Darby introduced to me—a prisoner—the International Federation of Stewards, Seamen, and Firemen. I also wish to show Mr. Darby's poster.

14,717. I do not think we want all those proofs; we are quite willing to take your assurance. The main point which you wish to prove I take to be that you were not in any way connected with the shipowners?—In no way. Then Mr. Pleasance writes to me on November 30th, 1890—this is in answer to question 10,771—“Dear Arthur—”

14,718. We do not want all your correspondence for years past?—It is really an admission that seeing I will not take any office in the Shipping Federation, he is willing to assist me, and it has a bearing on this statement that I was indirectly employed by the Shipping Federation. Mr. Pleasance stated that he never received any money from our Society. I have his receipts September 10th, for 3*l.* 5*s.*, September 20th, for 7*l.* 10*s.*, which I will pass in to prove that he was paid from the International Federation of Stewards, Seamen, and Firemen. Mr. W. A. Allison seemed very shocked at the pamphlet which was written by Abbott. He signs this address though which was presented to me as I came out of prison, and if he did not endorse my action he should not have signed this:—“We”—this is the National Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union, Tower Hill branch—“We, the undersigned members of the Tower Hill branch, do hereby express our most heartfelt sympathy with Arthur Richard Abbott for his manly stand in the cause of right and justice towards his fellow seamen, and in the interests of trades unionism. And we, the members of the Tower Hill branch, knowing that the said A. R. Abbott was ex-

Earl of Derby—continued.

“pelled from the National Union without any just cause, and not even granted a hearing by the executive committee, do hereby give him a cordial welcome, and express our most implicit confidence in him for the energetic manner in which he worked in forming the National Union in London. And we hereby condemn the way he was treated by the unscrupulous individuals whose sole ambition is their own aggrandisement, and not the intellectual, moral, or physical welfare of the seafaring classes. And trusting that our former secretary for the London district will now be in a position to show these autocratic monopolists up in their true colours before the eyes of the British public, we do hereby request our secretary, Mr. R. Pleasance, to convey to him the warmest thanks and best wishes of the members of the Tower Hill branch of the National Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union.” This is signed by a large number of the members of the Tower Hill branch, and was presented to me on August 27th. I have had published two letters from Mr. Allison, which will show the value of that gentleman's evidence when he attacks other people's characters. Mr. Allison states in one of his answers that he was introduced to shipowners by Hornsby and Abbott, and that he was advised to get the minutes of the Tower Hill branch published in the “Shipping Gazette.” I have his letters here and also the letters of Mr. Pleasance, telling me he is going to have those minutes published in the “Shipping Gazette.” I sent a letter begging of them not to do so, as it was recognised a good deal as a shipowners' paper, but to have them printed in the “Labour Elector.” As for introducing Mr. Allison to any shipowner, I did not know any shipowner in London, with the exception of Sir Donald Currie, whom I met on one occasion when we went and asked for an advance of wages. Therefore, it is an entire fabrication. In the summary that I sent forward I wish to deal with the way in which I have been libelled by Mr. Wilson and at his instigation. When the “Eastern Star” was blocked here by the National Seamen's Union and the coal porters together in 1890, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Fitzgerald—

14,719. Is this contradicting any evidence that was given before us?—Only this fact, these libels had been published against me repeatedly by Mr. Wilson.

14,720. We do not sit here to consider all the libels that may have been published against you or against anybody else. If evidence has been given before this Commission affecting your character, we allow you in common fairness to come here and rebut it, but as to libels which have been published, with which the Commission have nothing to do, we cannot hear your answer to those, they do not concern us?—Then that is all I wish to say. Perhaps you will permit me to leave these letters and documents in the hands of the Secretary (*handing in papers*).

The witness withdrew.

19 February 1892.]

Mr. P. B. SUTCLIFFE

[Continued.]

Mr. PAUL BROWN SUTCLIFFE called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,721. We understand that you have come before us to give evidence on various points. Perhaps I had better say at first that we do not want to go into some of the general questions which you raise in the summary of your evidence, because we have heard a great deal upon those subjects already, and it is absolutely necessary that some limit of time should be fixed. We should, therefore, be obliged to you if you would confine your evidence to any particular points which have been stated before us, as to which you have personal knowledge, and in which you have a special personal interest?—I suggest, then, that we commence with the fourth point,—the objects and aims of the Shipping Federation. I would say that it is the only means that I see by which the socialistic Union of Wilson can be combated successfully, and that if it was not for the Shipping Federation, men who have an independent mind from those of Wilson's Union would not be permitted to follow their avocations in life. The next point is the influence that the Shipping Federation carries and holds over the labouring and seafaring classes. The Shipping Federation was instituted, as I conceive it, to meet the evils which the socialistic institution of Wilson had foisted upon the country. I will say, so far as I am concerned, and I have had a great deal of experience with the Shipping Federation, that is indirectly, that I have never seen an unworthy act connected with the Shipping Federation—they have only combined themselves together as masters have a right to do to meet the dictatorial policy of these which I term socialistic Unions.

14,722. What opportunities have you had of judging this matter. What is your position?—I am a seaman.

14,723. How many years have you been at sea?—I have been all my life at sea very nearly.

14,724. Are you in any way connected with the Shipping Federation?—No, nor never have been.

14,725. Nor am I to infer, from what you say, with any union?—I was connected firstly with the Seamen's Union until I saw its socialistic tendencies, and then I took opposition to the great strike of 1889, and they expelled me from the Union. Then we will go to the seventh point, union men *versus* federation men on shipboard. I can say positively that I have sailed with better seamen, better conducted men, under federation auspices than ever I did under union auspices. The next point deals with unseaworthy ships and so forth. In all my experience of British ships, which has been for 10 years past, I have never yet sailed on an unseaworthy ship.

14,726. What trade have you been in, I mean in what part of the world?—I have been in all trades, the East India trades, the Continental trades, the American trades, the Mediterranean trades, and in fact all trades. I have seen masters come down, Lloyd's agents as well as Board of Trade men, and inspect the ships thoroughly before they went to sea, and as to

Earl of Derby—continued.

this thing of ships going to sea unseaworthy, I consider it all a piece of bosh simply. The men can see themselves whether the ship is unseaworthy or not when they go on board the ship, and if they do find she is, I suppose they would complain to the Board of Trade and have a strict investigation of the matter.

14,727. Of course you can only speak of what you know yourself, you have never sailed or been asked to sail in an unseaworthy ship?—I never have sailed in an unseaworthy ship. The next point is the food, quarters, and treatment of men on shipboard. The food generally, as far as my experience goes, is more than what the men sign for; there have been extras allowed. The quarters could be improved, but the men themselves could improve them by keeping more cleanliness in their quarters.

14,728. Do you agree with what has been said that a larger cubic area is required per man?—I think that there is sufficient in all ships that I have been on. The men themselves add, through laziness and dilatoriness, and so forth, to the insufficiency of air. They make their quarters filthy in a manner, so to speak. Then the treatment of men on shipboard, that depends upon themselves entirely.

14,729. Do you mean that if they are obedient to orders and amenable to discipline, you do not think that bad treatment is common?—Not in the least. I have never found it with any crew I have been with. When they are amenable to orders and conduct themselves as seamen should, I have never found one of them badly treated yet.

14,730. What do you know personally about the Shipping Federation?—I know this much, from my personal acquaintance with gentlemen who are connected with the Shipping Federation and shipowners in the city of Glasgow, that they were compelled to federate themselves together in a union, and to make it a sort of amalgamated national affair to combat Mr. Wilson and his tendencies towards coercing them into his belief and employing only union men.

14,731. Then from your point of view it is a purely defensive association?—A defensive association only, as far as I can conceive it.

14,732. You have something to tell us about the Seamen and Firemen's Union and the Dock Labourers' Union, I think?—Yes, I find that they are arrogant and aggressive in the extreme to non-unionists or anyone connected with the Shipping Federation. They would not allow anyone with the exception of themselves to follow the avocation of a seaman unless they became members of the Seamen and Firemen's Union. I have witnessed on several occasions assaults and intimidation in the city of Glasgow.

14,733. You state in the summary that you have something to say, I presume in reply, upon the evidence which Mr Wilson gave before the Commission?—I have only one question that I wish to speak to, and that is in reference

19 February 1892.]

Mr. P. B. SUTCLIFFE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

to Mr. Wilson's misleading evidence regarding picketing. Mr. Wilson says in his evidence that he is not aware of any intimidation, and so forth, being practised, but I have witnessed it being practised, and I have seen men's arms and legs broken through what he calls his picketing body, between him and the Dock Labourers' Union; I will not say exactly it was the seamen, but it was between them and the Dock Labourers' Union. I have known those men to be carried to the Western Infirmary in Glasgow.

14,734. Where was this?—It was on the Finieston Quay in Glasgow.

14,735. Then you are prepared to say that there was a good deal of intimidation on the part of the unionists against the non-unionists?—Yes, there was very much intimidation, and it is a practice that I would unhesitatingly condemn, for it is pernicious both to life and property.

14,736. Is there anything else in connexion with the shipping trade that you wish to state to us?—No, I have nothing further, unless there be some questions which some one of the Commission would be pleased to put to me. I should be pleased to answer them if such was the case, if I could.

Mr. Austin.

14,737. How long have you been a seaman?—For 20 years.

14,738. Were you ever a member of the Seamen's Union?—I was, but only for a short time.

14,739. Did you ever try to get an official position in that Union?—I did not.

14,740. Did you attend several meetings and denounce the shipowners as unscrupulous scoundrels?—I did not.

14,741. Were your services rejected by the Glasgow branch of the Union when you wrote them a letter?—They were not. I never offered them a letter.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. CUTHBERT LAWS called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,751. What evidence do you propose to give?—Might I explain that my father, Mr. G. A. Laws, is too seriously ill to attend here today. I propose, if your Lordship will permit me, to read the evidence he was to give, Mr. Laws being quite willing to submit himself at any later sitting for cross-examination, if necessary.

14,752. Certainly, will you proceed to do so?—Having read the evidence given by Mr. Clem. Edwards, before Group B, on the 16th November 1891, I respectfully request that I may be further examined by the Committee, especially concerning statements made by the before-named witness in replies to the following questions, namely, at question 8622, the witness said, "The origin of that dispute was a departure on the part of three large shipping lines in the "Albert Dock from the usual customs observed in shipping on men at the mercantile marine

Mr. Austin—continued.

14,742. Is this a letter written by you to Mr. Boyd, then secretary of the Seamen's Union, dated November 20th, 1890: "Dear Sir, "The struggle is going to be a desperate one, "and we must be prepared to fight with all "the sinews of war at our command. Eighteen "months ago and more I saw what the inevitable consequences would be at the mad rate "that we were rushing. I then determined "apparently to sever my connexion with the "Union for the purpose of sifting the chaff "from the grain. Moreover, I decided to let "all officials of the Union think I had done so "in order to worm myself into the good graces "of the shipowners, so that my weapons might "be the more effectual when the struggle came. "How well I have carried out my plan, my "past record proves." There is a lot more in that strain. Is that a letter you wrote?—I unhesitatingly denounce it as a forgery.

14,743. You do so?—Unhesitatingly.

14,744. Would you deny it if the original copy of this letter was produced?—I can deny it unhesitatingly.

14,745. What is the object of your giving evidence here to-day?—My object is my own object, to denounce Wilson and his fraudulent body.

14,746. Have you been induced to come here?—Not at all, until Maurice E. Darby brought my name before the Commission, and then I wrote personally to ask to rebut his evidence.

14,747. Are you connected with any union at present?—Not in the least.

14,748. With the Shipping Federation?—Not at all.

14,749. What is your occupation at present?—My occupation? I have risen to a little better position than a seaman; it is only since last September I quitted it. I am an author just at present, and in the literary world.

14,750. You deny that you wrote such a letter?—I do unhesitatingly.

Earl of Derby—continued.

"offices. The men strongly objected to that "departure, on the ground that it deprived them "of certain rights or privileges which they had "exercised under one of the Merchant Shipping "Acts, especially that providing for the trans- "mission of money, and the different facilities "given for their banking the money in the "mercantile marine offices. It also deprived "them of the right of having an independent "union delegate to look after their interests; "it further deprived them of the right of seeing "exactly who their shipmates were before they "signed on." The origin of the dispute at the Albert Docks is improperly stated in the answer. The trouble commenced in September 1890, when delegates of the National Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union claimed to monopolise certain ship work, which had previously been done by the Hammermen's Union, as stated by the witness Langridge, of the British India

19 February 1892.]

MR. CUTBERT LAWS.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

Steam Navigation Company. The Sailors' Union withdrew their members of the crew, and picketed the shipping offices. The managers then arranged for shipment of the crews on board the steamers instead of at the mercantile marine offices. The crew were mustered on deck, and signed articles in presence of the mercantile marine superintendent, as required by law. The men never objected to this; on the contrary, numbers of them complained that they were obstructed by the delegates. The men were deprived of no privileges by signing articles on board; there is no transmission of money on engagement, and no banking facilities are required. The unions have no legal right to have a delegate present when the crews sign on at the shipping office, but, on the contrary, when signing on board delegates were frequently present. It has long been the custom to ship crews on board foreign-going vessels, and I produce the Board of Trade handbill No. 313, in proof of this. Then in the coasting trade it has during 40 years been legal to ship the crews on board under all circumstances, and probably not less than 80,000 men are annually engaged in this way. I put in the handbill referred to (see *Appendix 89*). Then at question 8631 Mr. Edwards states, "We waited upon the Shipping Federation and they conceded to us the following terms: (1.) That the Shipping Federation will not give preference of employment to non-union men. (2.) That the Federation will 'sign on' men at the mercantile marine offices in those cases where ships have been in the habit of having their crews so signed prior to the present dispute." Doubtless through inadvertence the witness has mis-stated the result of a meeting on 12th February 1891. In my previous evidence I put in a transcript of the shorthand notes taken (see *Appendix 70, Vol. I, Evidence*), and I now hand in copy of the memorandum read by the chairman to the union representatives when they left, and to which they agreed. This is the memorandum: "12th February 1891, 5.30. Mr. Walsh, Mr. Tom Mann, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Clem Edwards"—those were the delegates who were present at the meeting—"Memo. The deputation will let me have a written proposal from the trades unions on strike, which, if received in time, I undertake to lay before the executive council of the Federation." At question 8632 Mr. Edwards states, "On Monday morning I received a letter from Mr. Laws." The letter referred to by the witness as received on Monday was a private letter, and so marked.

Earl of Derby—continued.

The witness did call upon me on the 16th in answer to my letter of that date, but was principally anxious to know whether the council would negotiate, if the terms named in my letter of that date were complied with. I referred him to the letter of 14th, and said the concluding lines implied that they would do so upon any proper question submitted, but they would not discuss whether union men only should be employed. Next day the manifesto (see *Appendix 85*) was withdrawn on paper, but the block was not removed, and no applications for work were made by the strikers, although I had arranged to keep one of the large steamers open for the union men if they chose to resume work. I now hand in copy of the letter conveying to the secretary of the Federated Riverside Trades the resolution of the Shipping Federation executive,* also the full correspondence, but no union delegates accompanied by any of the workers called (*handing in printed copy of the correspondence and memorandum above referred to*). No negotiations were entered into by my executive, therefore none could be broken off, as stated, and there could be no breach of faith, as alleged. At question 8634 the witness states, "I may say that Mr. Furness, member of Parliament for Hartlepool, seconded the resolution at the general meeting of shipowners; and so convinced was he that he had seconded it under misrepresentations that he withdrew." There was no misrepresentation of any kind, original letters were read in every case to the meetings. Mr. C. Furness did offer to mediate, and at his request the word "preference" was eliminated from the second issue of tickets about to be printed, as he properly pointed out that if all seamen accepted the ticket no preference could be given to anyone. Upon the main issue, however, the executive declined to negotiate. The dispute was settled by the good sense of the working stevedores, who refused to let the "Wade's Arms" delegates have "a voice in the matter first," and declined to abstain from working on any ships after 25th of February as ordered. I hand in a copy of the union manifesto of the 25th of February (see *Appendix 15, Vol. I, Evidence*), in which the "Wade's Arms" delegates asked for a voice in the matter first. Then at question 8640 the witness is entirely mistaken in supposing that any of the free labourers received firearms on board the "Scotland," but they may have provided these themselves. If so, it was without the knowledge or sanction of our officials. Then at question

* In a letter to the secretary (dated May 4th, 1892), Mr. G. A. Laws regrets that this letter was not read out, and particularly requests that it should be printed herein.—G. D.

TO CLEM EDWARDS, Secretary, FEDERATION OF TRADERS AND LABOUR UNIONS.

DEAR SIR,

The Executive Council of this Federation have to-day fully considered the correspondence which has been exchanged between the 13th and 18th instant, and I am directed to annex herewith a copy of a resolution which has been passed thereon.

Yours truly,

(Signed) G. A. LAWS.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

Friday, 19th February 1891.

"That this Council adheres to the public notice passed and issued on the 13th instant, and is surprised that the withdrawal of the 'Wade's Arms' manifesto has not been followed by the resumption of work. Subject, however, to the 'block' on the boycotted lines and other ships in London being removed forthwith and the men returning to work, this council will be prepared, if desired, to meet responsible representatives of the various Labour Unions interested in ship work, accompanied by actual workers interested."

19, February 1892.]

Mr. CUTBERT LAWS.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

8647 the witness states, "On April 6th a woman named Mrs. Buckner, of Wellclose Square, was brought up at the Old Bailey charged with forging discharges. The evidence upon which she was convicted went to show that she had forged 500 A.B. certificates in a period of two months; that every one of the men whose certificates had been forged had passed through the Shipping Federation offices." The witness is again mistaken. Very few of the forged discharges appear to have been presented at the Shipping Federation registry offices, and most of these were discovered and detained. I now put them in (*landing in discharges*), but some others were sent to the mercantile marine offices. Several others were sent. Then at question 8649, the witness is asked, "You say also that they have agents on the Continent, who have made engagements with foreign fishermen and seamen," and he replies, "That is so. There is undeniable evidence that a very large proportion of Finland fishermen and a considerable number of the Rhine steamboat men were pledged to come over to this country in the event of a dispute." The witness has been misinformed, and he did not offer to put in the "undeniable evidence" referred to. As a matter of fact, we have not, and have never had, a single agent abroad. The supply of free labour in this country was abundant. My policy from the first has been to displace local labour as little as possible, and to give work to the unemployed in each district. I can safely say that our labour agents throughout the kingdom are on the best terms with the actual workers, both union and free men; the paid delegates only are hostile. The Commissioners will understand that with thousands in this country willing and anxious to work for us, there was not even the inducement for bringing foreigners to compete with them. Moreover, public opinion upon our side would have turned against us, and agitators would have been supplied with the very grievance now suggested. Then at question 8814 the witness said, "I have failed to find, with one exception, any case where free labourers have been assaulted by union men." It is simply impossible that the witness could be ignorant of the large number of assaults and the continued and systematic intimidation that took place during the strike referred to. I submit a list of some cases where convictions were secured. (This evidence was only put into my hands late last night, and I regret that I have been unable to find this list, but I have taken from my diary several names of men who were convicted for assaults.) (*See Appendix 90.*)

Duke of Devonshire.

14,753. Where were these assaults committed?—They were assaults during the Carron and Hermitage wharves strike. A man called Butler got eight months' hard labour, a man called Hayes got four months' hard labour, a man called McCarthy got three months' hard labour, a man called Hampshire got six months' hard labour, and a man called Appleby was bound over in 30L

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

to keep the peace. Those are what I have just taken from my book. It is not the list referred to by Mr. Laws, but there are some of these assaults contained in that list. They were very bad assaults; the men were beaten with sticks, and in one case a man was ripped up with a stevedore's hook. Then at question 8815 the witness has drawn on his imagination entirely in this reply. No such gang as the "Eye-ball busters" was ever heard of by the Shipping Federation, and none such employed. Some of the free labourers were men of splendid physique, and gave a good account of themselves, even when attacked at a disadvantage, as was often the case.

Earl of Derby.

14,754. Now, you have some replies to make to the statements made by Mr. Wilson?—Yes. In regard to the evidence given by the witness, Mr. J. H. Wilson, Seamen's Union secretary, and the statement in question 9176 that ships were seriously undermanned in 1851—I may say that from that period I was serving my time as an apprentice on board Liverpool vessels in the East India trade, and I heard no complaints of undermanning. I know by experience that British vessels were well manned, and vessels of 500 to 1,000 tons would carry from four to eight hands more than American ships of similar sizes, which were then our great competitors in the trade. Then at question 9184 Mr. Wilson said, "considerable improvement took place from the year 1851 up to the year 1855." The improvement in seamen's wages described up to 1855 resulted from the great demand for shipping caused by the Crimean war, and in no way from the efforts of any union, such combinations being very little known and never spoken of by seamen at that time. The depression in wages which followed was caused by the decreased demand for shipping after peace was declared. (Wages from the north-east coast have always ranged 5 or 10 per cent. higher than from other United Kingdom ports entirely irrespective of unions of seamen.) During all this time I never saw or heard of brutality on board English vessels, although in some American and Canadian vessels discipline had to be enforced by the belaying pin, to some extent. This was a consequence of lawless and reckless men having to be kept in restraint by determined masters, but cruelty could never be made a general charge against the officers of our mercantile marine, and it is absurd to suggest that shipowners encouraged it. Then I wish to refer to the answer to question 9200. The explanation given here by witness cannot excuse or justify the language frequently employed by him to excite and inflame the minds of seamen against their employers generally, many of whom he has stated were "guilty of deliberate and wilful murder," and that while he believed there were honourable men engaged in the shipping industry, at the same time he knew there was "a gang of cut-throats and robbers in the business."—such statements taken in connexion with the printed suggestion in the paper of the

19 February 1892.]

Mr CUTHBERT LAWS.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

Union, viz., that shipowners had actually participated in the murder for which Conway, the union secretary, was convicted,—denote an evident intention to mislead. The Union has delegates at every port, and the general secretary could easily warn seamen against sailing in the old and unseaworthy vessels described, without making the sweeping charges referred to, when addressing uneducated and excitable men. I hand in a report of the speech containing the references I have quoted (see Appendix 91). Then at question 9263 Mr. Wilson states, “the provisions if anything are worse to-day than they were at that time, because the owners, being compelled by our Union to pay better wages, have taken it out of the men in another way by putting poor provisions on board and less men. That is how they have made up for the extra pay.” In regard to provisions, the statement made by the witness cannot be substantiated. In my own experience at sea on long voyages the minimum scale was adhered to of necessity, but bread was always *ad lib.*, and water was not stinted unless voyages were unduly protracted. The food, though uninviting and plain, was wholesome, as proved by the fact that lads thrive and become strong men on the usual scale. I can speak from personal experience in stating that the greatest care was taken by managing owners and ships’ husbands to see the casks of beef and pork opened and examined at the provision dealer’s stores before they were sent on board, and I am certain that this was a general custom. The Merchant Shipping Act, 1867, section 7, provides that if proper food and water are not supplied the seamen can, in case of illness, get damages, and “up to three months’ wages. Since the advent of steam the voyages have been much shorter, and it has been possible to vary and improve the provision scale. The statement made that owners could or would make up for high wages by putting poor provisions on board, and fewer men, is wholly imaginary. Shipowners get their provisions from ship store dealers. Bread and water are now carried in iron tanks instead of casks, and as a rule it will be found that provisions and ships’ stores have improved and kept pace with everything else. No doubt, however, the great improvement in steam appliances for lightening labour on board vessels have made it possible to navigate them with fewer hands and equal safety, and this in itself is a great advantage as fewer lives are at risk in case of a rapid foundering after collision or otherwise. Then in reference to questions 9272 to 9290 the witness is quite mistaken in attributing any of the alleged acts named to the Shipping Federation, which was only registered on the 1st October 1890. The Federation had no knowledge of these matters until as manager I was summoned by the Union to give evidence in the libel actions brought against the newspapers named, until that time I had never heard of the alleged libels, and could not have testified on the subject either one way or the other, as I knew absolutely nothing of the dispute, not having been connected with it in

Earl of Derby—continued.

any way. Then, in answer to question 9291, the witness says: “I shall also hand in a letter which was sent by Mr. Laws of the Shipping Federation to one of those men engaged in this work for him and others to go to Glasgow in the month of October 1889 for the purpose of upsetting our Congress. Their expenses were paid for by the Shipping Federation. In Mr. Laws’s letter he refers them to a Mr. Neilson Bird, who is the secretary of the Shipping Federation in the Glasgow district. Those seven men went to Glasgow and applied to Mr. Neilson Bird, and he paid them 25*l.*, or a sum equal to that, for their trip to Scotland for the purpose of annoying us at our annual Congress,” and so forth in the same strain. The statement of the witness in regard to my action in connexion with the Glasgow Congress of the Seamen’s Union is absolutely unfounded. The policy of my Federation from the first has been to support any union the members of which did not object to sail with free men, and our shipowners did assist Lawrence with travelling expenses, &c. for establishing new branches, and we also gave employment to any steady, reliable seamen of their international Union in the same way as we supported other free unions, but the condition on which Lawrence was assisted was that on no account should he interfere with the witness or enter into personalities with him. This is proved by my report (dated September 1890) on page 6 in the book of transactions submitted to your Chairman during my first evidence. The suggestion that I went to Liverpool for the purpose named in the answer is equally unfounded and absurd, and the object of my visit is clearly shown by my report dated 10th September, printed at page 7 of the book before named. If you will permit me, I should just like to read one extract from that report. This is a report on the interview spoken of by this witness, and Mr. Laws concludes thus: “In regard to any accusations or personalities in connexion with Wilson, I was most careful to impress upon these men that this Federation would not give its countenance to anything of the kind, and that any such occurrence would be certain to alienate the sympathy of the shipowners with whom I had arranged.” That is dated September 6th, 1890; that is Mr. Laws’s report to the executive council of the Federation. The man Pleasance was accredited to me by a shipowners’ association as being a person suitable to act as registrar at one of the offices we were about to open; but learning that he had a dispute with the witness I did not put him in charge until the dispute should be cleared up. Pleasance called upon me several times, and also brought his solicitor, Mr. Dutton, who explained that he had been a branch secretary for the National Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen’s Union, and had been improperly expelled, in support of which they showed me a judgment of a court that the books of the branch should remain in his custody. Pleasance stated that if he was enabled to make an appeal to the general meeting of the Union, as provided by the rules, his character would be vindicated; and

19 February 1892.]

MR. CUTHBERT LAWS.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

he begged me to interest myself with shipowners to obtain funds for taking him and his witnesses to Glasgow to lay his case before the annual meeting; and this I did, at the same time warning him that if he entered into personal matters with the witness he would lose any chance of employment in our offices. I told him that I would see by the papers whether he behaved himself properly or not. Then, at question 9301, in reply to the question "Who is Mr. Darby?" Mr. Wilson states: "He was a man who was formerly an official of our Union; then he was engaged by the Shipping Federation and those owners after he left our Union to join in this conspiracy to break our Union up." The letter read by the witness was written by me to the man Darby in reply to an application by him to be employed as registrar in our Glasgow office. I submit copies of his letters herewith. I would like now to read these letters; it will save my dealing with Mr. Darby's evidence later on. This is a letter dated the 4th September 1890, written from 80, Ingram Street, Glasgow, to — Laws, Esquire. "Dear Sir,—As I have been informed that you have been appointed general manager to the newly-appointed association of shipowners, you will no doubt be aware that I have already been in communication with the Chamber of Shipping on the subject, and also the shipowners of Glasgow, who have to-day suggested that I should at once write you with respect to the same, and offer to place my services at your disposal. In respect to the suggestion, I beg to offer my services, feeling assured that owing to the vast experience which I have in the matter of organisations, coupled with the knowledge of the present state of the labour market, will be of material assistance to you and the association generally. The favour of your reply at your earliest convenience will greatly oblige. Yours truly, Maurice E. Darby, late district secretary National Union of Seamen and Firemen." The reply was sent on the 5th September 1890. "Mr. M. E. Darby, 80, Ingram Street, Glasgow. Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of yesterday's date, I thank you for your offer of services contained therein, and will keep same before me should the occasion arise to use them after the first executive meeting. Yours truly, G. A. Laws." Then comes another letter from Darby on the 1st October 1890. "G. T. Laws, Esquire, Shipping Federation. Dear Sir,—I have just returned home from the Tyne or should have written you before, as suggested by you to me in London. I do not know what arrangements you may have made with Captain Lawrence, but to make a success of the movement in the Clyde, it will be necessary for me to have at once an office on the Broomielaw, with one or two delegates to get the men up. There is a fine opportunity just now, as dissatisfaction is rife all along the line. I can get an office here for about 20*l.* rent annually, and could work it in wages to staff, myself included, at about 6*l.* per week for the start. There is a large number of men ready to enrol with me as soon as protection to their

Earl of Derby—continued.

"employment is guaranteed." Darby, in his evidence before the Commission, stated that they had the greatest difficulty in getting men, in fact it was almost an impossibility, contradicting something which Mr. Laws had said: "Would you kindly enlighten me as to the definite course you wish me to pursue. I am your obedient servant, Maurice E. Darby." Then comes a letter from Mr. Laws to Darby on the 2nd October 1890: "Dear Sir, Your letter of the first received and carefully noted. No arrangement whatever has been made with Captain Lawrence with regard to yourself. I saw Mr. Bird yesterday, and asked him to hold a meeting of his district committee, and see what arrangement could be made with you in regard to the district offices, and I hope you will call and see him on the subject. Personally, I think that yourself and one delegate and a boy should be enough for the Glasgow office, but, of course, this is a matter which will be entirely subject to the decision of the local committee. It appears that a N. S. U. general meeting is to be held in Glasgow on Monday, and that you are likely to attend. Allow me to suggest that any remarks exceeding the bounds of fair criticism would only damage your position, if you are afterwards to be connected with the registry offices. A copy of this, with your letter, will be handed to Mr. Bird, who will no doubt write me on the subject. Yours truly, G. A. Laws." I had learned from Pleasance that Darby was also to be present at the Glasgow Union meeting, and I took the opportunity in my letter to caution him in that part of my letter which the witness omitted to read until requested. Then, as to question 9312, in support of my previous testimony as to the action of the union officials, I now submit copy of judgment under which the witness himself was convicted and fined for inducing men to desert after signing articles. This is also in reply to some statements or allegations made by Mr. Wilson. I have not got the exact number of the question, but he said that it was not with the cognizance of the officials that the men came out of ships after signing articles; that they came out of their own accord, and had been or would be censured by the union officials had it come to their knowledge. I should like to state that this evidence was in Mr. Laws's possession when he was here before, but he did not wish to bring in any personal matters unless forced to do so. Perhaps you will allow me to read this:—"Conviction for penalty, &c. In the borough of Sunderland, in the county of Durham. Before the Court of Summary Jurisdiction sitting at the police court, Bishopswearmouth, in the said borough, the sixth day of September one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, Joseph Havelock Wilson (herein-after called the Defendant) is this day convicted before this Court for that he, on the twenty-seventh day of April one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, at the parish of Sunderland within the said borough, unlawfully did attempt to persuade Thomas Carfrae, being a seaman lawfully

19 February 1892.]

MR. CUTBERT LAWS.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

“ engaged to serve on board a certain British steamship called the ‘Edmondsley,’ to desert from the said steamship contrary to the statute in such case made and provided. And it is adjudged that the Defendant for his said offence do forfeit and pay the sum of five pounds, and do also pay the further sum of three pounds six shillings and sixpence for costs. And in default of payment it is adjudged that the sum due thereunder be levied by distress and sale of Defendant’s goods. James Stokoe, Geo. R. Booth, Thomas Steel, Justices of the Peace for the Borough aforesaid.” Then, my Lord, here is a report of the case against the Newport branch secretary of the Union. It is from the “South Wales Times,” dated the 20th October. “Sequel to a Newport strike. The Seamen’s Union secretary charged with assault. Members of a crew and a boarding master maltreated. Heavy fines.” Perhaps I need not trouble you by reading all that, but the crew referred to had signed articles. The man Gillman, the union secretary, was fined 3*l.*; Sullivan, another union man, was fined 2*l.* and costs, or one month’s imprisonment. I have also another case here of the “Herschell,” in support of what I have stated, which I might be permitted to read. The name of the paper from which this is taken is the “Shipping World,” September 1890. “Useful as trades unions are when wisely directed, they are sometimes instruments of the worst kind of tyranny. An example of this was furnished at Plymouth in the early part of last month. The steamship ‘Herschell,’ owned by Messrs. Wilkie and Turnbull, of North Shields, and commanded by Captain Davidson, a cool-headed and skilful seaman, entered the Plymouth dock to discharge a cargo of grain previous to coming to the Bristol Channel to coal for Port Said. While at Plymouth the local leader or representative of the Seamen and Firemen’s Union found fault with the rate of wages that was being paid, and ordered the crew out of the ship, which order they obeyed. The current rate of wages was 4*l.* 15*s.* per month. Captain Davidson was not long in agreeing to pay these wages; but the local secretary of the Union then demanded 5*l.* per month, and also that an engineer’s steward should be placed on the ship, though the engineers themselves had not preferred such a request, and had no wish for it. Even to this arbitrary demand Captain Davidson was willing to agree rather than that his ship should be delayed. Then the secretary insisted that a steward of his selection should be taken on. This the captain of the ‘Herschell’ promptly refused to accede to. But he could not obtain a crew at Plymouth against the order of the secretary of the Seamen and Firemen’s Union. He was not, however, to be balked. So after consulting with his officers, who stuck to him in the most creditable manner, he resolved to navigate his ship in ballast, to Barry dock, without a crew. He had no easy task, and the risk was great, but he had confidence in himself and his

Earl of Derby—continued.

“ officers, and so in the teeth of endless threats from the defeated secretary on the quay Captain Davidson brought his ship out of Plymouth Harbour and round to Barry dock with six officers, a steward, and himself, without a single mishap.” Also in support of what I have stated I would like to read very briefly a cutting referring to the organising secretary of the Union who was convicted of this same offence which Mr. Wilson denies having any knowledge of. This is from the “Hartlepool Mail” of the 20th October 1891. “William Sprow, local delegate of the Seamen and Firemen’s Union, was next summoned for persuading a seaman, Angus Morrison, to refuse to go to sea, and to desert from his ship. The evidence for the prosecution was that Morrison signed articles on Friday October 23rd, and went on board with his effects. Shortly afterwards he was sent for by Sprow, who advised him to leave the ship, and said if he would do so, he would see that he got 12*s.* per week while he was out, and at the first opportunity a fresh vessel would be found for him. Morrison left the ship, taking with him his clothing, and did not go back again, although he was, he admitted, quite content to have sailed with the ship. Sprow, in defence, said that Morrison came to him early on the Friday night, and asked to be allowed to be a member of the Sailors’ Union. He was short of his money, and defendant refused to accept him, and said if he left the ship it would be on his own responsibility. He called witnesses to support this statement, and then asked the Bench to adjourn the case for the attendance of the captain of the ‘James Groves,’ who would substantiate what he had said. The Bench, who said they did not see specially why the captain should be present, retired, and on returning said they had come to the conclusion that the case was conclusively proved against defendant. He had persuaded the man to leave his ship. The penalty was 10*l.*, but they intended to inflict a mitigated penalty of 3*l.* and costs, or in default one month” (*handing in cutting*). The authentic reports made to me by masters and seamen on this subject were very numerous. At question 9326 Mr. Wilson is asked, “What was the general result of those strikes at the places you have mentioned?” and his reply is: “The general result has been that we have got the preference clause put out of the original federation ticket, and we have also got the tickets free instead of paying 1*s.*” The reply given by the witness is entirely incorrect. The federation ticket referred to never had a preference clause at any time, nor was any charge made for it. I now confirm my previous evidence on the subject, as the witness audaciously attempts to confuse the paper ticket which was required of all seamen, and for which nothing was charged, with the parchment registry certificate for which 1*s.* always has been, and still is, charged. I now go to the question of deck loads, referring to Mr. Wilson’s answer to question 9348. In regard to deck loads, both the presi-

19 February 1852.]

Mr. CUTHBERT LAWS.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

dent and the secretary of the National Association of Seamen and Firemen's Union improperly infer that 3 feet of timber may be legally carried on deck to British ports in the winter, whereas section 24 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1876 requires that no timber or heavy wood goods shall be carried on deck in the close time, under a penalty of 5*l.* per 100 feet, which together with the tonnage due is prohibitory as far as owners are concerned. The only exception is in the case of light wood goods, which may be carried on deck to the height of 3 feet. They can be jettisoned with safety and ease, if required, and most seamen agree that stable vessels so loaded are safer. The light wood acts as a spar deck, and prevents the wells being flooded by the seas in heavy weather. In regard to accommodation for seamen on board ship, the principal Act, section 231, and the Merchant Shipping Act, 1867, section 9, provides for 72 cubic feet and 12 superficial feet for each seaman. The latter section has nine clauses, providing for proper lighting and ventilation, exclusive of ship's stores, construction of privies, &c., under penalties, and the seaman can also recover damages if the master allows the accommodation to be encumbered by stores, &c. The Act of 1854 provided that forecabin and houses for seamen if situated on deck should not be added to the tonnage for dues, and this law had an excellent effect, inducing owners to build light and airy quarters above, instead of crowding them below the main or floating deck. Unfortunately this section was repealed by the Tonnage Act of 1889, and it does not appear that this Union attempted to assist owners when resisting this alteration of the law, so much against the interest of seamen themselves. Both the president of the Union and this witness should examine some of the East-end lodging-houses, where sailors often get to, and compare them with the quarters on board ship, which only require strict cleanliness to make them comfortable and healthy. At question 9390, in reply to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and others, the witness refers to "an extensive" circulation of libellous literature by the "Federation." Such a statement is absolutely unfounded. The only papers circulated to our registry offices for the use of seamen were Mr. Champion's speeches on trades unionism (whose platform we agreed with), and other works on the same subject, copies of which are herewith submitted (*see Appendix 92*). I do not think I should be overstating the case if I say that I have received some hundredweights of manuscript literature of the kind complained of, which was never even read when once its nature was ascertained. People have called upon me, offering to give absolute proof of matter to discredit the witness; most of those were union men. All were dismissed with the same reply, namely, that we had no personal quarrel with Wilson, and the Union must settle their own differences. In this connexion I would beg leave to put in a specimen of the kind of literature which was freely circulated by the Union at the formation of the Federation, both in circular form like the

Earl of Derby—continued.

present example, and in the form of large posters, also by means of "Seafaring," which was supplied to and distributed by all union branch offices throughout the kingdom. This is the circular referred to; I would ask leave to read only a very short extract, in which the Federation is referred to. This is a report of a speech by Mr. J. H. Wilson at a meeting in Newport on November 6th, 1890, under the presidency of Mr. Frank Gillman secretary to the Newport Trades Council, and to the Newport branch of the Seamen and Firemen's Union. The gentleman whose conviction for assault I have just read out. Mr. Wilson said, "The ship-owners, he was bound to say, had other intentions in building up the Federation than to deal with the wages. They had, some of them, sent their ships to sea in the hope that they would never return again, and some of them who had made such large piles of money in that way were the very men who were promoting the Shipping Federation to-day." He goes on in that strain for a little more, and concludes, "These were some of the reasons why these jettifogging, back-sliding cut-throats were leaning on the Shipping Federation. It was a large syndicate formed, not with the intention of fighting them on the wages question"—(although Mr. Wilson has stated this in his evidence)—"but to give them freedom to once more send men to their doom in the old cold-blooded way." That is just to show how the Federation is referred to. This is circulated in this form, and placarded on the walls very extensively. This is the language of the gentleman who accuses the Federation of circulating libellous literature concerning the Union (*see Appendix 93*). At question 9586, Mr. Wilson says in reply to Mr. Ismay, "In another case a man named Cross, to whom we have recently paid the 20*l.* was ordered by the mate to paint the funnel of the ship; the board which he was compelled to use was defective; when he got to the top of the funnel the board broke, and let him down on to the fiddley, his legs were both broken, his back was injured, his shoulders were out, and he was put in hospital, sent home, and his wages were taken at the rate of 3*s.* per day to pay his hospital expenses." I now hand in a letter from the consul, showing that the hospital dues were not charged to the man; also letters from the owners with Board of Trade application form, showing that the expenses of bringing the man home were paid by them. This is from Her Majesty's Consul at Constantinople; it is dated the 14th December 1891, and is written in reply to a letter of inquiry from the owners' agents: "Sirs,—In reply to your letter of the 12th instant, I beg to inform you that John Cross went into hospital on the 21st October 1890, suffering from injury to body and paraplegia, and on the 3rd March 1891 was sent to the hospital at Smyrna for further treatment and change of air, at the request of Dr. Patterson. His balance of wages, on being discharged his ship, was 5*l.* 4*s.* 6*d.* This amount was paid

19 February 1892.]

Mr. CUTHBERT LAWS

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

"to him on the 3rd March 1891, the day he left, no deduction of any kind being made. The expenses of boat, hire, sedan chair, &c., 5s. 4d., were charged to the owners of the s.s. 'Herschel' through the Board of Trade. His original account of wages, Form C. 12, his receipt for balance of wages, Form C. 13, and expenses charged to owner, C. 18, were sent to the Board of Trade in my account with that department for quarter ending 31st March 1891. I am, Sirs, yours obediently, William H. Wrench, H.M. Consul." I also submit Board of Trade receipt for 3*l.* 15*s.* 4*d.*, the payment of the man's passage home, and a letter from the owners bearing on the subject, and stating that his injuries were not as described by Mr. Wilson; that his legs were not broken (*handing in correspondence and receipt.*) Then as to question 9873. In my evidence referred to by Mr. Tait in regard to the standard hours of sea service, I was, of course, alluding to the lightness of the sailor's duty as compared with the examples of long continued and exhausting labour put forward in the dockers' evidence, and my object was to show that no case could be made out for an eight hours' day for deck hands. I spoke with a full sense of responsibility, and from my own experience at sea. The work of freemen is more severe, but on long voyages they have practically an eight hours' day. At question 10,208, Mr. Wilson is asked, "As regards compensation to seamen, have you seen the answer of Mr. Laws?" and he says, "Yes. I saw the answer given by Mr. Laws to the effect that ample compensation is provided by our laws, but that is not correct." In confirmation, therefore, of my answer I refer to the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, sections 507 to 515, taken together with the Merchant Shipping Act, 1862, section 54, which provides for the liability of shipowners without their actual fault or privity, up to 15*l.* per ton on the ship's tonnage, namely, in sub-section (1), "Where any loss of life or personal injury is caused to any person being carried in such ship;" and sub-section (3), "Where any loss of life or personal injury is by reason of improper navigation of such ship aforesaid caused to any person carried in any other ship or boat." Of course, in case of fault or privity of the owner, the liability is unlimited. The courts have dealt with the question of loss or injury caused by "common employment" at sea, in much the same way as it applies under the Employers' Liability Act on shore. At question 10,209, this is put to Mr. Wilson: "Mr. Laws also states in his evidence that all hospital and medical expenses are paid during the voyage in case of sickness or in case of accident," and his reply is, "It is not true that the hospital expenses are paid by the shipowners, because I have hundreds of cases similar to the one I quoted yesterday with reference to myself, where not one cent of expenses was paid by the owners, but it was deducted from the wages of the seaman if he had any wages." The case to which he refers as having quoted yesterday is as follows: "I

Earl of Derby—continued.

"remember being landed at Constantinople myself from a vessel. I had been in her nine months. I had about 15*l.* or 20*l.* money wages due. I was in hospital about three or four weeks. I was then put on board of a ship to convey me to Liverpool. Instead of going direct from Constantinople to Liverpool we went down to Smyrna to load fruit. We laid there about five weeks, and I was eventually landed in Liverpool. When I applied at the shipping office for my wages, to my astonishment I was told that I was in debt—that I had been charged 3*s.* a day hospital expenses, and 3*s.* a day on board the ship for my conveyance home. Since then, of course, I have seen hundreds of cases where men have lost their limbs abroad, and they have been put on board a ship in this way, and charged 3*s.* a day, and they are charged that now." In confirmation of my previous answer I refer to the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, sections 228 and 229. By the Merchant Shipping Act, 1867, section 7, the owners are further liable for expenses and up to three months' wages if illness should have been produced by the seamen not having been provided with proper food and water. It is only in case of self-imposed sickness that the expenses are payable by the seaman, and in such cases, by the same Act, section 8, he is not entitled to wages during the time that he is incapacitated from duty. I also submit a letter (*handing in the same*) dated the 4th January 1892, from Her Majesty's Consul at Constantinople, to the shipping agents at Galata: "Gentlemen,—In connexion with the question of hospital dues levied at Constantinople, and the admission of seamen serving on board vessels under the British flag to the British Seamen's Hospital, I have the honour to state that the hospital dues were reduced on the 1st August 1890 from 1*s.* 2*d.* per ton to 1*d.* on every three tons of nett register leviable on every British vessel arriving from the Mediterranean. These dues once paid, no further charge is levied from the vessel for the treatment of members of her crew in the British Seamen's Hospital. All seamen from British vessels wishing to see the doctor of the hospital are immediately provided on application to this office with an order, on presentation of which at the hospital they are examined, and, if necessary, admitted. No fee of any kind is charged to the seamen either by the consulate or by the hospital authorities for his treatment in the hospital, however long his stay there may be. I have the honour to be gentlemen, yours obediently, William H. Wrench H.M. Consul."

Duke of Devonshire.

14,755. There is no information about Mr Wilson's own case?—No; that is too far back and he did not give name of vessel, but said the same conditions were in force now. This is a letter from the consul quite recently. Then as to question 10,213, the answer of the witness in regard to incompetent seamen being introduced into the mercantile marine is absolutely

19 February 1892.]

MR. CUTHBERT LAWS.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

unfounded and incorrect, if it is intended to apply to the Shipping Federation in any way. At question 10,361 Mr. Wilson, speaking on the subject of assaults by union delegates, says, "I shall prove in one place that Mr. Laws did not state the truth. In his evidence he charges the union delegates with having sent 'emissaries'—and so forth, describing the "Bavaria" case; and he goes on to say, "No such case was ever heard in that court, therefore I say that such never happened." I now submit (1) a cutting from a Hartlepool paper reporting the case and stating amount of fines (see Appendix 94); (2) three letters from the agents to the owners concerning the case (see Appendix 95); (3) letter from the captain. The press cutting I was unable to find at the last moment, but I pledge myself to put it in to-morrow. I should just like to read the concluding part of the captain's letter. This is dated "s.s. 'Bavaria,' 25th October 1890," to Messrs. D. Scott and Son, Dundee, the owners. After speaking of the assault the captain says, "These men had apparently sneaked aboard to await the arrival of these sailors, and one of the sailors was badly cut in the wrist. Mr. Simpson (mate), who had gone to the fore-castle to try and pacify the men, also fared very badly, being terribly knocked about, cut, and bruised. By the time order was restored the tide was gone, and the writer followed them up the street and called the assistance of the first police, who managed to arrest one at once. Two others were again arrested by 4 a.m. on Friday, and the three were sentenced to one month each, hard labour." This is the case which Mr. Wilson states never occurred (*handing in letter*). At questions 10,367 to 10,370, Mr. Wilson is asked about calling men out of ships after signing articles. He is asked, "Do you deny that that ever took place," and he says, "I say that there are several instances where it has taken place. They have not been called out by the Union." I must again refer to the conviction, in Sunderland, of the witness himself, the general secretary of the Union, to the conviction, in Hartlepool, of Sprow, the organising secretary of the Union, and of Gillman, the Newport secretary of the Union, and I may state that these examples have been duly followed by the branch secretaries and delegates of the Union at the principal ports, in many cases which have been reported to me. Then, in another part of his evidence (I have not the reference) the witness denies that the shipping offices were ever blocked against non-unionists. In this connexion I should like, in addition to the proofs in contradiction of his statement which have been put in from other parts of the country, to read a letter referring to the state of affairs at the Tower Hill shipping office, London—"Local Marine Board, St. Katharine Dock House, Tower Hill, London, E. 23rd December 1891. Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

"your letter of the 19th instant, stating that "during the month of December 1890 frequent complaints had been made to you by non-union seamen that access to the shipping office premises was obstructed by crowds of union delegates and members, who by threats of violence intimidated well-disposed sailors and firemen, and prevented them obtaining employment, unless they consented to become union members by payment of heavy fees demanded from them. And further stating that some witnesses who have lately given evidence before the Royal Commission on Labour have denied that any such obstruction took place, and that under these circumstances you have been desired to ask whether it is within my knowledge that such obstruction did take place, and if so, whether any steps were taken to preserve order and give protection when required. In reply, I am directed to inform you that in consequence of the complaints made to the local marine board of the treatment received by the non-union seamen and firemen at the hands of union delegates and members of the Union, they considered it necessary, for the protection of non-union men, to double the staff of their police force (employing four policemen when, previous to this intimidation, two had been sufficient) from 13th October 1890 to 16th March 1891. It will be understood that the local marine board were powerless to prevent any action of the union delegates outside their own offices at Tower Hill. I am, Sir your obedient servant, John Steele, secretary" (*handing in letter*). That, my Lord, is all I have to read, but I would like permission to make one statement with regard to Darby, which is within my personal knowledge, and which will save touching on his evidence in any way. It was simply this. Shortly before he appeared before this Commission, Darby called at the Shipping Federation offices and asked to see the manager. Mr. Laws was engaged at the time and he saw me. Briefly, what he said was this: That he had been discharged from our employment, and wanted us to give him a berth ashore, a snug berth of some kind; he would not have a berth at sea, that did not suit him, he did not like the sea, he wanted a berth ashore. If we would not give him a berth ashore, he said "of course, as men of business you will understand me, Mr. Wilson's arms are open to me." I told Mr. Laws what he said, and in about half a minute after that Darby was outside the office; within a very short time afterwards he appeared before this Commission and made the statements he did with reference to the Shipping Federation and the manager.

Earl of Derby.

14,756. Is that all that you have to prove before us?—Yes, Mr. Laws is quite willing to come at any later sitting if the Commission desire.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Tuesday, March 8th, 1892, at 11 o'clock.

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

TWENTY-NINTH DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Tuesday, 8th March 1892.

PRESENT :

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE.

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF DERBY, K.G. (CHAIRMAN).

The Right Hon. Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH,
Bart., M.P.
Mr. J. C. BOLTON, M.P.
Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, M.P.
Professor MARSHALL.

Mr. S. PLIMSOILL.
Mr. HENRY TAIT.
Mr. M. AUSTIN, Mr. J. MAWDSLEY, and Mr.
G. LIVESEY (Group C.) also attended.

Mr. GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B., called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

14,757. You are the permanent secretary of the Board of Trade?—I am.

14,758. And you are, I believe, prepared to furnish the Commission with information on the subject of loss of life at sea?—Yes. I have caused certain tables to be prepared. In the first place I put in a table "A.," showing the number and nett tonnage of sailing and steamships on the register of the United Kingdom and Isle of Man during each of the years 1875 to 1890 (*see Appendix 96*). It will be seen that contemporaneously with a continuous increase in the total tonnage there has been a transition more or less rapid from sailing tonnage to steam tonnage, the former having declined from 4,153,688 to 2,915,455, whilst the latter has increased from 1,945,492 to 5,042,285. The increase in the total nett tonnage is 1,858,560. I also put in a table "B.," showing the number and nett tonnage of sea-going registered vessels which were employed at sea at some time during each year (*see Appendix 97*). It will be seen that although there is a considerable difference in the number of vessels registered and the number of sea-going vessels employed, there is only a difference of about 65,000 tons in the tonnage. I now put in a table "C.," showing the total number of persons who formed the crews of the vessels which were employed (*see Appendix 98*). I also put in a table "D.," showing how the total number of men employed are constituted. (*see Appendix 99*). This table shows that in the year 1890 the 234,910 men employed included 151,132 British seamen, 26,998 foreign seamen, 22,734 Lascars, 13,563 masters (allowing a master for each trading vessel employed), and 20,483 fishermen employed on fishing vessels registered under the Merchant Shipping

Earl of Derby—continued.

Acts. I now put in a table "E.," showing the rate of loss amongst seamen, excluding fishermen, in recent years as compared with the losses in the year 1881 (*see Appendix 100*). It will be seen that the rate of loss amongst seamen by all kinds of accident at sea in 1881 was one in 56.96; in 1883, the next year for which the figures were prepared on the same lines as those for 1881, which were analysed for the Royal Commission on loss of life at sea (in 1882 the figures were not prepared on the same lines), it was 1 in 66; in 1884 1 in 97; in 1885 1 in 106; in 1886 1 in 112; in 1887 1 in 99; in 1888 1 in 114; in 1889 1 in 126. The figures for the last two years have not yet been made up, but there is no reason to suspect that they are not equally favourable. The losses by wrecks and casualties alone were 1 in 79 in 1881; 1 in 94 in 1883; 1 in 159 in 1884; 1 in 165 in 1885; 1 in 183 in 1886; 1 in 153 in 1887; 1 in 208 in 1888; 1 in 269 in 1889; 1 in 184 in 1890; and 1 in 256 in 1891, so far as reported.

14,759. Those tables appear to show a progressive decrease?—They do. I also put in a table marked "F.," showing the classification of the wrecks and casualties in which lives were lost (*see Appendix 101*).

14,760. Is there also a diminution of loss of life through missing ships?—That is so. I also put in three tables, G., showing (a) the number and tonnage of British merchant sailing ships totally lost in each of the years 1875 to 1891, showing the nature of the casualties by which they were lost, and the number of lives lost; (b) the number and tonnage of British merchant steamships totally lost in each of the years 1875 to 1891, showing the nature of the casualties by which they were lost, and the number of lives lost; (c) the number and tonnage of

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

British merchant sailing and steamships totally lost in each of the years 1875 to 1891, showing the nature of the casualties by which they were lost, and the number of lives lost (*see Appendix 102*)

14,761. Do these tables show that notwithstanding the great increase of tonnage, there has been a decrease in the total tonnage lost, and also does this decrease relate to steam ships as well as to sailing ships?—The relative decrease is specially noticeable amongst steamships, in which the entire increase of tonnage has taken place. The steam tonnage lost in 1891 was only 73 tons more than that lost in 1881, although the steam tonnage employed had increased by considerably more than two million tons nett. The number of steamships lost in 1881 was 135, as compared with 116 steamships lost in 1891. Taking steamships and sailing ships together, there were 3,319 vessels lost in the last eight years, as compared with 4,913 vessels lost in the preceding eight years.

14,762. Do you think that the passing of the Load Line Act and the Life Saving Appliances Act have had any influence on the decrease of loss of life?—Yes, I think so far as our experience has gone, this has been the case.

14,763. You may have observed that Mr. Wilson has expressed the opinion that deck-loading should be prohibited in winter and limited in summer. Have you any information to lay before the Commission bearing upon this subject?—In the first place, I would say that the subject was fully considered by the Unseaworthy Ships Commission, and a complete history of the law as to deck-loading is contained in Sir Thomas Farrer's evidence before that Commission. (Questions 223 to 228.) The provisions at present in force with respect to deck cargoes are contained in sections 23 and 24 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, and relate to foreign as well as British vessels. The space occupied by deck cargo is added to the ship's registered tonnage for the purpose of liability to dues under section 23. The prohibitory provisions of section 24 only take effect—(a) in the winter season, defined as extending to ships arriving at a port in the United Kingdom from any port abroad between the 31st October and the 16th April; (b) during that season the carriage of any timber defined as heavy wood goods as deck cargo is altogether prohibited; (c) the carriage of timber defined as light wood goods during the same season as deck cargo is permitted to a height not exceeding 3 feet from the deck. I put in a return marked "H." (a and b) relating to the losses of timber-laden British ships, extending from 1873 to 1891. (*see Appendix 103*). Further returns with regard to deck loads giving greater details are being prepared, and I shall be able to lay them before the Commission in the course of a few weeks if desired.

14,764. Does the Board of Trade enforce the penal provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act as to deck-loading?—Yes; prosecutions are instituted in all cases in which sufficient evidence

Earl of Derby—continued.

can be obtained. The law is equally enforced with regard to foreign and British ships. I put in a return "I." of prosecutions by the Board of Trade during the last seven years (*see Appendix 104*).

14,765. Can you state what were the provisions in the Customs Consolidation Act, 1853, which Mr. Plimsole referred to before the Commission?—Yes, they were sections 170, 171, and 172 of the Act in question. I put in a copy, Document "J." (*see Appendix 105*).

14,766. Have you observed that Mr. Wilson charges owners and masters with murder, with robbery, and with brutality?—Yes; it is desirable that allegations of this kind should be made in as explicit a form as possible. I notice that Mr. Wilson has referred to two cases, namely, those of the "Embleton" and "Baron Blantyre."

14,767. Have you made any inquiry as to the facts of those two cases?—Yes; I am informed that the facts of the case of the "Embleton" are as follows.—In May 1887 complaints were received from the father of Robert White that his son had been ill-treated whilst acting as sailmaker on board the "Ben Douran" on a voyage to San Francisco. The complaints were referred to Her Majesty's consul at San Francisco, who reported that White had become insane during the voyage, had been forcibly placed under restraint, and on reaching San Francisco had been sent to an asylum upon a report from the Lunacy Commissioners. This information was sent by the Board to White's father. After his release from the asylum White went a voyage to Honolulu, returning again to San Francisco. There, in July 1887, he shipped as sailmaker on board the "Embleton," which reached the United Kingdom in December 1887. From evidence laid before the Board by the superintendents of mercantile marine at Queenstown and Sunderland upon the vessel's arrival, it appeared that White for some time after leaving America performed his duties satisfactorily. In August, however, his conduct became strange, he refused to do his work, and was treated as a loafer, and ill-used by the master and second mate. Finally, on August 25th he jumped overboard and was drowned. The case was laid before the Home Office by the Board of Trade, and was taken up by the Public Prosecutor. On the 6th January 1888 it was heard before the Sunderland magistrates, the charge against the master and mate (under the 24th and 25th Victoria, chapter 100, section 42) being that of "unlawfully causing grievous harm to a seaman named Robert White, which resulted in his death." Full evidence was heard, but in the end the case was dismissed on the technical ground that the section under which the prosecution was brought requires a "complaint by or on behalf of the party aggrieved," whereas in this case the "party aggrieved" was dead. The case excited great interest in Sunderland. The Local Trades Council on January 10th resolved to issue circulars inviting subscriptions with a view to a re-hearing. On January 11th a seamen's meeting was held with the same object. On the 12th

8 March 1892.]

SIR HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

and subsequent dates more meetings took place, and it was resolved to memorialise the Public Prosecutor. On receiving information of the unsatisfactory issue of the trial, the Board ordered an investigation into the master's conduct (the mate held no certificate) before the Sunderland Local Marine Board. The investigation was held on January 25th, and resulted in the suspension of the master's certificate (for tyranny). The certificate was suspended for six months. A public subscription was, however, subsequently raised for the prosecution of the captain, who was tried and convicted at the Durham Assizes in July 1888, and sentenced to one month's imprisonment without hard labour. With regard to the case of the "Baron Blantyre," I am informed that the facts are as follows:—The attention of the Board of Trade was first called to this case in January 1888 by the British and Foreign Sailors' Society. The secretary of that society forwarded to the Board of Trade a statement made by a seaman named Green, who had been in the hospital at Singapore with two other seamen belonging to the "Baron Blantyre." The latter had informed Green that a man named Barnes had been so ill-treated whilst on board the vessel that he died. The Board replied to the society that on the arrival of the vessel in the United Kingdom they would cause inquiry to be made. The vessel soon afterwards arrived at Liverpool, and the superintendent of the mercantile marine office at that port having been instructed to inquire into the matter he forwarded statements of three of the crew showing that the man Barnes had been ill-treated by the master and mate of the vessel, that he went out of his mind, and that he afterwards died on board. On receiving these statements the Board of Trade immediately laid the case before the Home Office, with the result that proceedings were taken against the master and the mate of the "Baron Blantyre," who were convicted of manslaughter, but were recommended to mercy by the jury. They were sentenced respectively to 18 months' and 15 months' imprisonment with hard labour, and the Board of Trade cancelled their certificates. If the attention of the Board of Trade be specifically called to the facts of other similar cases they will cause inquiry to be made, and the result laid before the Commission.

14,768. With regard to the charge of robbery, have you referred to the cases of the "Dougal" and the "Rowena" mentioned by Mr. Wilson in his evidence?—Yes; I am informed that the facts are as follows with regard to the "Rowena"—She was lost with all hands on the 6th November 1886 while on a voyage from Mobile to the Tynne. The owner (Mr. G. Milne) rendered wages and effects accounts to the superintendent of the mercantile marine office at Aberdeen, by whom they were accepted in the ordinary way, he being satisfied as to the amount of wages earned and the correctness of the various deductions. The accounts were inspected by certain of the relatives, and by the solicitor to the Aberdeen Branch of the

Earl of Derby—continued.

Seamen and Firemen's Union, but no question was raised with the Board of Trade. The "Dougal" sailed from Grangemouth in April 1887 to Buenos Ayres and Savannah, and was presumably lost with all hands off the Azores on the 27th December 1887 while on her return voyage bound to Trieste. The owners submitted wages and effects accounts for the crew, 13 in number, on which wages were calculated up to the 12th December only, but on the representation of the Registrar-General of Seamen additional wages from the 12th to the 29th December were applied for and obtained. Among the deductions from the accounts were amounts for "advances" abroad, for which it was impossible to produce vouchers, as all papers were lost with the ship, but the gross amount was shown in accounts rendered by the ships' agents at Buenos Ayres and Savannah. The Registrar-General of Seamen being satisfied that the advances had really been made, and that the charges themselves were just and reasonable, having reference to the duration and conditions of the voyage, approved of the amount being allocated to each man in proportion to his length of service and rate of pay, in accordance with the usual practice in the case of missing ships. The deductions for tobacco were calculated at the rate of a monthly supply of 1 lb. each man, and accord with our general experience. Some of the relatives appeared dissatisfied and communicated with the Board, through Professor Bryce, M.P. The case was again gone into, and placed in the hands of the Board's solicitor, who, after careful consideration, was of opinion that no further steps could be successfully taken in the matter.

14,769. Has your attention been drawn to Mr. Wilson's statement that in the year ending June, 1891, there were only seven inquiries held into the loss of missing ships, although 79 cases of loss were reported?—It is the fact that only seven formal inquiries were actually held into the loss of missing ships in 1890-91; but a preliminary inquiry was held in every case, and I have no reason to believe that any formal inquiry could have been usefully held in any case in which it was not actually ordered. It should be remembered that more than a third of the whole number were lost in the terrible blizzard of the 9th March. In every case of death on board a merchant ship or a fishing vessel an inquiry is held by a superintendent or a receiver of wreck or other officer under the 269th or 432nd section of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854, and in many cases sworn depositions are taken, of which anyone may obtain copies. Whenever a death is not satisfactorily accounted for, or there is a suspicion that there has been any foul play, or that the law has not been complied with, further steps are taken if possible.

14,770. We had some evidence from Mr. Becket Hill stating that the tonnage coming into London is falling off, while that of Liverpool, Glasgow, and some other ports has been increasing. Can you give us any information on that point?—Yes, I have had a short table prepared, which I will put in, which scarcely

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

bears out the view expressed by Mr. Becket Hill.

14,771. You will put that table in evidence?
—Yes, Document “K.” (see Appendix 106).

14,772. Now, one of the witnesses recommended continuous discharges for seamen containing a continuous record of services. Have you anything to say on this part of the subject?
—The Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea recommended such discharges in terms. I should like, however, to read a memorandum by the late Mr. Gray on this subject in 1886. “Under the Act of 1844 a ticket called a register ticket had been introduced. It was intended that each British seaman should carry about with him his ticket with his number and description. It was found to be an utter failure, and in the year 1853, after careful inquiry, the register ticket was abolished. Here, again, I wish to point out that one of the steps proposed at this day is a revival of the register ticket, though under another name, namely, as what is now called a continuous certificate of discharge. I shall in another part of this report show what has been done of late in this respect. The year 1853 was the year of perfect freedom as regards manning, and from that date forwards no restrictions whatever have existed as to the number or nationality or rating of the persons to be employed on board British merchant ships, other than the provision as to the minimum number of certificated officers to be employed in foreign-going ships and home-trade passenger steamers, and even they need not be British subjects. At the present time a British ship may be entirely officered and manned by persons who are not British subjects. In the former part of this memorandum I” (that is Mr. Gray) “have referred to the establishment, the failure, and the dis-establishment of the register ticket. A certificate of discharge, of character, and conduct is required by Statute, *vide* sections 172 and 176 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, to be given to every seaman when he is discharged at the end of the voyage. This certificate is to be in a form sanctioned by the Board of Trade. A form has been provided, and no charge is made for it. It bears on the face of it descriptive particulars sufficient to identify the seaman, and contains particulars showing his rating and the duration of the voyage, and a place is provided for recording the man’s conduct and character. A separate piece of paper is given each time the man is discharged. These certificates are really not of the value they were intended to be and ought to be. In the first place seamen are frequently engaged to serve who do not produce the last certificate issued to them. If it does not contain a good character they lose it or destroy it, and go back to a former certificate, but a master usually gives a ‘V.G.’ that is a very good character for ability and conduct, as a matter of course, to almost any seaman,

Earl of Derby—continued.

“and thus renders the certificate of little value except as a record of service. Besides this, crimps manage to obtain these certificates from seamen, and thus supply them to any man who applies to them to obtain employment. The proposal made is that the whole of a seaman’s service should be recorded continuously on one document. By this means it is thought that the character of the seaman can be improved and his status raised. Be this as it may, various attempts have been made in the direction indicated. During the time that the register ticket was in operation a question of the same sort, but in another form, arose. The ticket was a parchment ticket, and was continually being lost or effaced, and it was thought by the seamen’s would-be benefactors that if a case or cover was provided for it, this would not happen. A supply of tin cases like card cases was procured by Captain Brown, the then Registrar-General of Seamen, and they were offered at a nominal price to seamen. They remained on hand, and a stock of them was lying about until a short time ago. A clause was inserted in the Payment of Wages and Rating Act, 1880, as follows:—‘Service (at sea) may be proved by certificates of discharge, by a certificate of service from the Registrar-General of Shipping and Seamen (which certificate the Registrar shall grant on payment of a fee not exceeding sixpence) and in which shall be specified whether the service was rendered in whole or in part in steamship or in sailing ship, or by other satisfactory proof. Nothing in this section shall affect a seaman who has been rated and has served as A.B. before the passing of this Act.’ I am informed by the Registrar-General of Seamen that this is practically a dead letter. It is obviously to the convenience of everybody concerned, except perhaps some seamen, that the records of a man’s services should be continuous, and should be kept together for reference. It would be a convenience to masters when engaging men, and to the superintendents of mercantile marine offices if men appearing before them or making applications to them possessed such a record, but it is quite useless to expect it unless some stringent law as to rating and manning and against personation is passed, and even then, as in the case of the old register ticket, it would probably be a failure. In order to test the working of such a scheme we have the results of three experiments before us. The first experiment is the continuous record which each man who belongs to the Royal Naval Reserve carries with him, and has to produce whenever he is engaged or discharged or applies for his retainer or appears on drill. These have been in force since 1860, and there are 17,721 of them now (1886) in existence. The second experiment provides a pocket book of good strong leather sold to seamen for 6d. The superintendents of the mercantile marine offices place in this book, and stamp with the seal of the

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

" office each certificate of discharge as it is issued to the man at the end of his engagement, so that the book contains continuous records of the man's services. Some of the better class of seamen and many officers use this book. It was started in 1882, and down to the present time (1886) 7,700 of them have been sold. It is a great convenience to steady men, as it enables them to keep their certificates clean and in order, and ready for reference when they go up for examination as officers. The third experiment is a 'continuous discharge,' pure and simple, designed for the purpose of meeting the views of those persons who attach importance to it. This form is most complete in its design. It can be used at the beginning or at any moment of a seaman's career. On the first page of it is a place for the description of the seaman, a statement of his place of birth, and so forth, and on the second page a place for the record of all previous services, distinguishing respectively services as apprentice-boy, O.S." (An ordinary seaman is one who, from not being of sufficient age and strength, or from want of sufficient experience, is not quite competent to perform all the duties of an able seaman, and accordingly receives a little less than full wages, and does not contract for the complete qualities of an able seaman.) " A.B., boatswain, &c., &c., and on successive pages are places for the record of future services. This form has been offered to the men at the same price as the other, viz., 6d.; it has been before them since April 1884, and two only have been sold. I do not think, therefore, that we are justified in believing that a continuous certificate of discharge will answer the expectations of those persons who regard it as of great value, nor of those seamen who think it will be a means for keeping foreigners out of British ships." That is the end of Mr. Gray's memorandum.

14,773. Do you agree generally with the purport of that memorandum?—Yes.

14,774. Are proceedings ever taken for forging or using seamen's discharges fraudulently?—Yes, the Board frequently take proceedings under section 176 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, when cases are brought to their notice and the evidence is sufficient.

14,775. You have no doubt read Mr. Wilson's observations with regard to the allotment of wages, and you will have considered his proposal that the law should be amended so as to make it legal for a seaman to allot two-thirds of his wages weekly to his wife, or to a savings bank, or to a trades union, or to a friendly society. What have you to say to that?—The Merchant Shipping Act, 1880, section 3, already provides that an allotment may be made on certain conditions and through certain savings banks named in the schedule to the Act. The policy of the Act of 1854 was to limit the allotment of wages to the case of relatives, and I think that that policy should not be departed from without good cause shown. The section is the 169th of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854.

U 79799.

Earl of Derby—continued.

14,776. Has your attention been drawn to the points raised by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Quelch, also as to the employment of foreign seamen?—Yes. The questions are important, and raise larger issues than those involved in the administration of the Merchant Shipping Acts by the Board of Trade. It may be within the recollection of members of the Commission that the subject was dealt with by the Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea. I put in an extract, "L," from the report of that Commission with regard to it (*handing in extract*).

14,777. Will you kindly read that part of the report to which you referred?—This is the extract from the report of the Royal Commission:—"With respect to the employment of foreign seamen, there has been undoubtedly an increase in the proportion of foreigners of late years. In the report of Mr. Gray, it is said that the Board of Trade statistics show that the ratio of foreign seamen from 1861 to 1876 was 10·1 per cent., and in 1882 to 1884 13·8 per cent., an increase not of a formidable character. This increase has been attributed to various causes. Nearly 70 per cent. of the foreign seamen hail from the Scandinavian countries and from Germany, and most of them are sufficiently acquainted with the English language to enable them to understand the orders given to them. It is almost universally admitted by the witnesses that these men from the north of Europe are excellent seamen. They are alleged to be more submissive to discipline, generally more sober in their habits, and more careful in keeping their engagements than British seamen generally to be found in sailing vessels, but there is also a general concurrence that British seamen, even when inclined to be unruly in ordinary times, have, in times of emergency and danger, courage, coolness in the presence of danger, and resources which are not to be found equally in their more submissive mates from abroad. The process of substitution of steamers for sailing vessels which has recently been going on in the trade of the north of Europe, has driven many seamen from those parts to seek employment in our merchant service, and hence the competition; they get the same wages as British seamen, but it is alleged that they sometimes make it worth while to the persons who find crews for vessels to recommend them in preference to British seamen. We think it unnecessary to quote from the opinions of ship-owners which have been collected and printed in Mr. Gray's report. It appears that few foreigners are employed by the larger steamships, in regular trades or in the home and coasting trades, but there are considerable numbers employed in sailing vessels on long voyages. Of a list of 35 sailing vessels and 35 steamers employed in foreign trade, it appeared that the proportion of foreign seamen on the sailing vessels was 26·58 per cent., and on the steamers 8·5 per cent.; and of the foreign seamen, 68 per cent. hailed from the

M m

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

“ north of Europe. In view of all the facts of the case, we are unable to advise any interference by law with the employment of foreign seamen. It may be doubted whether, if American vessels are taken into account, it would not be found that there are more British seamen to be found on board foreign vessels, than of foreign seamen on board British vessels. In any case the proportion of foreign seamen on board our vessels has not reached the point at which even those who suggest interference think the limit should be placed. It would be well, however, that British seamen should generally understand the causes which influence some shipowners in the employment of foreign seamen, and that however ready owners are to acknowledge the great qualities which are a tradition in the British seaman, yet that submission to discipline, a readiness to keep engagements, and sobriety, are qualities in which some employers believe that the north of Europe seamen are superior to the British seamen they can engage for their vessels, except for continuous employment.”

14,778. Can you tell us what is the highest percentage of foreign seamen on record, and what it has been of late years?—I am informed that the highest percentage of foreigners was 16.42 in 1883; in 1889 and 1890 it was 14.63.

14,779. Have you any observations to offer with reference to the question of the examination of seamen raised by Mr. Wilson in his evidence?—Yes, the examination of seamen was also considered by the Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea. I propose to put in an extract, “M.,” from the Commissioners’ Report (*handing in extract*.) A voluntary system for A.B. had, however, been tried in 1878.

14,780. Will you read that extract to which you refer?—Yes. “With respect to the rating of ‘able seamen’ it is now the law that no man is entitled to be so rated unless he can prove four years’ service at sea before the mast; there is, however, great laxity in this respect, men are constantly rated as ‘A.B.’ without any inquiry as to their past services and with insufficient qualification; practically it rests with the masters of vessels whether to rate them as such or not. Nor does it appear to us that there is any certain method by which this can be prevented. We think, however, that a voluntary system of examination might with advantage be established, by which, through the local marine boards, and after a single examination in practical seamanship, men might obtain certificates as able seamen. We are also of opinion that the system of examination and certificates which now applies only to the cases of masters and officers, might with advantage be extended to boatswains and carpenters, the examination in this case being of a character suited to the duties of these classes.”

14,781. Now as to the engagement of crews, Mr. Wilson points out that there is a great difference between seamen signing at a shipping

Earl of Derby—continued.

office and those signing on board ship. Is there any difference in procedure as far as the Board of Trade is concerned?—No. The instructions to superintendents expressly direct that in terms. “All the rules contained in the Merchant Shipping Acts as applying to engagements and discharges in the mercantile marine offices are to be observed in engagements and discharges taking place on board. It is to be clearly understood that the seamen’s rights with regard to wages and freedom of action must in no way be prejudiced.”

14,782. Can the custom which exists in some large ports of engaging crews on board ship be extended to London?—Yes. The Board’s general instructions to superintendents provide for the engagement and discharge on board ship, “when the work of the superintendent’s office permits.” The instructions are general; they include London, and are not limited to strike periods.

14,783. Do you agree with Mr. Laws that there should be legislation to prevent persons remaining on board ship on leaving as well as on arrival?—No, I do not think it necessary to legislate for this. The ordinary law is sufficient. The enforcement of it must rest with the master who has entire control of his ship.

14,784. Has your attention been called to a statement by Mr. Laws that half the seamen at the port of London are supplied by crimps, who obtain 5s. or 10s. for each man?—Yes, but the Board of Trade have no information confirmatory of the statement; if adequate evidence is offered in proof of any such cases, proceedings will certainly be taken against the offender.

14,785. Then are we to understand that the Board of Trade do prosecute in alleged cases of crimping?—Certainly; they claim indeed to have diminished the influence of the crimp materially, so far as British ships are concerned. But in the recent conflict between employers and employed, the Board of Trade thought it right to abstain from interference. This policy was intimated to the law agent of the Seamen’s Union at Glasgow, in the following letter, dated 16th January 1891—“I am directed by the Board of Trade to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant, requesting, as the solicitor of the Seamen’s Union, to be informed upon what grounds a prosecution was not instituted by this department against a man named Darby, an employé of the Shipping Federation, for an alleged contravention of section 147 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854. In reply I am to state that the Shipping Federation do not admit that they have contravened the law in question, and state that the men in this and similar cases were supplied to the vessel by bonâ fide servants in the constant employ of the shipowners, in whose names the vessels were registered, and to whom the same belonged. The Board of Trade do not propose to contest this position. Several reports have recently been made to them of alleged infringements of the Merchant Shipping Acts by agents of the Seamen’s Union, infringe-

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

"ments not confined to the illegal supply of seamen, but the Board have hitherto abstained from instituting proceedings in these cases, considering that any such action on their part in present circumstances, at the instance of the shipowners, might have the appearance of interference by a public department in a dispute between employers and employed. It will be seen, therefore, that in dealing with these alleged contraventions of the Act, whether by officials of the Seamen's Union, or those of the Federation, the Board have followed the same course."

14,786. We have it stated or suggested that seamen supplied by crimps have a preference shown them by the superintendent at Sunderland, have you inquired into that?—Yes, and I am informed by the superintendent at Sunderland that no such partiality has been shown.

14,787. Have you any record of the proceedings recently instituted by the Board of Trade under sections 147 and 148 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854?—Yes, and I put in a return, "N." of all those proceedings (see Appendix 107).

14,788. Have the Board of Trade taken any steps to prevent men shipping as qualified seamen when they are not so?—Yes, the Board of Trade have felt the importance of this matter, and on the 1st June 1891 issued a circular to the superintendents in the following terms:—"It having been represented to the Board of Trade, that notwithstanding the provisions of section 7 of the Merchant Shipping (Payment of Wages and Rating) Act, 1880, a large number of seamen are entered in articles as A.B.'s, without possessing the statutory qualification of four years' service at sea before the mast, the superintendent is instructed to encourage seamen to apply to the Registrar-General of Seamen for the certificate as able seaman, entitling them to the rating as such. He should also, as far as possible, assist them in making out and forwarding their applications on the form prescribed. Before entering a seaman as an A.B. in any agreement, the superintendent should ask either the master or the seaman for proof of the seaman's qualifications to be rated as such, and in all cases in which the proof required under the section (namely, certificate of discharge, showing either service as A.B., before 2nd August 1880, or four years' service before the mast, or a certificate as able seaman from the Registrar-General of Seamen) is not forthcoming, or he is not otherwise satisfied that the man has the required service, he should place the letters N.P. (not proved) against the letters A.B., appertaining to the seaman's name in the agreement. The superintendent should distribute to seamen and others concerned copies of Handbill No. 106. He should also take care to keep in stock a sufficient supply of the necessary forms. This circular is to take effect from the 1st June 1891."

14,789. That is signed by you?—Yes.

Earl of Derby—continued.

14,790. What has been the result of that circular?—I have directed some of the superintendents to report the extent to which seamen proved themselves to be entitled to the rating of A.B., and I find that of 53,601 men shipped as A.B.'s, 25,240 did, and 28,361 did not prove their rating as such.

14,791. Is that proportion about the same over the whole country?—No, it varies greatly at different places; it is high at some ports and low in others.

14,792. Can you give us some instances of that?—Yes; at Liverpool it is about half and half. The superintendent at Greenock reports that most of the men engaged were qualified, but could not prove their service at the time. At West Hartlepool seamen would not prove their service, and could not be induced to apply to the Registrar-General of Seamen for the certificates referred to in the circular which I have read.

14,793. Does that arise from the fact that the men will not take the trouble or go to whatever expense there may be?—Yes, I think so. The cost of the certificates is only 6d. each, and it was hoped that the seamen would obtain them, in order to save themselves the trouble of proving their rating at each engagement, but it has never been found to be the case.

14,794. As long as the masters are content to take the men without proof, the men themselves will not volunteer to find proof?—Exactly.

14,795. Now, there is the case of a ship called the "Strathendrick," which was referred to in Mr. Wilson's evidence. I think you wish to make some statement with regard to that?—I am informed that the facts of that case of the "Strathendrick" are as follows:—Thirteen seamen of the s.s. "Strathendrick," which arrived at Gibraltar on the 26th October 1890, bound to Philadelphia, having complained that the ship was overladen, the master had her surveyed. Though the surveyor certified that the ship was in a fit state and condition to continue her voyage, the men were still dissatisfied, and complained to the captain of the port, who requested the port surveyor to go on board and survey the vessel with two of the complainants to check the measurements. As a result the ship was declared to be in a fit condition to continue her voyage across the Atlantic. Despite this the men persisted in their refusal to go on board, and the master then proceeded against them in the police court for desertion, with the result that they were each convicted and sentenced to 10 weeks' imprisonment, with hard labour, and to pay a fine of 2l. The master and officers petitioned the Governor to remit the whole or part of the imprisonment, but this the Governor deemed it inexpedient to do. It was afterwards pointed out by the men's counsel that by the Merchant Seamen Wages Act of 1880 the punishment of desertion by imprisonment had been abolished in the United Kingdom, and that the Act applied to Gibraltar by virtue of the Order in Council of 2nd February 1884. The Governors thereupon

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

released the men, and a writ of *certiorari* was obtained from the Supreme Court quashing the conviction of the justices. The men's balance of wages, after deducting the cost of their repatriation, was paid to them through the Board of Trade, but the papers in the office do not show what was done in regard to the fine of 2*l.* per man.

14,796. You do not know whether the men took any legal action to recover it?—No.

14,797. Now, can you give the Commission any information as to the food scale?—Yes. The scale is not fixed by the Board of Trade at present, but is a matter of agreement. The Board of Trade are, however, causing inquiries to be made into the food scale in operation in certain sailing and steamships with a view to consider whether any measures can be devised for improving the present state of things.

14,798. As the law now stands, is there any safeguard to ensure good and sufficient food for seamen?—Yes. The enactments provide that any three or more of the crew of a British ship may complain to any naval or consular officer, shipping master, or chief officer of Customs, that the provisions or water on board are of bad quality, unfit for use, or deficient in quantity. If the officer finds on examination that the allegation is true he signifies the same in writing to the master. If the master neglects thereupon to obtain a fresh and proper supply, or uses any provisions or water so found to be of bad quality and unfit for use, he incurs a penalty not exceeding 20*l.*, and the result of the examination is to be entered in the official log, and reported to the Board of Trade to be used in evidence upon any legal proceedings (section 221, Merchant Shipping Act, 1854). Should the complaint of the crew be found groundless the complaining seamen are liable to forfeit a sum not exceeding one week's wages (section 222). If during a voyage a seaman's allowance is improperly reduced, or if it is shown that the provisions have during the voyage been bad in quality and unfit for use, the seaman is entitled to receive, by way of compensation, for the reduction or bad quality, certain allowances for each day. That is under section 223. The master is required to keep on board proper weights and measures, and is bound to allow them to be used at the time of serving out provisions, &c. in the presence of a witness whenever a dispute arises about the quantities. In default the master incurs a penalty not exceeding 10*l.*

14,799. Now, are these enactments enforced?—No.

14,800. For what reason; do the seamen not care to avail themselves of them?—As a rule the seamen do not avail themselves of them.

14,801. Do you think the seamen are always aware of their existence?—I should think so.

14,802. What happens where it is shown that a seaman's illness has been caused by the neglect of the master or owner to provide proper food and water?—The master or owner has to provide food and water according to the agreement, and the owner or master is liable to pay all ex-

Earl of Derby—continued.

penses incurred by reason of such illness, not exceeding three months' wages, and this enactment is not to affect any further liability of the owner or master, or any other remedy which the seaman possesses. That is under section 7 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1867. The superintendents are directed to take every opportunity of urging upon owners or masters of vessels sailing on long voyages the necessity of supplying their crews with fresh potatoes, molasses, &c., and a larger supply of fresh or preserved meats in lieu of salt beef or pork.

14,803. You may have seen the statement made by Mr. Wilson, and I think it has been made by others also, that the accommodation for the crew is insufficient and that the ventilation is inadequate, what have you to say on that?—The crew accommodation on board ship is regulated by the Merchant Shipping Act of 1867 repealing the provisions of the Act of 1854, and section 9 lays down specific rules on the subject. It is provided that a space of not less than 72 cubic feet, and of not less than 12 superficial feet measured on the deck or floor, shall be provided for every seaman or apprentice in every place appropriated to their use (sub-section 1), and that every such place shall be securely constructed, properly lighted and ventilated, properly protected from weather and sea, and as far as practicable from effluvia from cargo or bilge water (sub-section 2). There are provisions for properly constructed privies (sub-section 3), and for inspection by the Board of Trade surveyors, without whose certificate of satisfaction the owner is not entitled to a deduction for crew space (sub-section 4), and every such place is to be kept free from stores or goods of any kind other than those of the crew in use (sub-section 6), under a penalty of forfeiting to each seaman 1*s.* per day on complaint of any two or more seamen (sub-section 8). In default of complying with the other provisions of this section the owner is liable for such failure to a penalty not exceeding 20*l.* (sub-section 9). Provision is also made for a disallowance of deduction from tonnage on account of crew space if on complaint a Board of Trade surveyor shall report to a collector of Customs at a port of registry that the above provisions are not complied with (sub-section 7). The owners have, therefore, a material interest in affording a proper amount of crew space, because it forms a deduction from the tonnage chargeable with dues, &c.

14,804. Do you consider that the space allowed, namely, 72 cubic feet, is sufficient?—Yes, I think it is sufficient if the other circumstances are proper, that is to say, if there is no smell from the deck or hold, and if the privies and other places are kept clean, and there is sufficient ventilation.

14,805. Have you read Mr. Wilson's criticisms on the constitution and duties of local marine boards?—Yes. Mr. Wilson was in error in supposing that inquiries into losses of ships are held before local marine boards. Such inquiries are held before magistrates, generally stipendiaries, assisted by assessors appointed by the Home

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

Office. The subjects into which inquiries are made by local marine boards are as follows:—Drunkenness, gross misconduct, tyranny, general incompetency, mania, or insanity, or affected mental condition. These inquiries, however extended in their scope, deal only with the misconduct or incompetency of certificated officers in the mercantile marine, and do not touch misconduct of seamen or others on board ship. When the local marine board sit in judicial character the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, provides (section 241), that they shall be assisted by the local stipendiary magistrate, if any, or a competent legal assistant. The other functions of local marine boards are, speaking generally, the making provision—(1) for the mercantile marine office work of the port; (2) for the examination of masters and mates for certificates of competency.

14,806. Can you tell us how these boards are at present constituted?—Yes, in accordance with section 110 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, they are composed of the following persons:—(1) the mayor or provost; (2) the stipendiary magistrate; (3) four members appointed by the Board of Trade from persons residing or carrying on business at the port or within seven miles thereof; (4) six members elected by the owners of foreign-going and home-trade passenger ships registered at the port.

14,807. Can you inform us what is the general policy of the Board of Trade with respect to the nomination by them of persons to serve on local marine boards?—The Board of Trade are of opinion that as it is the business of the local marine board to manage various matters in which shipowners and seamen are both interested, it is important that the local marine board should be so constituted as to deal fairly with both classes, and further, that members nominated by the Board of Trade should be persons who, besides taking an interest in nautical matters, will have regard to the interests of those who are not directly represented. The President has, where suitable persons of the class of an A.B., or a suitable representative of seamen can be found, appointed such a person as a member of the local marine board.

14,808. Is that commonly done?—Whenever a suitable person of that description can be found it is always done.

14,809. Has your attention been directed to Mr. Laws' complaint that intimidation was practised against non-union men, in the case of the R.M. steamship "Moor" in the Board of Trade shipping office at Tower Hill?—Yes; I caused inquiry to be made, and the superintendent at the St. Katherine Dock House has reported that the facts of the case are as follows:—"Respecting the statement by Mr. Laws before the Royal Commission on Labour, on 17th July 1891, that men were molested at this office on the 11th December 1890, when attending for the purpose of signing the articles of s.s. 'Moor' I beg to forward, for your information, a report from Mr. W. Powell, chief deputy superintendent in charge of the engagement room, also a statement from

Earl of Derby—continued.

"Police Constable Henry Hurding, 66 H, who was on duty on the date referred to in the courtyard, and wish to add, that when I pointed out to Major Armit, the strict impartiality that had to be exercised in not allowing agents either of the Union or of the Federation in the building or in the courtyard, he agreed to retire if ordered to do so. He was told such a course need not be adopted on that occasion, but that the master only could be recognised as engaging the crew. It was afterwards reported to me by one of the messengers that as the men engaged to sign had been brought to the office by a number of policemen, a crowd had collected in the road outside, but as it is no unusual occurrence for a crowd to collect when any incident occurs outside the building, owing to the large number of labourers loitering about, waiting to be engaged at the dock gate adjoining, no notice was taken of the report. Prior to the date referred to, strict instructions had been given to the police on duty, not to allow any agent of the Union or Federation in the seamen's waiting yard, or to pass the gate leading from the public road to the yard on any pretence, and to satisfy themselves that all men who passed were either seeking employment, had come to be paid off, or had business to transact. Every attempt of union seamen to hold impromptu meetings in the yard was stopped, and I am constantly satisfying myself that the instructions continue to be enforced, and the gate kept cleared for business. I wish to add that it was at the request of Major Armit that the men engaged were allowed to leave by a side gate, so as to avoid the mob on Tower Hill."

14,810. That was signed by the acting superintendent?—Yes. I do not know whether you would care for me to read the statement of the police constable and the others. They entirely confirm that statement.

14,811. I think we need not go further into that. Now take another subject. Something has been said about outbreaks of scurvy on board ship. Have you any statistics upon that point?—Yes; for the years 1882-91 inclusive. It will be seen that the number of ships in which outbreaks are reported has been for the 10 years from 1882 to 1891, 30·7, as compared with 66·4 for the preceding 10 years, 1872-1881.

14,812. That is, the annual average in the last 10 years has been 30·7, and the annual average in the 10 years preceding that, 66·4?—Yes.

14,813. What powers do the Board of Trade possess with regard to docks?—The Board of Trade have no statutory powers with regard to docks with the exception of some few instances in which they are required to confirm byelaws for the working of the docks. Before confirming byelaws it is the invariable practice to advertise for possible objections.

14,814. Now, it was suggested by Mr. Laws that there is no punishment for a seaman failing to go to sea even after he has received an advance note, and that the men make a practice of

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

getting advance notes and failing to join. Is that your judgment of the case, and have you any remarks to make upon it?—There is no express provision imposing a special penalty upon the seaman failing to go to sea after receiving an advance note, but there are provisions for punishing him for failing to go to sea. Under section 243 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, neglect or refusal to join, or to proceed to sea, or absence from a ship within 24 hours of sailing, or absence without leave at any time, was punishable by imprisonment not exceeding 10 weeks with or without hard labour, and also, at the discretion of the court, by forfeiture out of wages of a sum not exceeding two days' pay, and in addition for every 24 hours of absence, either a sum not exceeding six days' pay or any expenses which may have been properly incurred in hiring a substitute. By the Merchant Seamen (Payment of Wages and Rating) Act, 1880, section 10, it was expressly declared that a seaman should not be liable to imprisonment for desertion, or for failing to join the ship, or for the other offences above mentioned, and that part of section 243 was repealed, but the repeal was not to take effect out of the United Kingdom, unless specially provided for (*see* question 14,795). Section 10 also provides the means of conveying an offender on board with liberty to him to demand to be taken before a court. With regard to the practice of obtaining advance notes and afterwards failing to go to sea, Mr. Wilson agrees that the practice extensively prevails, and it would appear to be desirable that some express provision should be made to meet these cases. At the present day to re-impose the penalty of going to prison would be impossible.

14,815. Supposing a man takes an advance note and then, having received the money, fails to go to sea, to what extent is he punishable now?—He is not punishable by imprisonment under the Merchant Shipping Acts.

14,816. I suppose he would be liable if it could be shown that he had no intention of going to sea; he would be liable under the general law for obtaining money under false pretences?—Exactly so.

14,817. But in order to convict upon that charge it would be necessary to show that at the time he received the money he had no intention of doing what he was paid to do?—Exactly.

14,818. We have heard a good deal of the penal provisions of the Merchant Shipping Acts relating to overloading or improper loading. Can you tell us anything upon that subject?—This subject is dealt with under three separate heads, namely—(1) overloading or improper loading; (2) submersion of load-line disc; (3) deck cargoes. With regard to overloading or improper loading; for this either a British or foreign ship can be detained in a port of the United Kingdom until safely and properly loaded or released as safe under sections 6 and 13 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876. Under section 4 of the same Act the owner, master, or other person concerned in sending a British ship to sea in an unsafe condition from overloading

Earl of Derby—continued.

or other cause, is liable to fine or imprisonment. By section 34 it is provided that if a British or foreign ship breaks detention and proceeds to sea a penalty of 100*l.* may be inflicted, and if the detaining officer is on board and taken to sea, another 100*l.* may be imposed in addition to the officer's expenses. With reference to the second head—submersion of the load-line disc; by section 28 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, the owner or master of a British ship who loads her at any port so as to submerge the load-line disc (which is now made compulsory by the Load-Line Act of 1890) incurs a penalty of 100*l.* With respect to the third head—deck cargoes. The owner and master of any British or foreign ship arriving at a port in the United Kingdom between the 31st October and the 16th of April, carrying certain prohibited deck loads, are severally liable to a penalty of 5*l.* for every 100 cubic feet of wood goods carried in contravention of this law, recoverable by action or indictment, or, on summary conviction, to a penalty of 100*l.* under section 24 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876.

14,819. In connexion with what you have stated can you give us any particulars as to the enforcement of sections 28 and 34 in recent years?—Yes. I have prepared a return, "O," which I put in of prosecutions under those sections between 1883 and 1892, giving all the instances (*see Appendix 108*).

14,820. Now, as to the liability of shipowners, is it or is it not a fact that an owner is responsible for the hospital and medical expenses arising during the sickness of any seaman, or in consequence of any accident sustained by him?—Under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, section 228, the owner pays such expenses, together with the cost of subsistence and bringing the man back to his port of shipment in Her Majesty's dominions; if a seaman receives any hurt or injury in the service of the ship to which he belongs; or, in case of the temporary removal of a seaman for the purpose of preventing infection or otherwise, and the seaman subsequently returns to his duty; or, if the medicines and surgical or medical advice are given to the seaman while on board his ship; or, when the illness occurs through the neglect of the master to supply proper food, water, or accommodation, medicines, &c. required by the Acts (Merchant Shipping Act, 1867, section 7). But in all other cases the seaman is liable to repay to the owner reasonable expenses incurred in respect of his illness.

14,821. The question has been brought before us as to the discharge of seamen abroad; are the Board of Trade prepared, as has been suggested, to propose any legislation prohibiting the discharge of seamen abroad?—No, I think not. I do not think they are prepared to take the initiative in legislation of that description.

14,822. On the ground, I suppose, that it would be an unnecessary restriction on trade?—Yes.

14,823. You have seen Mr. Wilson's complaint as to seamen who ought to be discharged in the United Kingdom being forced out of their ships

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

at Rotterdam; can you tell us anything as to that?—Yes; there has been some correspondence with the Board of Trade on the matter. On the 21st September 1891, the Sailors and Firemen's Union, Rotterdam Branch, complained that masters and owners continually discharged crews at Rotterdam contrary to agreement, naming the steamship "Ethelgonda" as a recent instance, and they stated that the consul did not attend to any grievances connected therewith. On the 28th September the Sailors and Firemen's Union from London complained that 50 cases had occurred within three months of crews being forced to take their discharge at Rotterdam and Antwerp contrary to agreement, and gave "Ethelgonda" and "Rotherfield" as examples at Rotterdam of ships discharging crews and then returning to the United Kingdom, and stated that the same thing happened at Hamburg, and that the owners' object was to get cheaper labour. The Board of Trade sent copies of the last letter to the consul-general at Antwerp and Hamburg and the consul at Rotterdam. On the 6th October the consul-general at Antwerp stated that seamen are never discharged there before the termination of the voyage except by mutual consent and the payment by the master of their passage to the United Kingdom. He has drawn up a form to this effect which the discharged seamen sign. He thinks one cause why masters prefer foreigners is that they are more amenable to discipline. On the 10th October the consul at Rotterdam denied that men are ever forced to take their discharges, and in particular denied that this was the case with the steamship "Rotherfield," and he said he never sanctions discharge except by mutual consent. On the 17th October the consul-general at Hamburg stated that he never sanctions discharge contrary to agreement except by mutual consent, and he then insists on men being paid their passage money to the United Kingdom, together with two days' wages extra. He also stated that many agreements stipulate final port of discharge in the United Kingdom or Continent of Europe at master's option, and he asked that the Union should cite cases. On the 28th October the Sailors and Firemen's Union, replying to the statement of the consul at Rotterdam, stated that they would obtain statements from the crew of the "Rotherfield." This was never done. On the 3rd February the consul at Rotterdam stated that Mr. Wilson's evidence before the Labour Commission on this subject was most inaccurate; that only 112 crews were discharged in a year, though Mr. Wilson said 13 crews a week; he stated that mutual consent is always a condition of discharge where the voyage does not terminate at Rotterdam.

14,824. What are the primary objects with which shipping offices are established?—They are established to prevent crimping, to ensure a due understanding of the agreement, and a due settlement at the end of the voyage with regard to wages. Upon that various other things have been engrafted. First there is the

Earl of Derby—continued.

system of sending money for the seamen, when paid off, to their relatives at a distance. For instance, when a man is paid off at the shipping office, he is paid off, we will say, in London, he is asked, "Do you want to send your money to Aberdeen?" He may say, "Yes, I do." Then and there the money is taken, the order is given to him, that order is sent to Aberdeen, and in the course of the post the wife or some other relation at Aberdeen receives the money. This system is taken advantage of to a large extent.

14,825. A suggestion has been made that seamen might be engaged at the shipowners' office instead of at the mercantile marine office, the articles of agreement having first been settled by the superintendents of the mercantile marine; do you agree with this proposal?—No. I do not think that would be a satisfactory arrangement. I am afraid that it would lead in time to very much the state of things which prevailed prior to 1850, and which the Mercantile Marine Act of that year was passed to destroy.

14,826. Will you explain a little more fully what it is that you refer to?—To crimping; a system by which certain boarding-house keepers, if unchecked, take advantage of the weakness of seamen and the peculiar circumstances of their lives to obtain complete command of their liberty of action, and practically control the supply of seamen.

14,827. Has the administration of the Merchant Shipping Acts done much to destroy the influence of the crimps so far as British ships are concerned?—Yes.

14,828. Do you think that if the present interference were to cease the same abuses that existed before would revive?—I do.

14,829. Do you think that the settlement of the agreement by the superintendent of the mercantile marine would be a sufficient compliance with the Act of Parliament?—No. It is not the business of the superintendent to settle agreements before they are entered into. They are free contracts between the master and the crew relating to a particular voyage. The superintendent's business is to "cause the agreement to be read over and explained to each seaman, or otherwise ascertain that each seaman understands the same before he signs it," warning both parties of any provisions which are of doubtful legality.

14,830. Is it essential to the proper performance of this duty that the superintendents should occupy a position entirely independent of both parties concerned?—Yes, it is, and it is most desirable that the chief superintendent should be near at hand to assist his deputy with his superior knowledge and experience when questions of difficulty arise.

14,831. Then you think that these conditions are best assured by the engagement taking place in a public shipping office?—Exactly.

14,832. Now, how do the remarks that you have made apply to engagements on board ship?—They certainly apply, to some extent, and perhaps it is desirable, for this reason, not to

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

extend the practice of engagements outside the mercantile marine office.

14,833. Nevertheless, engagements on board ship do take place, do they not?—They do to a certain extent.

14,834. Do you absolutely object to them under all circumstances?—No, not under all circumstances; but it is not a system that I should like to see largely extended.

14,835. I presume it is an advantage that when an agreement is signed on board ship the seaman has the opportunity of actually seeing the ship on board of which he is to sail?—There is that advantage.

14,836. Very probably, if he were not brought on board in that way, for that reason, he would not take the trouble to inspect the ship?—Most possibly.

14,837. Is there anything else that you wish to tell us?—No.

Mr. Tait.

14,838. You have stated that the Board of Trade has not jurisdiction over all docks, but that they are consulted in regard to certain byelaws in the case of some docks?—They are not consulted; but by some of the Acts authorising docks there are clauses stating that no byelaws can be made for the working of those docks until they have been approved by the Board of Trade.

14,839. Can you tell us the cause of the recommendation to mercy on the part of the jury in Barnes' case?—No, I have not any information on that.

14,840. The consul's report to you either from Rotterdam or Antwerp stated that one of the reasons why English shipowners were desirous of getting foreign crews was that they were more amenable to discipline?—Yes.

14,841. But the consul does not give any case in point. Might I ask whether from your lengthened experience in the Board of Trade you think that that really is the case?—In the extract that I have read from the report of the Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea it is stated that that was the general opinion, that sailors from the north of Europe were more easily managed, and more amenable to discipline than the English sailors.

14,842. In the evidence which was led by Mr. Becket Hill, I think the impression that he left upon the Commission was that one of the reasons of the decrease of the trade in the port of London arose owing to the disputes which had occurred between the shipowners and the sailors. You have put in a paper on the subject, but you did not tell us what was your opinion upon Mr. Becket Hill's statement, although you told us you did not agree with what he said?—Shall I read the figures?

14,843. Just as you please?—The entries of tonnage coming into the ports of London, Glasgow, and Liverpool in the last five years were as follows in thousands of tons:—In 1886 in Glasgow 2,536, in Liverpool 7,566, in London

Mr. Tait—continued.

11,988; in 1877 in Glasgow 2,713, in Liverpool 7,940, in London 12,307; in 1888 in Glasgow 2,885, in Liverpool 8,104, in London 13,114; in 1889 in Glasgow 2,789, in Liverpool 8,445, in London 12,882; and in 1890 in Glasgow 2,874, in Liverpool 8,408, in London 13,141. Omitting the coasting trade the entries were in thousands of tons:—In 1886 in Glasgow 913, in Liverpool 5,017, in London 6,810; in 1887 in Glasgow 972, in Liverpool 5,186, in London 6,880; in 1888 in Glasgow 994, in Liverpool 5,368, in London 7,470; in 1889 in Glasgow 1,058, in Liverpool 5,789, in London 7,550; and in 1890 in Glasgow 1,121, in Liverpool 5,782, in London 7,708.

14,844. Therefore, your figures go to prove that there has been more tonnage up to 1890 in London, that there has been an increase of tonnage instead of a decrease?—Yes.

14,845. Complaints have been made before the Commission about crimping, can you suggest any further legislation for the purpose of preventing it, by increasing the present powers held by the Board of Trade?—No, I think not. I do not see what you can do by legislation to prevent crimping.

14,846. Have you no other reason to put forward than simply that it would interfere with the form of contract between employer and employed, why you would not be inclined to stop the discharge of crews at foreign ports?—I think that is a very important question. I think that is the chief reason, certainly.

14,847. Have there been any cases brought before the Board of Trade, where a crew or a part of a crew have been discharged without good or cogent reason satisfactory to the Board of Trade?—I cannot call one to mind.

Mr. Plimsoll.

14,848. I notice that in giving your evidence you gave the proportion of loss of life for several years past. Would you kindly refer to that again? I think you quoted from column 8 of the paper of last session, numbered 150. Will you refer again to that column which gives the number of lives lost by drowning, and other accidents to persons employed, and say what the figures are for 1883?—In the return, No. 150, column 8, it is 152, or 1 in 66.

14,849. Will you give the next year, if you please?—103, or one in 97.

14,850. I think it will simplify matters if you drop the decimals, and just give the actual proportion. It was 1 in 97, and not 1 in 164?—In which years?

14,851. That is the year 1884–85, marked in the returns as 1884?—The number lost by drowning and other accidents was 1 in 97 in the calendar year 1884.

14,852. And not 1 in 164. I have a reason for giving these figures, which I will show you directly. Now the next year 1885?—That was 1 in 106.

14,853. And not 1 in 223. The next year, 1886?—One in 112.

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Mr. Plimsoll—continued.

14,854. And not 1 in 142. Now 1887?—One in 99.

14,855. And not 1 in 157. Now 1888?—One in 114.

Mr. Plimsoll.

Not 1 in 200, and so on. Now the reason I have asked these questions is that a really insolent letter has appeared in the *Times*, quoting all the figures which you say were not the proper figures, and which I also say were not the proper figures, and then they abused me soundly for my inaccuracy because I did not accept their figures.

Earl of Derby.

That is hardly a question, is it? I do not want to be unfair.

Mr. Plimsoll.

The other day there was a gentleman here who was told to tell his story in his own way.

Earl of Derby.

All right.

Mr. Plimsoll.

I only want to point out that here is the secretary of the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, dating from Whittington House, Whittington Avenue, Leadenhall Street, London, writing abusive letters to the *Times*, replies to which the *Times* does not print, and these letters of this man are full of inaccuracies, of the inaccuracies I have given you. The mean of the figures you have given me is 1 in 102, but the mean of the figures given by this man, W. H. Cooke, is 1 in 182, which is preposterously wrong. I suppose he has got lost himself, you can tell he has got wrong.

Mr. Plimsoll.

14,856. The figures which were quoted by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach at the dinner of the Chamber of Shipping, in which he stated that 1 life was lost in 256 people employed, did not refer to the whole causes of loss I apprehend, did they?—They referred to the number lost by wrecks and casualties.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

I said so at the time.

Mr. Plimsoll.

The *Times* and sundry other papers have taken it as comparing with those figures in Mr. Chamberlain's returns, and have congratulated the public upon the wonderful improvement, and abused me proportionately for not giving credit to them.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

14,857. The proper comparison would be, would it not, between 1 in 79 in the year 1881,

U 72729.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

and 1 in 256 in the year 1891?—Yes, 1 in 79 in 1881, 1 in 94 in 1883, and 1 in 256 in 1891.

Mr. Plimsoll.

14,858. But this question only referred to a part of the subject. Is not that so?—No, I think not.

14,859. Surely it is not contended that these figures are on the line of the returns which were presented to Parliament on a motion by Mr. Chamberlain. The loss of life did not suddenly reduce itself by more than one-half between 1889 and 1890?—They are indeed on the line.

14,860. You told us just now it was wrecks and casualties only; that is only part of the subject?—I think, if you will look at the table and add the two columns together, you will see how they are made up, and that they include everything.

14,861. Which table do you refer me to now?—I am referring you to the table that I put in, but that is a statement in continuation of the Parliamentary Papers, 3,875 and 150 of 1891, to which you have referred me.

14,862. It is in continuation of those?—Yes.

14,863. I should be very glad to be supplied with a copy of that continuation, but I have not got it now. What does it state?—Shall I repeat the evidence that I gave about that?

14,864. If you please?—It will be seen that the rate of loss amongst seamen by all kinds of accidents at sea in 1881 was 1 in 56·96, in 1883 it was 1 in 66, in 1884 1 in 97, in 1885 1 in 106, and so on up to the time that we have got it.

14,865. Would you kindly continue, because you have just come to the crux of the matter?—to the crucial figures?—In 1886 there was 1 in 112, in 1887 1 in 99, in 1888 1 in 114, and in 1889 1 in 126. The figures for the last two years have not yet been made up, but there is no reason to suspect that they are not equally favourable. Then I referred to the losses by wrecks and casualties alone, and there we come to the figure of 1 in 79 in 1881 and get down to the figure of 1 in 256 in 1891.

14,866. Yes, but do you not see that it is a different line entirely. It is wrecks and casualties alone. It is not a continuation of those tables that you have given us before?—No.

14,867. I only just want to make it clear. I do not really wish to annoy or to put puzzling questions. I just want to get at the truth?—Certainly, they are two different things.

14,868. That is just what I have been contending, but the papers accepted the figures 1 in 256, and contended that the loss of life from all causes had been reduced to that figure, which is perfectly preposterous. The mean for the seven years ending 1887 was 1 in 102, and it was quite impossible that it could all at once have been reduced to 1 in 256. I pass now from that. You spoke of the seamen having the right of complaint when they find themselves supplied with bad food. Do you not find that

N n

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Mr. *Plimssoll*—continued.

that power is never used by seamen?—I think very rarely.

14,869. They put up with that; they let by-gones be by-gones. They have something else to do than to cool their heels in a police court when they come ashore?—I think so.

14,870. You read out the subject matters which are brought before the local marine boards for their decision. Would you mind giving me those again?—The subjects into which inquiries are made by local marine boards are as follows:—drunkenness, gross misconduct, tyranny, general incompetency, mania, or insanity or affected mental condition.

14,871. Those are all matters in which the interests of the sailor are very closely and very deeply concerned. I imagine you would agree that those are subjects of inquiry which deeply affect the welfare and the interests of seamen?—Certainly they affect them.

14,872. We had a witness last week who tried to show that they had nothing at all to do with the interests of the seamen. In stating that, ships must not arrive in our ports between certain dates, I think you said the 31st October, is it not the 1st of October?—Is that with regard to deck loading?

14,873. Yes; my memory is clear on the point, but I am not sure that it is accurate. I do not think I need trouble you at present to supply that point if you will kindly look at it and put the right date in your evidence?—The words in the Act are “arrives between the last day of October and the 16th day of April.”

Mr. *Plimssoll*.

I must ask you to excuse me for pressing those other questions, because the man who has written these letters is so enamoured of his blunders that he is publishing the letters in a pamphlet, and it is a tissue of absurdity, as I have proved out of your evidence. I have no further question to ask.

Duke of *Devonshire*.

14,874. I do not know whether I understand from the evidence which you gave, the proof of which I looked over before I came into the room, whether any system of requiring discharge certificates or certificates of ability from seamen is now necessary?—No, there is none necessary except in the case of the Royal Naval Reserve.

14,875. But the officers require a certificate?—They do.

14,876. Seamen do not?—No.

14,877. We understand it to be the opinion of the Board of Trade that no such system in regard to the men can be worked?—The trials that have been made have not succeeded. We quite admit that if such a custom could be provided it would be very useful, but all the attempts at present have not been successful.

14,878. You have seen in Mr. Wilson's evidence that he states that one of the objects of the Seamen's and Firemen's Union is to exclude from their Union any man who is considered to be incompetent?—Yes.

Duke of *Devonshire*—continued.

14,879. And that they claim the right, although they do not enforce the claim now, of their members to refuse to sail with non-unionists?—Yes.

14,880. Have you any reason to suppose that membership of such a union as the Seamen's and Firemen's Union would answer the purpose of excluding incompetent men?—I should personally doubt it, but I have no information on the subject.

14,881. Under the present law after a seaman had signed articles he would be liable to punishment if he refused to go to sea, even if he found that the other members of the crew were incompetent, would he not?—Yes, certainly.

14,882. He has no right to require any proof of the competence of the men with whom he goes to sea?—Exactly.

14,883. And there is no proposal at present under the consideration of the Board of Trade, as far as you are aware, to ensure the competency of the seamen?—Except such as I described here, namely, that we have given instructions to the superintendents at all the ports to, as far as possible, find out whether the men signing on as A.B.'s are A.B.'s, and if they are not satisfied with the evidence that they are A.B.'s that they are to put “not proven” against their names.

14,884. What would be the effect of that?—Eventually we hope that it may have the effect of making masters look out for the best men, and take only those men who can be proved to have been A.B.'s, but it is a matter now which rests with the master entirely what sailor he takes; it is for him to judge of the character.

14,885. If the master chooses to take the risk of employing an incompetent man, whom he knows to be incompetent, there is nothing to prevent him?—Nothing.

Professor *Marshall*.

14,886. Would there be any objection to requiring the master not to employ anyone except on the presentation of a continuous certificate, and I should perhaps add, the transmission of the fact that he had received a certificate to the Board of Trade?—Do you mean to say that a master should not be allowed to take a man unless he could prove that he was an able-bodied seaman?

14,887. No, but would it be possible that every man should have a number, and be entered under a name and number, that then the master should ask him for his certificate if he had served before, and if not, should grant him a new certificate?—It would be possible, but it would interfere very largely with the choice of the supply of sailors.

14,888. I do not quite see it?—If I understand you your proposal is that nobody should be regarded as being suitable to be hired as a seaman unless he had been registered as such somewhere, and had a number.

14,889. Or if he appeared for the first time should then receive a number; so that no one would be excluded by that plan, would they?—No. That could be done, of course, but I do

8 March 1892.]

Sir HENRY G. CALCRAFT, K.C.B.

[Continued.]

Professor *Marshall*—continued.

not see that merely having a number would help the matter.

14,890. Am I right in thinking that you believe that if the system of continuous certificates could be worked it would be for the advantage both of employers and employed?—Certainly; I think it would be an advantage.

14,891. Would it not be possible for each man to have a number and a continuous certificate, and for the master, if he had already served, to enter on a new page the statement of the new service, and if the man wanted a new certificate to supply him with one at a charge, say, of 6d.?—The difficulty is that the sailors will not keep their certificates, and that they lose them; I mean in the practical working of it when you give the sailors a certificate very often at the end of six months it is not forthcoming.

14,892. Exactly, and is not this a proposal to get over that difficulty? I understood that that was a difficulty, and I was suggesting whether it was not one that could be got over by that simple rule? Supposing he had lost his certificate, would it not be possible to say, "What was your old number?" and then grant him a new one at a small charge?—It would be quite possible, but I think the sailors would object to that. There would be no difficulty that I can see officially in doing that—no official difficulty.

14,893. But if the sailors desire a continuous certificate, would they not fall in with it?—Yes, but I think experience has proved that they do not want them; that they do not take the trouble to get them.

Professor *Marshall*—continued.

14,894. Is it not that they desire to avoid the trouble?—That may be.

14,895. Would not they be likely to fall in with the rule if it were made general?—I do not think that the experience we have had leads to that conclusion.

14,896. Supposing it were possible, it would get rid of the difficulty with regard to deserters, would it not?—You would be able to trace a deserter, but in what other way it would get over the difficulty I do not see.

14,897. It would bring a penalty practically for desertion, would it not; the penalty of having the desertion shown on the old certificate, and also on the new certificate, when he demanded one?—Yes; but I do not think that would have much effect.

Sir *Michael Hicks-Beach*.

14,898. Is not a record now kept of desertions?—Yes.

14,899. Are you aware whether the persons who engage crews pay much attention to the record?—I think not the least.

Mr. *Austin*.

14,900. We have had several witnesses here who have suggested that instead of signing articles in the shipping office, they should sign on board ship. What is your opinion on that subject?—I think, in certain cases, it is very useful, but it is not a system that I should like to see very largely extended.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. GEORGE DAY called and examined.

Earl of *Derby*.

14,901. You are a lighterman, we understand?—Yes.

14,902. Are you connected with any union, or in what capacity do you come here?—I am elected by the Lightermen's Society.

14,903. What have you to tell us; has there been a strike in the lightermen's business lately?—Yes, in October 1890.

14,904. How did it end; did the men get what they wanted?—Thereabouts.

14,905. We understand that in the first instance the men and the owners were not able to agree, but that there was a stoppage of work for four days?—Yes.

14,906. And after that you came to terms?—Yes; I can give you the details if it is necessary.

14,907. You have no particular reason to be dissatisfied with the terms come to, is that so?—Quite so.

14,908. Then what is it that you come here to put before us or to complain of?—I have been a lighterman on the Humber, chiefly at the port of Hull, for the past 22 years. I do not remember much about the society which was formed in the year 1872, and which I believe collapsed either in the year 1885 or 1886, but

Earl of *Derby*—continued.

from that time the condition of lightermen gradually got worse and worse, in fact, the lighter owners did just as they liked with the lightermen, and I believe it was through the men being unorganised that the lighter owners took that advantage, paid the men just as they liked, engaged them and paid them off at a moment's warning, and the whole condition of lightermen got so bad that it was impossible for a lighterman to know, when he was set on, how long he would be working. And this state of things continued till the establishment of the present Society of Lightermen and Watermen, of which I have been a member since the first. The present society came into existence on January 6th, 1890, and in the following September, the lightermen sent a scale of revised pay and conditions of labour, but the lighter owners did not seem to take any notice of the scheme, till we were likely, within the next two or three days, to go out on strike. After a joint deputation of four lighter owners and four lightermen had discussed the scale six hours, we amicably came to an understanding, and the chairman remarked that he was pleased with the fair manner in which the men had discussed the scale, and agreed to the alterations

8 March 1892.]

Mr. GEORGE DAY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

and the deputation parted with the idea that the dispute was settled and that a serious strike had been averted; also that the men would continue their work as usual, but, on the following day, at a general meeting of the lighter owners, they appeared to disagree with what the deputation had done, for they almost unanimously agreed not to accept the scale agreed upon conjointly. So at a specially summoned meeting of the men, the letter from the lighter owners was read, and the men agreed that the lighter owners had broken faith with the men, and that it was useless to negotiate any further with them, so they decided to cease work on the 4th October, and stand by the original demands, and, with one exception, every man refused to take any orders on the Saturday night. On the 6th October; Monday, at a mass meeting, a fresh scale of wages was submitted to the men, and a resolution moved and carried almost unanimously "that if the lighter owners fail to accept the revised scale, we are willing to submit the whole matter to arbitration." On the 8th, we received a letter from the lighter owners agreeing to submit to arbitration, and on the Thursday the whole case was gone into and settled, and we were awarded more by the award than we agreed to go in for at the joint deputation. Therefore we throw the whole blame on the lighter owners for the strike, and the inconvenience to trade in general, and the loss of wages to men through the strike.

14,909. What is your present rate of wages?—5s. a day for casual men, 26s. a week for weekly men.

14,910. And what are the usual hours?—12 working hours, but we are perhaps working at the other end of the town three miles away from the office; we have to come after we have knocked off at 6 o'clock at night to report what we have done during the day, and we are perhaps kept there till 8 o'clock at night waiting for orders for the next day, and perhaps at the finish they do not want us, but we have been 15 hours on duty that day for 5s.

14,911. You say the weekly men get 26s. a week?—Yes.

14,912. Then at the rate of 5s. a day men working six days a week should earn 30s.?—Yes.

14,913. Do they?—If they get a full week; those are casual men.

14,914. Are there many casual men in the business?—The majority of the men are casual.

14,915. Then I understand you have some complaint as to the safety of the lighters?—Yes. The lighters, in my opinion, as constructed at present, are very dangerous and unsafe, and in many instances men have lost their lives through the lighters being unsafe. I could show you a model of one of the lighters as they are constructed at present, if you wish to see one. (*Producing model and explaining same.*)

14,916. Do you say that that is of a safe construction?—It is unsafe.

Earl of Derby—continued.

14,917. Why?—In rough weather we have to walk along here to push the lighter along with poles; we have no rails round the bow or the quarter, nor man-ropes to save us with. In frosty weather when this gets covered with snow and frozen we are liable to slip overboard. I should think I have been overboard about 10 times, but I have been fortunate enough to get myself out.

14,918. Have accidents often happened from that cause?—Yes.

14,919. What is your remedy?—We should like to have stanchions round the end about 2 feet high, and then a man-rope, as we call it, from the fore stanchion to the after stanchion, so that we could have something to keep us on the deck. This deck is about 18 inches wide; it rises 3 inches; it is very sloping.

14,920. That would not be very expensive, would it?—So expensive that the lighter owners will not do it for us.

Mr. Jesse Collings.

14,921. Is there any other reason besides the expense?—I think not. I do not know of any other reason.

Earl of Derby.

14,922. Then, your complaint is the danger from the want of a rope and stanchions?—Yes.

14,923. And also I think you complain of the want of a lifebuoy?—Yes, or a boat.

14,924. You do not sleep on board these lighters, do you?—Sometimes we have to do so.

14,925. But as a rule you do not?—As a rule we do not.

14,926. Therefore, when you complain of insufficient accommodation, practically, I suppose, that refers to the times for meals?—Yes.

14,927. Because you must necessarily be on deck while you are working the lighter?—Yes. It is in cases of leaving home on tides work and going down to the docks. We, perhaps, leave home at 12 o'clock at night, and we get finished our tides work about 3 o'clock in the morning. We have not time to go home and get back to work again by 6 o'clock, and we have to walk the quays or anywhere, for three hours. We think the lighter owners ought to find us a place where we could shelter in until it is time to start work at 6 o'clock.

Mr. Tait.

14,928. Have you now got any better understanding with your employers since your Union was formed than hitherto existed?—In regard to wages and conditions of work we have.

14,929. You said that you used to leave work at a moment's notice?—Yes.

14,930. Does that still continue?—No.

14,931. What is the notice now?—Half a day.

14,932. What was the cause of the strike in October 1890?—We thought we should like more money and our conditions altered.

8 March 1892.]

Mr. GEORGE DAY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

14,933. How much more money did you ask for?—2s. for a weekly man and 5s. for a casual. They met us half way with the weekly men's wage, and gave us the amount we asked for for the casual labour.

14,934. How many days were you out on strike?—Four days.

14,935. How was it settled, by conference?—By arbitration.

14,936. Who was the arbiter?—Captain Hill, of Hull, and Mr. Welsh, of Newcastle, arbitrated for the watermen.

14,937. Who suggested arbitration; did it come from the employers or from the men?—It was suggested by us.

14,938. And accepted by the employers?—Yes.

14,939. Did you offer to the employers to arbitrate before the strike took place?—No, I do not think we did.

14,940. Has your Union made any overtures to the employers to reduce the hours?—No.

14,941. Have you ever had considered in your organisation the propriety of reducing the hours?—Yes.

14,942. What has been the result?—There has been a great difference of opinion in that.

14,943. When you say there is a difference in opinion what have I to take from that?—Some go for eight hours, some go for nine, and some go for letting it remain as it is.

14,944. Then, it is owing to the division of opinion among the men that you have not approached the employers?—Yes.

14,945. Have you any suggestion to make to the Commission about the hours?—I have a little to say about it after I have got done with the unsafe lighters. I have a little evidence I should like to read as to the unsafe lighters, and I could come at it afterwards.

14,946. It will answer my purpose as well, just now, if you will tell me, briefly, what have you, as an organisation, to suggest to the Commission with regard to the hours of labour, and what also have you to suggest for the purpose of doing away with strikes and the strained relations between employers and employed?—I believe in a legal eight hours.

14,947. You believe in a legal eight hours?—Yes.

14,948. Notwithstanding that there is a difference with your men?—Yes, that is my opinion.

14,949. When you say it is yours, are you speaking now as a representative of your organisation, or personally, as an individual?—I am speaking as an individual now.

14,950. Would you be prepared to let Parliament also legislate for wages if you ask them to do it for hours?—That I have not taken into consideration at all.

14,951. But do you see any good reason why they should not?—No.

14,952. You are prepared, therefore, to put the whole interest of the workman, so far as his working hours, his conditions, and his payment

Mr. Tait—continued.

are concerned, into the hands of Parliament?—Yes, I believe I am.

14,953. You say you sometimes sleep on board your lighters; is there provision made, such as a hammock for your sleeping like a sailor, any bed and bedding?—There is nothing of the kind. You go down to the bottom of the vessel; there is neither a bit of ceiling nor a plank to put your feet on, nor anything, that is the question.

14,954. You then lay down in the body of the boat?—We do not lie down, because we should get our deaths of cold in them. They are nothing but black holes. These places are merely made to take care of the ropes, and the bucket and the pump gear, and such like; they are not made for the accommodation of the men.

14,955. Do you often have occasion to rest there?—Yes, very often. Sometimes I have left home at 9 o'clock at night, and I have been perhaps five hours over my shift, that is, getting them out of one dock into the other. Well, it has been too late, I have not had time after I have done my shift, you know, because I have had to be there at 6 o'clock in the morning, to go home. I have had to walk about on the quay side or anywheres to keep myself warm until we commence work again.

14,956. Have you asked the lighter owners to carry out the improvements or suggestions you have made?—We have asked them about furnishing the lighters with stoves in the fore-castles.

14,957. I mean with the safety appliances?—Yes, we have talked to them several times.

14,958. As an organisation?—Yes.

14,959. They have refused it?—Yes.

14,960. You also say that you think there should be a boat for the purpose of saving life, the same as they have on ships, I presume you refer to?—Yes.

14,961. Have you asked them for that?—We have not as an organisation; we have not spoken to them.

14,962. Nor yet for lifebuoys?—I do not think we have for lifebuoys either.

14,963. Yet owing to the want of appliances you suggest there is a number of men who are continuously falling overboard?—Yes, there were two men overboard last week. If the men had not been handy to get them out they would have been drowned.

14,964. How is it that the casual men receive more than weekly men?—Seeing that a weekly man is regular from one week end to the other, and from one month end to the other; but we very likely get a day's work to-day and then we have to stand off to-morrow.

14,965. What are you paid for overtime when you work it?—9d. per hour.

14,966. At what extra rate is that, time and a half?—Yes.

14,967. What are you paid for Sunday work?—The same.

14,968. Time and a half?—Yes.

8 March 1892.]

Mr. GEORGE DAY.

[Continued.]

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

14,969. Were these things in existence before your Union?—No.

14,970. Do you not think now, seeing that you have been so successful in getting payment for overtime by your Union, and payment for Sunday work by your Union, you could reduce the hours on the same lines, were the men as unanimous as they ought to be?—Yes, I do think so.

14,971. And providing that the men were unanimous in this, would you think there is no necessity for the intervention of Parliament?—I should think not.

Mr. *Jesse Collings*.

14,972. Would these man-ropes and stanchions that you speak of interfere with the working of the lighter?—Not at all.

Duke of *Devonshire*.

14,973. I think you stated the names of the arbitrators?—Yes.

14,974. Had you two on your side?—No, Captain Hill was for the lighter owners and Mr. Welsh was for the men.

14,975. Has the scale which the arbitrators awarded to you been in force ever since?—Yes.

14,976. Without any complaint on the side either of the masters or of the men?—The

The witness withdrew.

Mr. THOMAS FAWCETT called and examined.

Earl of *Derby*.

14,986. What are you by occupation?—Keel man.

14,987. From what part of the country?—Lincoln.

14,988. Do you come here as representing any society?—As representing the Amalgamated Society of Lightermen and Watermen of the River Humber.

14,989. Is that a numerous society?—Not very; I believe we number between 1,000 and 1,100 members.

14,990. All employed on the river?—Yes.

14,991. Now we understand that you have come here to tell us of some things which you think objectionable which ought to be amended; will you now tell us what you have to say on the subject of the registration of canal boats; we understand you think that that is not properly conducted at present?—That is so. It is desirable that there should be a more uniform system of registration of canal boats under the Canal Boats Acts. Under the existing system it is a common thing for canal boats registered in one district to be certified to accommodate, say, 12 persons; the same boat, if registered in another district, would only be certified as fit to accommodate six persons. This anomaly is brought about by the different manner in which the various inspectors take the measurements of the cubical contents of the cabins.

14,992. How many inspectors are there, do you know?—One for every district. With your permission I would like to cite a few cases.

Duke of *Devonshire*—continued.

masters have tried to infringe it, but it has had no effect.

14,977. Are the greater number of the men employed in this business in your Union?—I should say between 300 and 400.

14,978. Out of how many?—Perhaps a thousand.

14,979. Then there would be a larger number who are not unionists?—No, the other 700 or 600, whatever there are, I cannot give you the exact figures, belong to the Dockers' Union. We belong to a local society.

14,980. You say the occupation is dangerous, have you known men to be drowned?—Yes.

14,981. Are the owners liable for any compensation?—They have not been held liable.

14,982. Has that question never been under the consideration of your Union?—I do not think it has.

14,983. You say men have been drowned; is it frequent?—I have known about eight or nine in my experience.

14,984. And you have never known any question of compensation to their families raised?—No.

14,985. Has it never occurred to your Union to raise this question?—I do not know that it has; it has not in my presence.

Earl of *Derby*—continued.

I should like to avoid being personal if it could be done. Would it be advisable not to mention names of owners and names of masters?

14,993. Not if you can help it. We do not want to go into personal complaints. We understand your complaint to be as regards registration, that it has not been a uniform system; that each district has its own manner of registering, and consequently that there are different rules for different parts of the country?—That is so.

14,994. Is that complained of?—That is complained of.

14,995. What is the practical inconvenience that it causes?—The inconvenience that it causes is this: a vessel may be a large and commodious vessel, fit, say, to accommodate six or eight persons; in the district to which she belongs she might be certified for three. I have here some certificates of vessels of that description certified for three and four, and one for two, while in another district the same vessels might be certified for 10 or a dozen.

14,996. A vessel can obtain a better kind of certificate in one district than it would in another?—Just so.

14,997. Do you happen to know how many districts there are?—I do not. We communicated with 13 within the range of our Union, and inquired the number of boats on their registers. I am sorry to say we only received replies from four.

8 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS FAWCETT.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

14,998. Do you think that this grievance of non-uniformity of registration is much felt or complained of?—It is very much felt by those who suffer from the inconveniences.

14,999. Then I infer that the rules, whatever they may be, which prevail on the Humber, are more severe and less favourable than in some other districts?—I cannot say that. I do not know what it may be in the Mersey district. On that matter I am entirely ignorant; or in the Thames district for the matter of that either.

15,000. Passing on from that, I think you complain of the system of inspection, or rather of the want of proper inspection?—Yes, of the lack of inspection.

15,001. Is the Canal Boats Act not properly enforced?—It is not enforced.

15,002. Why is that?—That is a difficult question to answer. I cannot say why it is not enforced.

15,003. I understand that you put it that there is not a sufficient staff of inspectors?—In some districts where canal boats are numerous, there is not; in other districts where canal boats are not numerous, of course one man could easily do it, but it so happens that the inspector is the servant of the sanitary authority, urban or rural. On the sanitary authority there might be some prominent canal boat owners, consequently, he would not like to prosecute those canal boat owners for infringements of the Act; they are practically his masters.

15,004. This is another, and a different complaint that you make. You began by saying that there were too few, now you say, as I understand you, that they are in a dependant position, and dare not attempt properly to enforce the Act?—Many of them are so; a great many of them.

15,005. As a fact, are you aware that there are many canal boats which are very seldom visited by the inspector?—I am. I can quote the names, and give full particulars of several that have not seen an inspector for many years.

15,006. What is the consequence of that deficient inspection; in what way is the Act violated?—Many of them are not ventilated as they should be. I have a certificate of registry here of one canal boat, where it is marked on the certificate that a certain system of ventilation shall be carried out; but the certificate is granted, that is, dated some years ago, and to-day that canal boat is not ventilated as required.

15,007. Now, I think you say also that there ought to be certificates of competency for any person having charge of a canal boat or of a lighter?—I do.

15,008. From what authority do you think that certificate of competency should come?—I think from the Board of Trade.

15,009. Is it a common thing now for persons to be placed in charge of vessels navigating rivers where there is often a certain amount of risk; is it common for such persons to be appointed without having any previous know-

Earl of Derby—continued.

ledge of the business?—I would not say not having any previous knowledge, but not having sufficient practical knowledge of the business to make them competent to take charge of a canal boat.

15,010. But surely, where that is the case such a man endangers the boat that he is on as well as all others?—Certainly.

15,011. And therefore the owners would not knowingly appoint an incompetent man?—We know that they do; we know that they often appoint an incompetent man. I could quote several cases that are within my personal knowledge.

15,012. If that is so, evidently they must consider that the risk to their boats is not great?—That is so. They are often insured, and consequently they would often gain by the loss of their vessel.

15,013. I think you are prepared to give three cases, in two of which the vessels were lost by collision, or at least sunk by collision, and in the third, vessels were considerably damaged?—I am prepared to give more than three.

15,014. Now, when you say that every person engaging in the business ought to have a certificate of competency, is the object of that to prevent more persons from coming into the business, and so tending to lower wages?—No, certainly not.

15,015. You do not care how many come in, provided they are competent for the work?—Providing they are skilful and competent men.

15,016. Do you consider that the practice of over-insurance is common in this business?—I cannot say that it is common. I would not go as far as that. I should like to state my ideas on the subject, with your permission.

15,017. Yes, by all means; you can tell your story best in your own way?—I look with suspicion on any system of insurance of obsolete river craft. I think it will result in our rivers becoming obstructed by a large number of wrecks, and be detrimental to the interests of watermen as a body and of the river and canal carrying trade in particular. Of the river craft of to-day in our districts, at least 97 per cent. are constructed of wood, many of them are old and worn, and wooden vessels of all kinds are fast becoming obsolete, and are being superseded by vessels constructed of iron or steel, an iron or steel vessel being much more profitable than a wooden vessel on account of her additional hold space and carrying capacity. It is reasonable to suppose that if a person has a wooden vessel that he can insure for her full value, and if lost get replaced by a steel one, and he does insure her for her full value, he will not care how soon she is lost, provided he runs no personal risk; and thus he will have no objection to place any incompetent person in charge. I may remark that Mr. Hewson, the witness who follows me, knows a great deal more about this matter than I do. He has just recently been appointed agent for one of these mutual insurance societies undertaking liability for damage done by canal

8 March 1932.]

Mr. THOMAS FAWCETT.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

boats, such as the running down of another vessel, damage to lock gates, bridges, quays, buoys, &c., and which he informs me they pay in full at a maximum rate or liability of 15*l.* per ton. He, no doubt, will be able to tell you much more about it than I can. I believe the policies of this society cover even damage to telegraph poles or wires. So you will see the little risk owners run in putting incompetent men on board.

15,018. What you have stated, if I understand it rightly, goes rather to show that some limit should be put upon the practice of insurance than that greater stringency should be exercised in the selection of men, because if an owner cannot recover by insurance the loss of his vessel, he will have no inducement to neglect proper precautions. Is not that so?—That is so in a sense. But an owner being able not only to recover loss of his vessel by insurance, but any damage done; that is, to be, as it were, compensated for any damage done in a sense to either vessels or quays, or lock gates, or anything of that kind in connexion with navigation, he would not take so much care as to the man he puts in charge.

15,019. But I presume if his vessel does damage to any other vessel, that the owner of the vessel injured, or the property injured, whatever it may be, may proceed against him and obtain compensation?—Yes, and in that case the insurance company pays.

15,020. That is what I say, that your argument is really directed against the practice of over-insurance?—Oh no, it is not altogether. It is really directed against the practice of employing incompetent men. Certainly over-insurance has a good deal to do with it. I am bound to admit that.

15,021. Now, I put it to you fairly, when you say that incompetent men should not be employed, is it in your mind that none except union men are likely to be competent?—Oh no; there are many competent men outside the pale of any union.

15,022. Then, I think, you say that vessels are frequently under-manned?—That is so.

15,023. What is the custom in the Humber district?—It is getting a common practice for many vessels to be manned by a man and his wife and family—ofttimes a family of girls. The result is that the children of such boatmen get no education worth mentioning. It oftentimes enables the parents to spend the earnings of their children in drink, &c., and has a very demoralising effect on the whole family. I have seen a mother and two daughters, who were, at 2 o'clock in the morning, pulling the vessel along with a rope, and practically doing the work of a horse. At the time I speak of—that is last autumn—the grass on the river bank was long, and there was a heavy dew, and the women had to stop frequently to wring the water out of their skirts; while the husband and father stood on the deck, steering, smoking, and swearing at his wife and daughter for not pulling the vessel along faster. When the vessel

Earl of Derby—continued.

arrived at her destination, the aforesaid model of a husband and father paid another man to do his work, while he went off drinking. Only the other morning, near Keadley Lock, I saw a woman on board a keel, certainly not under 30 years of age, knocked overboard by the tiller during a snowstorm. The accident was caused by the wash of a passing steamer.

15,024. You say it often follows from the manner in which they live that the children are brought up without education; but the rule of compulsory education applies to them as well as to all others?—Yes, but I am sorry to say the Canal Boat Acts are not enforced with regard to them, the same as with regard to the system of registration and inspection. Very many canal boat children have no education whatever.

15,025. Do you object to a wife and family being employed to help, as far as they possibly can, on-board a boat?—I do in a certain sense; when it affects them in the manner it does. I object to a woman being out all night working as a man in all weathers; it is not a woman's work.

15,026. And you say that that practice is common on board canal boats?—It is common on board of the class of canal boats with which I am connected.

15,027. Then would you require that two able-bodied men should be employed on every boat?—Certainly.

15,028. That would considerably increase the number of persons employed in the business, would it not?—It would.

15,029. And reduce the profits of the business accordingly?—Yes, no doubt it would.

15,030. Do you think, if you brought so large a number of extra men into this industry that the tendency would not be for their wages to become lower?—No, I do not think it would. I do not think it would have a tendency to reduce wages.

15,031. Then I think you also say that there is not sufficient examination of these boats for cleanliness and sanitary purposes?—That is so. I have been a canal boatman all my life. I never have had an inspector down my cabin but once, that is since they took the measurements for registration purposes.

15,032. Do you sleep on board your boat?—Yes.

15,033. I suppose you would hardly make the owner responsible if the men on board choose to keep their cabin in a dirty condition?—No, we would not make the owners responsible in that case. I believe the Order of the Local Government Board deals with the matter in a certain sense, but the order is not enforced.

15,034. Then I think you have something to say about life-saving appliances?—I have.

15,035. Would you have every vessel provided with a lifebuoy?—With two lifebuoys, with life-lines attached.

15,036. Why two?—So that there will be one for each man when there are two men. It is fair to assume that no vessel ought to have less than two persons on board. I can quote cases

8 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS FAWCETT.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

where lives have been lost through not having buoys and life-saving appliances on board.

15,037. I gather from what you have written here that you are not in favour of a compulsory eight hours' day as applied to river traffic?—That is so.

15,038. Trade, I suppose, varies from time to time, and it depends upon wind and tide?—In a great measure.

15,039. Therefore it would be impossible to limit the number of hours' work on any particular day or any particular work?—That is so.

15,040. Is there anything else you wish to put before us?—Yes; there is a matter in connexion with commission agents and their ways. And another matter which I have not yet mentioned I should like to say a little about, that of overloading. Overloading is not practised to any very large extent, but still it is practised, and sometimes results in loss of vessels and occasionally in loss of life. The principal offenders are those watermen who, like myself, work their vessels on the share system, and is, no doubt, brought about by a greed of gain. It sometimes happens that watermen paid by time will receive instructions from their owners to take in a greater quantity of cargo than their vessels can safely carry; or an impecunious or greedy owner will sometimes grumble at his men for not loading deeper; but I am bound to admit, in justice to the great carrying companies, that overloading is rarely practised with them. In fact some of them strictly forbid their watermen or lightermen to overload, and one railway company running into Hull have a load-line placed on the side of their lighters, something after the style of the Plimsoll mark, beyond which their lightermen are forbidden to load on pain of dismissal. It would be a good thing if Mr. Plimsoll's mark was compulsory on all lighters and river craft. I would suggest one inch of free-board for every foot of draught of water as the minimum amount of spare buoyancy.

15,041. That is what you have to say as to overloading?—That is what I have to say as to overloading.

15,042. You began just now to tell us about commission agents. Will you continue your observations of that point?—Yes. There is another little matter that I should like to mention, and that is with regard to the payment of freights and brokers' commission in a public-house; and ship brokers and their ways in general. It is a common thing for the keeper of a public-house to combine with his business of publican that of a broker for canal boats and other river craft, with the result that the waterman who can empty the greatest number of pint pots down his throat in a given time, or who is the most successful in running up a score at the broker's swipe shop, is also the most successful in obtaining a remunerative cargo; and it sometimes happens that if the broker is not a publican himself, he is in league with someone else who is, and there is an under-

Earl of Derby—continued.

standing between them to fleece the keelman as long as he has a shot left in his locker. Now, I believe there is a law prohibiting the payment of wages in a public-house; why not also make it illegal to pay freight in a public-house? Freight is certainly a keelman's wages, and I think the law should grant him the same protection as any other class of workman. There is also another class of shipbroker who, assisted by his servants or agents, robs the keelman of a considerable portion of his earnings. I allude to some of those who style themselves forwarding agents. It is a frequent occurrence for a broker of this class to receive from a shipper or consignee instructions to provide craft for a quantity of cargo at a certain freight. The freight he is accustomed to pay, to illustrate my meaning, say, 5s. per ton; and it may so happen that, trade being slack at the time, the broker may be able to secure craft at 4s. 6d. per ton, or even 4s. per ton. Now, he will say nothing to the keelman about the freight actually offered; neither will he advise the shipper or consignee that he can get craft for less freight, but will put the difference between that paid and received into his own pocket in addition to his legal commission of 5 per cent., and then sometimes he has the impudence to demand a commission for paying the keelman his freight; or, on the keelman objecting to any further payment, tell him he will have to wait for his money till the end of the month, and in addition to that, the broker's foreman or clerk, or sometimes both, will demand a gratuity, and they will have it, or will do their utmost to prevent him obtaining another cargo there. I think I have said enough to show you that watermen sometimes get fleeced pretty well by one or the other. I may here remark that we had a dispute between a body of our members, 16 in number, and a firm of boat owners and commission agents of the latter class, about 18 months ago, which resulted in a strike of two days' duration, and cost the Union about 14s., principally in correspondence. The firm used to blackmail their men on every opportunity, and told the men openly that if the sanitary authority compelled them to cause their cabins to be painted as required by the Canal Boat Act, the firm would deduct the cost of painting from the men's share of freight. After some correspondence, in which the firm refused to recognise the Union, or to hear anything their men had to say on the subject, the men gave notice that on and after the first day of the following January they would work their vessels only under certain conditions, a few copies of which conditions I have here. The notice expired, but on that date all navigation was stopped by the frost. However, the men became anxious as to the firm's intention, and a deputation of six of them waited upon the principal without any result. In the latter part of January a thaw set in, and navigation opened early in February. Acting on instructions from the executive council of the Union, I, myself, waited upon the firm, but they declined to hear me. The next

8 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS FAWCETT.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

day the Union called the men out, and the day following the firm sent a clerk to my home, with a very polite request that I would call upon them without delay, but being from home that day I waited upon them at their office the following morning, and, after an interview of about three hours' duration, the firm surrendered on every point, and the principal signed an agreement conceding the men's demands. I would suggest, as a remedy, municipal or State registry offices, municipal for preference, something after the manner of the Paris Labour Bureau. The servants of the office should be the servants of the municipality, paid by the municipality, and the fees paid by the public for services rendered should go into the municipal treasury. The office should be a means of introduction of employer to would-be employed, and nothing more. All classes of masters and servants should be permitted to enter their names on its lists, and there should be, in all seaport towns, or large centres of canal or river traffic, a special list kept of merchant- or shippers seeking craft and watermen seeking cargoes. Such a registry office would be a godsend to everyone seeking employment, and particularly to domestic servants.

15,043. I do not understand what you want to do with the commission agents. You object to various things that they do; but you do not perhaps want to get rid of them?—I suggest as a remedy municipal or State registry offices.

15,044. How is that to dispense with the services of agents?—It would do entirely; there is no doubt about that.

15,045. If a man went to the registry office, that is?—If he went to the registry office and applied for a craft, he would know where to get one.

15,046. Provided the employer chose to take him on?—Yes.

15,047. But I suppose that would rest with the employer, would not it?—Of course it would. These remarks apply entirely to those who work their vessels on the share system, and the majority of the river craft in our district work their vessels on that system.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

15,048. You have been speaking of vessels that ply only on canals and inland navigation?—Canals and inland navigation only.

15,049. You do not refer to those which ply up and down the Humber?—Yes, certainly; the Humber is an inland navigation in that respect.

15,050. How far do your boats go?—Grimsby, and occasionally Louth.

15,051. You get a considerable sea there?—Yes, a very good sea.

15,052. There is much more danger there than there is on an ordinary canal?—Certainly, a very great danger.

15,053. Do you propose that the same restrictions should be applied to all boats, whether they ply on a place like the Humber, or merely in an ordinary canal?—In an ordinary canal, of

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

course, I would not have the same restrictions, but many boats ply on the Humber, and also up some miles of canal. We do ourselves. We ply on the Humber, on the Trent, and we have about 11 miles of canal, still water. We have about 63 miles of tidal stream, and 11 miles of still water.

15,054. I suppose an ordinary canal barge would not ply on the Humber?—Yes; there are some hundreds of ordinary canal boats that ply on the Humber, towed by tugs of course. We are propelled principally by sail. I have one or two photographs showing the kind of canal boat, if any of you would like to see them. I am sorry I have none with the sails set.

15,055. This is very much larger than an ordinary canal barge, is it not?—No, we have some much larger than that. That is a vessel of about 100 tons. We have some as large as 150 tons, though not many. They average about 95 tons, I daresay.

15,056. That would be much in excess of the barge of the ordinary inland canal. What draught of water do these vessels require?—From 5 to 8 feet. The vessel I myself navigated is 5 feet 7, about, high, 74 feet odd inches long, and 15 feet wide.

Mr. Bolton.

15,057. What is the measurement of this boat in the photograph?—57 feet long, 14 feet 6 wide, and 6 feet 9 high.

15,058. What is her tonnage?—About 90 tons. The one on the other photograph is exactly a 90-ton boat. There is no register about canal boats, about their measurement or displacement.

15,059. Do these wrecks to which you refer as blocking up the navigation, result in loss of life?—No, I cannot say they do. They often result in damage to property; loss of anchors by grappling with them, and that sort of thing.

15,060. Which damage is paid for by the insurance company?—Sometimes, yes. I know where one wreck lies right in a bridge-way, a railway bridge-way, Keadley Bridge. It cannot be blown up on account of being so near the bridge.

15,061. Does it block the navigation?—It cannot be removed. There is water over it at high water. There are many anchors lost there.

15,062. But does it block the navigation?—No, I cannot say it exactly blocks the navigation at all times of the tide.

Mr. Tait.

15,063. It would be dangerous though?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton.

15,064. To what?—To the navigation.

15,065. In what sense. Has it caused a wreck?—No, I cannot say that it has caused a wreck. It has not been very long there yet. I am not speaking of things that occurred many years ago. Everything that I quote is of recent occurrence.

8 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS FAWCETT.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

15,066. You say that owners of some of these canal boats make a profit by insuring them?—It is possible. They might do it. I do not say they do it. It is possible they might do so.

15,067. Have you had any experience in insuring?—No, I have not been an owner. My owner will not insure.

15,068. What induced you to make that statement that you have done?—I have no particular inducement to make a statement of that kind.

15,069. Then what ground have you for it?—I have fear.

15,070. Suspicion?—Suspicion.

15,071. You have no knowledge of the fact?—Not any knowledge of the facts with regard to it, simply suspicion.

15,072. Do you compete in carrying with any other conveyance?—With the railways.

15,073. Then if you add to the cost of your conveyance by employing always men, instead of allowing boats to be navigated by females, would you add to the cost of carriage by boats?—No, I do not think you would.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

15,074. You would pay the men more than you pay the women?—Yes, and they would be able to obtain a larger freight.

15,075. A higher freight you mean?—Yes.

15,076. Why?—They often carry now for less than a third of the railway rates. I hold they might advance them up to, say, four-fifths of the railway rates, without losing any trade.

15,077. Do they go as quick?—No.

15,078. Are the conveniences for the sending of freight by the boats equal to those afforded by railways?—Even more convenient. For instance, you receive cargo off a ship, over the ship's side, direct on to the boat, and in nine cases out of ten you cannot do that direct into a railway waggon.

15,079. Why?—It has to be trans-shipped into lighters, and then reloaded on to railway waggons.

15,080. Is that the case in the Humber?—That is the case at Hull. The railway companies at Hull own numerous lighters for that purpose. The cost is one shilling per ton.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. WILLIAM HEWSON called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

15,081. What are you by occupation?—Forwarding agent.

15,082. And where do you live?—Hull.

15,083. Now, what have you come to tell us. We understand you have something to say as to the dangers of navigation caused by the condition of the River Ouse?—Yes.

15,084. Will you tell us what it is?—In 1883, I believe it was, a Bill was got by the Aire and Calder to make what is called the River Ouse Improvement. From that time until now the work has been going on, but not at a very rapid rate, and it is really and truly very dangerous. In fact the navigation between Hull and Goole is so dangerous at present that vessels are detained in Hull with cargoes of merchandise for up the river, because they dare not meet the dangers which there are in Goole Bight at dark. From time to time the vessels have been doing damage to the piles, and have had bills presented to them for a certain amount of money, which really and truly has knocked the life out of the men, and has made them so that they dare not leave until daylight at that place. On one occasion I was going by myself with one vessel, and it happened that the boat that was towing the vessel had to turn round three times between Hull and Goole, on account of vessels coming down the river. *(The witness produces and exhibits model, and explains the nature of certain work which he suggests should be done.)*

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

15,085. Whose business is it to do all this?—The Aire and Calder.

15,086. You mean the Aire and Calder Canal Navigation?—Yes. They got a Bill in 1890, I think it was.

Earl of Derby.

15,087. I do not think this is a matter for us. It is entirely a local matter?—I am only speaking of the danger of navigation and the detention.

15,088. Putting it generally, I understand you to say that however it has come about the navigation is dangerous in consequence of certain improvements not having been carried out; and that you are not aware whose business it is to do it?—That is so.

15,089. But you think that somebody ought to see that the river is made safely navigable?—That is so.

15,090. Now, I think you have something to tell us about undue preference given to the boats which belong to canal companies, at locks and bridges?—Yes. We have always been led to suppose that in a canal the turn at a lock or a bridge was one up and one down, or vice versa, one down and one up; but it has often happened during recent years that as many as 12 vessels are towed through a bridge at once before you can go the other way. There is another class of vessels of which as many as 30 are towed before you can go the other way. Therefore, you see we are bothered in that way, and we cannot get along with our business. To-day we are about nine hours longer in getting from Goole to Leeds than we were 30 years ago.

15,091. When you say "we" you mean the owners of canal boats?—And I have done it myself.

15,092. You mean the owners of canal boats in connexion with the company get the preference?—Yes.

15,093. You have something to tell us about unused rivers and canals?—Yes.

8 March 1892.]

Mr. W. HEWSON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

15,094. What rivers do you refer to?—The River Derwent and the Ripon Canal. Forty years ago there would be about 84 vessels on that river, and to-day there are not above four, on account of the canal being in the hands of the railway company. The tolls have been raised to that extent that the vessels have had to fly for refuge to other places to get a living. The tolls have risen from 4*d.* a ton on coal on the Derwent to 2*s.* 8*d.* a ton. Therefore, that has sent the vessels away. Then here is the Ripon River in the same position exactly at the same rate. Here is the Market Weighton Canal, which is in the hands of the same company, which is a drainage first and a canal afterwards. It is 11 miles in length, and the rate was 1*s.* 8*d.* per ton for the length, but during the past five or six years I have worked upon it they have reduced the rate to 6*d.* The dues are now 6*d.*, and I believe that if the rate of mileage per ton was, say, 1*d.*, we should then be able to do the work that we ought to do. I represent about 2,500 river men, and I ought to represent 4,000 at least, if the rivers were made so that we could navigate them, and if the tolls were not so heavy.

15,095. You say the canal is now in a condition in which it is hardly navigable, in order to give a preference to the railway?—The canal is in the hands of the railway altogether, and the tolls are so high that the vessels had to leave the canal, because they could not pay the toll to make a freight. I may say that the Aire and Calder have lowered their dues from 1*s.* 4½*d.* on coal to 10*d.*, but the North-Eastern is 2*s.* 8*d.*, as against an original 1*s.* 4½*d.*

15,096. I presume that the company is doing nothing beyond what it had a legal right to do, in raising the tolls?—I do not know. It is for you, my Lord, to say what is legal or illegal.

15,097. No; if they were doing what was beyond their legal right, it would be in your power, or in the power of anybody, to call them before a court of law, and prevent their doing it?—I may say I believe the farmers and merchants and others of the River Derwent will, no doubt, meet the railway company before the Board of Trade when their return is made with regard to navigation. I believe that the people are very anxious that the navigation should be made navigable, and the rates such that vessels can navigate the river; and therefore on these grounds they will attend the Board of Trade when they make their return on the navigation.

15,098. I think you have something to tell us in the same sense as to what was mentioned by the last witness, with reference to danger to life on board lighters, owing to the want of ropes, rails, and other precautions?—Yes. I have been at this for many years, but I am sorry to say that our class of vessels are apparently not within the reach of the Board of Trade; they are not registered; and therefore it appears that it is not known to the country that we are in existence. But I hope from to-day that we shall be known and recognised, and that all these things that are required for the safety of life

Earl of Derby—continued.

will be accomplished. Life is a great thing to us, and therefore we have a right to do all in our power to protect life. Only about November, I believe it was, a lighter foundered in the Hull roads, towing down from one dock to another, and two men were drowned, because she had no boat. If that lighter had had a boat of course the men would have been saved; but the lighter foundered, and they were trying to climb along the tow-rope from one vessel to another when the vessel struck the bottom; the rope broke, and they were in the water, and never came up until a few days ago, when they were got ashore. Man-rope, bow-ropes, and boats and rails are things of great necessity.

15,099. I think you have something also to say in regard to the sanitary condition of lighters?—Yes. Lighters, of course, are a different thing from keels. Lighters are a craft which no one ever lives on board of, because they have no place to live in. Hence they are neglected in every way. A man is simply sent on board to do certain work, and he goes as soon as that work is done. He is not paid for washing the vessel, cleaning the vessel, or sweeping the vessel; he simply has to go and do the work, and then leave the lighter. Lighters are not sanitary. In fact during the summer months lighters have been ordered out of the docks, through the stench of the bilge water being so bad.

15,100. Is there no provision as to their sanitary condition under the Canal Boats Act?—We hold that all vessels that do business in inland navigation should be under the Act. I believe that all vessels should be under that, and therefore we maintain that these vessels should come under the sanitary authority.

15,101. Are they not now?—The Act does not apply to them. The Humber lighters appear not to be under the sanitary law. The keels all have to carry a plate with a register number.

15,102. Then what I understand you want is that men employed on these lighters and canal boats should have a certificate of competency?—Yes. We believe that we should get a better class of men—men who would be more particular in doing their work. A man who has no fear of losing his ticket has no sense of responsibility.

15,103. Have you any reason to complain of the class of men who are now employed?—We do not believe that they are up to the mark. They get drunk sometimes when they have no right to, and neglect the work they ought to do. Therefore, if there were some means of holding them to their duty in the shape of a ticket we believe that we should get a more steady class of men than we have to-day.

15,104. Then I understand you want your vessels registered, and the men tested as to competency?—Yes, and I really trust we shall be put under the Board of Trade.

15,105. You wish that all rivers and canals should be put under the supervision of the Board of Trade?—I do.

8 March 1892.]

Mr. W. HEWSON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

15,106. With what special object?—As I say, we do not believe that we get our share of privileges on the different canals. As I have stated before, 12 and 13 vessels are towed through the bridge before us. They get to a lock before us, and they stop us there for hours, whereas we believe that one and one each way is the Act; and we wish that Act to be carried out.

15,107. You want then, I understand, the arrangement and regulation of the traffic put under the Board of Trade?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton.

15,108. You have told the Commission that some canals are rendered useless by the increased dues imposed by the proprietors, the railway company?—That is so.

15,109. Does that apply to the River Derwent?—It does.

15,110. Is the navigation of the Derwent in the hands of the railway company?—It is.

15,111. What railway company?—The North-Eastern.

15,112. Is that the place where you say they have reduced the rates to 6d.?—No; it is the Market Weighton River, 10 miles from Hull.

15,113. Twelve miles for 6d.?—11 miles for 6d.

15,114. And you say if they reduced the rate to a ½d. certain things would happen?—Yes.

15,115. Do you mean a ½d. for the whole run?—No, per mile.

15,116. What is the difference between the ½d. per mile and 11 miles for 6d.?—I say, by reducing it from 1s. 8d. to 6d. it has made it so they can work again, but before that they were all having to sell their boats.

15,117. Were the railways not under some obligation with regard to the Derwent as to keeping it open?—The navigation is really for a vessel of 14 feet 2 inches beam, 57 feet in length, and about 5 feet draft of water, say about 60 tons of coal. Very well, as I have said, there were 42 vessels there when I have been by—I have been there many and many a time—and now there is only one, and the owner of that vessel is a brewer or malster, or something of that sort, and he uses this vessel for his own convenience to get the class of coals that he requires, and these coals which that vessel fetch cost him 7s. 6d. a ton, whereas he can get them by rail for 6s. Now, it is unreasonable to think that the cost on a canal should be above that on a railway, because I believe that the canals are the oldest and cheapest mode of transit there is in the country to-day.

15,118. The railway company is bound to maintain a certain depth of water?—Yes.

15,119. Do they maintain it?—Yes, I believe they maintain the depth of water and the locks in repair, and everything of that sort; but, nevertheless, the dues are too high for the traffic to pass along.

Mr. Tait.

15,120. The vessels or lighters which you said had to be ordered out of the dock owing to the stench from the bilge water, by whose instructions were they ordered out?—By the dock company, or the sanitary authority, one or the other of them.

15,121. And did the sanitary authority not prosecute them for a nuisance?—I could not say that.

15,122. Are you aware of any prosecution having ever taken place?—No, I am not. I believe they moved them as soon as ever they were ordered, and no doubt that stopped the prosecution.

15,123. The last witness said that he thought that the dues for canals could be raised with advantage to about four-fifths of the ordinary railway rate, are you of that opinion?—Do you mean the rate or the dues?

15,124. The rate?—I may say that we now pay from Goole to Leeds 2s. 6d. a ton, and in addition to that for water to swim the vessel in what is called 5s. mill toll. Now, supposing that it is about 33 miles from Goole to Leeds, and 32 from Hull to Goole, if we had 5s. a ton including the lot, and if we had 1d. per ton to pay dues from Hull to Leeds, of course we should not have a farthing freight. Therefore I am of opinion that no tidal river should be taxed a farthing. All tidal rivers should be kept free until you come to a lock, which has to be raised, and then I believe you may be fairly expected to pay dues on the navigation.

15,125. But still you have not really answered my question. What I wish to get from you is this. Are you of opinion that the rates per ton on the canal could with advantage be raised to four-fifths of the railway rate, as I think was stated by the previous witness?—Provided the dues were such as that there was a balance for the men's expenses, but not otherwise, say ½d. per ton per mile toll on all goods.

15,126. You referred to an Act of Parliament about regulating the canal; have you seen the Act?—Do you mean the old Act of the Aire and Calder?

15,127. Yes?—There are so many of them, but we know very well the proper arrangement is one turn up and one turn down.

15,128. Does any existing department of State carry out the provisions of the Act of Parliament?—I do not know. I hope so. I hope some one does, surely.

15,129. What I wish to get at is, is there a department of State which carries out the Act of Parliament; have you directed your attention to the fact of the Act being complied with?—We believe that the Board of Trade are the only people that we can refer to.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

The Board of Trade have nothing to do with it, it is a private Act.

Mr. Tait.

15,130. Then I understand you want this private Act put under the Board of Trade?—

8 March 1892.]

Mr. W. HEWSON.

[Continued.

Mr. Tait—continued.

Yes, so as to see that the trade is regulated properly.

15,131. When you speak of certificates of competency do you refer to certificates similar to those granted to able seamen and engineers?—They are more than able seamen.

15,132. But it is a certificate of that character that you advocate the granting of?—Something like that. You see the men have neither compass nor chart to do their work with, and the tides in many places run five and six and seven knots an hour. That has all to be calculated in order to get into a channel here and there, as the case may be. No compass or chart can do anything for us except just to give us the head of the vessel, the tides are running at that speed.

15,133. Suppose this Commission were to come to the conclusion that something of that kind was necessary, and should suggest to Par-

Mr. Tait—continued.

liament that such certificates of competency ought to be granted, have you considered what would be a fair standard of efficiency on the part of your men to submit to before they got these certificates?—I suppose you would want a committee to examine these men in certain things.

15,134. Have you considered the particular points of a practical nature which it would be necessary to submit to these men, and which they must pass before getting these certificates?—A man should be able to give you the bearings and calculations of the tide and all these things that he has to encounter.

15,135. You think it would induce a better class of men to go on to the navigation?—I believe so.

15,136. You think it would raise the status of the canal men generally?—Yes.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

9 March 1892.]

Mr. ELLIS GATLEY.

THIRTIETH DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Wednesday, 9th March 1892.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF DERBY (CHAIRMAN).

The Right Hon. Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH,
Bart., M.P.
Mr. J. C. BOLTON, M.P.
Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, M.P.
Professor MARSHALL.
Mr. SAMUEL PLIMSOLL.

Mr. HENRY TAIT.
Mr. T. BURT, M.P., Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, M.P.,
Mr. E. TROW (Group A.), and the Right Hon.
LEONARD COURTNEY, M.P., Mr. M. AUSTIN,
and Mr. J. MAWDSLEY (Group C.) also attended.

Mr GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Mr. ELLIS GATLEY called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

15,137. We understand that you are general secretary of the Upper Mersey Watermen's and Porters' Association, is that so?—Yes.

15,138. Where are the head-quarters of the Society?—At Runcorn.

15,139. How long has it been in existence?—It was established in 1889.

15,140. How many members has it?—About 1,035.

15,141. We understand that it includes the men working on the Bridgewater Canal, the Rochdale Canal, the Leeds and Liverpool Canal, the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Canals, and the Mersey between Liverpool and Warrington, and I suppose it will also include the Manchester Ship Canal when that is opened?—Yes.

15,142. Have you branch establishments besides the head-quarters in Runcorn?—Yes.

15,143. Where?—At Liverpool, Burscough Bridge, and two in Manchester.

15,144. What are the weekly wages paid in this business?—The weekly wages are 11s., and 16s. in some districts.

15,145. Are they not sometimes fixed by the piece, or by the tonnage of the boat?—Yes, and these men have so much per ton to the different districts that they carry certain traffic to.

15,146. Then I suppose the captain and mate have higher pay?—No, that is their pay; they have exactly the same ton money, the one as the other.

15,147. Do I understand you that the captain and the mate are not more highly paid than the others?—The captain is paid 5s. weekly more than the mate, and then the ton money is divided equally.

Earl of Derby—continued.

15,148. Then the men who are paid weekly are also paid by the ton in addition?—Yes.

15,149. What do their total weekly wages on an average come to?—11. 10s. 9d. the captain, 11. 5s. 9d. the mate.

15,150. Is there any extra pay for night work?—No extra pay for night work.

15,151. Any for Sunday work?—Yes, some little in some cases if they travel the whole of Saturday night and Sunday loaded 1s. per man, if light 2s. per man.

15,152. The hours of work, I suppose, are long?—They are.

15,153. What are they?—The average for the year round is 100 hours per week.

15,154. When you say 100 hours per week, do you mean that the men are actually working the whole of that time or only that they are obliged to be on board?—They are obliged to be on board, they are not in actual work all that time.

15,155. It is difficult, I suppose, to say how long they are actually at work because they may be on board very often when they have very little to do?—That is so.

15,156. Have you anything to say about hours; have you made any representations upon that point; do you object to the hours?—Yes, the hours are too excessive; they also make very long shifts, sometimes a matter of 48 hours, 60 and up to 70 hours.

15,157. Have you anything more to say on the question of hours before we go to something else?—I may say that the hours are very excessive indeed,—that is, the long stretches that these men make. It is a fact that I myself have made the 70 hours without any rest, and

9 March 1892.]

Mr. ELLIS GATLEY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

it is not an exceptional thing for these men to do that. It is a thing that is constantly occurring, I mean 48 hours at one stretch without any rest.

15,158. The men asked some time ago for a six hours' rest after 24 hours work?—Yes.

15,159. But the masters could not see their way to concede that?—No.

15,160. Have you any complaint to make on the subject of danger to the men employed?—Yes.

15,161. Will you tell us what it is you complain of?—The nature of their work is very dangerous, it is work that they have to do in all kinds of weather, and in cases of travelling betwixt Runcorn and Liverpool on the River Mersey they have no boats, belts, or buoys, and it is a fact that men and women have been drowned in this length. They have actually been drowned in the sight of men who could have helped them had they had the required appliances at hand, but they are not supplied with the same. *That is a model of one of the flats, which perhaps might give you some idea of what they are like [producing model].*

15,162. Where are such boats as that plying between?—They ply betwixt Manchester and Liverpool, but chiefly betwixt Liverpool and Birkenhead.

15,163. On the Mersey, where the water is stormy, weather is apt to be very rough?—Yes.

15,164. Have you ever known boats of this kind lost?—I have not known any of the kind being actually lost, but I have known men to be drowned overboard the same.

15,165. I believe you have something to say about the Canal Boats Act, is that Act properly observed?—No, it is openly violated.

15,166. Violated in what respect?—A case came under my notice on the 13th February last of a boat being worked by a man, his wife, and seven children. It is a fact that boats registered to accommodate three or four persons are worked by a man, his wife, and six, seven, and eight in a family. I may say that on the 13th February last a case also came under my notice of this kind, where the children were hired out so that the inspector would not actually have any hold upon the father and mother, that is a boy aged 10, and another aged 12 are hired out to another boat to work with another captain for 5s. each, their food, and washing.

15,167. Was that in violation of the law?—It is, this way, it is a violation of the law as far as I can see it, if the children had not been let out like this so young they would have been on board one boat, and, of course, there is the possibility of the inspector falling in with this boat, and bringing them under this Act, whereas when they are hired out so young there is no prospect of the Act being carried out. I may say that the two boys told me themselves that they had never been to school a day in their lives.

Earl of Derby—continued.

15,168. But as far as the violation of the Act goes, the Act provides, as I understand, that there shall not be more than a certain number of persons on board one boat?—Yes.

15,169. But the Act is neither violated nor evaded if the family of the man employed on that boat are travelling on another boat?—No. The Act may not be violated, but it is a fact that there are a great many cases of this sort where the Act is openly violated. There is an instance of one in Runcorn, when to my own knowledge, I think about January last, within some 30 or 40 yards of the inspector, there was a boat with a woman and four children on board.

15,170. And you say that there are children there who have never been to school?—That is a fact.

15,171. The parents of those children are under the same legal obligation as any other parents?—It does not seem like it.

15,172. It seems to me from what you say that it is not so much a case of the Act being insufficient as of its not being observed?—That is so.

15,173. In your judgment is there a sufficient amount of inspection under the Act?—That I could not say. It is either through insufficiency of inspectors, or the laxity of the inspectors who are on at the present time.

15,174. In the paper before me you say that sometimes three or four years intervene between inspections; is that so?—That is so.

15,175. Then do I understand you to object to women and girls being employed on canal boats?—Yes.

15,176. Employed in what way?—At anything connected with the water business.

15,177. Is that in order to make more work for men, or is it because you think the work is unfit for women?—It is because we think the work is unfit for women or children.

15,178. But if the husband lives on board a canal boat, where is the wife and where are the children to live?—I think myself it is a very poor situation for a man who is a married man which will not provide a home for himself, his wife, and his family.

15,179. But, as a matter of fact, a good many of them make their own home on the canal boat; is that not so?—That is so.

15,180. Then do I understand that you would prevent women and children from either working in these boats or living on board them?—Yes.

15,181. Now, I observe that you have stated in your proof that there is no compensation made for accidents when they occur?—There is none that I am aware of.

15,182. But is not the employer in the case of a canal boat under the same general laws as any other employers?—I have never seen anything that the employers have done in case of accident to any of the men.

15,183. You have not known any cases then where their legal obligation has been tested?—It is generally evaded.

9 March 1892.]

Mr. ELLIS GATLEY.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

15,184. How do you mean evaded?—I mean that the men are fully aware that it is put up in the different warehouses where they load at, that to come under the Employers' Liability Act they are to give notice if they see defects; it is often the case that they do not see defects where accidents actually occur.

15,185. Then in that case it is not as I understand, that the Act is evaded, but that the provisions of the Act are not, in your judgment, stringent enough?—That is so.

15,186. Now, have you had any trouble as regards your relations with the employers?—We have not had a great deal of trouble, we have had small disputes, which the men, at different times, have settled with the masters. With respect to one thing, they refused me permission to go on the canal banks to see the men who are in our Union; in fact, there is no case where I could say that the masters have amicably met me, or the officials of the Union.

15,187. They prefer to negotiate with the men directly rather than through a third party?—That is so.

15,188. Is there anything else that you wish to state?—I may say, with respect to that, that the men's desires are that the masters shall treat with the Union officials; for one reason, because the men are afraid after treating with them that they would be marked out as marked men. In fact, there are men at the present time who have been threatened through taking up cases that other men have been connected with; they have been deputed off by the Association; they have gone and faced the masters at the office, and then afterwards they have been threatened with having their ticket—otherwise, their dismissal—for so doing. The men think that in these cases the master ought to treat with the Union officials.

15,189. You are yourself a Union official?—Yes, I am also a flatman, I have been a flatman for over 20 years.

Mr. Tait.

15,190. Have you ever, since your organisation was formed, attempted to do away with the tonnage rate which you receive besides the payment?—Do away with it?

15,191. Yes, do away with the tonnage rate of payment as being part of your wages?—No.

15,192. You believe in the system of getting part pay as weekly wage and part as tonnage?—Yes, that is so. It encourages the men to get on with their work to get from one place to another with the cargoes which they have in their charge.

15,193. With expedition?—Yes.

15,194. Now you said that you got no extra pay for night work?—That is so.

15,195. Have you made any application to the employers for it?—Yes.

15,196. What has been their reply?—That they could not see their way to concede it.

15,197. And for Sunday work there are a few men you say, or a few instances where they get

Mr. Tait—continued.

1s. extra on a Sunday?—Yes, that is only in cases where they travel the whole of a Saturday night and Sunday.

15,198. They get 1s.?—If loaded; 2s. when light.

15,199. Why do they get more when they are light than when they are loaded?—The masters consider that the cargoes the flats take in when they are loaded assist in paying the men.

15,200. By the extra tonnage rate?—Yes.

15,201. Still the men, notwithstanding they protest against it in regard to Sunday pay, would still prefer to continue the weekly wage system and tonnage rate combined?—That is so, but they would prefer not to work on the Sunday at all if they could see their way to get out of it, but having to compete with the railways there is no way to get out of it for the simple reason that carriage that is shipped on a Saturday with the railways in Liverpool is expected to be in Manchester on the Monday morning, and it is expected to be so with these flats.

15,202. When you say that the hours are long, and that in many cases they work 100 hours per week, do I take that to be a general statement, or just referring to a few men?—It is a general statement; it covers one district.

15,203. You said you had 1,035 men in your organisation, how many men would be employed in your particular calling in the districts where you have branches?—I really could not say.

15,204. You could not give me an idea of the per-centage of the whole?—No, I do not think so.

15,205. In answer to Lord Derby, you said that the men were not working the whole of the time while they were of course at hand, if needed. Could you give us the per-centage of the time worked by the men?—No, I could not. One reason that I could not, is, that it may be a fact that a flat to-day may go in to a certain wharf to load, and of course he may take it as it comes in, that is, taking it off the lorries as the lorries bring it up; they may have to wait some hours sometimes betwixt one lot coming in, and then the other; in some cases they go in, and their cargo is down on the quay ready; they load it all straight away. In that case it is a case of actual work all the time.

15,206. What was the reply of the masters when you asked them to concede to you six hours' rest after working continuously for 24 hours before again taking duty. What was their reply?—They pooh-poohed and laughed at it.

15,207. Never met their men, and discussed it with them, or anything of that kind?—Yes, they met them to discuss it, but said, "Pooh, we really could not see our way to do any thing at all in the matter."

15,208. Have any of the strikes which you referred to arisen from any of the complaints which I have enumerated?—No, not that I am aware of.

15,209. How many canal boat inspectors have you in your district?—There is only one in Runcorn.

9 March 1892.]

Mr. ELLIS GATLEY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

15,210. Has he the charge of the whole of the districts where your branches are?—No, there are others, but I could not say how many.

15,211. Does the Act make any provision that they shall periodically inspect the boats?—Not that I am aware of.

15,212. You have made a complaint here that children are hired by certain captains or mates of these boats, and that they run clear of some of the provisions of the Act from the fact of their not being part and parcel of their own family?—That is so.

15,213. Have you ever attempted to prevent that at law, or have you ever directed the attention of the inspector to the fact that it does not matter whether the member belongs to a man's own family or not, the fact of a larger number of persons than the boat is registered to carry being there would be a violation of the Act?—No.

15,214. Do you think it would be an improvement if the Act was so framed then that there should be periodical inspection?—Yes.

15,215. Is there a provision made in the canal boats for proper sleeping accommodation for adult men and women?—For only so many as the boat is registered for.

15,216. When you speak of a family being of seven or eight persons, do I take it that they are all young, or that the family is getting up to manhood and to womanhood?—Yes, that is so.

15,217. And is there no separate apartment for these people sleeping?—No.

15,218. And your contention is that women ought not to be there?—That is so.

15,219. You mention, as a reason, that you do not think it is fit work for them; do you mean from a physical standpoint, that it is too hard work?—We mean that it is a work, the nature of which is both degrading and entirely unfit for women and children.

15,220. It is on the line then that you think it demoralises a woman?—Yes.

15,221. And to a certain extent the men also, that women should be there?—That is so.

15,222. Do you come within the provisions of the Employers' Liability Act, as flatmen and bargemen?—Not that I am aware of.

15,223. Therefore any accident which may happen to any of your members as the result of negligence on the part of a fellow workman would come under what is known as the common law of the country, not under any special law; that is, you not being in the position to take advantage of the Employers' Liability Act, you would come under the ordinary law of the country?—That is so.

15,224. Are you aware that the ordinary law of the country known as the common law, does not make provision for compensation to a workman?—I am not aware of it.

15,225. Who may be injured by any neglect of his fellow workmen, it being looked upon as common employment?—It is not often, I may say, that men do get injured through neglect of their fellow workmen; it is often through other causes.

Mr. Tait—continued.

15,226. Now before you had any disputes with your employers, did you offer to meet them in conference or arbitration?—Yes.

15,227. And in any of these disputes were you met in conference. Did they accept the conferences?—Yes, they have accepted the conference but they would not allow me to stay.

15,228. Why?—I have been in with one conference with the men, and only one.

15,229. Why would they not allow you?—Because I was simply the secretary of the Association.

15,230. Simply because the men thought fit to employ you as their secretary the masters refused to meet you?—That is so.

15,231. Have any of those masters, managers, or superintendents of their boats?—They have managers.

15,232. Were any of those managers at that conference?—Yes.

15,233. Therefore the masters claimed for themselves the right and privilege of sending their manager, but refused the men to send practically theirs?—That is so.

15,234. That is your cause of complaint?—Yes.

15,235. Have you anything to suggest to the Commission for the purpose of minimising these disputes between employers and workmen?—The men would be prepared if there were boards of conciliation to go to them; but I do not believe that the masters would be prepared to meet anything of the kind.

15,236. Therefore your opinion would be that you will only force the masters into meeting with you at boards of conciliation and conference by the force and power of your influence by striking?—That is so.

Mr. Jesse Collings.

15,237. You spoke of children employed in your industry; when you say "children" what age do you mean?—They range from all ages, from five up to, we may say, young men and young women of 16 and 18, all ages.

15,238. And are they boys and girls?—Yes.

15,239. Then what do they do so young as five and six years of age?—Some of them drive the horse, some of them steer. There is generally something that they can be doing, even the youngest children I have seen myself that could only just reach the line that is hung on the horse, have been actually driving the horse.

15,240. And do not they come under the care of the school inspectors of the district?—That may be.

15,241. Has your Union taken any steps to call the inspector's attention to the employment of these very young children?—No.

15,242. Then may I ask why your Union has not taken that step?—I think myself that it is not a step that the Union ought to take, the inspectors being placed in a position to look after this work, it is simply for them to look after it not for the Union to interfere with them in their work unless in cases where they do not actually carry out the work.

9 March 1892.]

Mr. ELLIS GATLEY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Jesse Collings—continued.

15,243. Then what would be the use of passing a law of any kind if those affected do not lend their aid to carry out the law?—They might do so if they could see that it would be any benefit.

15,244. But do you mean to say that if your Union took steps to call the inspector's attention to this violation of the School Act it would not have some effect?—I cannot see myself that it would.

15,245. At any rate they do not do it?—No.

15,246. Is it or is it not the fact that the men themselves, the parents of the children, are willing and anxious to send their children to this employment for the sake of the wages?—Yes, I have no doubt they are willing and anxious to do that as well as to evade sending them to school.

15,247. And is the reason why the Union does not take action because the members of the Union and others in their individual capacity are benefiting by the employment of these children?—It might be in time to come that the Union would do something in that direction but up to the present they have been formed but a short time, and they have simply had as much to do as they could to look after their own work without going outside of it.

15,248. That is not my question; the members of the Union in their individual capacity as individuals and parents of children, are they not in favour of the employment of their children for the sake of the wages?—I could not say that they are all in favour of it.

15,249. There are some of them in favour of it?—Some of them might be.

15,250. Does the Union think that it would be unpopular with their own members if it were to interfere and take steps to stop that employment?—No, it would not so far as the Union is concerned.

15,251. And you recommend as I understand that this employment should be stopped by direct legal action?—That is so.

15,252. Would that be a popular movement among the members of your industry, the working men of your industry?—I believe it would.

15,253. Then, if they are so anxious for a legal enactment to prevent it, why do they not take steps to use the law that already exists to stop it?—I think it is a case for the inspectors to use the law, not for the members of the Union.

15,254. But if the law you require were passed, it would be quite possible, over a large area, to evade the law as the present law is being evaded unless the men themselves would assist in detecting the breaking of the law?—What we desire is an enforcement of the law. We think the law would do as it is, for the simple reason that if the inspectors did even what they might do now there would be very little to grumble about afterwards, except with respect to the women and the children being on board the boats. What we wish and desire is an amendment or extension prohibiting the women and the children as well.

15,255. But you do not think it worth while in the Union to lend any assistance to the inspectors by simply pointing out the case where

Mr. Jesse Collings—continued.

the law is evaded?—I have no doubt if we saw it would be any use we should at once point out the same.

15,256. But have you ever tried it?—No.

15,257. Then how do you know it would be no use?—We do not think it would be at the present time.

15,258. But if you are so anxious that these children should be at school is it not worth while to call the inspector's attention to the fact that these children are at work and not at school?—It may be, but it might be very often the case that these cases would come under our notice when the inspectors were nowhere about, and we really could not actually show them a case that we saw ourselves.

15,259. But I suppose the employment of the children is continuous, a child is not employed to-day and not to-morrow; do you know the particulars of the employment?—Yes, they are almost continually employed there is no doubt.

15,260. Then, with that knowledge, where is the difficulty in informing the inspector of any particular case of children who are continuously employed?—The difficulty would be, as I said before, that the inspector is not there, and it would often be the case that we should not know where to find him.

15,261. You said, I think, that you were not under the Employers' Liability Act?—Not that we are aware of.

15,262. Have you ever tested that question?—No.

15,263. Has the Union ever obtained a legal opinion as to whether you are subject to it or not?—No.

15,264. As a Union do you not think it worth while to get such an opinion?—Yes, it might be if there were any case occurred in which we think we should be prepared to go on with it, but nothing of the kind has occurred.

15,265. I am not speaking of going to law; I am speaking of getting a legal opinion, simply a legal opinion, from a barrister, or someone with legal knowledge as to whether or no you were under the Employers' Liability Act?—It might be worth while, but we have not done so up to the present time.

15,266. How many are there in your Union?—About 1,035.

15,267. And how many are there in your industry who are outside the Union?—That I could not say.

15,268. Are there an equal number should you think?—I do not think so.

15,269. Do you think about half, perhaps, or less?—No, there is not half outside in the districts we cover.

Professor Marshall.

15,270. Do you think that the work on canals is not fit for women?—That is so.

15,271. Have you tested the opinion of the women themselves on the subject?—No.

15,272. Have you not heard in the course of your life the expressions of women on the subject?—No not that I am aware of.

9 March 1892.]

Mr. ELLIS GATLEY.

[Continued.]

Professor Marshall—continued.

15,273. Have you never heard women say that they considered their life is the most enviable of that of almost any working women?—It may be with women who have been brought up to it.

15,274. You think, then, that there are women who consider that their life is almost a perfect life for a working woman?—Well, I do not consider so; there might be some few.

15,275. And would you rule them out by law?—I would prohibit the women altogether.

15,276. Will you explain a little more why it is necessary that a woman on a barge, she being the wife of the man on the barge, should do unwomanly work?—I do not understand your question.

15,277. Would you explain what work it is that the wife of the man in charge of a barge has to do which you think is unfit for women to do?—When the boat is actually at work the woman or one of the children either has to drive or steer; that is a part of the man's work.

15,278. What is there unwomanly in steering?—It is a work, I think myself, that is entirely unfit for women.

15,279. Why?—For one reason there are women who go in the river craft as well as on the canals; you may think that they may be able to steer a boat, but not as a man would steer it, and in some cases accidents have occurred, and do occur, through this practice of women doing this work.

15,280. The point you are now making is that they steer badly?—Yes.

15,281. But that was not the point which you put before, which was that the work was injurious to the women themselves; how is it injurious to the women?—Well, they are up night and day as well as the men, therefore I cannot see myself but what it is injurious to them.

15,282. But in other occupations do not women stay up as late as men?—They may stay up late, but not to work night and day.

15,283. Is it necessary that a woman should work night and day?—I do not think so.

15,284. Would you not be contented with such a change of the law as should prevent a woman from working night and day, but not exclude her from the barges?—I would rather she were excluded from this work altogether.

15,285. But why?—Having seen the work done by women for 20 years I consider myself that they are incompetent to do it.

15,286. Do you not think that before asking that women should be excluded you should have ascertained whether the women themselves wished to be excluded?—I do not think so.

15,287. Why?—I do not think myself that it is necessary to get to know as to the women. I know that there are certain women who have been brought up from their childhood in this state of work who are as well satisfied with the work as the men are, for the reason that they are hardened to it, and, of course, in time they come to like it.

Professor Marshall—continued.

15,288. Is the position then, that you do not think there is any work that they have to do that is injurious to women except staying up at night; that you think that they wish to do it; and that you wish them to be prevented by law from doing it?—I wish them to be prevented by law from doing it.

15,289. Can you give any further justification of that wish?—Not that I am just aware of at present.

15,290. Now, with regard to the children, I suppose we are all agreed that they ought to go to school; have you any doubt that if the Union tried to force them to go to school it could succeed in getting them to school within a month?—I do not think so.

15,291. Is it not true, as Mr. Jesse Collings said, that although the inspector is not always with you the children always are, and that if you choose to fix on the opportunities when the inspector and the children are together you could at once enforce penalties on those parents who send their children on the barges when they ought to be at school?—When the inspector is there it is his duty. I would not consider it was my duty at all.

15,292. That is not quite an answer to my question; it is not a question whether it is your duty, but whether, if you wished to do it, you could do it?—Yes, there are cases where we could do it.

15,293. Do you not, then, think that if you really wished to do it, and set yourselves to do it, you could drive young children off the barges in a month?—I do not think so.

15,294. Why?—Not in that time, because the women wishing the children, and the men wishing the children to work, they would try to evade us as well as to evade the School Board Acts.

15,295. I quite see how the parents could evade the inspectors, but do you think they could evade the Union if the Union really set itself to do it?—They would try, there is no doubt.

15,296. But do you think that they would succeed if the Union really exerted itself?—Not in all cases.

15,297. Do you not think you could drive nearly all off the barges within a month?—I do not think so without some force.

15,298. Then is it not really rather this way, that if you were to try to put the Act in force you would very much diminish your chance of being re-elected at the next election?—I do not understand your question, elected what?

15,299. As secretary?—I do not think that it would make any difference to my election as secretary at all.

15,300. You wish this Act to be enforced very much in regard to the education of children?—Yes.

15,301. You know that it is very difficult for inspectors to find out what is going on?—That is so.

15,302. That, therefore, it to be done by the inspectors without the aid of the Union,

9 March 1892.]

MR. ELLIS GATLEY.

[Continued.]

Professor *Marshall*—continued.

there must be a great number of inspectors?—I do not think that would be necessary if they were men who were acquainted with the workings of the men and women who are on the various canals.

15,303. Do you think the present staff of inspectors could do it?—No, not the present staff.

15,304. You are aware that an increase of inspectors means an increase of taxes?—Yes, but I think on the whole that there would be a benefit by the children being educated.

15,305. But would it not be better for the Union to do without charge things that they can do more efficiently than the inspectors can at the expense of an increased tax?—If possible; but I still cannot see how the Union or the inspectors at present could do it.

Mr. *Tait*.

15,306. Have you lived on board a boat yourself?—Yes.

15,307. Do they live for lengthened periods on board?—Some of them live on board altogether.

15,308. Altogether?—It is their home.

15,309. For a year or two years?—Yes, for years.

15,310. Might I ask whether you people pay taxes?—Me, yes.

15,311. Those that live on the boats?—Yes, I did then.

15,312. You paid taxes?—Yes.

15,313. And lived on a boat. What did you pay taxes for; what taxes did you pay?—Do you mean the rates?

15,314. The ordinary municipal or school board rates?—Yes, I pay them all.

15,315. You had to pay them?—Yes.

15,316. While living on board this boat?—Yes.

15,317. You had not a house?—Yes, we had a house.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. JOSEPH BILLAM called and examined.

Earl of *Derby*.

15,329. What are you by occupation?—I am an insurance agent, the secretary of three large friendly societies, and the honorary secretary of a branch of this Union.

15,330. Have you ever been personally connected with the canal boat business?—Except as working for them for the major part of my life, I am a shoemaker by trade and been engaged in that business all my life.

15,331. Then do I understand your only connexion with them is having made shoes for them?—In trading with them in this way, and in being brought up with them from a boy, right up to manhood, up to now.

15,332. And do you come here as representing any association?—I am come here as the honorary secretary of the Piccadilly section of this Association.

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

15,318. You had a house as well?—Yes.

15,319. What I want to get at is, are there any men entirely living on board who pay any rates?—Not that I am aware of.

15,320. Now these men will have no vote for a municipal election?—Not those who live entirely on board the boats.

15,321. Nor for parliamentary elections?—No.

15,322. Their not being on the register will be the reason why the inspectors of the school board do not get at the children of these men who live on the boats?—Quite likely.

Earl of *Derby*.

15,323. Did I quite understand you to say that without taking any steps to inquire what the feeling of the women was themselves on the subject you would forbid women to work at all, or to live at all on board these canal boats?—That is so.

15,324. You think you and other men are competent to decide that point for them without their having anything to say to it?—I think so.

Mr. *Trow*.

15,325. Are these married men whose wives are on board the boats members of your Society?—Very few of them.

15,326. What is the view of the members of your Society with regard to it?—Their view is that women and children ought to be prohibited from being on board the boats, either working or being housed on board.

15,327. What is the view of the men who are outside of the Union, the men who have their wives and children on board. Have you consulted them?—I do not understand you.

15,328. What is the view of the married men who have their wives and children on board who are not members of your Society. Have you consulted them?—No.

Mr. *Jesse Collings*.

15,333. That is in Manchester?—Piccadilly, Manchester.

Earl of *Derby*.

15,334. Then you do not personally represent the business; you represent the Union?—Yes.

15,335. Have you any means of ascertaining the number of persons employed in this business in the district?—No, I know of no means by which you can ascertain the actual number. There is a large quantity of boats passed to and from the district, and right through the district. What we call slow boats, merely birds of passage.

15,336. We know that is a very large industry in those parts?—Yes.

15,337. Do you know of your own knowledge how the men are paid?—Yes.

9 March 1892.]

Mr. JOSEPH BILLAM.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

15,338. How is it regulated?—The section that I represent I know particularly, that is the fast boats—what we call the quick boats—fly boats they are generally termed. The pay of the fly boats connected with the Peak Forest Canal trading from Manchester to Macclesfield, averages for mates 22s. per week; the highest paid to any single man is 25s. I do not think out of 50 or 60 men so employed there is more than two in that section receiving 25s.

15,339. Does that include the captain?—No. In the section to which I refer practically the companies contract with the men; or rather a man takes over the job for so much money, and finds horse and tackle, and men.

15,340. Therefore it is impossible to tell what he receives, because part of that is repayment for the use of his horse, and for his trouble in finding men?—Certainly, but the rate of wage that I refer to is for the mates employed by such.

15,341. I think we have heard of the conditions of labour generally. You confirm, I suppose, what was said by the last witness as to women and children living on board?—There is none in this section that I represent except the slow boats.

15,342. That is the boats engaged in the conveyance of heavy goods?—Yes.

15,343. Coal and lime, and stone?—Yes, quite so.

15,344. Is the pay there the same as on the fly boats?—I cannot say exactly with regard to pay, but I am conversant with them. They give as a reason why women are so employed because the pay is so exceedingly low.

15,345. You do not know yourself personally anything about life on board these boats, do you?—Not personally. I have a full knowledge from intimate acquaintance with the men, of course. I know their hours of labour, and the conditions under which they work and this kind of thing.

15,346. Do you agree with the last witness that female labour ought to be altogether prohibited on the canals?—Yes, I do.

15,347. On what ground? Do the women themselves desire it?—All the women that I have spoken to, I think, so far as my memory carries me back over 20 years, would prefer to leave, if it were possible, under the conditions of wage received. The great bulk of the slow boats are worked by a man, his wife, and children, and if they paid men's wages it might be different, but really men could not manage the job for the rate of pay already received.

15,348. Then I suppose part of the objection that you take to their being employed is that they receive wages, and do work which might otherwise be received and done by men?—It might be in part, but I contend that the labour is altogether too degrading for a woman.

15,349. It is labour in the open air, is it not?—Yes.

15,350. What is there specially degrading in steering a boat?—I think you would agree with me if you saw women handling pig-iron half

Earl of Derby—continued.

a cwt., and handling a shovel, that it was altogether too degrading for a woman.

15,351. Now as regards the fly boats, we understand there is no female labour, is that so?—No female labour.

15,352. What have you to say to the hours of work?—They work on an average 10½ hours per week; frequently 109. It is principally night work. The class of boats that I represent will begin work at about half-past 5, and they load and unload on the journey for, say 20 miles, as the case may be, and they are rarely released from duty until midday on the following day, and then to commence the same routine of business at 5.30, that is, after partaking of tea, and feeding their horse, and this kind of thing.

15,353. Is there any Sunday work?—No Sunday work actually, though they rarely ever finish work before midnight on Saturday, and they begin immediately after midnight on Sunday.

15,354. What holidays have they in the year?—So far as regards the larger portion of them, it was understood, ever since I remember, for more than 20 years, that Good Friday, Christmas Day, and three days that had reference to the regular stoppage of the canal at Whitsuntide for repairs, was a holiday that was paid for, but during the last year this has been stopped. I am speaking with regard to the Sheffield and Lincolnshire Railway Company's Peak Forest Canals.

15,355. Do you consider that the work on canals is dangerous?—Yes.

15,356. Is there any considerable loss of life?—I cannot say considerable, but there is rarely ever a winter comes, but there are several lost. We have 60 or 70 locks, and several lose their lives in the frost and fogs, and from the dangerous condition of the work about the locks. There are a large number of locks.

15,357. Do you mean that they have not ladders?—There are no ladders, or any means of getting out of a lock. There are 16 locks in one stretch of the canal a mile long, 20 feet deep. There is no means in the event of anyone getting into the lock, or a horse getting in of rendering any assistance, and on the greater part of the gates, the top gates especially, there are no hand-rails.

15,358. I see you have said in your proof that you would have locks and towing-paths regularly inspected by Government inspectors?—Yes.

15,359. And hand-rails affixed to all lock gates, and that there should also be steps?—Yes.

15,360. Then besides the abolition of female labour, of which you have told us, and these increased securities against danger by drowning, have you anything to suggest?—It would be a great boon if six hours continuous rest could be obtained after each voyage.

15,361. Do you mean obtained by arrangement with the masters, or made legally?—I do not care how it is obtained. It seems to be a natural claim for rest, six hours in 24.

9 March 1892.]

Mr. JOSEPH BILLAM.

[Continued.]

Professor Marshall.

15,362. You say that women on the boats have to do work that is degrading?—Yes.

15,363. Will you explain that a little more?—I think it is altogether unseemly to see a woman, perhaps the mother of children, with a long shaft 15 feet long, endeavouring to push a boat containing 20 tons of coal.

15,364. That is, however, not quite an answer to my question. I did not ask whether they sometimes do work that is unwomanly, but are they compelled to do work that is unwomanly?—Decidedly.

15,365. Would it not be possible for your Union to confine its opposition to their engaging in those classes of work that are unwomanly, and to allow them to do such work as steering which is not unwomanly?—So far as I am aware I do not think there is any great number of men connected with the Union whose wives are engaged in this way.

15,366. Would not the alteration in the law that you require be sufficient if it merely prohibited them from doing work that is unwomanly; is it necessary to ask that the law should compel them to leave the canals altogether?—My impression is that the whole employment is altogether outside the pale of a woman's work altogether.

15,367. Can you give me any reason for thinking that steering a barge is unwomanly work?—That is a very small portion of the work.

15,368. Is it not that which occupies women a great deal?—In the transit from one place to another it may be, that and driving along the canal banks, but they assist in unloading and that kind of thing, and in betwixt the locks where the horses cannot help they have to do the work of men as I say by way of shafting and pushing about just the same as a man would.

15,369. You think then that a law that prohibited them from doing unwomanly work but allowed them to be there to cook their husbands food and to steer the boat would not work well?—I scarcely caught your question.

15,370. Should you be contented with a law that prohibited the women from doing this heavy work of unloading and punting, and so on, but allowed them to be on the barge for the purposes of steering and other light work, cooking the husband's dinner and so on?—Should we be contented with the law.

15,371. Should you be contented with that change in the law?—I would prefer they were not there.

15,372. Why?—For the simple reason that I do not think the employment is at all fit for the women.

15,373. But you cannot give me any further reason than what you have given?—I can give you no further reason than that. You would be of the same opinion as I am if you saw them so employed—if you saw a woman, a mother, climbing a wall four or five feet high, and jumping off walls and going backwards and forwards with very heavy material you would say it was not fit employment for women.

Mr. Taii.

15,374. Do you say that the bargemen whom you represent are those that are engaged upon fly boats?—Yes.

15,375. That is a quicker class of boat than the last witness represented?—Yes, it is a narrow boat.

15,376. Notwithstanding that the boats are quicker I gather from you that the hours worked by the men are longer?—Yes.

15,377. Therefore it cannot be just simply because they have not expeditious boats, but it seems to be the system of employment that men should be worked about 100 hours per week?—Yes.

15,378. Can you give me any per-centage of the actual time the men are at work?—In the case of the fly boatmen that I represent as near as I can tell you they begin work at half-past 5 to load their vessels; they may get along the canal five or six miles and then have to empty part of their cargo and take in cargo, they are frequently working continuously in this way loading and unloading.

15,379. Now, during the time of any of these men being on these long and continuous hours during the week could they go and take a rest; for instance, could they lie down contentedly and take an hour's sleep or two hours sleep?—During the week?

15,380. Yes, during the working of their 109 hours?—Certainly not.

15,381. They could not do that?—No, except from 12.30 to half-past 4, when they are knocked up by the company's servants ready to commence work at half-past 5.

15,382. And the owners of the fly boats have refused the men the six hours' rest at the end of the 24, the same as the owners of the slow boats have done?—Yes.

15,383. Have they never asked for any longer rest than six hours; do you think the men would be content to work 18 hours with six hours' rest?—Certainly not, if they saw a prospect of getting more rest.

15,384. What is the longest stretch of work which these men have, which has come within your knowledge?—Do you mean within one voyage?

15,385. One continuous period?—Last week but one the Macclesfield boat commenced to work at half-past 4, and did not reach Manchester till tea-time on the following day.

15,386. How many hours would that be?—That is pretty near 24; that was in consequence of the ice, mainly, which caused delays.

15,387. Are there any stretches of duty running up to about 70 hours, as was explained by the last witness?—No, not in this line.

15,388. About 24 hours is about the longest they have on the fly boats?—Quite so.

Mr. Bolton.

15,389. You say the ordinary working time is from 104 hours to 109 hours?—Yes.

15,390. One hundred and nine hours is rather more than 18 hours a day?—Yes.

9 March 1892.]

Mr. JOSEPH BILLAM.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

15,391. And the shortest time is rather over 17 hours a day?—Yes.

15,392. Do you say that this is worked continuously?—Yes, continuously, as they are compelled to be there; there is no getting away from it.

15,393. So that the men are only getting from six to seven hours in the 24 regularly, not exceptionally?—Yes.

15,394. That is for their meals and sleep, and everything?—Yes, that is so.

15,395. And they do that from year's end to year's end?—Yes.

15,396. Your acquaintance with the slow boats is not very great, I think?—No.

15,397. But you have given evidence with respect to them to the effect that slow boats are worked by a man and his wife and children?—Principally.

15,398. Do you mean that there is occasionally a second man?—Yes, occasionally a second man; they sometimes run in pairs.

15,399. How do you mean run in pairs?—Two narrow boats together, they sometimes run in that way.

15,400. And on each of these narrow boats there is a woman and a family as well as the man?—More frequently than not.

15,401. Do they live there entirely?—Entirely.

15,402. Then they have not to pay house rent?—A great number of them do not, but of late years I find, and I think it is principally through the operation of this Act, that many of them have been compelled to take cottages.

15,403. But still a great many do not?—A great many do not, the boat is their only home.

15,404. Then would you compel these women to live on shore?—Yes.

15,405. And hire cottages, and so on?—Yes.

15,406. Whether they wish it or not?—Yes, I am inclined to compel—

15,407. Whether they could afford it or not?—I think the business ought to be made to pay for manual labour.

15,408. I think the last witness said that things had to be cut very fine on board these boats to enable them to compete with the railways?—Yes, that is so.

15,409. Then if you increase the wages there you would increase the expense of working the boats, and might you not put an end to the work of the boats altogether in that way?—I do not think that the heavy traffics run so much against the railway as the quick traffic, such as I represent.

15,410. Then you do not agree with the last witness in that respect?—He has had a greater knowledge of the matter than me, still—

15,411. Still what?—It is my impression that they are not run so much against the railways as the quick boats.

15,412. You say the work is very dangerous?—Yes.

15,413. And you spoke of women having to jump over walls and that sort of thing?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

15,414. If the women are steering the boats do they require to jump over walls?—No.

15,415. And in passing through locks is it the custom for the woman to help the lockman?—Yes.

15,416. Or the man?—The woman.

15,417. The woman?—Yes.

15,418. Why is that; is the steering so difficult into the lock, or what?—Entering instead of steering do you mean; but entering the lock, you see, practically the steering is done as soon as they get into the mouth of the lock, and then there is the pulling of the lock gates to.

15,419. Do the women get out of the boat and pull the lock gates to?—Yes, they do.

15,420. Supposing they are coming up stream, how do they get out of the boat?—There is no stream on the canal.

15,421. No, but on the low side, going up the canal?—They get out before they really get into the lock tail.

15,422. Who steers the boat in?—They need no steering when once she gets in.

15,423. It is before she gets in. Do you say the woman gets out before the boat gets in?—That is what I have seen. I saw them in this way handling the boats, only yesterday.

15,424. Why do the women get out and not the men?—The necessity for steering has ceased whenever they get to what we call the lock tail.

15,425. Then the boat is left to itself?—Certainly.

15,426. That is after it is in the lock?—Yes, really in the lock.

15,427. But before it gets into the lock there must be steering in order to get it into the lock?—Yes.

15,428. Who steers then?—The woman or children, who may be about.

15,429. Supposing they are rising, how do the women get out of the boats and help at the lock gates?—In that event they could not get out.

15,430. That must be as often as the other way—there must be as many boats go up as go down?—Certainly.

15,431. Is it not rather an arrangement between the man and the woman how the work is performed?—No doubt.

15,432. And you are of opinion that the men impose upon the women work which they should not undertake?—Well, it does not look to me a class of work fit for women.

15,433. The men impose the work upon the women?—There appears to me to be this class of men, and, of course, with 20 or 30 tons of material in the boats—

15,434. The man imposes the work on the woman?—He could not do it himself, it is too much.

15,435. But he could do the work of helping at the lock gates, and the woman could be on the boat?—Yes, but there would have to be somebody with the horse still.

15,436. The woman could be with the horse then?—Yes, that would be preferable.

9 March 1892.]

Mr. JOSEPH BILLAM.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

15,437. Then this must be an arrangement between the man and the woman?—Yes.

15,438. How would you prevent that sort of thing?—I would prevent it because I think the work is altogether—

15,439. How would you do it, I say?—That is assuming that they are employed?

15,440. Yes?—I do not know how to prevent that.

15,441. You say that steering is a very small portion of the work in a boat. Does a boat travel along the canal without being steered?—No, certainly not. I am talking now of where they are travelling betwixt locks in a case like this, where there are 16 in a mile.

15,442. Quite so; but when travelling betwixt locks is steering a small portion of the work?—Certainly not, it is the principal portion, that and driving.

15,443. But it is done?—Certainly.

15,444. The boat must be steered?—Certainly.

15,445. And somebody must be steering?—Certainly.

15,446. And if there is only a man and a woman in the boat what is the difficulty, or what is the hardship of the woman steering?—I do not see any hardship there.

15,447. That might be her principal work?—Yes, it would be then.

15,448. If the man so arranged it?—Certainly it would then.

Earl of Derby.

15,449. If respect to this question of female labour, is it not really a struggle for employment between the man and the woman. If you succeed in your object of preventing any female labour being employed, would it not follow that a larger number of men would be employed in their place?—Yes; but not so large a number as there would be of females displaced.

15,450. Precisely; that is to say, there would be more women thrown out of work and more men obtaining work?—Certainly.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. WILLIAM TURNER called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

15,463. We understand you to belong to the Burscough branch of the Mersey Watermen and Porters' Association?—As honorary secretary.

15,464. What are you by occupation?—I am a basket maker.

15,465. Now, you have heard the evidence of the last two witnesses, and we need not go over it again. Are the hours of labour and the conditions of labour the same on the canal with which you are acquainted, as on those that have been described?—No.

15,466. Will you tell us, then, what the hours of labour are on the Leeds and Liverpool Canal?—On one section of the boats, the steamers and fly boats, they actually work 120 hours per week.

Earl of Derby—continued.

15,451. And that is a question which you say you think ought to be decided without any reference to the wish of the women upon it?—In part; yes.

Mr. Bolton.

15,452. With reference to your reply to Lord Derby just now, you said that if the women were prohibited there would not be an equal number of men required?—There would not.

15,453. How would you arrange that. If you displace one person, who does all the steering, you say, you would then arrange to do with a fewer number of men than those women who are displaced?—All the women who are engaged on slow boats would not be able to take their fair share with the men in the emptying and loading the boats.

15,454. It is not that; it is while the boat is passing along the canal?—Of course, then, they would be equal to a man.

15,455. You would require a man for a woman there?—Precisely.

Mr. Burt.

15,456. What arrangements are made for the education of the children connected with the canal boats; do they attend school?—In some instances to my knowledge they do, but in a greater number, judging by the age of the children that I see travel through my own district, they do not attend school at all.

15,457. According to the Act they ought to do so, I presume?—Certainly.

15,458. You say that the Act is evaded so far as that is concerned?—Yes.

15,459. To a great extent?—Yes.

15,460. Have you inspectors connected with the canal?—Yes, certainly there are inspectors.

15,461. Is the attention of the inspector ever called to this evasion?—I am sure I do not know. I cannot say with regard to that.

15,462. It might be well for the officials of the Union, might it not, to call the attention of the inspector to it?—I think so.

Earl of Derby—continued.

15,467. When you say "work" you mean, I presume, that they are on board the boat that time?—On board the boat. They have 48 hours' rest in the 120 hours' work. I may explain how I have got these items. I have had some trouble to get them, but I took three of the most reliable captains that I know, and they undertook to book every hour they worked and every hour they rested in an all round trip, and this is the result.

15,468. You say they work so many hours, but I presume they are not actively employed all the time?—Yes, that is the number of hours they actually work in the loading, and the manning of the boat, and the discharging of the boat.

15,469. How long are they ever required to work without an interval of rest?—At the very

9 March 1892.]

Mr. WILLIAM TURNER.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

outset all hands work 12 hours, that is, in the loading and preparing for the up-hill journey. Then these boats are four-handed, and they work two up and two down.

15,470. They are four-handed, you say?—Yes, the steamboats are.

15,471. That is to say, only two men are working at a time?—Only two men are working at a time and two men are down at a time, with slight variations, but this is the general rule.

15,472. Then when you speak of the men being at work 120 hours a week, do you not include in that the hours during which the other two men are on duty?—Yes.

15,473. Therefore, in point of fact, if I understand you rightly, they only work half those 120 hours?—The whole of the men work the 120 hours, but this is the rest, they go down for an hour or an hour and a half, and then come up again.

15,474. What are the ordinary wages?—3½d. per hour.

15,475. That would be 3s. and a little over for a day of 12 hours?—Yes, that is the captain's; the mate's wages is 3d.

15,476. Does that include all the money that they make, or are they paid in any other way also?—No additions whatever.

15,477. Then what is it that you describe in the paper that you have handed in as the system of giving bonuses?—That is a system followed out in another class of boats that I will come to by-and-by. I represent three classes of boats. I have just been talking about the steamboats and the boats in tow. The next boats are three-handed boats, worked by horses. These men work by the trip, three trips per fortnight. They work 72 hours per trip, and they have 108 hours per week with 36 hours' rest, and receive 3½d. per hour. They are the best paid men.

15,478. Is there any other class of boats besides those?—There are the slow boats which get the bonus.

15,479. Now, will you tell us what the payments are on the slow boats?—The average hours worked on the slow boats are 84 per week. They work two-handed, a captain and mate. The captain gets 1l. 4s. and the mate 1l. 1s. The bounty amounts to 5d. per day when the trips are made in exact time, but then there are delays often through no fault of the men, so that they do not derive the bounty, not one trip out of 10. The slightest little incident deprives them of the bounty.

15,480. The bounty is for accomplishing the trip within a short time?—Yes, in the exact time, the stipulated time.

15,481. Therefore it is not a part of the regular wages?—No.

15,482. But rather a premium upon extra exertion?—Yes.

15,483. Are women and children on board those boats?—Yes, particularly the slow boats. I was on board a slow boat last week going over the river to Birkenhead, and, as Mr. Gately described, our craft are far less than the boats

Earl of Derby—continued.

you have seen the model of, and there was on that boat two youths under 12 years of age, and one man. Plenty of those slow boats are worked by husband, wife, and children, that is in order to secure two men's wages in the one household.

15,484. Do you object altogether to female labour on canal boats?—Yes.

15,485. On what ground?—On the ground of the degrading nature of the work, and its demoralising tendencies.

15,486. Do you consider that steering a boat is degrading?—No.

15,487. Then what is the work which you consider degrading?—One of the former witnesses was asked about a boat coming into lock, not down lock but into lock. I have seen my own sister-in-law have to climb up the lock gates from the boat down below in order to close the gates to raise the lock again for the boat to go out, and I have seen that woman thrown into the canal with a child suckling at her breast, by the force of the tiller. I have seen, and I know, being an eye witness to it during the past week, where a coal boat, not this class of boat, but a coal boat that carries coal down and manure up, I have seen females there with a large manure fork in their hands dressing a cargo of manure.

15,488. Now as you have had opportunities for observation do you think that the women themselves would approve of being compelled to give up all work on boats?—In some instances they would favour going with the boats. I would give you a few cases that I know of. I have a very close acquaintance with the boat people, they have good husbands and in those cases lads of 12 and 14 years of age and they can just assist in steering the boat, keeping the cabins, attending to the meals, &c., but they are not required to do the real work of navigating the boat as the great bulk of the women are. They are the few instances that would prefer to go with the boat in order to keep the income of the boat to one family.

15,489. In short, if women were not allowed to work on those boats the collective wages of the family would be very much diminished?—Very much diminished.

15,490. Is there anything else that you particularly wish to put before us?—There is one item—I have been engaged for the last four months on a mission to get the men into the Union. One of the employers, I must say in all credit to him, he did it in a very courteous manner, but a very peremptory manner, ordered me to leave the boat, leave my nephew's boat and clear off the premises. Of course he knew my mission.

15,491. There was no question, I suppose, about his legal right?—No, he had an abstract right.

Professor Marshall.

15,492. You say you are honorary secretary of the Union?—Yes.

15,493. What does that mean. I do not understand the phrase "honorary secretary," is

9 March 1892.]

Mr. WILLIAM TURNER.

[Continued.]

Professor Marshall—continued.

there another secretary?—No, only an assistant, there is an assistant secretary.

15,494. You are a secretary—that is not paid,—receiving no salary?—As I have pointed out, for the last three months I have been engaged in a mission and of course during that time, it was a three months' mission, but it has extended a little longer, I am paid a salary.

15,495. Is there any special reason that causes your Union to have an unpaid secretary?—Only that there was a voluntary man coming to the rescue.

15,496. Why was it needed?—We have a general secretary, we are a branch of the Upper Mersey Watermen and Porters' Association, of which Mr. Gately is the general secretary.

15,497. And you are a volunteer helper?—Yes.

15,498. You said the wages were 3½d. an hour for the captains?—Yes.

15,499. How is that arrived at; are they paid by the hour?—They are paid by the week.

15,500. By the week?—That is what I have brought it to, 3½d. an hour; it may be a fractional part of a farthing, but it is only a fractional part of a farthing.

15,501. Then there might be some room for doubt as to whether you have divided the week's salary by the right number of hours, might there not?—No, if the men have given me a correct statement and if they booked the hours they worked and the hours they rested in an all round week's trip.

15,502. Do you think that the employers would generally admit that you have divided it by the right number of hours?—Yes, I do. I have in my hand here a code of working regulations signed on behalf of the company by the general manager, Alfred Williams, and those regulations plainly state that they are to cover a week of seven days.

15,503. Do they say anything further as to what a day means?—No, there is no limit of hours.

15,504. What are the wages per week?—1l. 13s. 6d. per week for the captain.

15,505. That sounds rather differently to 3½d. an hour, does it not?—It does, but I think I should be correct; I think so; I am open to correction.

15,506. You think you have divided it out by the right number of hours?—I think I am correct.

15,507. You have given some instances of women who have got into disagreeable situations in working on a barge. Is the case of a woman being knocked overboard by the tiller of a barge which has no sail at all a common occurrence?—I cannot vouch for that. I plainly stated that I had seen my own sister-in-law knocked from the deck by the force of the tiller.

15,508. Yes, I understood that, but I asked if that was a common occurrence?—I cannot vouch for it being a common occurrence.

15,509. Have you ever seen anybody else?—I have heard of it frequently, and particularly in coming down locks.

Professor Marshall—continued.

15,510. With regard to climbing up the lock from the inside, might not that have been avoided by a little forethought?—Not so when the man is busy with the horse, and the managing of the lock, in many instances the woman is bound to come up the lock gates to close the bottom gates.

15,511. Why could not he do it?—He could do it if all other things were equal, but there may be a boat coming one way pushing for the lock and another boat the other way and the man is engaged with the horses and the ropes and cannot leave them at all times.

15,512. It would only mean the wait of half a minute would it?—Yes, and then you know there comes in the question of the temper of the horses, the horses have to be contended with as well as the ropes. I have seen some confusion along the locks, some very confused instances of where there has been some very loathsome, some very fearful language, drawn out by the circumstances.

15,513. I am afraid we can hardly legislate against that can we?—No, we cannot.

15,514. Are the conditions under which a woman has to climb up a lock from the inside such as frequently occur, unless there is some want of forethought or some impatience to get on very quickly?—It might be mitigated in many instances that is true, but they get so accustomed to it do the females having grown up with it from their childhood, plenty of them have been born in the boats and lived in the boats, and have never known anything else but the boats, and they really think nothing at all about climbing up the lock gates, plenty of them; but I say it is a degrading sight.

15,515. I am not sure whether it was you or another witness who said there were no means of saving anybody who fell into a lock. Is there not always a long boat hook at every lock?—Such a thing as drowning along our canal is very rare.

15,516. Are there no boat hooks?—Yes, they have boat hooks.

15,517. Is that not a means of saving life?—Yes, there is no danger, or comparatively speaking there is little danger of loss of life, along our canal; we do not draw much water.

15,518. I think this statement was made in answer to a question from the chairman with regard to the dangers of the occupation?—The danger is in the cross river. This is a canal where we draw in the deepest places a little over four feet of water, and in the bulk of the places I can ford the canal myself.

Mr. Jesse Collings.

15,519. You spoke about your being engaged in a mission: what mission is that?—It was to organise the men in the Union, to draw them together.

15,520. And are you still engaged in that?—Still engaged till the next executive meeting.

15,521. I did not quite understand what kind of boats you referred to which have four men?—Those are the steamboats.

9 March 1892.]

MR. WILLIAM TURNER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Jesse Collings—continued.

15,522. On those boats two do the work, while the other two are below, I understood?—Yes.

15,523. Are they employed on long trips?—Yes, from Liverpool to Leeds.

15,524. What length of line?—118 miles some of the boatmen say.

15,525. How many hours?—I cannot give you the exact number of hours steaming.

15,526. What I want to ask you is are all these four men paid by the hour the whole of the trip, the 118 miles?—They are paid by the week.

15,527. You said they earned 3½d. an hour?—Yes, at this rate of hours, 120 hours per week.

15,528. Are they paid for every hour on that trip of 118 miles, whether they are below or actually at work?—Yes.

15,529. And half the time they are being relieved and resting?—No, not half the time, in all the locks all the men have to be up.

15,530. Part of the time?—Part of the time.

15,531. But the wages are paid the whole of the time?—Yes.

Mr. Tait.

15,532. Have you found much difficulty in your mission work and organisation?—No.

15,533. Did the employer who prevented you going on to the boat explain the reason why he desired you should not be amongst his men?—No, I did not wait to ask him; I simply retired. At the time I stood on my own nephew's boat, he was captain of the boat. Of course he knew my business.

15,534. When you say that the rate of wages is 3½d. per hour for some, and 3d. per hour for others, you calculate the hours of the men at 120 per week?—Yes, that is for the captain and the mate.

15,535. And you have arrived at that as being the number or hours given you by three captains of boats?—Yes, the most reliable men.

15,536. Three captains of boats who gave you a complete record of their week's proceedings?—Yes.

15,537. And that is the result?—Yes. I could not get figures that were satisfactory to myself by any other means.

15,538. When you speak of the men resting for periods when they are on duty, do you mean by that term that they go to sleep?—Yes, go into their bunks and have refreshments.

15,539. The 5d. which you get as bounty money per day is not given to assist wages; it is rather given for expedition?—Yes.

15,540. Now supposing it takes 72 hours to run a particular trip, and that number is looked upon as being the right number to occupy upon the voyage, if they were 74 or 75 hours, would that 5d. be taken off?—It would not be given to them at all.

15,541. It would not be given to them?—No.

15,542. Simply because they were late?—Yes.

Mr. Tait—continued.

15,543. Even if that was caused by any stress of weather, as is the case sometimes?—Yes.

15,544. Would it still be taken from them in that case?—It would be taken from them, no matter whatever incident occurred. They must not have the bounty except the time is put in. The boat must be at her destination at the exact hour.

15,545. Have you examined for yourself the Canal Boats Act?—No, it has only come into my possession very recently.

15,546. However the fact of inspectors being provided for in the Act?—We have nothing to complain about the inspectors; our boats are fully inspected.

15,547. Fully inspected?—Yes, both at Bootle and at Liverpool.

15,548. Are the sanitary arrangements complete; are they satisfactory?—Not quite so; there is scarcely space enough.

15,549. Have you made complaints to the inspector?—Yes, the men do frequently.

15,550. Have you, for instance, as secretary of a branch?—No, I have never met with an inspector.

15,551. Do you not think that it would be right that you should direct his attention by letter to the fact that certain things are taking place which you think ought to be inquired into?—Quite so.

15,552. It would be an advisable thing to do?—Quite advisable.

15,553. Have you as a branch made any overtures to your employers to reduce these long hours?—Yes, as you see from this circular I have (*see Appendix 109*).

15,554. Have they refused to reduce them?—Yes, they have refused to reduce them, and they have refused to give Sunday pay, as you will read here.

15,555. May I take it for granted that the statement made by your general secretary would cover everything in that respect, and that you are just getting the same pay for Sunday work as what he related to us, namely, that some men are getting 1s., and some 2s. extra for work on Sunday?—Nothing at all.

15,556. You are getting nothing at all?—Nothing at all.

15,557. You are not even working under the conditions that Mr. Gately stated?—No.

15,558. He said that there are a certain number of men getting 1s. when the vessel was loaded, and 2s. when she was not loaded?—We are not getting that.

15,559. You do not get that?—No.

15,560. Are you getting no extra money at all?—No extra money at all, only this one class of boat which has the bonus, or as the men call it, bounty pay.

15,561. And you only get that under certain conditions?—Yes.

15,562. Have you any suggestion to make to the Commission how the complaints of your members, with reference to the long and continuous hours they are working, can be met?—Yes.

9 March 1892.]

Mr. WILLIAM TURNER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

15,563. By what means?—By, in the first instance, the prohibition, as far as practicable, of Sunday labour, that would meet the case, all round it would meet the case if our boats were allowed to tie up on the Saturday night.

15,564. But you think that your men are perfectly satisfied to work the 24 hours and 40 hours at a stretch, as they do, for the purpose of getting backwards and forwards to their various places?—Yes, with this proviso that they either tie the boats up on Sunday, or be paid Sunday pay. If the Sunday work were taken off that would bring down the hours materially.

15,565. What per-centage of the men in your district are in your branch?—Three-fourths.

15,566. Therefore you can be looked upon to be a fairly organised body of workmen?—Yes.

15,567. And three-fourths of the men employed upon the barges would be content if they got paid for their Sunday work?—Yes, they have no other complaints to make.

15,568. They are quite satisfied with all other conditions?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton.

15,569. How long has your branch been in existence?—Two years on the 15th February last.

15,570. Is there much Sunday work?—Yes, I walked two miles on a Sunday afternoon down the towing-path, and met 15 boats, Leeds and Liverpool Canal Company's boats.

15,571. Speaking generally of the work on these boats, is the work on Sunday as continuous as on other days?—Quite so.

15,572. No difference?—No difference, only in the loading and unloading, and then there is occasionally plenty of boats loading on a Sunday

The witness withdrew.

Mr. WILLIAM HOUGH called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

15,584. We understand that you are the secretary of the Watermen's Association?—Yes.

15,585. That is the Weaver Association, which has its head-quarters at Winsford in Cheshire?—Yes.

15,586. Now, I understand that one of the points you wish to bring before us is what you consider to be the excessive hours of work?—Yes.

15,587. Now, as to the hours worked on the Weaver and the Mersey, will you state what they are?—The hours worked on the Weaver and the Mersey by the men I represent are just as I have stated; there is really no limit to the hours here worked if the state of trade admits it.

15,588. I suppose the work necessarily varies very much according to the state of trade?—Very much indeed.

15,589. Are there times when the work is very slack?—There are times when it is considerably more slack than at others.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

and discharging on a Sunday, but that is with the quick traffic.

15,573. Where do they discharge on Sunday?—Both at Bootle and at Liverpool.

15,574. On board the ships?—No, at the warehouses.

15,575. At the warehouses on a Sunday?—Yes, if there is nothing to go on board ships they wait till Saturday night's tide, or the Monday morning's tide.

15,576. The 1*l.* 13*s.* 6*d.* is the earnings of a captain, is it not?—Yes, that is the earnings of a captain of a steam boat.

15,577. That 1*l.* 13*s.* 6*d.* does not include the bonus?—No, that is his entire wage, they do not get the bonus on that class of boats.

Mr. Tait.

15,578. I see you are named the Mersey Watermen and Porters' Association?—Yes.

15,579. Have you men in your Society who are porters in the warehouses?—No, we have no porters, ours are all boatmen.

15,580. In the agreement which I have read there is a clause which says that when your men are engaged doing porters' work in warehouses, they will get the same rate of pay as the porters get?—Yes.

15,581. Can you tell us the rate of pay that the porters get?—No, I cannot.

15,582. Do you know whether it is higher or lower than your own?—It is lower than two classes of our boats, but not lower than the slow boats.

15,583. Would that mean a reduction in the wages of the men who may be working in a warehouse?—Yes, a slight reduction.

Earl of Derby—continued

15,590. Now, I see in the paper you have given me here you say that the men whom you represent sometimes work from 12 o'clock on Sunday night till 12 o'clock on the Saturday night following, or every hour in the week, day and night; you do not mean that a man passes the whole of the week without sleep?—That is quite right.

15,591. That he passes six days without rest or sleep, and working continuously?—He sleeps while he is working, very often.

15,592. What is the nature of the work?—Steering and navigating in general the steam barges and the barges without steam which are being towed by the steam barges.

15,593. Then his work consists in taking care of a barge which is being towed by another barge?—Yes.

15,594. You have spoken of an extreme case what are the more ordinary hours of work?—40, 50, and 60 hours, that is actual working hours.

15,595. Taking the average through the year, for I suppose there are slack times, times when

9 March 1892.]

Mr. WILLIAM HOUGH.

[Continued

Earl of Derby—continued.

no work is available, what should you suppose the average hours per week came to?—60 or 70 hours.

15,596. What is the rate of wages?—The rate of wages varies somewhat. The captain's weekly wage is 1*l.* 3*s.* on the steam barges, and the mate of the steam barge has 1*l.* and the engine driver 1*l.* 4*s.* per week.

15,597. But there is something besides?—There are other items.

15,598. In the way of a bounty or a bonus?—Yes, for each trip or voyage from Winsford or Northwich to Liverpool and back the captain receives 6*s.* and the mate 3*s.* and the engine driver 3*s.* In addition to this the captain receives 1*d.* per ton, and the mate $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* per ton, and the engine driver $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* per ton. In the barges without steam the captain's weekly wage is 1*l.* 1*s.* and the hands the same. For larger barges over 150 tons to 250 or 260 tons the captain gets 6*s.* per trip trip money, and the hand 3*s.* For lesser barges of the 100 ton class the captain gets 7*s.* per trip, and the mate 4*s.*

15,599. How often does he get that; how long does the trip take?—Sometimes he will make one a week, sometimes two a week, sometimes three, sometimes four or close upon four.

15,600. Therefore, saying that the rate of wage is 1*l.* 1*s.* a week or 1*l.* a week really gives no idea of his total gains?—No.

15,601. He may get nearly double that by your statement?—The average of the captain would be about two guineas.

15,602. Then I presume that upon the question of wages you do not consider that you have much to complain of?—Not very much to complain of.

15,603. What you do object to, as I understand, are the very long hours?—Yes.

15,604. They arise, if I understand the matter rightly, from the uncertainty as to the amount of business to be done; at one time there is a great deal, at another time there is very little?—To a very considerable extent that is so.

15,605. If the hours are to be reduced, which of course they might be, either by law or by arrangement, you must have a larger number of men employed; is not that so?—Yes, just so.

15,606. Then when the slack time came would not those extra men diminish the amount of employment which was obtainable at a time when there is not too much for those now in the business?—From our knowledge of the business we do not think it would.

15,607. Will you explain that please?—The reason why the work in our opinion, from our practical knowledge all round of it, is so distributed out now in the manner it is, and why the men are so ill affected, is either from the incapacity or the culpable neglect of the managers of the business in hand, the officials of the various firms.

15,608. You mean you think that if the employers chose the work could be more equalised?—Yes.

Earl of Derby—continued.

15,609. At different times of the year?—All the year round.

15,610. Now as a fact is there ever a difficulty in getting employment in this business; are there ever more hands than are wanted?—No, very few, if any.

15,611. Do you think that the men in all cases object to working long hours and making high wages?—Yes, all our men.

15,612. They object?—Yes.

15,613. They would be content to take a lower rate of pay and do less work?—I will not say so. We think better arrangements could be made whereby the hours would be shorter and the rate of pay remain as it is or better.

15,614. But that is only your opinion, you have never brought it to the notice of the employers have you?—Yes, frequently.

15,615. And what do they say?—Of course they are opposed to it altogether.

15,616. But why, if as you say the same amount of work might be done for the same pay by better distribution without any excessive labour?—For the simple reason the heads of the firm will not listen to information tendered by practical men, they trust too much to the officials that have not the full practical knowledge of the working of the business all round.

15,617. But suppose there is at any time a pressure of business, and suppose that the hours are so materially reduced that the business cannot be done in the same time, and there is a considerable delay, are you sure that that traffic would not be lost, that it would not go to other channels?—Quite sure. We have been threatened by our employers that the business would be taken to other parts of the country if we insisted on any new arrangements being made when the fact of the matter is here. If there are 25,000 tons of Calcutta salt being loaded now in Liverpool, this present week and the next perhaps, there will be, say, only one-half, or little more than one-half of the craft (the steamers and barges) to convey it to Liverpool, the remainder, through bad management on the part of the officials, being bound fast at Birkenhead and Liverpool and other points, carrying things they ought not to have in them, then the consequence is that those at liberty are obliged to run night and day.

15,618. Then do you contend that the hours might be very materially shortened without loss to the employers?—Yes.

15,619. By better arrangement?—Yes.

15,620. But they do not think so?—No.

15,621. Then I think there is another point which you want to bring before us, as to the alleged under manning of boats, having regard to their carrying capacity?—Yes.

15,622. What is the ordinary size of the boats employed in this industry?—Do you mean the average boat?

15,623. I refer to the tonnage?—They vary from a tonnage of 300 tons down to 100 tons. Some will take 100 tons, others 120, 125, 150, 160, 175, and 185, but the average tonnage is about 185, taking steamers and barges all round.

9 March 1892.]

Mr. WILLIAM HOUGH.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

15,624. The steamers I understand are worked by three men?—Yes, two sailors or deck hands, and one engineer.

15,625. The barges without steam by how many hands?—Two men only, the captain and mate.

15,626. I understand you have no complaint to offer as to the unseaworthiness of the craft or as to the supply of life-saving apparatus?—None whatever.

15,627. And you also do not find fault with the sanitary arrangements?—No.

15,628. Then in point of fact what you have to complain of is confined to the too great number of hours that the men occasionally work and to the vessels being under-manned?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton.

15,629. Are you a waterman yourself?—Yes.

15,630. And work regularly at it?—Not now. I am the secretary.

15,631. You have done so?—Yes; and my father and grandfather, and great grandfather before me.

15,632. Have you had any experience in the management of the business which you say these firms so mismanage?—Yes.

15,633. You have had it yourself?—It is so closely connected.

15,634. You have been in a firm of that kind, have you?—Yes; there are no secrets that can be kept from us as far as the management goes, practically.

15,635. You know exactly the orders they receive, and how they fulfil them?—Yes, to a very great extent.

15,636. What is it you do not know?—Not much of that line.

15,637. Do you know the orders that they get to load a certain ship, and when they get them, and what they get?—Yes.

15,638. All the conditions of the order?—Pretty nearly so.

15,639. What is short of the whole?—Better management.

15,640. No; what is short in your knowledge of the whole?—Better men, that is in the office.

15,641. That is not my question at all; you are complaining of the incapacity or the culpable neglect of the firms?—Of the officials who have got the orders to carry out.

15,642. Of the firms you said who control this business?—Of the firm's officials, yes.

15,643. I want to know whether you have had any experience yourself in the management of such a business, the management of which these firms you say do so badly?—It is not with the firms and the heads of the firms, but with the officials of the firms.

15,644. How do you know that the officials are not obeying orders?—I have every reason to know.

15,645. What are the "every reason," would you explain if you could?—Yes, from being in the offices over and over again, and connected with the ships while they are loading, and with

Mr. Bolton—continued.

the work while it is being carried on at the loading end.

15,646. How does that give you a knowledge of the instructions which the officials receive from the heads of the firm?—The heads of the firm give the officials instructions to carry out these orders.

15,647. Which orders?—The orders of loading the craft and getting the material conveyed down to Liverpool.

15,648. And do you see those instructions?—Yes.

15,649. You do?—Yes.

15,650. The officials show you the instructions they receive?—Frequently; and we hear them verbally.

15,651. And you say that they do not carry them out in accordance with the instructions?—No, frequently they do not, oftener than anything else.

15,652. Do you say that now really after consideration?—Yes.

15,653. That they receive certain orders from their masters which they fail and persistently fail to carry out?—Yes.

15,654. And the masters pay no attention to it?—Yes, they do pay attention to it, in cases.

15,655. And what results then?—They change the officials at times.

15,656. Then the new ones, are they as bad as the old ones?—Sometimes they are better, sometimes they are worse.

15,657. But on the whole there is no improvement?—Not much.

15,658. Is there any?—I do not think so? I do not think there is.

15,659. Because you say you attribute the irregularity of this work to the incapacity or neglect of the officials?—Very largely so.

15,660. Not entirely?—Perhaps not entirely.

15,661. Then what is the other irregularity due to. What is the rest of it due to?—Well, perhaps there are little things sometimes that the wisest and the most far seeing cannot avoid?

15,662. Such as?—Me, for one.

15,663. What do you mean by "me"?—I cannot always see; perhaps there is something that I cannot see.

15,664. Yes, but what are these things that are not seen which tend to produce the irregularity?—Little bits that are worked behind the scenes, perhaps.

15,665. Can you tell me really what is the cause of the irregularity other than the incapacity and the neglect of the officials?—I do not think there is any.

15,666. Nothing but that?—I do not think there is.

15,667. And the firms or the heads of the firms are so stupid that they cannot alter that state of matters?—I did not say so. I said they have tried.

15,668. And failed?—And failed more or less.

15,669. But if they would employ you it would be all right?—Very likely.

15,670. That is your opinion?—Yes.

The witness withdrew.

9 March 1892.]

MR. WILLIAM CHADWICK.

[Continued.]

MR. WILLIAM CHADWICK called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

15,671. You are the general secretary, we understand, of the Mersey Flatmen's Association?—Yes.

15,672. Where are the head-quarters of that Association?—Liverpool.

15,673. How long has it been in existence?—Since March 1889.

15,674. How many branches has it?—We have five.

15,675. Two at Liverpool?—Yes.

15,676. One at Birkenhead?—Yes.

15,677. One at Widnes?—Yes.

15,678. And one at Sankey Bridge?—Yes.

15,679. How many members have you?—We have about 1,100.

15,680. That includes captains and mates?—Yes.

15,681. Any boys?—We have a few boys.

15,682. Do you take in boys?—We take in boys at 14. Boys are allowed to do a certain portion of the work up to 16 years of age, but not to act as mates.

15,683. Not so, I suppose, as to compete with men?—No, not till they are over 16.

15,684. Now, on board the vessels worked by members of your Association, are there any females employed?—No, we do not allow that: our men would be fined if they moved their flats with women.

15,685. How comes it that your position is different from that of other flatmen and canal men as regards the employment of women?—We are a different class of men altogether, and a different class of craft. Ours are principally sailing craft, not canal craft, and could not be worked with women.

15,686. Are your craft mostly sailing craft, do you say?—Yes.

15,687. What is their general size?—They average from 80 tons up to about 200 tons burden.

15,688. Where do they ply to?—All about the lower Mersey, and up as far as Runcorn, Widnes, and so on; some of them go up the St. Helen's Canal, but not all, and to Warrington, and some coastwise.

15,689. Now, how are your members paid?—Principally on freight, by shares.

15,690. The captain and the men hold shares in these boats; they are part owners, in short?—No; we say if the freight is 1s. per ton the captain takes 6d., and then he has to employ his mate, and any other additional labour that may be wanted.

15,691. Then what do you mean by working by shares?—If the full freight is 1s. per ton, and that is the full freight in the Lower Mersey to or from the different docks or Birkenhead, the captain takes 6d., in some cases 8d. Then he has to employ his mate and pay his mate, and any additional labour he may choose to employ.

15,692. Have you any men paid by the week?—We have a few.

15,693. Do you think that system better than the payment by shares or worse?—We prefer

Earl of Derby—continued.

share system. We do not really acknowledge the weekly system at all, but as these are a few men we just keep them in along with us.

15,694. Why do you say you do not approve of the system of weekly payment?—We believe it is better and gives more satisfaction to the men and the masters when the men are paid by shares.

15,695. But you have no special reason to give beyond that preference?—Not beyond that preference, the master always gets more than his share out of the men in the weekly system.

15,696. Now as to the hours of labour are they long?—Yes, when there is work to do they are from the beginning of the week to the end of the week, we have no hours that we can call our own.

15,697. In the paper you have put before me you say it is a common thing to work 60 or 70 hours consecutively, and in some cases 100 and even as much as 150 hours without being in bed or undressed?—Yes.

15,698. You do not mean that a man works 150 or even 100 hours without getting some rest or sleep do you?—Yes.

15,699. Without getting any rest or sleep?—Yes. One or two of those special cases I have referred to are principally the weekly men; the 60 or 70 hours is amongst the sailing flats principally.

15,700. I understand you have no particular complaint to make on the score of insecurity, you have not had many accidents?—No, we have not had many accidents.

15,701. Now when a man works 60 to 70 hours a week what amount of pay would he generally be able to earn?—It would depend upon the size of his craft and the firm he works for; some craft are only 100 tons, some are up to 200 tons, so that the man with the 100 tons will have to do the same labour as the man with the 200 tons, but still his freight will only be half as much.

15,702. But you cannot tell us what they would earn upon an average?—Our men who are working on the shares may average a couple of pounds a week; that is on the average sized flat.

15,703. Do you see any mode of remedying the grievance of too long hours considering the nature of the traffic?—Yes.

15,704. What would you propose?—I think that some Act should be passed which would forbid a master to allow or force his man to work more than say 36 hours, 36 hours' work I should think, and one night's rest after that.

15,705. You say that masters should be forbidden to allow a man to work so long?—Yes.

15,706. Do the men themselves willingly work this length of time?—Some of them, but not all.

15,707. Now, I think you have a complaint to make as to men being employed who are not fit for the work?—Yes.

15,708. When you ask that all men having charge of small craft, sailing or steam, shall

9 March 1892.]

Mr. WILLIAM CHADWICK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

undergo a previous examination as to fitness, are you under the impression that that would limit the number of men who go into the business? No, not at all.

15,709. You do not think that the effect would be to lessen the supply of men as compared with the employment to be given?—No, I think that it would not.

15,710. You want nothing then except that the men shall be proved to be fit for their duty?—Yes.

15,711. Surely it is not the interest of owners to put incompetent men in charge of their boats, is it?—No, it is not to their interest, but it is being done. My point on the long hour system is the same: it unfits the competent man who is working so much at night for his duty, so that he is really incompetent through working so long. My principal point is the danger of loss of life and property through long hours.

15,712. You said there is not much loss of life?—Not amongst our own men. We have not had many accidents amongst our own men considering the kind of work they have to do. These incompetent men are beginning to creep in amongst us, and working around us.

15,713. I put it to you plainly, do you think that that objection that you take is really intended to exclude men who do not belong to your Union?—No, not at all.

15,714. Have you had many strikes?—We have not had what you may call any particular strike—only one. We had a rise in wages in 1890, and one in 1891, but we were not stopped, with the exception of a very few cases, more than one day. The masters conceded at once, as we only got back what had been taken from us.

15,715. And at present your members are not dissatisfied with their rate of pay?—Not at present.

15,716. Then in point of fact, as far as I gather from what you have said, it is only the long hours to which you do object?—The long hours and incompetent men.

15,717. How does it affect competent men, if some who are incompetent get into the business?—It affects them in this way, that they have got their own craft to look after, and the incompetent men's craft and all when under weigh.

15,718. Is there much danger of collision then?—Yes, the Mersey is not to day what it was 20 years ago; you know the different size of the craft, and there is so many more of them.

15,719. There is so many more of them?—Yes, they are very thick sometimes in the Mersey.

15,720. Is there anything else that you wish to refer to or to bring before us?—On some of the very large craft we think there ought to be an additional man or an apprentice on board; that is on the very large craft that we have.

15,721. You think that they are dangerous unless they have a large number of hands on board, is that it?—They are not fit for two

Earl of Derby—continued.

men to work; they are too heavy, too large for two men to work. I mean the 200-ton craft.

15,722. On what ground do you put that, on the ground of danger?—Yes, it would be on the ground of danger. We have some craft that will carry 400 tons, but they are not rigged, they are not sailing craft.

15,723. You say you have 1,100 men in your Union, do you know at all how many are outside the Union in the same employment?—I do not think there will be more than 100 outside any of the unions; they are in Mr. Hough's Union, or the Upper Mersey Union; they are in one of the unions.

15,724. They are nearly all in some one union?—Yes.

Professor Marshall.

15,725. You say that two men are insufficient to work some of these larger vessels?—Yes.

15,726. How do you propose that the change should be made; do you want legislation?—If there was a third man on board the captain should pay one part, the owner should pay the other part.

15,727. How do you propose that that third man should be caused to go on board, by legislation?—Yes, a craft of a certain size ought to have a certain number of men on board.

15,728. You think it is necessary to have a law for the purpose?—Yes, we cannot get it without.

15,729. Could not a man decline to go on such a large vessel unless he had two besides himself?—Declining means in some cases dismissal, and then it would mean that if a man left his situation on account of anything of that kind we should protect him, and then it might cause disturbance amongst the employers, and we try to avoid that as far as possible.

15,730. Would you have a definite law as to the number of men for every kind of tonnage and craft without reference to the particular voyage it was going to do?—Yes, I should think so, that would answer our purpose.

15,731. Would that be better than an elastic understanding by which the number of men could be accommodated somewhat to the character of the voyage which the craft had to do?—You see understandings do not do now; things must be definite, especially with some of the masters things have to be definite.

15,732. Is not one of the chief uses of the Union to make elastic understandings?—If we wanted to do that with the Union we should have to pass, as it were, an Act in the Union, a resolution in the Union, and carry it out, that might cause friction if we were to enforce it.

15,733. But would not the Act as you call it passed among yourselves be more elastic and take account of the actual nature of the journey the craft had to do, might not two men be sufficient for some journeys, while three or even four might be required for others?—It is not the question of the journeys, it is the question of getting the sail up or down and getting in and

9 March 1892.]

MR. WILLIAM CHADWICK.

[Continued.]

Professor *Marshall*—continued.

out of the docks. If you get a 200-ton craft and about a 50-foot gaff with it and 10 inches thick, and a 54 or five foot boom, and 300 or 400 yards of red canvas in it two men are not sufficient to get that up in about five minutes and that is all we have, and perhaps less than that is allowed to us sometimes when we leave a dock.

15,734. Does it not make a good deal of difference whether the craft is going down low where the water is rough, or going up high where the water is smooth?—It makes no difference, the sail has to be got up whether it is rough or smooth.

15,735. Is the management of the boat equally difficult in smooth water and in rough?—No, rough water is worse, unless it is too smooth, and then if it is too smooth if there is no wind, it is worse than rough.

15,736. Do you think it is necessary to have the same number of men whether the boat is bound to go down to the lower Mersey where the water is rough or to the higher Mersey where the water is smooth?—I think all craft of that kind ought to have an extra man on

Mr. *Bolton*—continued.

board always, and then they are ready for all kinds of weather, as the water is rough in the upper Mersey very often.

Mr. *Bolton*.

15,737. Have the craft ever had that extra man?—Yes.

15,738. They used to have it?—No.

15,739. Did they ever have it?—They have it now if the captain chooses to pay for it himself.

15,740. But there are a good many without it?—There are some working without it.

15,741. And they do get the sail up and down?—Yes, they do get it up and down, but it is very hard work.

Earl of *Derby*.

15,742. Is there anything you wish to add to your evidence?—No; my particular point is that the men who are working for three or four nights in the week are not fit to navigate their craft in a dangerous river like the Mersey.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

THIRTY-FIRST DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Thursday, 10th March 1892.

PRESENT:

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE EARL OF DERBY, K.G. (CHAIRMAN).

The Right Hon. Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, Bart.,
M.P.
Mr. J. C. B. OLTON, M.P.
Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, M.P.
Professor MARSHALL.
Mr. SAMUEL PLIMSOLL.

Mr. HENRY TAIT.
Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, M.P., Mr. E. TROW
(Group A.), The Right Hon. A. J. MUND-
DELLA, M.P., and Mr. M. AUSTIN (Group C.)
also attended.

Mr. GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

15,743. I think you are a barrister-at-law, and reside in the Temple?—Yes.

15,744. I see you have stated that you have been identified with the short hours' movement for about 12 years. Identified in what sense?—As an outsider, not in any way connected with the labour movement, simply as an outsider taking an interest in the short hours' movement.

15,745. You have come to give us evidence as to the tram and 'bus men?—Yes.

15,746. They have formed a union, have they not?—They have formed a union recently which is very much better than the organisation previously existing. They attempted to form a union four or five years ago, which proved abortive, and the union with which I have been associated for some time really was scarcely worthy of the name of a union, because the men, unfortunately, were prevented from joining it by reason of the action of the companies. Whenever meetings were held in order to promote a spirit of unionism the companies invariably sent inspectors in order to spot the men, and the prominent men who took an active part in endeavouring to form a union amongst themselves were eventually discharged. Therefore up to the present time no really good union has been formed, but quite recently several tram and 'bus men have formed a union, which I think is about the best organisation that has been formed up to the present time. I have nothing whatever to do with any organisation as an official, I merely take an outside interest in it.

15,747. You speak of a good union. I suppose by a good union you mean one which shall be strong enough to be at least equal, if not superior, to the employers in point of power?—A proper union, in my opinion, ought to be able to treat upon

Earl of Derby—continued.

equal terms with the employers, and I think this Union, in all probability, after it has been in existence a little longer, if the men support it, will undoubtedly be able to do some good, and I think already it has done some good. That Union, I may tell the Commissioners, has been started, I believe, under the auspices of the London Trades' Council, and they have rendered very excellent service in connexion with the formation of that Union since the last strike. Up to that time they had taken no direct interest in the tram and 'bus men, but since then they have worked very excellently in connexion with the movement. I ought to mention to the Commissioners that I think it is extremely indiscreet on the part of the companies to regard the unions and union men as their enemies, because from my experience—and I may say that I am perfectly disinterested in this matter—I find that union men serve their employers very much better than non-union men as a rule; and if only this animosity, the animosity which undoubtedly exists between the companies and their men, could be removed, and they would recognise the existence of the Union and work in a friendly spirit, they would get better men and they would be honestly served.

15,748. What is the total number of men employed on the trams and 'buses?—I think throughout the country from 100,000 to 150,000 directly and indirectly, but in London from 12,000 to 15,000.

15,749. I suppose the London men are the only men of whom you have had much experience?—I have been into the provinces a little. I took part in a conference at Birmingham some short time ago, and I know something of the provinces; but I am not in a position to speak

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

authoritatively. I know throughout the country tram men and 'bus men are overworked and underpaid. In Hull, for instance, they are working 15 hours a day and getting a very small wage indeed. In Birmingham they are overworked, and in nearly all the large centres. In Glasgow, of course, they are not overworked; they have got reasonable hours there, because the trams are under the immediate control of the municipality. In Huddersfield, also, their hours are reasonable, and the companies are doing very well indeed.

15,750. The labour, I suppose, we may take it, is partly skilled and partly unskilled?—That is so, but I think it is a mistake to suppose that the majority of the men are unskilled. It requires a very clever man to tool a pair of horses through the streets of London, and the conductors, as a rule, have to be very able men; not only so, but their characters are thoroughly investigated before they are employed by any of the companies, before they get a licence, in fact. Therefore, I think I may say that they are above the ordinary class of unskilled labourers; they take a higher position than that.

15,751. What are the ordinary wages; of course they vary?—They vary.

15,752. Between which limits do they vary?—The tram men vary from 4s. to 4s. 6d. and 5s. 6d. and up to 6s. a day. The companies, of course, take 6d. off whenever they can possibly do so.

15,753. How are they paid; daily or weekly?—The tram men are paid weekly, and the London Road Car men are paid weekly, but the London General Omnibus men are paid daily. The wages of the omnibus men vary from 4s. to 4s. 6d. and up to 7s. 6d. and 8s. a day; but the 8s. a day is paid only where they are working 16 hours every day.

15,754. I presume that the principal cause of complaint is not the amount of wages, but the length of hours?—Yes, the length of hours.

15,755. How long do they work?—I have taken the pains to investigate the matter rather carefully, and I have got the hours worked upon several of the leading lines, and I think probably it would be as well for me to give you them in detail, if that is agreeable to the Commissioners.

15,756. Yes, certainly, do so please?—I will take first the London General Omnibus Company. On the line of 'buses going from the "Prince of Wales," Hackney, to Piccadilly Circus, they begin at 10.40 a.m. and they work to 12.30 a.m. on one day; another day they begin at 10.40 a.m. and work till 7.40 p.m. They are allowed 20 minutes off at each end of the journey, but they have no time for meals, except the 20 minutes, and they are obliged to get their meals whenever they possibly can. There is no chance of going home to get a comfortable meal with their families, and the 20 minutes allowed at each end of the journey is, I take it, more for the benefit of the horses than of the men. Then we will take the Stoke Newington to Victoria 'buses, the Favourite 'buses. They begin at 9.43 and work till 12.30 a.m. one day, and the next day

Earl of Derby—continued.

they work from 9.43 to 6.30 p.m. They get 30 minutes off four times a day on the long days. The drivers and conductors have to be in the yard three quarters of an hour after leaving the 'bus, the conductors to give in their money and the drivers to see their horses put into the stalls, therefore that adds very nearly an hour to the time they work from point to point. The Companies, I ought to mention, in making their calculation do so from the point at which the 'buses start and to which they return; they do not take into consideration any time the men are employed in the yard or in going from the yard to the point from which they start. Then the "Hornsey Wood Tavern" to London Bridge, Favourite 'buses. They work 10 hours one day and 15 hours the next day, and they have very little time off. Then the city 'buses, Kilburn to Liverpool Street. They work 10 hours one day and 15 hours and a half the next day. Then the Walham Green 'buses to Victoria and Liverpool Street work 16 hours one day and 10 hours another day. That includes the time in the yard in that instance. Wormwood Scrubs to Charing Cross they work 9½ hours one day and 15½ hours the next, with 15 minutes off at each end of the journey. That "off" does not mean that they leave their 'buses, they are obliged to be there to look after the horses and take care of the property of the Company. Then Cricklewood and Charing Cross, that is very nearly the only road or branch rather where the 12 hours' day is worked. They work 12 hours every day, and if the roads are very bad they get no time off at all. Then the Kilburn and Charing Cross 'buses work 9 to 10 hours one day, 15 to 16 hours another day, with 20 minutes off at each journey. Then the King's Cross and Victoria 'buses run from 7.45 to 10.20 daily, that is 15 hours a day, and then there is the extra in the yard. I believe they are working between 15 and 16 hours a day every day on that road. Then Walham Green to Islington, 9.10 a.m. to 1 a.m. on one day and 9.10 a.m. to 6.30 p.m. on another day, with 25 minutes off, and they have three journeys. The Royal Blue 'buses running from Oxford Circus to Victoria run from 8.44 a.m. to 9.10 p.m., with 15 minutes off each journey. The 'buses from the "Nag's Head," Holloway, to West Kensington run from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. on one day and from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on another day. The 'buses from Waterloo to Camberwell work 16 hours daily with hardly any time off. From the "Adelaide" to Victoria they run from 9.10 a.m. to 12.15 p.m. From Hammersmith to Liverpool Street it is 16 hours daily again. In that instance they are allowed 40 minutes for their dinners and 15 minutes each journey. Of course there is no opportunity of going home or leaving their 'buses at all. On the Atlas 'buses to Waterloo, Camberwell, and the "Swiss Cottage" it is 16 hours a day, with 20 minutes off for each journey, but one journey they go into the yard, from 8.20 to six minutes past 9. That gives them a little rest on that line. On the Blackwall and Piccadilly Circus 'buses it is 16 hours daily again. These are the

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

chief lines of the London General Omnibus Company, and the hours applicable to the drivers and conductors. Now the horsekeepers in the same company. In the Holloway Yard, which is a very large yard indeed, the men are in the service of the company—I do not say they work all the time but they are at the call of the company—from 14 to 16 hours a day and they get one day off every month, which they pay for. Of course it may be contended that these men are allowed periods of rest during the day, but they are not very long, and they must be at the call of the company. There is no absolute cessation from work, and they are at the disposal of the company. Then the Bramber Road, Fulham Yard, the horsekeepers there work—or rather they are in the service of the company—from 14 to 15 hours a day. One night a week they work two hours longer, as they take it in turns to be night men. Now take the London Road Car Company and the buses between Brompton and Walham Green. They work nine hours one day and 15 hours the next day. That makes an average of about 12 hours a day, but in addition to working the 12 hours a day they are obliged to be in the yard a considerable time before starting and to reach the starting point before the 12 hours is taken into consideration, and they are obliged also to go back to the yard after leaving their buses. Therefore, although apparently they are working 12 hours a day, yet before they leave the premises of the company and are absolutely released they probably work very nearly 13 hours a day. Then West Kensington to Liverpool Street they begin at 7.15 and go on to 4.15 on one day; the next day the hours are from 7.15 a.m. to 10.15 p.m., and 20 minutes off each journey. Then Walham Green to Islington Green, they run from 9.10 a.m. to 1 a.m. one day, and the next day from 9.10 a.m. to 6.30 p.m., with very little time off. The buses from West Kensington to London Bridge work nine hours one day and 15 the next, with 20 minutes off at each end of the journey. These are the chief lines on the London Road Car Company. The horsekeepers work 14 to 15 hours a day. They are paid 4s. a day, and they take it in turns to be night men, when they are at work two hours extra. That finishes the London Road Car Company. Then there is another small company called the London Omnibus Carriage Company. On the King's Cross to Victoria buses the men work 15 to 16 hours a day, with 10 minutes off at each end of the journey. On the Baker Street to Victoria buses 13½ hours a day, with three-quarters of an hour for dinner and no more time allowed during the day. On the Baker Street to Charing Cross buses they work 15 hours daily, with little time off, and are stopped 6d. a day if they do not earn 2s. for the Company. The horsekeepers of this small company at Baker Street Yard, work from 6 a.m. to 8.30 and 9 p.m., some longer, for only 4s. a day. That finishes the omnibus men so far as their hours are concerned. Of course I have not dealt with the question of wages yet. The

Earl of Derby—continued.

wages vary, and the men who work the long hours sometimes get a little extra for working the long hours; the companies tempted them to work longer and they yielded to their requests. I will now take one or two leading tram lines. First I will take the North Metropolitan Tram Company, which, I believe, is about the largest company. On the trams running from Mare Street, Hackney, to Aldersgate, they work 15½ hours one day and 10½ hours another day. From Moorgate Street to Finsbury Park their hours vary very much indeed; some days they work nine hours, another day they will work 12½ hours and another 14½. As a rule, upon all the London tramways the area over which the work is spread is about 15 or 16 hours a day, but taken out of the 15 or 16 hours a day is probably a journey off, varying from two to three hours, at a certain portion of the day convenient to the companies. Therefore the companies allege that the men really only work in some instances from 11 to 12 hours, and in other instances about 12 hours, but the men are absolutely at the disposal of the companies for 16 hours a day. They can be called upon at any time, and the periods at which they are released are extremely irregular and at the caprice of the companies. Then the horsekeepers. At the "Archway Tavern," Highgate, stables, they vary from 10 to 14 hours a day, they receive 4s. a day, and they get two hours off. At another stables in the same district they work 13 hours a day, and get 4s. a day. Then the South London Tram Company, from Newington Causeway to Southwark Bridge, they work from 7.30 a.m. to 9.30 p.m. daily, with three hours off at one time, that is, one journey off during the day. From St. John's Hill and Lavender Hill to London Bridge they work from 12 to 14 hours a day, with two hours and 20 minutes off. From Wandsworth to London Bridge they work 11 hours a day. Between Vauxhall and Westminster Bridge they work 12 to 13 hours a day, all work; that means there is no journey off there at all. Then, the horsekeepers, Queen's Road and Clapham Junction to Chelsea, they work 12 to 16 hours a day. If there are 10 horses in the stud the men get 3s. 9d. a day, if there are 12 horses they get 4s. a day. Now take the London Tramway Company. The trams from New Cross to Westminster Bridge they work 11½ hours daily, including time off. Then between Tooting and the "Wellington" 11 to 12 hours, all work. Between Greenwich and Blackfriars Bridge 11 hours, including time off. Then Clapham Common to Blackfriars Bridge, 11½ hours, including time off. Now the London Street Tramways Company; on the trams between the "Nag's Head" and the Euston Road, they work from 8 in the morning till 12 p.m.; they get a period varying two to three hours off in the middle of the day—that reduces it to about 13 hours a day. Between Euston Road and the "Archway Tavern" they work from 6 a.m. to 8 p.m. and from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m., and the men get 4s. a day and two hours off. These are the hours worked by the principal

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

companies and on the principal roads of the metropolis.

15,757. Do these companies that you have mentioned employ the greater number of 'bus men who are employed in London, or are there besides them many 'buses owned by twos and threes—by private owners?—Yes, there are a great many other 'buses as well as the 'buses owned by the two companies, but if any new 'buses start, or if the pirates run, the companies place a 'bus in front of them or a 'bus behind them in order to run them off the road and prevent competition. They always try to ruin any other company which starts in opposition to them.

15,758. Therefore we may take it, I suppose, that the wages and hours fixed by these companies practically regulate the wages and hours of the employment generally?—Yes, that is so.

15,759. Now, I think you have something to tell us as to the amount of takings (takings, I presume, by the men), of fines, and of penalties?—Until quite recently the tram companies used very often to fine their men for the most trivial offences, and now the men on the London General Omnibus Company are obliged to pay so much a week to a fund which goes to repair the omnibuses of the company. The men derive no advantage whatever from that fund, and they regard it very properly, I think, as a tax upon their wages.

15,760. Is it to repair the 'buses generally or only in cases where accidents have arisen, presumably through some fault of the driver?—Only in cases of accident, but the men say it is unfair, for this reason, that they are not responsible for accidents as a rule, and if they are, of course they are willing to pay for them, but they are obliged to pay for accidents of every description; there is a levy made upon the whole of the men, and they have no control whatever in the management of that fund.

15,761. We remember the strike of last June; what is the only considerable strike that has taken place, is it not?—I believe so. There had been several attempts before but no real strike.

15,762. It lasted something like a week I think?—Yes, about a week.

15,763. What was the principal ground of that strike, the long hours?—Yes, if the men had had reasonable hours they never would have struck.

15,764. It was not so much a question of wages as of hours?—Not a question of wages at all, it was a question of overwork.

15,765. Do you know what number of men went out?—Directly and indirectly the men who were connected with the strike were from about 8,000 to 10,000 altogether, including every branch of the trade.

15,766. What concessions did the men obtain?—I will tell you the concessions which were promised. I have got the document here which the company issued, and probably I had better hand it to the Commissioners in order that they may see it for themselves (*handing in document*). I will read the

Earl of Derby—continued.

document; this was the arrangement come to at the termination of the strike: "Reduction of hours. The London General Omnibus Company, Limited, and the London Road Car Company, Limited, to the *employes*. The directors have carefully considered the proposals of their men and have come to the following determination: First, as soon as possible, but not later than the 13th July 1891, the average day's work for drivers and conductors shall be 12 hours. Second: When the 12 hours' day comes into operation the wages shall be as follows: Drivers commencing at 6s. a day; after 12 months' service 6s. 6d. a day. Conductors commencing at 4s. 6d. a day; after 12 months' service 5s. a day. Past service in each case will reckon in fixing the wages. Horse-keepers 4s. a day; washers 4s. per 'bus per week. All former notices are cancelled." That was dated the 8th June 1891, and signed by John Pound, chairman of the London General Omnibus Company, and by J. Howard Moore, chairman of the London Road Car Company. That agreement in the majority of instances has been shamefully violated, and the men, according to the evidence which I have adduced to-day and which I am prepared to prove, if necessary, by witnesses from all the roads concerning which I have given evidence, are working now not 12 hours a day but in many instances 13 hours a day, and in a great many instances 16 hours a day. The men immediately after the conclusion of the strike were tampered with by the officials of the company. When I say "tampered with" I mean they did not respect the honest decision which had been arrived at, but they endeavoured to get the men by detachments to sign agreements to work 16 hours a day by offering them sixpence a day or a shilling a day more, and the result was that the men being at that time in the power of the companies some of them signed the agreement; and the further result was that on several of the roads the hours went up to 16 a day, and the 12 hours' movement, although faithfully promised, has never really come into force. I think now the men are most anxious to have their 12 hours a day, it is not a question particularly of wages, although they attach great importance of course to being properly paid, but they want reasonable leisure to spend at home with their wives and their families, and of that they are absolutely deprived at the present moment.

15,767. When this agreement was made on the part of the companies, was there any understanding as to how long it was to be binding for?—The understanding was that they should adopt it and act upon it permanently, otherwise the strike would not have ended at that time unless they had yielded the 12 hours' day. Probably the Commissioners may remember the strike would have ended two or three days before it did, only the companies endeavoured to evade the 12 hours' day by saying that they would work their men on an average 12 hours a day. As I pointed out, under that arrange-

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued

Earl of Derby—continued.

ment they might have worked their men worse than they did under the whole system, and experience has proved that they have actually gone back to the old system and neglected or rather ignored the last agreement altogether.

15,768. I believe you have framed a Bill fixing 12 hours as the limit of work?—I have. I framed a Bill last year fixing the hours at 12 a day.

15,769. Did you do that in concert with the men or with the representatives of the men?—There were resolutions passed at several meetings in its favour, and I believe now the men would be satisfied with a 12 hours' day and a fair wage, providing they had sufficient time allowed for their meals.

15,770. Do you mean allowed within the 12 hours?—Within the 12 hours; 12 hours and meal times would of course make 14 hours a day. They ought to have two hours allowed for meals, reducing it to 10. I shall deal with the other part afterwards, but I probably might remark here, that although a great many of them are satisfied with the 12 hours a day, they contend that two shifts of 8 hours a day each would be far more beneficial to the men and to the companies as well, and that the long day (the 16 hours' day) would then be properly divided, and the men would have some leisure to themselves.

15,771. Then when you propose to fix these hours by law I presume you do not intend to attempt to fix the wages?—My Bill does not deal with wages at all. You cannot legislate in the present day for wages.

15,772. No; but do you not contemplate a probable reduction of wages as following upon a reduction of hours?—I will tell you my view about the wages. I contend first that the drivers and the conductors should have a subsistence wage, and what I mean by a subsistence wage is this: sufficient to keep them and their families in food and clothing and to put something away for a rainy day; at the present time they cannot do it. It costs the drivers and conductors 1s. every day for their dinners, they cannot go home, they are obliged to get all their meals, or very nearly all their meals, out of doors. For two rooms they are obliged to pay from 6s. to 7s. a week rent, and the expenses of one man alone would come to about 21s. or 22s., including the fines or rather the contributions which he pays to the company. Now, what is here left for the wife and the family and to the man himself after making those deductions? Therefore, so far as wages were concerned, I would begin by assuming that the men must have a reasonable wage to start with.

15,773. When you say "must have," you do not propose that it should be enforced by law, I suppose?—I do not, but I would enforce it in this way: So far as the trams and buses are concerned, the public at the present moment do not wish to travel the long distances as cheaply as they do now. The long distance penny fares I am dealing with now, and they were brought

Earl of Derby—continued.

about by the cut-throat competition of the London General Omnibus Company with the London Road Car Company. The London Road Car Company very properly—and I think credit is due to the company for doing it—initiated a great many reforms in the management of the omnibus traffic of the metropolis; they started the penny fares for short and reasonable distances. The London General Omnibus Company then said we will run these people off the road, and they tried to run them off the road. They extended the penny distance to about twice the length they ought naturally to have been, and although they have endeavoured to come to some arrangement, I believe that they cannot work harmoniously together and the result is that the public travel too far for a penny and the men of course are obliged to suffer in consequence and not to receive the wages they ought to. I believe I am interpreting the sentiments of the majority of those who travel by omnibus, when I say that they do regard the very long distance penny fares as being far too cheap, and they think that if they would only add another penny for the long distances, that would bring a revenue to both companies which would not only leave a reasonable dividend for the companies, but which would enable the companies to pay their men decent wages and give them reasonable hours.

15,774. But if the companies thought that the public was willing to consent to that I presume they would have no interest in opposing it?—They have. I will tell you how. The London General Omnibus Company is controlled partly by foreigners and partly by English people. It was originally a French Company, and there are a great many French shareholders at the present time, and the Frenchmen do not care a rap about overworking and sweating the English employes as much as they possibly can. Their policy from the beginning has been to extinguish all competition. They have tried to extinguish small companies and large companies, and they have been fighting the London Road Car Company now ever since it started, and they have on several occasions very nearly, I believe, driven them into bankruptcy. If they had succeeded what would have been the result? The fares would have gone back to the old price, there would have been no 1d. fares, in all probability they would have been 2d. and 3d. instead of 1d. and 2d., and the public would have suffered. I know as a matter of fact that during the recent strike there was an attempt made to effect some kind of working arrangement between the two companies so that they might increase the 1d. fares to 2d. for the long distances, and thus benefit the men and keep up the wages, and give them shorter hours, but the London General Omnibus Company have persistently refused to make any arrangement with the London Road Car Company. Therefore it is, I contend, to the pecuniary interest of the London General Omnibus Company to extinguish all opposition if they possibly can, and then municipalize the streets of London and

[10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

exploit the public for the benefit of their shareholders. That is their policy.

15,775. I understand you to suggest that the municipal authorities should intervene and take this into their own hands?—Yes, I do. I sent copies of my proposition on this matter to Sir John Lubbock, and to every member of the county council last year. I will hand in a copy to your Lordship. (See Appendix 110.) It is unnecessary to go into that in detail, but I suggest that the county council should buy up the whole of the tram lines and the rolling stock, and lease them out to companies who should be under their control, and the control of the men as well. I would give the workmen certain seats on the board, in order that they might attend to the practical management of the company. After paying the interest upon the capital, 3½ per cent. or from 3 to 3½ per cent., I would divide the profits between the ratepayers and the men. That is being done with admirable effect in Huddersfield.

15,776. Assuming that there are not profits but losses, I suppose the losses would fall exclusively on the rates?—That is a very delicate point, but there ought not to be any losses, because the public ought to pay, and would pay, a sufficient sum to enable the company to pay the interest upon the capital and their wages. I contend that the interests of humanity come first, before everything else, the interests of human flesh and blood, and if we find that it is necessary to increase the fares we ought to do so, in order to see that the men who work this traffic, and who produce the returns, are properly paid. This is not a question, of course, in which foreign competition is involved; it cannot interfere with our foreign trade in any way. It is merely making our fellow creatures comfortable, and erecting a standard in the metropolis which might very profitably be followed by the whole of the municipal authorities of the country.

15,777. As you put it the men are in the first place to have certain advantages secured to them under all circumstances, in the next place the public are to have locomotion reasonably cheap, and then if there is a profit I presume it is to go still farther to cheapen the fares, and if there is a loss it is to fall upon the ratepayers?—It is, but I do not assume a loss. You assume a loss when, under proper management, there ought not to be a loss at all. How can there be? If it were a question of manufacturing anything it would be an entirely different matter, but there cannot be a loss unless there is bad management, and if there is bad management the ratepayers are responsible, and if the ratepayers had to pay they ought to pay because they use the streets themselves. It is the duty of the ratepayers, first to pay the working men a reasonable wage, and give them reasonable hours.

15,778. And, if in consequence of raising the fares the traffic falls off, who is to suffer?—If the traffic falls off the expenditure would fall off the number of buses would be diminished.

Earl of Derby—continued.

15,779. But you are supposing the existing businesses to have been bought up at a settled price?—At a fair and reasonable price. I would not pay them an extravagant price. I should apply the principle which is being applied now to the purchase of the tramways.

15,780. Is there anything else you wish to bring before us?—I should like to mention to the Commissioners that it is supposed that these long hours being worked in the open air conduces to the health of the men. There is no doubt it is very healthy, so far as the air is concerned, to sit upon the box seat and drive, but if the inconveniences are considered it is extremely unhealthy to sit up there 15 or 16 hours a day, with very little leisure, and exposed to the inclemency, for instance, of such weather as we have to-day, and for the conductor to stand the whole of the day, and run up and down as he has to do for 15 and 16 hours a day, very often with his fingers so numbed and cold that he can scarcely handle the penne that he is receiving from the public. All these incidents are extremely unhealthy and produce diseases of different kinds, as medical men from the different hospitals can testify. Then their meals—in many instances they are obliged to eat their meals upon the trams and upon the buses. There is no regular place for them to meet in at the end of their journeys; they are obliged to go into the public-houses and get their meals there, or they are obliged to sit upon the box seat or inside their buses. Now I would suggest that the municipal authorities ought, in conjunction with the companies, to provide some shelters where the men could go for the purpose of taking their food and resting at the end of their journeys. If that were done it would be a very great benefit to them. Then I ought to point out, also, that the ticket inspectors receive 2l. a week and work eight hours a day. Then being obliged to take out a licence and to pay 5s. for it is a hardship upon men who receive such a comparatively small sum as these men do; then they have no holidays, and they work on the majority of Sundays.

15,781. Who are these ticket inspectors that you speak of?—The ticket inspectors are employed by the company in order to go round and examine the tickets, just the same as a ticket inspector of a railway company for instance. I am pointing out of course the difference between a ticket inspector, and a driver, and a conductor; they only work their inspectors eight hours a day in order to give them a superior position, I suppose, and create a distinction between the different classes of men, instead of making them all work harmoniously together by the ties of interest and affection—that is what it ought to be.

15,782. A ticket inspector, I presume, is a check, is he not, upon the driver and upon the conductor?—I am not objecting of course to a check, but the check I should prefer, instead of being a check by the way of an inspector, would be interesting the men themselves in their work,

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

and then no check would be necessary. I should just like to point out to the Commissioners with regard to Sunday labour, that it is contended that the men can get a Sunday off when they want it, but that as a rule the men work the majority of the Sundays, and Sundays very often, and holidays, are the hardest days, and they get no extra pay for the holidays or the busy days. Then they are obliged to give three days' notice if they want the Sunday off. Then, very often, they are discharged very capriciously. Of course, I am in favour of maintaining discipline; it is very necessary to maintain discipline, and to see that men do their duty, but I believe honest, industrious men, such as the majority of the London 'bus men are, would prefer to have a week's notice instead of being discharged at a moment's notice by the companies. An inspector or a manager may at any time find fault capriciously with a man, and he is discharged at a moment's notice. That is extremely unfair, because if you take the majority of occupations throughout the country they get a week, and in some instances 14 days' notice. Then I would point out also to the Commissioners that we are not dealing with men without character. It is assumed by some that these 'bus and tram men are nonentities, as it were, and lack the ordinary intelligence of the artisan and mechanic. I admit of course that there is a difference, but these men are obliged to prove that they have good characters before they are employed. Then I should like to give you the aggregate hours worked by the men. It is all very well to say 12 hours a day, but the tram and 'bus men are now working actually on and off from 80 to 90 hours per week, and sometimes up to 95 hours per week.

15,783. Then according to your statement they have not gained much by the strike of last year?—They have not. It would have been otherwise if the company had kept their contract, which I hope they will be obliged to keep, because the men are extremely dissatisfied. Then I should like to point out also the wage, for the from 80 to 95 hours comes to about only 6d. an hour for the drivers, and for the conductors it comes in the best instances to about 4½d. to 5d. an hour. Therefore there is no doubt that the wages are extremely low, and the hours are abominably long. I ought to mention that an attempt is being made now by a few of the men to start co-operative 'buses. I have nothing whatever to do with that myself, but I think it is a very laudable attempt, and that the working men ought to encourage it by travelling in the 'buses, because the men would then realise the responsibility of management, and show their capacity for helping to conduct the traffic of the metropolis.

Mr. Tait.

15,784. You spoke of some unions which had been in existence four or five years ago, were you in connexion with them?—No, I merely spoke at one of their meetings down at the East End.

U 73739.

Mr. Tait—continued.

15,785. Did the Unions at that time do any good?—Very little indeed, they obtained a few concessions, but as soon as the Unions ceased to act energetically, the concessions were revoked at once.

15,786. Do I take it that your connexion with the various 'bus men's unions, perhaps the present one, or the one in existence four or five years ago, was from your professional standpoint?—No, it was entirely disinterested. It has cost me a very large sum of money to go into it.

15,787. Then I may take it that your evidence to-day cannot be taken to be as representing the 'bus men, but rather as the evidence of one who has taken an interest in 'bus men?—I give evidence, because if the men were brought here to give evidence, they would be spotted by the companies, and discharged if they spoke the truth.

15,788. My point is, that you to-day have not been sent by any representative 'bus men, or association of 'bus men, but rather that you have volunteered evidence for the purpose of giving your experience of 'bus life?—That is so. I received a summons to attend here, and I am here, and I do not represent any union.

Earl of Derby.

15,789. I beg your pardon for interfering but in this pamphlet you have handed to me, you are spoken of as president of the Tram and 'Bus Union?—Yes, that was a Union which ceased to exist as soon as the men themselves formed a new union. I ought to tell you that that was really a very small society, and that the men joined it in very small numbers indeed; in fact they paid very little towards its maintenance. I took the matter up from the point of view of taking an interest in the short hours' movement for several years. I ought to say that I do not represent any union, nor am I connected with any union of tram or 'bus men officially. I ought also to say that I think the men ought to be here to speak for themselves, and I should be very glad if they could be called, but unfortunately, as soon as ever they take a prominent part they are spotted and marked by the companies. There is no doubt that I represent the sentiments of the majority of the men, but there are 'bus men and tram men here, such as Mr. Atkinson and Mr. Bowbrick, who are connected with the new Union established by the London Trades Council. I think great credit is due to them for having at last established the Union; it ought to have been done years ago.

Mr. Tait.

15,790. Now you said that you did not appear here as a representative, and you also said that you had been summoned here, and that you did not volunteer?—No, I said that I had been summoned—in pursuance of a previous communication certainly.

15,791. In which you asked to give evidence?—What date?

S 2

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

15,792. I have a letter here addressed to the secretary of the Commission, dated 6th May 1891?—Yes, that is quite right.

15,793. There you make application that you should be heard?—Certainly. I was requested at that time to do it.

15,794. And at the finish of the letter there is this paragraph: "I may add that I am connected officially with the Tram and 'Bus Men's Union, " and also with the Shop Assistants"?—That is quite right. So I was then, but since that time, after this new union was started by the London Trades Council, I had nothing whatever to do with it. I thought it very much better to leave the management in the hands of the men themselves; that is the proper thing; the 'bus and tram men should manage their own affairs. I merely take the same interest in the tram and 'bus men as Mr. Plimsoll does in the sailors.

15,795. You spoke of there being 150,000 tram and 'bus men and others connected with the trams and 'buses in the country; have you any data for the statement?—It is a generalisation.

15,796. Now, dealing with the question of the tramway men and their average hours, has there been any agreement between the tramway company and their servants as to the specified working day?—Yes, I believe arrangements have been entered into from time to time.

15,797. And your contention is that the tramways in future shall be taken over by the municipal authorities?—Yes.

15,798. Similarly to Huddersfield?—Yes.

15,799. Why would you ask the municipality to take over the tramways, and then lease them to another company?—Or work them themselves; it is not necessary that they should lease them to a company; they could work them themselves.

15,800. You suggested that they should be leased to a company?—Yes. I think probably one course is as good as the other, either working them themselves or leasing them.

15,801. There would not be so much benefit to the municipality or to the ratepayers generally in leasing them as there could be by their holding them themselves and working them similar to Huddersfield?—No, there could not; I quite agree with you. I think probably the local authorities working them themselves would be the most profitable.

15,802. Have you any experience outside of Huddersfield as to the municipal authorities working tramways?—There is the Glasgow one; they work their men eight hours a day. They lease them, of course.

15,803. They are leased, but they do not control the hours of the men?—I will read you something in connexion with that. The Glasgow Town Council inserted the following stipulation in its last lease: "Only such persons as can satisfy the magistrates' committee that they have a thorough knowledge of the city and the duties of car conductor shall be licensed as such; the working day of conductors and drivers shall not exceed an average of 10 hours; the conductors of cars shall be pro-

Mr. Tait—continued.

vided with proper uniform, consisting of tunic, "trowsers, and cap; and no conductor shall be permitted to be on duty without uniform."

15,804. What are you quoting from?—I am quoting from a resolution which has been passed by the town council.

15,805. What authority are you quoting from?—I am quoting from a statement made by Mr. Sidney Webb.

15,806. I wish it were correct that the Glasgow men had a 10 hour day, I assure you; but I know it is the opposite to that. Certainly there was a proposal on these lines submitted to the tramways company, but they have not accepted it, and the result is that at the end of the present lease the municipal authority of Glasgow will take over the working of the tramways themselves.

Mr. Bolton.

I think this should be put right. The witness has quoted this as being from the last lease; now, as far as my knowledge goes, there has only been one lease, and this that he has read is not a lease, but a proposed lease, which has never been accepted.

The Witness.

That is for the 10 hours' day.

Mr. Tait.

And the other conditions.

The Witness.

I see, but I take it, of course, that they will not lease unless they do get the 10 hours' day inserted.

Mr. Tait.

15,807. You are correct there. Now, regarding this levy which is made upon the men for accidents, is it deducted from their wages?—Yes, it is deducted from their wages; it varies in amount.

15,808. They do not get their wages into their hand, and afterwards go and pay this contribution?—No.

15,809. Has the company any special Act of Parliament for that?—Not that I am aware of; they cannot have.

15,810. You know then, professionally, that it is a violation of the Truck Act?—I regard it as a violation of the Truck Act certainly.

15,811. Have you suggested to the men as a professional man that they should take some steps with regard to stopping that deduction?—No, I do not think I have; but I have suggested that it should be abolished altogether.

15,812. Now regarding this strike, it was stated by some authorities that the strike of the 'bus men would not have taken place had it not been for the introduction of the ticket system. You have said that the men struck for reduced hours and better conditions. Do I take it that from your very intimate connexion with and knowledge of the men, you say that they did not

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

object to the ticket system as a system, but that they really struck for reduced hours?—I can only give you the facts. I was at several large meetings, and the resolutions passed were in favour of a 12 hours' day and certain conditions. The ticket system was never alluded to by me, and, as far as I remember, by very few, if any, of the speakers. I rather said that if the company wished to adopt the ticket system the men, of course, ought not to object to that alone providing they had reasonable hours and fair wages. I never encouraged the men to object to the ticket system. I believe that if the men had had reasonable hours and fair wages, although 20 ticket systems had been introduced, they would not have struck, if their hours had been reasonable and their wages fair.

15,813. There had been a continued agitation amongst the 'bus men previous to the strike, had there not?—I have been speaking at midnight meetings for the last four or five years.

15,814. It became more formidable in every way about three or four months previous to the strike, did it not?—Yes: owing to the French success.

15,815. The French tramway strike, do you refer to?—Yes. I think the men were inspired by the success of the French tramway strike.

15,816. Previous to the strike did you take any step to consult with the omnibus companies to prevent the cessation of work?—Yes; I did.

15,817. Did they hear you and discuss the matter with you?—They would not; they refused.

15,818. They refused your intervention?—Yes.

15,819. Then did you call in any of the trades or federated trades of the city to assist you?—What, for the strike?

15,820. Yes; to assist you in the strike. Did you call upon the assistance of any of the trades of London, or upon the federated trades of London, such as the Trades' Council?—What I did was, I think, a day before the strike, after the strike had been decided upon, I made arrangements with the London Trades' Council for them to help in the strike, and they did; they did help in the strike; several members of the London Trades' Council rendered very excellent services during the strike.

15,821. Now, had you a committee of the 'bus men previous to the strike taking place?—Yes.

15,822. They were elected by the 'bus men?—Certainly, by the 'bus and tram men. There is one of them in the room now who has been on the committee.

15,823. And when you approached the London Trades' Council what was their attitude towards them?—Friendly.

15,824. Did they appoint any of their numbers to assist them?—They did; I forget the number.

15,825. They appointed a committee?—Yes; they appointed a committee.

Mr. Tait—continued.

15,826. That was after you had decided upon this strike?—After the strike was decided upon, and the strike was practically on, of course.

15,827. And the London Trades' Council were not consulted in the matter until it began?—Nor until it was decided. There would have been a strike whether the London Trades' Council had helped or not. But the London Trades' Council, I ought to say, rendered very excellent service, and I have always expressed my admiration, of course, for the energy that they displayed in the matter. Now they are organising the men, and I think they are the proper people to organise. I do not want to interfere with organisation at all. I am very glad to help them as an outsider, but as trades unionists they must help themselves just the same as I do. As a member of the Bar, I belong to a trades union.

15,828. Now, when the Trades' Council appointed their committee it would be with a view of their acting along with you and your committee for the purpose of carrying on the strike, would it not?—No, but it was with the view to help, of course.

15,829. Certainly, to assist your committee?—Yes.

15,830. And yourself?—Yes.

15,831. Now, during the first two or three days of the strike, if I remember right, overtures were made by very many people, yourself amongst the number, to bring it to a conclusion?—What overtures?

15,832. That is, that gentlemen of position in London were called in or asked to intervene?—Gentlemen of position in London did intervene, but I never asked anyone to intervene.

15,833. I am not saying that you did, but I said it was a fact that gentlemen in London did try to bring the strike to a conclusion?—I believe they did towards the end.

15,834. Now who settled the strike?—The men settled the strike themselves, of course.

15,835. At the commencement of the proceedings you read to us some agreement, signed by the chairmen of two of the large companies, as to the condition of work?—Yes.

15,836. Who drew that up?—I cannot tell you, I am sure.

15,837. Were the men not consulted?—This is a document from the companies.

15,838. But was there no document signed or agreed upon by the leaders of the strike and the companies as a settlement?—There was only one leader, and I was the leader.

15,839. Was there any agreement between you and the tramway companies or omnibus companies as to the terms of the settlement, any signed agreement?—The correspondence was placed before the public at the time—every letter in connexion with it was placed before the public.

15,840. Yes, but that is not answering my question.—Do you mean a contract?

15,841. I want to know whether or not there was an agreement between the companies and you as the leader of the men. You have com-

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

plained here that the companies have broken their agreement?—Yes, certainly.

15,842. Now I want to know what was the agreement which they have broken?—I have read the agreement.

15,843. What I want now to know is whether the men were consulted before the settlement of the strike as to the terms of the agreement?—I quite follow you. After the letter was written embodying those terms a meeting was held; they were submitted to the men and the men passed a resolution ending the strike after hearing the letter read.

15,844. They heard the letter read?—Yes; and in consequence of hearing the letter read from the company embodying those terms, the men passed a resolution ending the strike and resolving to go back to work.

15,845. But there was no agreement signed further than just simply a communication?—Of course, it is quite a sufficient agreement if the companies sign a letter.

15,846. Just let me press this question a little further. From what company did you receive the communication?—From the London General and the London Road Car Companies.

15,847. From both of them?—Yes, from both.

15,848. The terms of the communications were similar?—Yes.

15,849. Therefore your complaints are justified if they are broken?—Quite.

15,850. What cost, might I ask you, was the London strike to the bus men?—I asked Mr. Shipton to appoint a finance committee, and they received the subscriptions and paid the moneys, with the exception of three or four items which were sent to me direct.

15,851. But you cannot give me an idea of the cost of the strike?—I am afraid that I cannot. I have not seen a balance sheet yet. I have never seen a balance sheet, and I cannot tell you exactly what the amount is.

15,852. Were you a member of the finance committee?—No, I was not. I had nothing to do with it.

15,853. Nothing at all to do with it?—No; it was quite an independent committee appointed by Mr. George Shipton—well, by Mr. George Shipton, I suppose. I approved of the names, I suppose, but I do not remember now.

15,854. But the London Trades' Council have put out their balance sheet for the bus strike?—They have never sent me one.

15,855. Then you cannot tell us the estimated loss to the companies?—To the companies?

15,856. Yes, I want to know what it was on both sides?—I thought you meant the cost to the men.

15,857. So I did. I asked you that and you could not tell me?—No, I cannot tell you.

15,858. Now I ask you the other?—I cannot tell you. The loss, of course, to the men has been very considerable, there is no doubt.

15,859. Now, as soon as the strike finished, or during the running of the strike, did the men join their Union?—When the strike was declared I ought to tell you there were very few mem-

Mr. Tait—continued.

bers of the Union, very few, and they joined, I believe, during the course of the strike, but when the strike was ordered it was ordered for both union and non-union men to come out. The fact was they were all united in sympathy, but there were very few union men at the time.

15,860. But during the running of the strike did the men join their Union?—I cannot say. I cannot tell you about these details at all; they were left in the hands of the committee and the secretary.

15,861. Then can you tell me if after the strike the men still retained their connexion with the Union?—I will tell you. Several men went to see the London Trades' Council, and I advised the men to form a union under the auspices of the London Trades' Council. It appears they had an interview with the Trades Council, but they could not come to any arrangement, and eventually it was taken up by Mr. Hammill and several other men interested in it, and they formed a new union, I suppose about a month afterwards, and now, I believe—I do not know, of course, their numbers—that they are going on very satisfactorily.

15,862. Did you take any steps after the strike the same as you did before the strike to keep the men in their Union, that is, did you look after their organisation and assist them as much as lay in your power?—No, I did not. I went away then. I went abroad.

15,863. Therefore the men would be left practically under the control of the committee which had been appointed by the Trades' Council?—Absolutely. I was very glad for them to be so, certainly—they are the proper people—trades unionists are the proper people to look after the men, and I am very glad they took it up.

15,864. I have not seen your Bill which you have suggested regarding a 12 hours' day?—I shall be very glad to send you a copy (*see Appendix 111*).

15,865. Do I take it that you wish the men to work 12 hours?—No, 10 hours.

15,866. When you mentioned 12 hours a day, it means that allowing for meal hours you would bring the working day to 10?—Yes, two hours for meals.

15,867. In answer to Lord Derby you said that while you should ask Parliament to regulate the hours, you had not considered, I think you said, the question as to whether or not Parliament should interfere with wages?—Yes.

15,868. In drafting your Bill, did not the possibility of such being done occur to you?—No. I think it is the duty of trades unions to attend to the wages so long as the hours are reasonable, and the men by their trades unions can keep up the wages if they are united.

15,869. You think that if Parliament just simply regulates the hours the men will regulate the wages?—The men by their unions.

15,870. Through their unions?—Yes.

15,871. You afterwards said that there was a feeling among the men that two shifts of eight hours would be better for themselves, and

10 March 1892.]

MR. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

also you thought it would be an advantage to the company?—Yes.

15,872. Now, if it is the feeling of the men that they require an eight hours' day, your Bill of 12 hours or 10 hours cannot be in harmony with their opinion?—It is merely an instalment. To go from 16 hours a day down to eight at a stretch, of course, is a very great deal, and if we go by instalments it would be better. I should prefer the two shifts of eight hours myself, decidedly.

15,873. If there is sound reasoning for two shifts of eight hours you had better put the soundest reasoning before Parliament, should you not suggest an eight hours' day?—You mean make an eight hours' Bill instead of a 10 hours' Bill?

15,874. Yes?—I should have no objection to that at all.

15,875. You have suggested that if municipal authorities take over tramway lines the profit should be divided between the *employés* and the ratepayers. What is your reason for saying that after a man receives the trades union rate of wages, he being an *employé* of the community, has a right to have a profit on his employment at the general expense of the ratepayers?—I made that assertion based upon the statement in this pamphlet with regard to the county councillors leasing the tramways, and then after 3½ per cent. being paid, any surplus profit I should give partly in relief of the rates and partly to the men.

15,876. But why not wholly give the profit to those to whom the concern belongs? What right have the *employés* of the tramway, because they are simply tramway *employés*, to participate in the profit of their employment more than I have, who may be an engineer, or a railway servant, and a citizen of the same city?—I think it is sound policy always to interest workmen in the various departments in which they are engaged. They ought to participate in the advantages which are derived from their occupation, and if they know that they derive an interest from the advantages, of course it identifies them more closely with the interests of the community as well as of themselves, and as to the wages, although the wages are trades union wages, yet at the same time they are not exorbitant in any calling of life—

15,877. I am not saying they are?—Therefore, although a man gets trades union wages, if he was so identified with his calling as to derive additional profit, I think it is only fair that there should be a species of co-operation between the employer or the man who finds the money and the men who do the work.

15,878. Then you are prepared to go further than just simply dividing the municipal profit; you are prepared to go the full extent of saying that all employers of labour should divide the profit between themselves and their *employés*?—All employers of labour should interest their *employés* in the work in which they are engaged.

15,879. I do not think there are very many *employés* who will put any barrier in the way

Mr. Tait—continued.

of that being done, but can you devise a method whereby this Commission could suggest to the employers of the country such a thing being put into operation?—I will give you an instance. I am connected myself with a paper-making company, and I am on the board of directors. I suggested to my brother directors quite recently—within the last two years certainly—that we should apportion a certain number of shares amongst the workmen, so that they might feel an equal interest with us in the management and the success of the undertaking; because, although a workman may be very pure minded and devoted to the interests of his employers, it is impossible for him to feel the same interest in a pure wage that he would feel in co-operating in the results of his labours. Therefore I made a proposition that a certain per-centage of the profits should be given to the workmen, in order to more closely identify them with the industry. I think that in all companies of that description it would be a very excellent suggestion and might very well be carried out.

15,880. I will come on to the question of co-operation again further on. Can you give us any reason why the company refused to put their men on ordinary hours, and yet give an eight hours' day to men who have scarcely any physical work to do but who have just simply to take supervision over the men?—Yes, I can give you this reason. The object of the companies—and this applies both to tram companies and omnibus companies—is to create a distinction, to create classes,—unnatural classes, artificial classes—amongst their *employés*, so that the inspector may feel himself to be a better man than the driver and be in a position to assert his authority, if possible. These artificial distinctions which are made by the companies are made in their own interests, and for the purpose of making one workman tyrannise over another workman, if disposed to do it, instead of identifying them all in one common object—in the interests of the company.

15,881. And in your opinion it will rather incense the relations between the companies and their *employés* from the fact that their foreman, so to speak, or inspectors have an eight hours' day while they are called upon to work from 12 to 16?—Undoubtedly. I am not objecting to the eight hours' day for the inspectors, but I think the other men ought to have the same.

15,882. Now what have you to suggest to the Commission for the purpose of preventing such strikes as the omnibus strike?—Arbitration would be a very excellent thing provided the employers would meet the workmen on equal terms; but, unfortunately, the companies will not meet their *employés* on equal terms. If six representative workmen and six persons representing the companies could sit round a table, and an umpire could be chosen by both parties, and the voting should be equal, I think in all probability that that would constitute a fair

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

Lord of arbitration, and the men would be quite willing to abide by a decision arrived at by a board of arbitration of that description. But the great remedy, I think, is by passing an Act of Parliament to prevent these companies from overworking their men.

15,883. I did not ask you when I was dealing with the strike, but I will do so now, whether there was any other person than you and your committee taken into consideration when the terms of the agreement were arrived at that is, were the Trades' Council committee, for instance, who were elected to work along with you, consulted?—No; I conducted the whole of the negotiations myself up to a certain point. I kept control during the whole of the time, and I kept control because it was my intention to do it, and because the men had given me full authority to act by resolution passed at all their meetings. At every meeting that was held a resolution was submitted, placing the whole of the power in my hands with regard to the strike, and resolving to obey my orders during the strike. I did not act autocratically. I acted constitutionally under the instructions, and in pursuance of resolutions passed by the men. One meeting particularly was a very large one, that was the meeting at Wilham Green, the first or second meeting, which passed a resolution which was subsequently acted upon. Therefore I take upon myself the whole of the responsibility. I did not consult the Trades' Council as to the negotiations. I wanted to keep it in my own hands. I did keep it in my own hands, and I intended to keep it in my own hands, but up to a certain point. When the terms were submitted by the companies they were read to a meeting of delegates, and they passed a resolution in favour of accepting the terms.

15,884. Was the then Lord Mayor of London in any way mixed up with the settlement?—One day, I forget the exact date, the Lord Mayor, Sir James Savory I think it was, wrote a postcard to me. It was sent to the Victoria Hall, and afterwards it was sent from the Victoria Hall to my chambers by Mr. Tom Mann, asking me to go and see him at the Mansion House. I went and saw him at the Mansion House, and that was the beginning of the intervention of the Lord Mayor.

15,885. How far did he proceed in further intervening?—He merely proceeded in endeavouring to get a settlement of the dispute.

15,886. Was he consulted as to the terms of settlement?—No, not at all; he had nothing to do with the terms of the settlement whatever. He was consulted of course. I have no doubt the companies instigated the Lord Mayor.

15,887. What?—In my opinion the companies instigated the Lord Mayor.

15,888. For the purpose of coming to a settlement?—Yes; because at that point we were at a dead lock.

15,889. Whilst the companies refused to negotiate with you as the accredited representative of the tram men and the 'bus men, yet your

Mr. Tait—continued.

opinion is that they ring up the Lord Mayor to do that which they refused to do with you?—That is my opinion, but I have no data.

15,890. I understand you are only expressing it as your opinion?—It is my opinion. I have no document or evidence except my opinion that they probably did that; but, of course, we had reached a point then at which intervention was advisable, there is no doubt about it.

Mr. Jesse Collings.

15,891. You said, with regard to the contract which Mr. Tait asked you about, that you considered the letters which you had received from the managers of the omnibus companies as being a contract?—Certainly.

15,892. From what you said, I think the terms of that contract have, since the cessation of the strike, been violated?—They have.

15,893. Have any representations been made to the directors of the omnibus companies?—They have.

15,894. On that head?—They have been made, or attempted to be made rather. I believe the companies have treated the representatives of the men rather with contempt since that time when they tried to obtain an interview. The Lord Mayor, I think, endeavoured to intervene in order to see that the terms were carried out according to the arrangement, and they wrote a letter to the Lord Mayor which was certainly far from being complimentary. They, on the other hand, told him to mind his own business, and they told the men to mind their own business, and they would have nothing whatever to do with them, or words to that effect. In other words they ignored the combination of the Union.

15,895. Has that correspondence been made public?—Yes, it has.

15,896. I understood that the Trades' Council was now acting for the men?—No; the position is this: After the strike it was felt that some complete organisation was necessary. Up to the time of the strike it had been more sentiment than organisation, and there were a few outside people assisting the men. You could not call it a trades union; it was not worthy of the name, of a trades union before the strike. Therefore after the strike it was felt—I felt with the men and with the members of the London Trades' Council, that some kind of complete organisation was necessary, and I met the London Trades' Council with a few of the men and asked the men to go and come to some arrangement with them so as to work under them. The few men who were introduced to the London Trades' Council apparently did not wish, for some reason or other, to work with them, but I think they acted wrongly. Subsequently the London Trades' Council convened a meeting, and eventually the omnibus men and tram men formed a committee, which is founded, I understand, upon a sound trades union basis, and is as it should be. That committee has now charge of the interests of the tram and 'bus men. I am not officially connected with it in any way.

10 March 1892.]

MR. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Jesse Collings—continued.

15,897. Has that committee made any representations to the bus directors calling attention in any definite manner to the violation of the contract which has been entered into?—I believe it has on several occasions.

15,898. Has that representation been published in any way?—I am sorry I cannot give you the details, but the secretary of the Union, Mr. Bowbrick, I understand, is going to be called before the Commission, and he will be able to tell you exactly what they have done with regard to that.

15,899. There is one question on your suggestion that the partial profits should be given to the men. Might I ask you what effect that would have on the trades unions?—I think the effect would be that they would still maintain their trades unions throughout the country, and they would probably become more important and influential than they are at the present time.

15,900. You do not think it would have the effect of destroying or improving the Unions?—I do not think so for one moment, because you generally find the best, the most enterprising, and the most capable men do belong to trades unions.

15,901. You said that the men were discharged at a moment's notice?—Yes.

15,902. What are the terms of engagement, by the week or by the day?—They are engaged by the day. That is what I was complaining of. I say it is unfair that they should be discharged at a moment's notice unless, of course, they have been doing anything very seriously wrong. What I complain of is that they are discharged at the caprice of the inspectors and men whose words are not absolutely reliable. I will give you an instance.

15,903. I do not want the instance, I simply want the fact. What you mean then by being discharged at a moment's notice is that they are discharged at a day's notice, with a day's pay?—No, they may take their money in at night and be discharged then.

15,904. Without any notice at all?—Yes, instantly.

15,905. Is that a legal proceeding?—It has been the custom for a very long time.

15,906. In summing up the hours worked you gave them as 95 hours per week for the men; what men did you include in that?—I should like to qualify that; I said from 80 to 90 hours and up to 95 hours.

15,907. What men did you refer to; how many?—I referred to the drivers, to the conductors, and to the horsekeepers.

15,908. Of the principal companies?—Yes.

15,909. You said that if these men came before the Commission to give evidence they would be spotted and marked by the companies if they tell the truth. What are your grounds for making such an assertion as that?—It may seem a very harsh thing to say. I do not say that the directors in every instance are to blame. Probably if the petty tyrannies which are exercised by the under officials became known to

Mr. Jesse Collings—continued.

some of the directors they would not allow such proceedings to take place. I have attended a great many midnight meetings, and in going up to the meetings I have seen inspectors stand at the street corner to watch the men pass, and, after the lapse of three or four days, some fault has been found with the men and they have been discharged. That is a result of the anxiety on the part of the minor officials to win promotion by apparently being zealous in the interests of the company against their fellow working men.

15,910. Yes, but do you not see the distinction between a man coming before a Commission, to use your words, to state the truth, and the case you name?—Scarcely. Supposing you summoned a man from a road upon which he was working 16 hours a day, and he stated all the harsh conditions of the labour on his road, he would be a marked man, and they would not discharge him ostensibly for coming to give evidence, but they would take an early opportunity of finding some fault with him, and allege that as a reason for discharging him, when really he would be discharged because he came here and gave evidence in a manly, straightforward, and independent manner.

15,911. They are in terror that that would be the case?—I am sorry to say they are. I have no interest one way or the other, but I want to be fair.

15,912. But you have no definite cases to support such a very definite charge as that?—I can bring you cases.

15,913. In reference to your proposal for the two shifts of eight hours each, would the meal times come out of the eight hours, or would they be extra?—It would be eight hours' work.

15,914. That would be practically a 10 hours' occupation then?—Eight hours' work it would be, I take it.

15,915. And the meals to come out of the eight hours?—That would be reducing it to six. I do not propose reducing it to six. I mean eight hours' work.

15,916. What particular legislation are the omnibus companies under now?—The omnibus companies are under the ordinary common law of the country, but the tramway companies, of course, are constituted by Acts of Parliament, and their property is protected. They, as you know, monopolise the streets, and there are certain regulations controlling and protecting their money and property in every way, but there is nothing but the common law which applies to the ordinary omnibus.

15,917. And you consider that the low fares, the penny fares which you refer to, are made up by practically sweating the men in order to pay a dividend; that is, the savings by long hours and low wages given to the men, compensate for the loss of income from the penny fares?—Certainly; I think the penny fares ought to be for short stages and not for the long ones. I would not abolish the penny fares.

15,918. Have you considered the possibility or the advisability of regulating the fares with regard to the omnibuses as is done in the case

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Jesse Collings—continued.

of cabs?—By the county council, do you mean?

15,919. By the same authority as regulates the cabs?—It never did occur to me, but it is a very excellent suggestion, and I think that it might very well be done by the county council. I never thought of it before, but I think it might very well be done.

15,920. With regard to your suggestion that the municipality should buy up the trams and omnibuses, are you aware whether the London municipality possesses any tramways at the present time?—They have passed a resolution to purchase the London Streets Tramway Company, and that, of course, will come into operation as soon as the lease expires.

15,921. Then is your suggestion that if they were to acquire the tramways and lease them out to the companies they might lease them out at a price that should pay interest on the purchase money?—Certainly.

15,922. And by that means they would avoid all the details of management and the fear of loss being made by the community?—Certainly.

15,923. And would you prefer that plan to the other suggestion of their taking the responsibility of actually working all the details of this great business?—I should regard it as a matter of expediency. If it were to be found in the interests of the community that the county council should work and administer the tramways and the buses themselves, I should certainly be in favour of that proposition. If the alternative proposition of leasing was found to be more in favour of the interests of the community, then I should be in favour of that.

15,924. Then, in your opinion, if the plan of leasing to the companies were adopted, and provisions put in to prevent overwork, would not that secure the object aimed at, and at the same time protect the ratepayers and the community from any possibility of loss?—Yes, it would.

15,925. In your opinion would that not simplify the matter and be the most practical way of doing it?—Certainly; that is in accordance with the suggestion I have made already in the pamphlet handed to the Commission.

15,926. You spoke of the appointment of the ticket inspectors and the arrangement for the short hours of work as being done in order to incense the men against one another, but have you any grounds for making such an assertion as that?—No; probably you did not quite understand me. Not in order to incense the men, but it does incense the men. Supposing you get a driver and a conductor working 16 hours a day, they see a man of equal capacity, and probably not equal capacity in many instances, coming round and inspecting them. I do not, of course, object to the inspection; supervision and discipline must be maintained in every department of industry; there is no doubt about that; but supposing an intelligent driver or conductor sees the man coming round, they say to themselves, "Oh! that man is only working eight hours

Mr. Jesse Collings—continued.

" a day, he is getting 2*l.* a week, and here am I " stuck on the box for 16 hours a day and " getting less wages."

15,927. Then I misunderstood you in supposing that you said it was done by the companies for that purpose?—No, not for that purpose, not intentionally; but the effect is that it does incense the men.

15,928. Do you yourself see any difference in the extent of responsibility between an inspector who has to look after the tickets and a driver on the bus?—The driver, I think, is the most responsible person.

15,929. I am speaking financially?—Financially I think the driver ought to be better paid and ought to be better treated.

15,930. I am speaking of the position of trust as regards the company. Do you see any difference between the position of an inspector of tickets and the driver on the bus?—No, I think they ought both equally to be bound by the interests of the company of course.

Professor Marshall.

15,931. I should like to ask you to explain more fully what you said about the terms on which the municipality, after it had bought up the tramways and the omnibus companies, should hire its men. You said something about starting with a subsistence wage. I think you said that at present they pay 7*s.* a week for dinner, 7*s.* for rooms, these expenses, including fines and rent, making 20*s.* to 21*s.*; and then you stopped short, you did not go any further. Would you explain that and add to it a little. How much do you allow for fines there?—I will tell you. I have got the details here. Rent of two rooms, not three (and of course a family ought to have more than two rooms), 6*s.* 6*d.* a week; dinner from home 1*s.* a day; tea 5*d.* a day; supper, when a man works a long day, 5*d.* (they are very moderate figures, these, of course); accident fund, 1*s.* a week; and then the drivers are obliged to provide for their gloves, their rugs, their whips, and their capes, and that altogether comes to about a guinea a week for two rooms, and includes nothing for the family, nothing for the clothing, nothing for education, and nothing for a reserve fund.

15,932. Then will you go on and say what you regard as a subsistence wage?—I think that the men ought to have certainly at the very least about 2*l.* a week; 2*l.* a week for six days' labour, six days' labour and reasonable hours.

15,933. Now, with regard to the hours of labour, there would be two shifts?—Yes, two shifts.

15,934. Some omnibuses run 16 hours a day?—Yes, they do.

15,935. But are not the times of running spaced out more in the early morning and in the night than in the busy times of the day?—I do not quite catch the idea.

15,936. Are there not longer intervals between successive omnibuses in the early morning and

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Professor Marshall—continued.

late at night than in the middle time of the day?—At some times they have short intervals and at other times long intervals.

15,937. Therefore there would not be nearly eight hours' work for the whole of two shifts of men. There would be, during the eight hours for which a man was put down, a good deal of time when his omnibus had not yet begun to run, or had ceased running?—No, but under proper management the eight hours' system could be adopted without any difficulty. It merely requires reducing to a system. It is chaotic at the present moment and ought to be reduced to a system. I could bring before the Commission, I should say, six men who would draft a system which would work satisfactorily for all concerned, and introduce the eight hours' day. That is a question, I think, of management and administration.

15,938. You are aware that it has been said it could not be done?—It has been said by persons who are interested in maintaining the old system.

15,939. Is it not then for those who think it can be done to show how?—Certainly, when we reach that point.

15,940. Why not at this stage?—If the Commission would like I should be very glad to draft a system which will show that the eight hours can be introduced without any difficulty at all.

15,941. I did not mean specially before the Commission, but why should it not have been worked out if it can be done?—For this reason: When men are working from 12 to 16 hours a day, it seems to be idle, until you come to close quarters, to draft a system of eight hours a day, until we know that it can be introduced without any difficulty. I admit of course it is a practical question and it might be done, and I shall certainly, as interested in the movement, give it my attention.

15,942. Taking it then that the wages are 2*l.* for six days' work, and that the hours are eight per day, and knowing also what we know of the character of the work done, how many persons do you think would be competitors for posts offering these advantages?—I think a very large number.

15,943. Do you think that perhaps 3,000,000 men would be willing to take employment on those terms?—3,000,000?

15,944. Yes?—Perhaps you have made a calculation. I have not, but I should certainly say that judging from the number of unemployed, there will be a very large number of applicants. But I hold that the number of unemployed ought not to be the medium through which the standard of hours and wages ought to be fixed.

15,945. I had not in view any unemployed. Do you not think there would be at least 3,000,000 men who would be willing to leave their present employment to get such work at such pay?—I think there would be a very large number, there is no doubt about it.

Professor Marshall—continued.

15,946. Have you considered what the comparatively highly educated clerk gets?—What class do you refer to?

15,947. The commercial clerk?—I think the commercial clerk is shamefully underpaid.

15,948. Do you see any reason for doubting that something like 3,000,000 men would be candidates for such posts?—Of course, if you tell me that you have made a calculation, I am willing to accept your word that 3,000,000 men would apply, but I would not pledge myself to saying more than that there would be a very large number of applicants, there is no doubt about it.

15,949. I am not expressing any opinion myself; what is your opinion?—I think you are exaggerating when you say 3,000,000.

15,950. Do you think that there are many people engaged in any industries that are not very highly skilled, that are getting as high wages?—I think that there are a great many people getting lower wages, but where we are dealing with a class of men and a monopoly conferred by the community, it is the duty of the county council, or we will say the Government of the country, the people, to erect a standard which private employers should follow as far as possible. I hold that we should erect a standard of comfort for the masses of the people, and not be governed by the plethora of labour that exists.

15,951. My questions are not directed towards throwing doubt upon your statement, but to the difficulty of selecting the fortunate 100,000, or whatever it may be, from the large number of 3,000,000, more or less, who might desire to have that employment?—The difficulty of selection? The tendency would be then for the most intelligent, the most industrious, and the best men to be employed, and the weak, the indolent, and the vicious, would go to the bottom, and the best men would come to the top and be employed.

15,952. I can hardly quite understand those phrases with regard to the work of an omnibus conductor?—Well, you cannot probably, because you are prejudiced with the views of the age in which we live.

15,953. That does not help me to understand it?—I will explain it in this way; supposing you had a wife and five or six children, and you were obliged to pay 6*s.* or 7*s.* a week rent for two rooms; you were obliged to go out early in the morning, and remain out for 14 and 15 and 16 hours a day; to pay away a guinea in the manner I have already described; to find that your children wanted decent clothing; that you had not a 5*l.* note in the bank; and that your condition altogether was one of degrading drudgery without any independence at all—when I call it degrading drudgery, any work is degrading that does not afford a man a sufficient means to live upon and to make himself comfortable, and to provide clothing and food for his family—I say supposing you were that man, I take it that you would not

10 March 1892.]

MR. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Professor Marshall—continued.

think 2*l.* a week too much under the circumstances.

15,954. I am not even indirectly expressing any opinion on that question; I am asking simply how these fortunate 100,000 men are to be selected from the 3,000,000, more or less, who might desire to obtain such posts?—Supposing we were sitting round a table and selecting the men, I should apply the ordinary principles of prudence and common sense to the selection. I should take the most intelligent, the most industrious, and the men likely to discharge their duties in the most efficient manner, and all the others of course would be obliged to seek employment elsewhere.

15,955. Do you not think that there might be a possibility that by opening a number of public posts with very light work requiring no skill, with very high pay, you would be opening the door to a greater amount of jobbery than has ever yet appeared in England?—I do not admit 2*l.* a week to be high pay. A man could save very little indeed out of 2*l.* a week for six days' work; therefore I cannot admit your premises that the pay is high.

15,956. Have you considered the skill required of an agricultural labourer who has to manage animals, his pay, his work, and compared them with what you propose?—Yes.

15,957. Would there be any reason for believing that any agricultural labourers would prefer their present position to such occupation as you are proposing to offer?—An agricultural labourer is not to be compared with a man who tools a pair of horses through the streets of London.

15,958. Is it not found that any man who can drive, very quickly learns to drive an omnibus?—You may drive probably along a country road, but when it comes to driving through Charing Cross, and Piccadilly Circus and Regent Circus, you will find an agricultural labourer will probably have a dozen collisions before reaching the termination.

15,959. Is this 2*l.* to apply to conductors as well as to drivers?—I say that there ought to be 2*l.* a week in my opinion. Of course you ask me to fix it rather arbitrarily without time to go into details, and to think. My contention was, and is, that a man ought to have sufficient to live upon, to clothe his wife and family according to the station in life in which he is placed, and to save money for a rainy day, to have a reserve fund, that is the beginning, that is the foundation of everything: whether it is 2*l.* a week, or whether it is a little more, that ought to be a *sine quâ non* with regard to employments which are not interfered with by foreign competition, and this is not.

15,960. I thought that this was the wage at which you said the county council, when it owned the tramways, should hire the men?—I did not presume of course to fix a rate of wages, because that would be dealt with by the authority itself. I was merely dealing with the hours; but in dealing with the wage about

Professor Marshall—continued.

which I was asked, I gave the opinion that the wage ought to be the subsistence wage, and then I was endeavouring to give you a definition of my subsistence wage.

15,961. You said that the working of tramways by a municipality was different from the working of factories, because there could not, in the former case, be a loss?—Yes.

15,962. What reason have you for that opinion?—Because the council, being the authority controlling the management and administration of the tramways, could fix the rate at which the public could travel, so as to afford a return for the capital invested and the men a reasonable wage.

15,963. Is it certain that they could obtain largely increased net receipts by raising the fares?—I am quite sure it is certain in the metropolis upon the long distance fares; I am quite sure that there could be an immediate augmentation of the revenues of the two companies if they only increased the penny fares to twopence for the long distances, keeping the penny fares for the short stages.

15,964. Is it not said that very few people avail themselves of the power of riding those long distances?—Yes, it is said so; there is no doubt about that.

15,965. Have you any reason to believe that this change would add anything considerable to the revenues?—I have.

15,966. Have there not been many cases of tramway companies with a practical monopoly and the power of fixing their own fares who have failed? Have not bankruptcies been as common among tramway companies as in most other classes of business?—Not so common; not by any means so common.

15,967. Still, they can occur?—Yes, they can occur through bad management.

15,968. There is one small point; you said that when a new omnibus is put on by a private company the General Omnibus Company puts on a special omnibus in front and another behind, in order to drive it off the roads?—Yes.

15,969. Has the legality of that been tested?—I do not think it has, but I believe it will be.

15,970. Has the practice been carried on very extensively?—I think it has very extensively with regard to small owners and small companies starting in opposition to the two large companies.

15,971. Can you tell me why it has not been tested legally all this time?—Because it is extremely difficult for a poor man to bring an action against a rich company. The expense of going to law, and the delay and the uncertainty about it, are so great that the rich company is sure to win against the poor company or the poor man.

Earl of Derby.

15,972. I did not quite understand you in regard to your proposal that the county council or the municipal authority, whatever it may be, should take over the working of the 'buses. I

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

think you did not confine it to trams, did you?—No, 'buses and trams.

15,973. In that case would you prohibit any private person from setting up a 'bus; would you establish it as a monopoly?—I think the county council, as representing the people, ought to control the streets of London; they pay for their repair, and I think they ought to control the streets of London. Of course, the further question that you put would mean that the people themselves should say whether there should be competition or not. It would not be for me to say; it is for the county council to say whether they will permit other companies to compete with them or not.

15,974. The way I put it is this: If you forbid all private persons to compete, you are establishing a very strict monopoly, liable to the abuse which all monopolies are liable to. If you do not establish that monopoly, it is quite clear that your highly paid system of 'buses will be driven off the road by the competition of people who pay less?—I see your point, but in answer to that I would say that the county council would act in the interests of the ratepayers, and that the ratepayers are the people who control the government of the metropolis. If the ratepayers wish to control the traffic of the metropolis, they ought to do it.

15,975. Controlling the traffic might go as far as the exclusion of private carriages from the streets?—I think we are a nation of common sense. I am an Englishman, and I believe my fellow citizens at all events are in favour of doing what is right and fair and just. We do not go to such extremes in England as prohibiting private carriages. I think the fund of common sense which exists in the minds of the majority of the working men would prevent them from doing an act of injustice. All they want is something fair and just as between man and man.

15,976. Very possibly. I only point out the logical results to which your theory leads?—I rather dissent from your Lordship's view of it.

Mr. Bolton.

15,977. Do you propose, in connexion with the county council taking the 'buses, that they should run them themselves or let them out to somebody else?—My proposition was that the county council should purchase the lines and purchase the rolling stock.

15,978. Of the—?—Of the omnibus companies, and should lease them out to a body managed partly by the members of the county council, and partly by the men, and partly by the people providing the capital. That was my proposition, but there was a question put to me by another Commissioner, asking me whether I should approve of the county council working and managing and administering the omnibuses and trams themselves. I said it was a question, of course, of expediency. If one course proved more beneficial to the public than the other naturally I should adopt that course.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

15,979. By the people providing the capital, do you mean the ratepayers providing the capital?—Of course, but then they would want capital, you see, beyond the rolling stock.

15,980. Yes, and where are they to get that?—They must get that—

15,981. From the general public?—Yes.

15,982. Privately?—Yes.

15,983. Assume they do not, because you spoke of an interest of 3½ per cent.—3½ per cent. upon the money invested in the roads and in the omnibuses—the rolling stock.

15,984. Then as to the balance, this other money?—Of course you would have to give a little more to get the balance, there is no doubt about it.

15,985. And would you give as much as would bring the money?—Yes.

15,986. Whatever it was?—Yes.

15,987. You spoke of men who passed a certain point being watched and discharged?—Yes.

15,988. Do you assert that all of them were discharged?—No, I do not. What I complain of is the general attitude of unfriendliness adopted by the companies towards their men. That is a general statement. Now to come to particulars. When I have been going to a mid-night meeting, I have seen men, inspectors, standing at street corners in order to take the names of the men down, and I know, as a matter of fact, that a certain number of the men who were seen to go to the meeting were discharged, not all of the men, of course.

15,989. Not all?—Not all.

15,990. Do you know that they were discharged because they went to this meeting?—The companies say they were not discharged because they went to the meeting, but I put it to you, is it not very suspicious—

15,991. No, do not put it to me?—I must. I put it to you, is it not a very suspicious circumstance, when you find an inspector watching men go to a meeting, and several of these men are discharged within a reasonable time upon a paltry pretext? Of course I do not defend any act of illegality. I do not defend irregularity. There must be discipline. I quite agree with discipline. I am not here to defend anything which is contrary to the good management of a corporation.

15,992. Then the only reason you have for stating that in your opinion men who take some prominent position, such as going to a meeting of dissatisfied 'bus drivers or 'bus guards, are discharged is that it is a natural suspicion that seeing they did go, and were known to go, and were discharged afterwards, they were discharged for that cause?—No. I go further. I can adduce instances where men have been discharged, and I have got all the evidence which is available to prove that they could not have been discharged for any other reason or purpose whatever.

15,993. Do you give those reasons here?—Since the strike I know a very large number have been discharged, ostensibly for one reason,

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

whereas in all probability it has been for another reason, and, of course, the men have no redress.

15,994. Then a reason was given for their discharge by their employers?—Yes.

15,995. And your assertion is that that reason was false?—My assertion is that that reason was a pretext.

15,996. It comes to the same thing?—It was a pretext.

15,997. You spoke, I think, of the possible result, or the certain result, of an advance in fares?—Yes.

15,998. What certainty have you on that point?—As to the—

15,999. You said that an advance in fares would produce a sufficient increase of revenue to enable the companies to pay this advanced wage which you advocate, and to reduce the hours?—To reduce the hours, yes.

16,000. And advance the wages, I think; you do not propose that these men should be reduced in wages in proportion to the number of hours taken off their labour?—As you may determine. As a man who takes an interest in these social questions I look first to the health of the people, and I think the conditions ought to be healthy and sufficient. As to the wages, there is no doubt the fares ought to be raised, so as to afford the men a means of living comfortably and to provide something as a reserve fund.

16,001. You have stated that the raising of the fares would increase the receipts of the companies?—Yes, I think that is a matter of course.

16,002. Is it a matter of course?—I think it is.

16,003. From what knowledge do you speak?—During the time the fares were high, the London General Omnibus Company paid dividends of 12½ per cent., 10 per cent., 12½ per cent., 11 per cent., and 10 per cent., and the reserve fund was 172,000*l*. That came out of the fares as they existed then.

16,004. That fact, I think, led to a considerable amount of increased competition?—Yes, it did.

16,005. Then with the increased competition do you think that the same results would still follow; would not the increased competition reduce the earnings of the company to which you refer?—There is no doubt it has done so; it has reduced them very considerably.

16,006. Therefore, why do you say that an advance of fares now would restore that company to the same position as they held before?—Because I am dealing with a proposition to place the management of the trams and buses in the hands of the local authority. I am dealing with that proposition, and I would allow the county council, as suggested by one of the Commissioners, to fix the rate at which people could travel just the same as they fix the rates for hackney carriages.

16,007. I think you suggested that a remedy which might be applied by the existing com-

Mr. Bolton—continued.

panies to produce the result you desire was to advance the fares?—Yes, that is so.

16,008. Now I want to know what is your reason for stating that an advance of fares would so increase the revenue?—Because the penny fares now are so long, the distances are so great, that if they were to cut them down to the short penny stages at which they originally stood when they were first introduced, that would afford a sufficient revenue to enable them to deal very much better with the men than they do now. I cannot give them to you now, but I can give you, if you wish, figures proving the assertion I make. I will adduce, though, some little evidence in support of what I say. The two companies, the London General and the London Road Car, have been attempting to come to some working arrangement by which the penny fares should be increased for the long distances; they did it for the purpose of increasing their revenue and enabling them to comply with the men's wishes, by shortening their hours and increasing their wages.

16,009. I think you have already admitted to Professor Marshall that a very small proportion of the passengers travel the long distances?—I would not make that assertion. I did not go quite so far as that, I think. It is admitted, both by the companies and by the men who attend to the revenue of the companies, that if the long penny fares were cut down to the short stages that would afford a considerable increase of revenue.

16,010. Then you disagree with the general opinion that very few travel the long distances?—I am not in a position, I am afraid, to give you the exact numbers.

16,011. You recommended a court of arbitration for the settlement of disputes, did you not?—Yes.

16,012. How are you to compel observance of the decisions of the court?—I admit that is one of the difficult questions, but if a Bill could be passed which was approved of by the men and by the employers, I believe both would allow Parliament to give the sanction of law to the decisions of the court of arbitration so that it should be binding upon both.

16,013. You would compel the man to work after having once accepted the wage?—After having once accepted the wage I would make a contract with him.

16,014. You would make him in effect a slave?—I think if a man makes a contract he must abide by it, there is no doubt about that. If the men willingly make a contract for a certain wage and certain hours they must abide by it. I do not dogmatise upon this matter at all. You put the question; of course it is quite new to me the way you put it, but I think a Bill might be framed very well which would be agreeable to both men and employers.

16,015. Which would compel the men to remain?—Which would compel the men to obey a contract they had made, certainly.

16,016. You made a complaint, I think, in answer to Mr. Tait, that when you offered to

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

intervene in the case of the strike the employers would have nothing to do with you?—Nothing.

16,017. At that time there was no Union, or only a very small one?—There was the nucleus of an agitation which had been carried on for years.

16,018. And you represented the nucleus?—I represented the public sentiment upon the question. I was the only person at that time. Of course, I do not wish for one moment to take, in fact, it is my duty not to take, any credit for the work of other people. This movement has been carried on by different people. I happened to be on the stage at the time the strike took place, but such people as Mrs. Reaney, as Mr. Charrington, as Lord Meath, and innumerable other social reformers and philanthropists have helped the movement for years; I am merely one of them. Therefore, I take it, that I represented the public sentiment, and was supported by the men. I ought to tell you this. Before applying to the company, resolutions were passed by thousands of men asking me to see the company in order to endeavour to avert a strike.

16,019. But that was your only credential—that you represented sentiment?—No, I represented heads, noses.

16,020. Whose names were unknown?—Not at all. There was a very large number—I should say 10,000 at that time—I represented certainly 10,000 at the time I tried to see the company.

16,021. That is to say there were 10,000 at a meeting, or a certain number of thousands, who accepted resolutions, and upon the strength of that you called yourself their representative?—They appointed me their representative.

16,022. And the masters did not think that appointment sufficient to warrant them dealing with you on behalf of the men?—Not at all.

16,023. They declined?—They refuse to deal with innumerable trades unions—they treat them with contempt.

16,024. But you had no trades union here—you had merely a public meeting or public meetings?—Not at all, there was a society—you can call it a society—composed of bus and tram men, for the purpose of promoting the movement.

16,025. I thought you told us that there was no society at the time, there was only a nucleus?—I should not honour them by calling it a trades union, it was a society.

16,026. It was a nucleus?—I do not say a nucleus—a society, of course, composed of very few.

Duke of Devonshire.

16,027. I do not know whether you have explained this fully, but I think your suggestion is that the plant of the tramways is to be acquired by the municipality?—Yes.

16,028. That is to say the rails?—The roadway.

16,029. The rails?—Yes, of course, that would be the rails.

16,030. The cars?—Yes.

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

16,031. The horses?—No.

16,032. Not the horses?—No.

16,033. Then a certain amount of capital is to be found by other parties?—Yes.

16,034. Who would work the enterprise?—Yes, in conjunction with the representatives of the county council and the representatives of the men.

16,035. Under some contract or agreement with the municipality?—Undoubtedly; I should propose to lease them.

16,036. To lease them to this?—Company, to be approved of by the council of course; but the governing body should be composed of so many members of the county council, so many members representing the men, and so many representing those who have found the money.

16,037. Of course they will expect a certain amount of interest on their money?—Certainly.

16,038. And the bargain must be such that they will have a fair prospect of getting it?—Undoubtedly, it must be a fair bargain.

16,039. Then if the total gross receipts should not be sufficient to pay that amount of interest, and the interest on the capital expended by the municipality, do you suggest that the loss is to be borne by the rates?—Yes, I do. I beg your pardon, I ought to qualify that by saying that, of course, you would not expect the rates to make good the dividend upon the capital which was provided by the outside public. I do not think the county council probably would be justified in going as far as that, because it would be under their management—it would be under the management partly of the people finding the money, partly of the county council, and of labour as well.

16,040. The receipts would go first to pay interest on the outside capital?—Yes, certainly.

16,041. And if the receipts were not sufficient to pay interest on the sum laid out by the municipality the rates would have to bear the loss?—Yes, they would.

16,042. Have you any reason to suppose that a very heavy burden might not be thus thrown upon the rates?—I do not think it is at all probable.

16,043. Do you propose to obviate it by raising the fares if necessary?—Yes, and I do that because I think any institution, or any corporation or combination, ought not to be worked until you provide sufficient for the workers—until you provide a subsistence wage for the workers and reasonable hours. Therefore I do not think that there is any probability of the council agreeing to any terms with a company, which would be inconsistent with all the interests involved.

16,044. Do you know by what class the tramways and omnibuses are chiefly used?—It depends upon the locality. They are used very largely by artisans and mechanics, by city people, by professional men, and, I should say, the community generally use them indiscriminately. Omnibuses have become very much more popular recently on account of the introduction of a great many improvements.

10 March 1892.]

MR. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

16,045. So far as they are used by the artisan and mechanic's class, would there not be a very strong feeling against any proposal to raise the fares?—I think probably there would—yes, there would, no doubt about it; but, unfortunately, where the working men now, under the present system, require early 'buses to go to their work, in many instances they have not them—they cannot get them. The companies do not consider the convenience of the working men at all, they consider first their own interests—naturally, as business men, I suppose it is their duty to do it, but from my point of view, they ought to consider the requirements of the localities, and I know, as a matter of fact, there are many localities not properly served now, and that the interests of the working men are not attended to, and that they are obliged to walk to their work very long distances when a 1d. or a 2d. 'bus would be very acceptable to them. That, of course, would all be obviated if it was under the county council.

16,046. Might not a very probable result of your proposal be increased cost of management, fares as low, or perhaps even lower, than they are now, and a consequent burden on the rates?—No, I do not think the cost of management would be increased.

16,047. You propose to give better wages?—Yes, but that is not management.

16,048. I mean higher working expenses.—Yes, of course; I quite agree with you—it would be so.

16,049. And at the same time a strong feeling against any raising of the fares?—There would be a strong feeling individually against it, but, taken collectively, I think not amongst the working men. We are dealing now with working men—men, of course, who regard a penny or twopence a day as being of very great importance. Supposing the working men know that their servants—they would be their servants then—were being underpaid and overworked, they would say "No, we must pay a penny more" in this locality in order to increase the revenue, "because we ourselves are opposed to sweating" and overworking." The working men do not wish to sweat their brother working men nor to overwork them, and, therefore, a representative assembly such as I take it the county council will be, acting in the interests of the ratepayers, would not impose fares which would not be approved of by the men who had to pay them.

16,050. Would not the poorer classes who use these means of locomotion very likely think that if there was to be a loss it should be recouped out of the rates?—Undoubtedly; I think it would come out of the rates. If there was a loss it would come out of the rates.

16,051. And you are prepared that it should do so if necessary?—No, I do not go so far as that. I say that the people who travel by 'bus or by tram ought to pay a sufficient sum to work the undertaking upon fair lines. First, they ought to provide a reasonable subsistence wage for the men who do the work, they ought to provide interest upon the capital, and then of

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

course the undertaking must pay, and if the fares are a farthing, or a halfpenny, or a penny, as the case may be, too low to enable them to meet these working charges, then, of course, they must raise the fares in order to make the undertaking pay.

16,052. Supposing the majority are unwilling to raise the fares?—They have got a very easy remedy, they need not travel by it. If they do not like to pay the fares they need not travel.

16,053. But the fixing of the rates will be in the hands of the same people as fix the remuneration of the servants?—Yes, that is so.

16,054. That is to say, in the hands of a majority?—Yes.

16,055. Is it not very likely that while the majority wish their servants to be well paid, they at the same time will not wish to provide proper payment out of their own pockets. Are you sure they would be willing to pay the increased fares which may be necessary?—I think they will be willing to pay the fares which will be necessary.

16,056. Are they not very likely to think that if the burden is to be borne by anyone it should be borne by the rates?—I do not think so.

16,057. All I want to ascertain is whether you are prepared to throw a burden upon the rates if necessary, if your plan does not work in other ways?—I think that is unsound in principle. I think that the undertaking itself ought to pay of itself.

16,058. Yes, but supposing it does not?—You must make it then. Shut it up altogether, close it altogether if it will not pay. It must pay the men's wages, of course.

16,059. But if you shut it up the ratepayers will have to pay the interest on what they have laid out?—I contend that no industry ought to be continued, or can be continued, unless it provides sufficient of itself to pay for the working and the legitimate working of the undertaking.

16,060. But if your municipality buys these undertakings and works them in such a way that they do not pay, the rates will have to bear the burden of the capital which has been sunk?—No, they would confer together and they would say, "Well, we are 10,000*l.* short this year, we must increase the fares in South London or West London and make up this balance somehow, make 10,000*l.* more," and would do it.

16,061. Supposing their constituents, the people who use these tramways, &c., said "We will not have our fares raised"?—Then let them send men to the county council to represent their views.

16,062. And supposing they do so, and refuse to raise the fares?—Then, of course, the fares will not be raised.

16,063. And the loss will be borne by the ratepayers?—No. I do not admit for one moment that there ought to be any loss to the ratepayers if the undertaking is properly managed and administered. I do not admit any

10 March 1892.]

MR. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

loss, you are assuming a loss, I do not admit that there is any loss.

16,064. I assume what appears to be very probable, that the representatives of the rate-payers on the county council may decide upon a higher scale of payment to the servants of these undertakings and may at the same time decline to raise the fares, in which case I assume there would be a loss, is that not so?—Do you mean to pay more money out and receive less?

16,065. To receive the same, or less?—Then the county council, acting just the same as the managers or directors of an ordinary corporation would act, would say, "Well, we are going to make the revenues of this undertaking sufficient to pay the wages, to give short hours, and to pay interest upon the capital invested." That would be their duty, and that is what they would do.

16,066. Would it not be in the power of the municipality under your plan at the same time to raise the working expenses of the undertaking and to decline to raise the fares, so as to increase the receipts—it would be in their power to do so. I do not say what they ought to do?—I am not so sure about that. I am not so sure that it would be in their power, I think it would be *ultra vires*.

16,067. They would have the control of this concern?—I do not think they would have the power to do that at the present time.

16,068. What would be *ultra vires*?—To increase their wages is not *ultra vires*, to regulate the hours is not *ultra vires*, to regulate the fares, of course that would not be *ultra vires*, but to go and say that we will make a clear deficit every year of 30,000*l.* or 40,000*l.* regardless of the rates, I think that certainly would be *ultra vires*.

16,069. In what way?—It would be acting quite contrary to the usual principles which govern the management of any undertaking in this country.

16,070. Supposing they did it, what would be the remedy?—I am not so sure that probably a mandamus would not issue against them.

16,071. Then, personally, you are not prepared to throw the cost of working this system upon the rates?—No, I think that it ought to pay itself.

16,072. You only advocate it in the belief that it will not throw a charge upon the rates?—I advocate it in the belief that the people through their elected representatives ought to have the control, in the belief that it is a remedy for the overwork and for the underpay of the present system, and that if it were in the hands of an honest body of representatives, who are able to do justice, who are willing and anxious to do justice to the community at large, it would pay, and it would be made to pay; and my proposition was that it would pay properly managed and administered. If there is a deficit the fares must be increased to make up the deficit, because you cannot go to a lower cost, you cannot reduce the cost.

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

16,073. You do not advocate providing cheap locomotion for the people at the cost of the rate-payers?—No, certainly not.

16,074. And if you were convinced that that would be the result you would not advocate the plan?—That is carrying the point too far, I will tell you why, because you are assuming that it could not be managed.

16,075. I do not assume that, I say that what I have suggested to you is possible?—I say that the undertaking ought to pay, and that the rates ought not to pay for any deficit at all, that it ought to come out of the management of the undertaking.

16,076. Perhaps you have already mentioned this; do you know any case in which the tramways are managed by a municipality?—Yes, Huddersfield.

16,077. Do you know with what result?—Yes, I have got a balance sheet here.

16,078. Have you stated this before?—I made a statement about Huddersfield, but I did not give details. I have got a balance sheet here, shall I let you see it (*handing balance sheet to the Duke of Devonshire*)?

Mr. Jesse Collings.

16,079. Are those tramways managed by the town council or leased by them?—Administered; managed by them.

Mr. Bolton.

16,080. Do they work them?—They work them.

Duke of Devonshire.

16,081. Can you state generally what has been the result?—It has been satisfactory; there has been interest paid upon capital, the men have had reasonable hours, and wages with which they are satisfied.

Professor Marshall.

16,082. Are they horse tramways chiefly or steam?—I am afraid I cannot tell you.

Duke of Devonshire.

16,083. I have not had time to look through it, but I see here "2 per cent of capital," is that the dividend that has been paid, and "interest and sinking fund 4½ per cent." I do not quite understand it, but at any rate you say so far as you know it has been satisfactory?—Yes. (*See Appendix 112.*)

16,084. I understood you to say if considered necessary you would give the municipality a power to exclude competition, but that it would be for their own decision?—Yes, certainly. As Lord Derby pointed out, it would be no use unless you did exclude competition; you cannot have competition and a monopoly at the same time.

16,085. Why do you consider that the men employed in the trams and omnibuses are less able to protect themselves by organisation than other classes of labour?—They are not less able, from the point of view of intelligence, but they

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

have not been educated in trades union principles up to the present time, and very long hours have prevented them attending meetings at a reasonable hour.

16,086. How long has the Union for which you speak been formed?—I am not speaking now in connexion with any union, I am merely an outside helper, a disinterested outsider helping—

16,087. To assist the Union?—Yes; and the secretary of the Union is coming to speak about the Union. There has not been a society which had the name of a union until now, but now they have got a *bond fide* union established upon sound principles, so I understand.

16,088. But as an outsider do you see any reason why if the men were organised, as many trades are organised, they would be unable to secure for themselves fair wages and reasonable hours?—I think it is highly probable if all the 'buses were stopped again that the men would not go in until they got the hours they wanted, and the wages they wanted too. It is highly probable, but that is an uncivilised kind of proceeding. Strikes ought to be avoided if possible, I think, and in this age we ought to introduce some mode of settlement by conciliation. The companies make a very great mistake indeed in not meeting upon friendly terms, and upon terms of equality, the men who represent their fellow workmen. If they would only do that, and discuss in a friendly manner the differences which exist between them, there is no doubt things would be very much more agreeable than they are at the present time.

16,089. Does not that question depend very much upon the power of the Union, the amount of organisation?—No; it depends upon the ability of the men to work in combining themselves, and having opportunities of combination, and it depends also upon the power of the company to watch and check the development of their organisation. Now in this instance the hours are long, the men cannot meet as a rule at a reasonable time, and the Union is regarded with suspicion and contempt by the companies instead of being treated as an instrument whose object is the benefit of the men themselves and of the companies as well.

16,090. That has been the case, has it not, in a great many other trades?—It has, no doubt.

16,091. The Unions have been at first looked upon unfavourably by employers?—Quite so.

16,092. And subsequently recognised?—Yes.

16,093. And good relations established?—Undoubtedly.

16,094. Do you see any reason why that should not happen in this case?—Not at all. It is only a question of time and perseverance, I believe. I think it will be done.

Mr. Gerald Balfour.

16,095. You say that if the tramways were placed under the control of the locality and a deficit ensued, you would try to make good that deficit by raising the fares?—Yes.

Mr. Gerald Balfour—continued.

16,096. Would not that have the effect of causing fewer persons to travel by the tramways?—I think it might reduce the percentage of travellers, but not to a sufficient extent to neutralise the advantages which would be derived from the increase of the fares.

16,097. But if you are mistaken in that view and it did have the effect of neutralising that advantage, what would you do then?—I think that the business would then shrink to its natural proportions.

16,098. What do you mean by shrink to its natural proportions?—I will tell you. Supposing the raising of fares resulted in a diminution in the number of travellers, and that the revenue correspondingly diminished, if they should then reduce the expenses, they should reduce the number of 'buses and the number of horses, and the general expenses in proportion until they arrived at the point at which there was sufficient to meet the expenses.

16,099. Supposing that point was not arrived at until you had abolished the tramways altogether, what then?—It is an impossibility and an absurdity.

16,100. Why?—Because there is no other means of conveyance. There is only a small portion of the public that would object to the increase.

16,101. You say it is absurd to suggest that the point might not be reached until the trams had ceased to run at all. Supposing that the present number of passengers was reduced by three-fourths, you would then reduce the accommodation and throw idle the plant in the same proportion?—I should reduce it, of course.

16,102. You further enunciated the view that no industry should be allowed to continue unless it gave adequate wages and adequate returns, and was worked during reasonable hours?—Yes.

16,103. What do you call sufficient wages?—Sufficient to enable an average man to live with an average family, and to provide food and clothing, and have a reasonable sum for reserve.

16,104. And in the case of the tramways' conductors you put that at 2*l.*?—I say that occurred to me as being the amount necessary to maintain a man decently with a moderate family.

16,105. You would estimate it at 2*l.*?—I think so, without going very carefully into the figures.

16,106. Then do you think that all industries should be abandoned, which could not pay wages amounting to 2*l.*?—That is going too far. I am merely dealing with the trams and 'buses, and there is no foreign competition there at all. I am not prepared to deal with other industries at all. I merely deal now with trams and 'buses, and as there is no foreign competition, I think that a standard of comfort ought to be erected which would make the community satisfied.

16,107. I think you laid down a general principle that no industry should be continued, which was not able to pay such wages?—I did not intend to go so far as that. I confine it to

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Gerald Balfour—continued.

the case of trams and 'buses, and I believe my opinion with regard to other industries. I know that as to the economic conditions governing other industries foreign competition especially is a very important factor, and there the good of the community and not of the locality is brought into consideration.

16,108. Let me return to your proposal that if a deficit ensued in consequence of municipal control, the travellers by tramways should be asked to pay higher fares?—Yes.

16,109. From what class are those travellers drawn?—All classes.

16,110. And very largely from the artisan class?—Very largely, but not more largely in proportion than others.

16,111. But still very largely?—Largely there is no doubt.

16,112. Now are those artisans who travel by the tramways in the receipt of wages amounting to 2*l.* in the average?—Now?

16,113. Yes?—No, I do not think they are upon an average.

16,114. Then do you think it would be reasonable to ask them to pay a higher fare than they are at present paying, in order that the tramway men and the 'bus men should receive higher wages?—I do, undoubtedly.

16,115. You think it would be reasonable to ask them to do that?—It would be reasonable to ask them to do that. Supposing they make six journeys a day and the men are underpaid, and supposing they could be more reasonably paid, and have reasonable hours by paying a penny a day more, or a halfpenny a day more, as the case may be, it is quite reasonable to ask them to pay the men, whom they employ indirectly, a reasonable sum more than they do even out of their wages.

16,116. And even though their wages may be as low as, or perhaps lower than, those of the men whom they are asked in that way to benefit?—Certainly. They may be employed in an industry. Of course they are obliged to compete with foreign nations, and then you apply different considerations altogether.

16,117. But why should you give this special privilege to one class of men?—Because where you can control the trade in your own country, and erect a standard of comfort which should be an example to the whole country, you are justified in doing it, it is sound policy.

16,118. This principle could not, you think, be followed in trades where there is foreign competition?—No, I do not go so far as not to admit it. I said that I reserved my opinion with regard to it, and I merely dealt with trams and 'buses.

16,119. You consider it would be right to ask those who are themselves no better off to pay this additional fare?—Yes.

16,120. Do you think they would be prepared to pay it?—Certainly.

16,121. You think they would look upon this question in the same light as you do?—Yes, I do.

U 73723.

Mr. Austin.

16,122. What is the position now of the 'bus men as compared with that previous to the strike of last year?—In many instances it is very much better than it was, but not nearly so good as it ought to have been if the conditions had been complied with which were arranged.

16,123. The old union collapsed after the strike, did not it?—No, it never has collapsed, because the new union was formed of trades unionists, and men who thoroughly understood trades union principles. It really ceased to exist in consequence of that. It never did collapse, and never has collapsed.

16,124. But since the new organisation has been formed and joined by practical men it is more successful?—Practically, I believe. Of course it is not a very old organisation yet, but as far as I am informed it is conducted upon sound principles, and I have every confidence in the manner in which it is conducted, but I have nothing whatever to do with it at all.

16,125. Have you made yourself acquainted with the working of the systems adopted in other countries as regards tramways?—No, I have not. I have confined my attention to England.

16,126. To England alone?—Yes, with the exception of Paris, I know a little about that.

16,127. Do you know the system there?—They work 12 hours a day.

16,128. But are the tramways under the control of the municipality?—I am afraid I cannot give you the details. I only know as a broad matter of fact that their hours were reduced to 12 hours a day. I am afraid I cannot give you the details of it, or of the management of them.

Mr. Trow.

16,129. What would be the proportion of tram men employed, as compared with the number of artisans who would be required to pay the extra 1*s.* a week?—Very small indeed.

16,130. Have you any idea of the proportion of artisans enabled to pay 1*s.* a week without robbing their families of some comfort?—I could not give it you accurately, or even approximately accurately, without careful consideration, but as a matter of fact there is no doubt that the majority of travellers would be asked to contribute as you say, to keep the family in comfort, and the proportion would be extremely small. The proportion they would contribute would be infinitesimal.

16,131. Would not the major portion of the people who would pay the extra 1*s.* be artisans?—I am not so sure of that. I should think a very large proportion indeed would be artisans and people living upon wages.

16,132. At the present moment would they have a difficulty in making ends meet?—A very large number would.

16,133?—Would not the number of passengers be considerably reduced?—I do not think so. I believe the spirit of the working men now is such as to lead them to do to others as they would like to be done by, and I believe if it was necessary in a poor locality to pay the men higher wages and reduce their hours, if it was

U u

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Trow—continued.

necessary for the artisans or workmen who travel by the trams and buses to pay $\frac{1}{4}d.$ or $1d.$ a day more they would do it, in order to do the right thing, as they hope to be done by in their relations with their employers.

16,134. Even although they rob their families of some small comfort to that amount?—I believe their sense of justice is such that they would sacrifice $1d.$ or $\frac{1}{4}d.$ a day in order to enable them to do it if necessary. I do not admit that it is necessary, but you are putting the case hypothetically, and assuming it were necessary, I say the majority of working men would say, "Look here, we employ these men, and we are not going to overwork them; we will pay $\frac{1}{4}d.$ or $1d.$ a day more than we do pay, and we shall not begrudge it either."

16,135. Have you ever known a case where the tram companies have raised their fares for the purpose of meeting a deficit, and where they have done it successfully?—I cannot give you an instance, but I believe instances have occurred.

16,136. Would you be surprised to learn that where the population is nearly all of the artisan class such an attempt has been a failure?—An attempt to do what?

16,137. To raise the fares so as to give the men better wages and shorter hours, and to meet a deficit, would you be surprised to learn that that has been a failure?—I should like, before giving you the answer, to know what the conditions were. I should be surprised certainly if it is exactly as you represent, but before giving the answer I should like to know all the conditions. I should like to know the whole of the management of the company before being able to say that it was a failure.

16,138. A company which is on all fours with yours, charging penny fares only for long distances?—How long?

16,139. Not so long as yours, but considerable distances. To meet a deficit and assist in bettering the men's condition, a tramway company attempted to raise the fares $1d.$, and that amount the artisans were not prepared to pay?—But was it necessary to raise the fares in order to pay higher wages and reduce the hours?

16,140. Yes, because there was an absolute loss upon the transaction?—I know, but the loss does not prove that the money went to labour.

16,141. I did not go into that?—But it does not prove, as a matter of fact, that the money went to labour. It may have been over capitalised. The promoters of the tramway might have—

16,142. Might have received nothing?—They may have added very largely to the cost of the undertaking at the beginning, and taxed the whole matter, but I should be surprised certainly if the case which you represent occurred.

16,143. It is one of those cases where you cannot compel people to travel at a given price unless they think proper?—No, you cannot.

16,144. They would rather walk the distances if they had the $1d.$ to pay extra?—Yes.

Mr. Trow—continued.

16,145. With regard to the municipalisation, would you have a clause in the lease that tied the company down to the stipulated fares?—No. I should have a clause in the lease fixing the hours. That was my proposition, but a suggestion was made by one of the Commissioners to the effect that the whole question of fares and distances should be regulated by the county council, exactly as the fares of hackney carriages are regulated. That was the proposition made by one of the Commissioners, or rather a question put upon a proposal.

16,146. A close corporation established with the entire control of the district over which the county council run its trams?—Yes. It would not be a close corporation. You could scarcely call a public institution a close corporation.

16,147. The only power the travelling public would have in that matter would be to abstain from travelling?—Yes, to abstain from travelling.

16,148. Then you would throw a lot of your dead stock representing capital out of employment?—Of course, if they did abstain from travelling, that would be so.

16,149. Now, by what means would you meet the interest which you say is due to that dead capital?—I say that if a proper estimate were made at the outset, and if the men knew how to manage the traffic of the metropolis, the fares ought to be so regulated as to produce the revenue necessary to pay the working expenses and interest upon the capital, and if they did not, it would be bad management, and they ought to be discharged and other people appointed.

16,150. To enable them to manage this successfully, the ratepayers would be compelled to travel at their prices?—You carry it to an absurd length. You cannot compel men to travel. You cannot interfere with individual liberty to that extent, at all events.

16,151. But if you interfere with individual liberty so far as to raise fares higher than a man can pay to ensure success, you prevent the individual having power to reduce the fare?—No, you must reduce your expenses to keep within your income in order to get success. If your expenses are 10,000*l.* a year you must see that your revenue is going to be 11,000*l.*, or, at all events, 10,100*l.*

16,152. Would it be to the advantage of the ratepayers in the community if you had to throw one-half of your rolling stock idle and dismiss one-half of your men, and pay 2*l.* per week instead of 30*s.* per week?—Of course such a state of things as you represent could not be to the interest of the ratepayers or anybody, but I do not admit it.

16,153. You would say you had too much stock, and "If we cannot keep up a stock we will lay by a certain proportion of our stock and just meet the requirements." If you lay by a portion of your stock would not you lay by a portion of the men employed in using that stock?—That could only occur once by a miscalculation. Supposing at the outset the joint

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Trow—continued.

board, composed of members of the county council and workmen, and people supplying capital, made a proper estimate there could not be a deficit. If there was a deficit at the end of the first year it could not possibly occur again with proper management.

16,154. No, but the proper management would be to dispense with the unnecessary stock and the unnecessary labour.—Yes. It may not occur again.

16,155. But what becomes of the men who are thrown out?—Of course they would far rather be thrown out than be overworked and underpaid, because they can get employment in other industries.

16,156. Would the people be better off with a loss of 40 per cent. in wages?—No, but things would regulate themselves. There is no doubt questions of the kind you are putting refer to economic and abstruse principles which require very careful elucidation in order to answer them properly.

16,157. But there is such a thing as experience in connexion with these things, and we are only gleaning information now?—Just so.

Mr. Mundella.

16,158. I have one question to ask you—Have you had experience in the working of tramways?—No experience at all.

16,159. Have you ever been a shareholder in a tramway company?—No.

16,160. Have you watched the fluctuations in the receipts of traffic for the last 15 years since tramways came into existence?—I have. I have examined them.

16,161. Is it a fact that the slightest increase of fares produces a very large diminution in the number of passengers who avail themselves of tramways?—I do not think as a rule that that is a fact.

16,162. And you think the converse is not the fact that the reduction of fares does not double them. A reduction of 50 per cent. would not double the number of passengers, do you say?—No, but that is going rather from one extreme to the other.

16,163. I know; but is it a fact or not that a reduction of fares very largely increases the number of passengers?—I know that it does increase it. There is no doubt about it. It considerably increases it.

16,164. Do you know anything of the working of omnibuses?—I know a little from the evidence that I have collected very carefully.

16,165. What would you say is the difference since the penny fares have been established in London in the number of persons who avail themselves of them?—It has enormously increased.

16,166. Is it not a fact that the great number of persons using tramways and omnibuses are young people very often—young women going to the city from the south side or from the north side, from business, who go into the city daily to work as feather makers, and fan makers, and sempstresses, so that if you raise the fares of

Mr. Mundella—continued.

the people travelling you impose very great hardship upon that class?—Yes; but if it is necessary for those travellers to pay a little more—

16,167. That is not the question; kindly answer my question?—I was trying to do so.

16,168. Is it not a great hardship on that class if you put a fare upon them which compels them to walk instead of being able to travel backwards and forwards by riding?—You call it a great hardship. I do not call it a great hardship, and I do not think they would either, to pay 2d. or 3d. a week more if necessary in order to enable the men who carry them to work comfortably and under comfortable conditions.

16,169. But is there not a proof of hardship in the fact that they walk miles backwards and forwards whereas they would otherwise ride, is not that a great hardship?—You mean if the fares were raised they would walk.

16,170. If the fares are lowered they ride and if the fares are raised they walk, is that a fact or not?—Yes; a great many more do.

16,171. Is not that a proof of hardship on that class, or an industrial class of women, in weather like this for instance, who have to go backwards and forwards to their homes. Is it not a hardship to require them to walk by putting such a fare upon them, so that they cannot ride?—I quite agree with you; that, of course, would be a hardship.

16,172. Then is it not the effect of a larger increase of passengers that a larger number of workmen are employed?—Yes; in consequence of the increase of passengers, that must be so.

16,173. And a larger number of cars are employed?—Yes.

16,174. And a larger number of drivers?—Yes.

16,175. And a larger number of horses?—Yes.

16,176. And a larger number of horsekeepers. Is that so?—Yes.

16,177. Then in your opinion the fares may be maintained at the lowest rates and a fair interest earned on the tramways, and the hours could be reduced and better wages paid, without at all interfering with the reasonable income of the shareholders?—I do not know that I mentioned shareholders at all.

16,178. You said interest upon capital?—Yes.

16,179. It does not matter whether the shareholders be stockholders or public proprietors?—Yes.

16,180. You are in favour, I understand, of the municipality not only holding the tramways and making the tramways, but also working the tramways?—I stated this morning, before you came, that I was in favour of municipal authorities acquiring the trams and buses and leasing them out, and providing a fair interest for capital, a fair subsistence wage, and the management being under the control of three or four members of the county council. Three or four people providing the capital and three or four representatives of the working men, so that it

10 March 1892.]

Mr. THOMAS SUTHERST.

[Continued.]

Mr. Mundella—continued.

should be a joint board. That was my proposition.

16,181. Would you find responsible lessees to undertake the duty unless they were paid a fair return for their capital and some remuneration for their services?—I think so. I think if I had the opportunity of taking a lease of the whole of the tramways and 'buses of the metropolis I could find the capital necessary to do it within a very reasonable time and on those conditions.

16,182. What conditions would you consider a sufficient inducement to the public to take a lease of the tramways of London?—First of all the county council ought to pay 3 or 3½ per cent. for the money with which they purchased the rails, the road, and the rolling stock. The live stock would have to be purchased by the outside public, they would have to provide the capital for that.

16,183. You go rather fast, I think. Who is to maintain the road?—The corporation who would work the road. But if you would allow me to finish my composition of the corporation. I say that the board would first be constituted of three or four members of the county council, three or four members who should be responsible for the capital, who would get the capital and represent the shareholders, and three or four representatives of the working men. They would start business with the roads and rolling stock owned by the county council and leased to them by that authority for a certain rental. The live stock would be provided for by the capital subscribed, and the capital would be represented by three or four shareholders, and they would then start business and pay an interest of 3½ per cent. upon the capital, pay an interest upon the money subscribed by the public, and the balance, after paying the interest, would be divided between the county council as representing the ratepayers, the workmen, and the people, who found the outside capital. It would be divided into three parts so that the workmen should be benefited, and the ratepayers should be benefited after the interest upon the capital had been provided.

16,184. You would divide it into three parts, but who is to pay for the maintenance of the

Mr. Mundella—continued.

roads?—Do you mean the tramways themselves?

16,185. The maintenance of the tramways?—The company, the corporation.

16,186. They would have to charge for that, would not they?—Yes, certainly, of course they must.

16,187. Three and a quarter per cent. would be for interest on the first outlay of capital?—You did not ask me about the interest on the capital to be provided for the live stock.

16,188. I am not talking about the live stock at all. You say that the corporation is to own the roads and the rolling stock?—Yes.

16,189. And on that they are to receive 3½ per cent. interest?—Yes.

16,190. But the roads are in a constant state of depreciation?—Yes.

16,191. And the rolling stock is in a constant state of depreciation?—Yes.

16,192. How are you going to provide for this?—No system would be perfect unless you provided for depreciation of plant and a reserve fund so as to meet the expense of reinstatement after it became exhausted in the course of years.

16,193. Three and a quarter per cent. would be provided by the corporation, and how much by the shareholders?—I do not know that I ought to fix a dividend for the shareholders.

16,194. What would you think a reasonable dividend for the shareholders?—In a safe concern somewhere about 4 or 5 per cent. as things go now.

16,195. Do you think that that could be done with the reduced hours and at low fares?—I stated before that I would not increase the 1d. fares for the short distances. I would increase the 1d. fares to 2d. for the long distances.

16,196. You would double the fares for the long distances?—Certainly I would.

16,197. And of course you would reduce the number of passengers, do you admit that?—No. I stated before to one of the Commissioners that they might be diminished to a small extent, but not sufficient to neutralise the advantages which would be obtained by charging the extra 1d. fare for the long distances.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. HENRY BOWBRICK called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

16,198. We understand that you are the general secretary to the Amalgamated Omnibus and Tram Workers' Union?—That is so.

16,199. How long has that Union existed?—Since the 19th July 1891.

16,200. Since the strike, that is?—No, some considerable time after the strike. The strike terminated on the 13th of June.

16,201. Then it would be shortly after the strike?—Yes, six or seven weeks after.

16,202. What number of men does it contain?—In good standing at the present time, about 2,500.

Earl of Derby—continued.

16,203. And I suppose it grew out of that dispute?—Yes.

16,204. Previous to that there was no union of the men employed on trams and 'buses?—There never was a union.

16,205. Perhaps, as you have mentioned the strike, you might tell us what you consider the cost of that strike to have been?—The actual cost during the week do you mean, to the company, or to the men?

16,206. I mean to the men in the first place?—The actual cost, I should say, was about 9,000l. for that week.

10 March 1892.]

Mr. H. BOWBRICK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

16,207. And to the company?—To the London General Omnibus Company in particular, about 20,000*l*.

16,208. I see you state here in this document that the right of the men to combine is at present opposed?—Yes.

16,209. What do you mean by its being opposed?—The London General Omnibus Company and the London Road Car Company have set their faces against the combination of the men, and in all cases where they have become convinced that men are members of the Union, there is a wholesale discharge of them; in proof of which, since the late strike, I should say that in the service of the London General Omnibus Company there are not more than 200 men who were in their service at the time of the strike.

16,210. But you say you have 2,500 men in the Union?—Yes.

16,211. Are not those men employed by the London General Omnibus Company?—There are two companies, the London Road Car Company and the London General Omnibus Company.

16,212. As a rule your men are employed by one company and not by the other?—No, they are employed by both; by the London Road Car Company and by the London General Omnibus Company, and in addition we have a great number of tram men in the Union.

16,213. Then how could it be said that the company oppose your right to combine if they are actually employing men who are in the Union?—They are doing so. There are a great number of men who do not proclaim the fact of their being unionists owing to a certain amount of fear, and, so far as the London General Omnibus Company and the London Road Car Company are concerned, since the formation of our Union, we have had deputations of men to the office giving us facts in connexion with the threatening language used by some of the officials of the London Road Car Company.

16,214. What do you mean by threatening language?—Threatening them that if they belong to the Union they would be discharged.

16,215. Does your Union as a matter of fact include a large proportion of men employed in this business?—Yes.

16,216. You say as a matter of fact that members of your Union are not discharged?—Only in the event of the officials of the company becoming aware of the fact.

16,217. But you do not mean to tell us some hundreds of men in the employ of the company are members of your Union, and yet that the company know nothing about it?—Yes, I am quite sure of it.

16,218. Have you something to tell us about the character system, I do not understand it?—It is necessary in the first place, if a man wishes to become an omnibus man, or a tram car man, to make an application to Scotland Yard for a licence. In that case the Commissioner of Police institutes inquiries into his character,

Earl of Derby—continued.

and after a period of about a week, provided the inquiries are satisfactorily answered, a licence is granted to him. That being so, it would naturally follow that the man's character would be good; but in addition to that, in making application to the various companies, they have to undergo another inquiry by the officials of the companies, so that by the time the inquiry is finished the man has given satisfactory proof that he is thoroughly respectable. Notwithstanding that, there seems to be a system amongst the various companies, such as that when a man is discharged from one company, it is impossible for him to obtain employment in another company.

16,219. They exercise the right, and they may exercise it wisely or unwisely, of choosing the men whom they think the fittest to serve them, is not that so?—Exactly.

16,220. I suppose you do not assume that they can be prevented by any law or regulation, do you?—They may not be prevented by law, but at the same time, it appears to me that after a man has undergone such an examination as to his character, no matter what offence he is discharged for, or even should he resign, and make application to another company, it is a system of boycotting amongst the companies, that he is not employed, having once been engaged in the business.

16,221. If a man has been in the service of one company and has been discharged, I suppose they will not know what he has been discharged for?—The very fact of his licence being marked by the name of any other company is sufficient for them to refuse his application, without any inquiry.

16,222. Are you sure that is the universal practice?—I am.

16,223. We have heard nothing as yet about the ticket system and its effects; I think you are prepared to tell us something upon that point?—The effect of the ticket system is this, that prior to the ticket system being introduced, of course the men were dependent entirely upon their own energy for producing the very large dividend which the companies have some years been paying. When a man was not capable of producing what they considered a satisfactory return day by day of course he was discharged. That being so it naturally followed that the men became very efficient. On the new system being introduced, what with the worry of looking after the tickets, and seeing that the number corresponded, &c., the men have really got no energy, and at the same time, as occurs very frequently, when a man should be looking after his business as he used to do under the old system, he now has his face in the omnibus attending to the passengers inside, and not only that, but the men working on omnibuses and trams have an idea that when there was no ticket system they certainly were trusted more than they are at the present time.

16,224. As a matter of fact, I suppose the ticket system was introduced to prevent the possibility of embezzlement by the men em-

10 March 1892.]

Mr. H. BOWBRICK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

ployed?—That was the cause adopted, supposedly, by the company.

16,225. What is the real object of it, if that is not the object?—That may be the object, but the result has not been so, so far as returns go

16,226. As I understand there was no check upon the driver or conductor, and they could represent any number of passengers as having been carried, there was no check upon their calculation?—No, there was no check; they had a way bill which they used to use and account for the number of passengers carried, and also what the amount of money came to at the end of the day.

16,227. But then the way bill was entirely in their hands, was not it?—No, they had to deposit the way bill in a box at the office at the end of every journey.

16,228. But who made out the way bill?—The way bill was printed by the company.

16,229. As I understand it the new check system was intended to make it certain that every passenger who was carried had paid his fare to the company?—That is so.

16,230. And I presume that the men being in general honest would not object to a check of that kind in itself?—Not at all.

16,231. What is the objection you have to it; I have not followed that?—The objection that the men generally take to the ticket system is this, that the men are not enabled to display that amount of energy that they used to display, and at the same time they do not consider that they have the amount of confidence reposed in them that they used to have, because under the old system a man was alive all day to the fact that unless he returned sufficient to pay the expenses of the omnibus, and also to declare a good dividend amongst the directors and the shareholders, he would not be wanted. But in this case, assuming that the company get every penny that the conductor takes, they have no need to display that energy which they used to do on former occasions.

16,232. That is to say that rather less responsibility is thrown upon them now than before, is not that so?—Quite so. I might add that although there may be less responsibility there is actually more work.

16,233. There is some addition to his trouble?—A great addition.

16,234. And on the other hand he has the advantage of being, I suppose, able to prove more certainly than he could before that his dealing in the matter of the receipts and fares and paying them over has been honest?—It does not follow that that is the case, because we have evidence before us of a number of men who have been reported for very trivial things in connexion with the ticket system. For instance, there are a number of ticket inspectors appointed on various roads. I might jump on to an omnibus, and the conductor might be inside attending to the passengers there, and before the conductor could attend to those outside the ticket inspector would jump up and ask

Earl of Derby—continued.

me for a ticket. I would naturally say I had none, and he would then, without saying anything to the conductor, report the fact that he had visited this particular bus, and had found a passenger on the roof with no ticket, and that man would be discharged from behind the omnibus.

16,235. I think you have something to say as to what you call the indiscriminate issue of licences, what does that mean?—At the present time, from the last police report issued, it appears that there are five licences issued to every omnibus, that is about 2½ to each man. That gives the omnibus and tram companies greater opportunity of discharging their men who are at the higher rate of pay, and men taken on by the different companies they start at the lower rate of pay, and my impression is that the licences should be limited to the requirements of the public, because at the present time, since the late strike especially, there are hundreds of men walking about the streets of the metropolis duly licensed, but who, having been discharged, have no possible way of getting employment in that particular business.

16,236. You want an artificial restriction of the number of licences granted, so that it shall never be more than the actual demand for men, and consequently, if one man is turned off another cannot be found to take his place?—No, we do not go as far as that.

16,237. But that is the direction in which your proposal tends, is it not?—No. I mean to say this, that taking into consideration accidents and illnesses, &c, if you were to allow one and a half licences to each man, or three to an omnibus, you would always then have a number of men to recruit from. But it is the fact of men being able to get licences so easily after their character has been investigated that enables companies in a great measure to do as they please with their employées.

16,238. Who grants the licences?—The Commissioner of Police.

16,239. At present does he ever refuse a licence on the ground that there are enough already?—Never.

16,240. In point of fact any man of good character may go into the business?—That is so.

16,241. You want to restrict it so that only a certain number of people should be in the business at one time?—Yes, to meet the requirements of the public generally. I mean to say I should not wish to limit the number of licences, so that in the event of a number of men being discharged or being ill the omnibuses or trams cars should be lying idle because there were no men to take their places.

16,242. But as a matter of fact this particular industry is open to every man of good character, and you propose to restrict it to a certain number of men?—Yes, I do.

16,243. The tendency of that is to keep up wages and to make it difficult for the employers to replace men when they are discharged?—I

10 March 1892.]

Mr. H. BOWBRICK.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

might give you an instance which occurred just before the late strike which will illustrate what I mean. In the week preceding the strike, the manager of the London General Omnibus Company made application to the Commissioner of Police for a number of licences. That being so, had he been enabled to have got the licences, it would have meant that he would have imported, no doubt, a lot of, possibly, country labour or unemployed labour, but it was refused by the Commissioner of Police unless those men went through the usual routine of inquiry as to their character. In that case, although there were a great number of men who were licensed and were not in employment, the strike was declared on the morning of the 7th of June, and very successfully carried out by the London Trades' Council.

16,244. We have had some complaints as to the conditions agreed upon at the time of the strike not having been observed, is that your experience?—The conditions of the strike have not been observed at all, and I might add that the men, at the time the strike was supposed to be closed, were ignorant of the fact that the strike was declared closed. We were informed that the strike was closed, and that the companies had agreed to a 12 hours' day. But since that time the agreement, if any, has not been adhered to. After the strike had closed a number of timekeepers and officials of the various companies were presenting papers to the men asking them to sign for the old hours at a certain increase of pay.

16,245. Then, as a matter of fact, I understand you to say that the advantages which you gained, or were supposed to have gained, at the time of the strike have been to a certain extent lost?—To a great extent lost, owing to the fact of the organisation being lost since the strike was declared, because had the men been organised immediately after the strike they would have been in a position to compel the companies to adhere to what they promised, namely, that no man would be discharged for having participated in the strike.

16,246. I suppose the men are organised now?—Yes, they are organised now. Of course I might add that the companies place every difficulty in the way, because we have evidence that when midnight meetings have been convened for the men (because, of course, that is the only time which omnibus men can meet at, namely, midnight), the officials of the company have been told off, by whom we do not know, but by someone connected with the company, to watch these men and to take their names. I say I have proof here.

16,247. But nothing followed upon the taking of their names, is that so?—As soon as two or three men attended a meeting and found that these officials were posted there, naturally the news spread, and the result was that in many cases it prevented a meeting taking place.

16,248. The men were not willing to have it known that they attended a meeting?—They were not willing to stand the risk of their being discharged, that is how it was.

Earl of Derby—continued.

16,249. I think you are in favour of a compulsory eight hours' day and double shifts?—I am.

16,250. Do you think under those conditions that the rate of wages would be what it is now?—Yes, I am sure it would, because in order that the eight hours' day should be a success I should suggest a double shift of the men of eight hours, and I am sure by that system and by a proper board of management that the thing would be more successful financially than it is at the present time.

16,251. How do you make that out. A large number of men must be employed and the wages would not be diminished, do you say?—I say so.

16,252. How, would not the expenses be increased?—In the first place the companies have increased their expenditure since the strike to a very large extent. Firstly, the London General Omnibus Company employ about 150 ticket inspectors, which means 300*l.* a week extra, and I would suggest that in a double shift you would save a great deal of the expenditure by not paying the directors and a number of officials, who do nothing, the tremendously large salaries which they are in the habit of receiving.

16,253. You would cut the expenses down by reducing the directors' salaries. Did you say something about diminishing the number of inspectors?—I would suggest, if it be put to me, that the inspectors are not of any use at all.

16,254. The men would naturally require that there should not be inspectors?—Quite so.

16,255. That I understand, and from their point of view, therefore, the money that is spent upon inspectors is entirely thrown away?—I think so, because it is a positive fact that the majority of the men who have been promoted to the position of inspector are men who have been in the service but a very short time, whereas men who have been 20 years or 25 years in the service of the company, are still behind the omnibus, till such time as the company can, with safety, discharge them. One great objection that the men had, and which practically led up to the strike, was the introduction of the sliding scale, because prior to the strike all the men, no matter how long their services were, were paid one wage.

16,256. And after it what occurred?—After it, of course those men who were paid at the higher rate remained but a very short time, and, as I said before, I do not think there are more than 200 men who were in the service of the company at the time of the strike who are in their service now, so that that would mean that all the men who have been engaged since that have gone on at the lower rate of pay.

16,257. The strike did not attempt to regulate the rate of pay, did it?—The strike practically took place for a 12 hours' day.

16,258. But it did not attempt to fix the wages?—No, I think not.

Mr. Bolton.

16,259. Not more than 200 men, you say, are in the service of the company who were in their

10 March 1892.]

Mr. H. BOWBRICK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

service at the time of the strike?—That is my estimate.

16,260. There are new men who have been engaged since, and I think you told us that the system was that the Police Commissioner made inquiry as to character?—Yes.

16,261. And the company also inquired into their characters?—Yes, quite so.

16,262. But the company show themselves very much opposed to having union men in their service?—Yes, they do.

16,263. But they have a great many?—Yes, they have a great many.

16,264. You say that the men will not allow this to be known?—A great number of them.

16,265. Now tell me this; when these inquiries are made by the company as to the characters of these men, can they not inquire at the same time whether or not they belong to the Union?—No, not at all.

16,266. Can they not ask them?—True, they may ask them.

16,267. And the men tell falsehoods?—I take it that when a man is engaged by any of the companies, at the time of the engagement he is not a union man because he has come new into the business.

16,268. But I suppose they can continue these inquiries if they like?—Yes.

16,269. Is it the fact that when men are engaged they always take care not to belong to the Union and join immediately afterwards?—I do not quite understand that question.

16,270. Do you say that the men when they joined need not belong to the Union, so that they can honestly say "we are not in the Union"?—I take it that men as they are engaged by the companies of course come new into the business. In all probability a number of men who may go and be engaged by the companies at the time of their engagement are not aware of the fact that a union exists amongst that particular class.

16,271. Are they so ignorant as that?—I should say so.

16,272. The fact, however, is, as you state, that the men do declare that they do not belong to the Union when they are engaged?—Some of them.

16,273. But they join the Union immediately afterwards?—Not all of them.

16,274. But you said the bulk of them belong to the Union?—No, not the bulk of them, a great number of them.

16,275. The old system was a way bill system, do you say?—Yes.

16,276. That is instead of the present ticket system?—Yes.

16,277. When did the men fill them up?—They had the way bill in a bracket during the whole of their journey.

16,278. They filled it up as they went along?—They filled it up as they went along and as they received the money from the passengers.

16,279. And was that a more rapid operation than tearing the ticket off and taking the money for it?—Yes.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

16,280. Very much quicker?—Very much quicker.

16,281. How long does it take a man to give a ticket to a passenger and receive a *1d.*?—It is not the giving of one passenger a ticket, but the fact that when you once start you have to go the whole length of the omnibus outside and inside. As I understand it, the rule of the companies is that as soon as you leave one point you shall start and collect fares, so that consequently they have to go over the whole tramcar or omnibus.

16,282. Not those who have paid already?—But you have to go up the omnibus.

16,283. But there is nothing to prevent a man giving a ticket to a person as he enters the omnibus?—Nothing to prevent it.

16,284. But the men do not like the ticket system, do they?—I should say not.

16,285. You say it prevents them from displaying energy?—Yes.

16,286. How does the mere fact of having this ticket system prevent them displaying energy?—Because the companies are undoubtedly convinced that by the introduction of the ticket system it is an impossibility for the men to have any of the money themselves. Consequently the issuing of these tickets was meant to prove to the companies that the whole of the money taken is delivered over into their hands.

16,287. But how does that affect the energy of the men?—Simply because under the old system a man was responsible for the amount of money he earned.

16,288. Is he not now?—No, how can he be, because he has to prove by giving up the tickets, only giving the money for the tickets sold, that all the money that he has taken he has handed over to them.

16,289. That is all he did before, is it not?—I meant to say this: that under the old system it was an acknowledged fact by the different companies that when the men were placed on an omnibus some of them got used to the business and were much more energetic, if I might so term it; more skilful in placing their omnibus so as to get more money than others were, and if a man was not able to compete with other omnibuses as to his returns he was discharged.

16,290. Does the company not look with so much favour on a man who fails to make a good return as one who does?—No.

16,291. Is there the same inducement to fill up as before?—Yes, but that is what I consider an injustice, because if a man sells 500 tickets and accounts for 500 tickets, and another man sells 700 tickets it is thought that this man is not acting as he should do, and in many cases they suspend him for what they term "low earnings."

16,292. But during the time of the way bill system did not that same law operate?—No, not so much.

16,293. You say that while the way bill system was in force the company expected the

10 March 1892.]

Mr. H. BOWBRICK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

men to return a certain amount per day?—Yes.

16,294. But now they do not expect them to return a certain sum per day?—Yes, they do. They expect the men shall return all the money they earn.

16,295. But they did not before, do you say?—They did not.

16,296. They expected a man to pocket some of it?—They knew the men would have to pay expenses to the officials employed by the companies whom the companies did not pay themselves.

16,297. Is that the reason the men do not like the ticket system?—Not at all.

16,298. Formerly they helped themselves?—Formerly they had to pay a number of men engaged in the business who were in a sense recognised by the companies but who the companies did not pay themselves.

16,299. Exactly, and they took what they pleased from the receipts for that purpose?—They had to do so.

16,300. Well, they did do so?—Yes.

16,301. Now you object to the number of licences granted?—Yes.

16,302. These licences are not given gratis, are they?—No, they cost 5s. each.

16,303. How long do they run?—12 months.

16,304. Do you think that a man takes a licence for the fun of having it?—Not at all.

16,305. But because he means to use it?—Because he means to use it.

16,306. You would really propose to prevent any person in the city of London with a good character getting a licence if he chose to pay for it?—I should, if there was no possibility of getting a situation for it, and that does occur.

16,307. But who should decide that?—Those who have the issuing of the licences.

16,308. The Commissioner of Police?—At present.

16,309. If I go to the Commissioner of Police and ask for a licence I must prove to him also, you say, that I have got employment. You would impose upon me the necessity of proving to the Commissioner of Police that I had got employment, and you say that the spending of the 5s. would not be sufficient security for that?—Not necessarily so, because I take it the Commissioner of Police should be aware of the fact that there are considerably more licences issued than there are men employed.

16,310. But why do you say that men should not take out licences?—I am thinking of men who do not know the conditions under which they are to be employed.

16,311. Do they not know that?—I have known men to hold licences for six months without getting employment.

16,312. And yet men rush in and take them, so that there are more men than omnibuses?—That is so.

16,313. They do not display that wisdom which they ought to gain by experience?—I do not say that. A man being out of employment,

Mr. Bolton—continued.

naturally if there is an opportunity of getting employment on a tram car or omnibus asks for a licence, and he is astonished when he finds, as we already know, that there are three licences to every omnibus man in the metropolis.

16,314. You think that a man out of employment who has so many five shillings to spare, when he is out of employment, and wants to spend 5s. upon a licence, ought to see beforehand whether he can make use of it?—No, I do not; I say it is owing to the ignorance of the men who take out the licences in the first place.

16,315. You say that these companies, very shortly after the termination of the strike, commenced to solicit the men's signatures to new terms of service?—That is so.

16,316. Was there any condition at the close of the strike, that the terms then arranged, or upon which the men came back, should remain for an indefinite period in force without alteration?—We were under the impression, not having seen an agreement or heard one read, that the companies had acceded to the men's demand of 12 hours per day, and that that was to be the working day for the future.

16,317. But they had not done that?—That I cannot say.

16,318. Then those new conditions of service which they would ask the men to adopt, are not a breach of the old agreement?—Unquestionably, if the agreement was that the men should work 12 hours per day.

16,319. But was it?—That is what we were given to understand.

16,320. But was that the agreement?—I did not see the agreement.

16,321. Then you cannot say, and so far as you know, it is not a breach of the agreement?—I should say so, owing to a letter written by the Lord Mayor to Mr. John Pound, if you will allow me to read it.

16,322. Certainly?—"The Mansion House, London, June 19th, 1891"—that is about six days after the strike—"To Mr. John Pound, the Chairman of the London General Omnibus Company,"—from Mr. Savory, at that time Lord Mayor—"Dear Mr. Pound I have had this morning a deputation representing some 25 or 30 conductors in the service of the Atlas and Waterloo Omnibus Association and the Elephant and Castle Omnibus Association, but working under the rules, and with the tickets of your Company, who complain of having been discharged *en bloc*, some of them after 25 years' service, without rhyme or reason. The plea given for the discharge of these men is that the takings of their omnibuses were low, but as the ticket system is in operation, and the tickets issued and used, agree, there is no reflection on the honesty of the men. They state that they have not abated their exertion to obtain passengers in any way, and that their discharge is simply inexplicable, except upon the hypothesis that they are now being directly punished for their participation in the recent strike. If this is so, the agree-

10 March 1892.]

Mr. H. BOWERICK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

"ment of last week 'that no men should be prejudiced in consequence of the strike' has been broken. I should be much obliged if you will kindly look into this matter, and bring it to a satisfactory and amicable termination, for I should imagine that it would be more to the interest of the Company and their Associations, that their old servants should be retained than that men, and untried men, should be engaged. I enclose the papers given me by the men showing they are working under the rules, and with the tickets of your Company. Believe me, Dear Mr. Pound, Yours very truly, Joseph Savory, Lord Mayor." In reply to that, a letter was sent to the Lord Mayor from Finsbury Square, by Mr. Pound, of the 19th of June 1891,— "The London General Omnibus Company Limited, Office, 6, Finsbury Square, E.C., London, 19th June 1891. The Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, My dear Lord Mayor, I have received your letter of this date in reference to statements made by the men discharged by the Atlas and Waterloo and Farringdon Road Associations, and will have the matter inquired into. I am, my dear Lord Mayor, yours faithfully, John Pound." The result of that was, that the London General Omnibus Company took no further notice of the matter, and those men who were discharged at that time, have never been engaged since.

16,323. There was no other communication than that made to the Lord Mayor, was there? Was that the only communication?—That was the only communication that I know of, that was sent in answer to that letter.

16,324. He says he will make inquiry?—Yes.

16,325. Did he make inquiry?—Whether he made inquiry or not I am not in a position to say, but I can only say that he never wrote to the Lord Mayor after that, on that particular matter.

16,326. On what authority do you say that?—I say so because all the correspondence has been published.

16,327. We have not seen any?—No.

16,328. Has the Lord Mayor told you that he has not received any further communication?—No, not to me.

16,329. Do you know that he has said so to anyone else?—No, I cannot say that I know he has said so.

16,330. Then the only reason for your stating that the promised inquiry did not take place and that no further communication was made, is, that you never heard of it?—I never heard of it, because I have seen the men and have been in conversation with them.

16,331. The men would not know. My question to you was whether the further communication which I think was not promised, but which might be inferred as going to be made by Mr. Pound to the Lord Mayor, was or was not made?—I cannot answer, but I should say so.

16,332. But you do not know?—No, I am not in a position to say definitely.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

16,333. You never heard even from the Lord Mayor, that he did not receive this?—I have not the honour of an acquaintance with him.

16,334. You have this correspondence somewhere?—I have got the correspondence (*handing in correspondence*).

16,335. How many men were so discharged?—Do you mean at that particular time?

16,336. Yes, I should say so?—There was a deputation of 25, on this particular day, taken by Mr. Hammill to the Lord Mayor, from one association.

16,337. All discharged?—All discharged. Men of 25 years' service.

16,338. Did the company at the time of discharging them give any reason for discharging them?—Only for low earnings.

16,339. And that you think was the result of the impossibility to display energy in earning?—That was the result, in my opinion, of the men having taken part in the strike, because these men were discharged three days after resuming work.

16,340. Do you deny that there were low earnings?—Yes, the men deny it.

16,341. You say there have not been low earnings?—Yes, quite so.

16,342. You have no proof of it?—Yes, I have seen the proof of their earnings, and I know, as an omnibus man, that it is not true.

16,343. That is not stated?—I am giving you my opinion, as a practical omnibus man, that I have got by looking at the men's books. The amount of money paid in at the time of their discharge was more than they were paying in prior to the strike.

16,344. But you admit that there were deductions made from the amounts prior to the strike?—True, but before that strike they were working 16 hours a day.

16,345. But still the deductions reduced the amount paid in, and it would not be fair to compare the payments in, after and before the change of the system?—I am not comparing them.

16,346. Yes, you are comparing them, if you will excuse me saying so. You said that the amounts paid in after the change of system were as much or more than were paid in before?—I say in excess of those paid in before, notwithstanding that they were working four hours a day less.

16,347. But they would require to be in excess, because deductions were made under the old system from the drawings?—That is so.

16,348. Now, as to the eight hours' day, you make a statement that requires, I think, some explanation. You say that an eight hours' day and double shift, the men being paid at the same rate of wages, would result in a saving to the companies?—Yes, if carried out by a better management than exists at present.

16,349. What do you mean by better management?—By doing away with or abolishing a number of officials who are of no practical use, and not paying men a large salary who know nothing about the practical management of the business. I mean by doing that, and giving an

10 March 1892.]

Mr. H. BOWBRICK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

eight hours' shift the men would reap the benefit of the saving, and financially the company would be in a better position than it is.

16,350. Have you ever had any personal experience in the management of a large company?—I have had no personal experience.

16,351. And do you think it needs experience in order to know about it?—I have had 16 years' experience on an omnibus and that gives me sufficient experience to know how money is squandered in many cases.

Mr. Tait.

16,352. What is the number of omnibus men in London?—I should say about 7,000.

16,353. Seven thousand fairly entitled to take advantage of membership in your Union?—Yes.

16,354. You make the complaint here that the men would really join the Union in greater numbers were it not for the fact that spies had been sent to your meetings to intimidate the men from joining your organisation?—Yes, that is so.

16,355. Were those spies ordinary 'busmen or were they inspectors, or what were they?—They were inspectors, the companies' officials.

16,356. Have you yourself put the question, or is it within your knowledge that others have put the question, straight to the inspector and asked him what he was there for?—Yes.

16,357. What has been their reply?—Their reply is that they have as much right there as anyone else; that was all the satisfaction that could be got from them.

16,358. Did you ever get an answer to the effect that they were just there as having been sent by the particular company by whom they were engaged?—Their answer was only this, that they had as much right there as anybody else, and, of course, we surmised that they had been sent there by the officials of the company whom they represented.

16,359. Yes, but during your examination-in-chief you said to Lord Derby you had the proof of the spies being there?—That is so.

16,360. But you did not give us the proof. It would be as well we should have that proof?—Yes. I will do so. I might say this was the letter written by Mr. Hammill, the president of the Union, in connexion with something that took place at one of the midnight meetings:—
"27 November 1891, Robert Gresley Hall, Esq.,
"Managing Director, London General Omnibus Company. Dear Sir,—I enclose you an "Evening Standard" report of a meeting of omnibus workers which was held last night and early this morning. Is it true that Mr. W. Lane, road director, Mr. J. Coney, assistant road director, Mr. H. Cakebread, assistant road director, and Mr. W. Palmer, timekeeper, all of whom are in your employ, were sent by you, or through superior officials, to watch, spy, and spot the men who attended the meeting. If true, I am of opinion that no company of directors and shareholders claiming to be gentlemen, or even respectable,

Mr. Tait—continued.

"would stoop to give you instructions to exercise your authority in carrying out such dirty work. I, however, hold you responsible, as managing director of the Company, and you and your Company must know that combination is legal by Act of Parliament, and that you are supporting intimidation, which is illegal, if you give countenance to such unmanly, un-English conduct, as some of your officials are seemingly prepared to carry out for you. After careful and serious consideration I now state emphatically that if this continues by your men I shall hold you responsible, as being cognisant of it, and shall be prepared to demonstrate a policy to the men and the public, from which, whatever be the outcome, you must take the entire responsibility. If, again, it has to be fists up between your Company and the men it means bankruptcy for you and we have nothing to lose. We do not want it, have not sought it, but if it is to be we are prepared to meet it. I am, sir, on behalf of the men, yours sincerely and faithfully, Fred. Hammill. P.S.—You must not consider this letter as of a private nature." To which the president of the Union received no reply. After waiting some time, till the 12th December, Mr. Fred. Hammill wrote Mr. Gresley Hall again, "Robert Gresley Hall, Esq.,
"Managing Director, London General Omnibus Company. Dear Sir, I write to remind you that I have not as yet received any reply to my communication of the 27th ultimo, to which I now solicit your early attention. Yours sincerely and faithfully, Fred. Hammill. P.S.—You must not consider this letter as of a private nature." I have a copy of the report which Mr. Fred. Hammill sent to Mr. Gresley Hall.

16,361. A report of the meeting?—A report of the meeting.

16,362. We do not want that unless there is proof in it. Is there any proof in that report of your contention?—Yes, there is a report that the officials were there at the meeting; there is a report in the "Standard" of the next day (see Appendix 113).

16,363. Has Mr. Hammill received, or has your Union received, any reply to your second communication?—Not any reply.

16,364. And they have not attempted to disprove it?—Not at all.

16,365. You have publicly declared that it is so?—That is so.

16,366. And that is your contention?—That is so.

16,367. You say that it is impossible for a man having once left the service, either having left of his own accord or being discharged, to get employment in any of the omnibus lines in London?—That is so.

16,368. Is there such a thing as a black list; are the men's names sent round to the various companies?—I am not prepared to go so far as that, but when a man leaves the service of one company, no matter for what he leaves, he is not employed by any other company.

10 March 1892.]

Mr. H. BOWBRICK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

16,369. How many men does that company employ, or can you give an idea; you say there are only about 200 men left in their service?—That is the General Omnibus Company.

16,370. How many men do they employ?—I should say at least 5,000.

16,371. Therefore your contention is that upwards of 4,000 men have either left that company or have been discharged since the strike?—I am dealing now particularly with drivers and conductors when I say that, and when I say 5,000 I include those in the stables as well.

16,372. Let me have the number of conductors and drivers?—I should say at least over 2,000.

16,373. When there have been 2,000 men that have been discharged or who have left of their own accord since the strike?—Yes, I should say so.

16,374. Now do men leave in large numbers of their own accord?—No, they do not.

16,375. Therefore you evidently lead me to think that the larger number of these men have been discharged?—Unquestionably.

16,376. For such things as low earnings?—Low earnings, for having taken part in the strike, and for the purpose of bringing in men at a lower rate of wage.

16,377. The men have been victimised?—Undoubtedly.

16,378. Previous to the strike, in your experience as an omnibus man have you ever had depositions to the directors seeking redress of grievances?—There were one or two attempts to form a combination, but in all cases where the men attempted to do so, by some means or other the officials had notice of it. I remember upon one occasion we were about forming an organisation in Kilburn, for the sole purpose of looking after our own interests as regards the summonses taken out by the police, and even in that case officials were at the door of the hall, and dispersed the meeting by telling the men that if they took any part in it in all probability they would be discharged.

16,379. What I want to get at is whether you have had delegates up to the directors or to the managers of the company on questions regarding the men's interests previous to the strike?—Not that I know of.

16,380. Then there would not be that wholesale dismissal previous to the strike that there was after it?—Oh, certainly not. I was in their service 15 years.

16,381. During that experience you never knew such a large number of men discharged?—Never heard tell of such a thing.

16,382. The profits of the company have been reduced these last two or three half years, have they not?—They have unquestionably.

16,383. You have stated that the men do not put as much energy into their work as they did previous to the introduction of the ticket system?—That is so.

16,384. Do I take it, then, that you also infer that, owing to the want of energy on behalf of the men, the companies have been to a very

Mr. Tait—continued.

considerable extent placed in a worse financial position than before, and that they have reduced their profit?—I mean to say that, owing to the fact of this system being introduced, the men really have not the time to devote, as they used to have, to the earning of the money. For instance, a man is inside an omnibus delivering tickets, and instead of having his back to the omnibus looking after intending passengers, and not only that, but since most of the old servants have been discharged there is a sort of different class of men from those that used to be there, who thoroughly understood the business.

16,385. When men are suspended or dismissed for low earnings, who puts forward the approximation of the earnings?—They do that in the different districts, but I might add that that "low earnings" has been an excuse for many years for getting rid of men when they do not want to keep them, when it is for other reasons, which, of course, they would not say. For instance, they would not tell a man, "You can take your licence," simply because he participated in the strike, or "You can take your licence," simply because you attended a midnight meeting. I have it as a matter of fact that one man was discharged for the sole reason of having his name on the book of rules of his Union after it was formed.

16,386. You mentioned a sliding scale?—Yes.

16,387. Was the sliding scale a result of the strike or had it any existence before the strike?—The sliding scale was in operation before the declaration of the strike.

16,388. And in it wages were given in proportion to length of service?—That is so.

16,389. The men objected to that?—They did, and they object to it at the present time.

16,390. Is it in operation still?—It is in operation still. For instance, a man who has been in the service 12 months as conductor gets 5s. a day, and if they take a new man on it is 4s. 6d. The same applies to coachmen. As to coachmen, their money should be 6s. 6d. for 12 hours, but on working 16 hours they give them an extra 1s., making 3d. an hour extra for the four hours worked.

16,391. You also said that the objection you had to this sliding scale of payment was that it led to dismissals of the old servants, simply because they could replace them with cheaper men?—That is so.

16,392. You heard Mr. Sutherst give evidence here this morning?—I did.

16,393. There is certainly a contradiction between your evidence and his regarding the settlement, of the strike. Mr. Sutherst stated that the agreement which was arrived at between himself and the companies, and which also had the cognisance of the Lord Mayor, was read to the men?—Yes, I heard him say so.

16,394. But you have said that no such agreement was ever submitted?—I say so now.

16,395. When you returned to your work I suppose you thought that the men's demands

10 March 1892.]

Mr. H. BOWERICK.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

were to be fully complied with and granted?—That is so.

16,396. How long was it till you found out that such was not the case?—I might say that on the Saturday when the strike was closed I, in conjunction with a number of other delegates, was present at the Victoria Theatre. The building being required for an entertainment the meeting had to be adjourned to the Temperance Hall in the Blackfriars Road, and at the time we were waiting for Mr. Sutherst to come, it was actually in the paper that the strike was closed and we knew nothing about it.

16,397. Were you upon the committee?—I was a delegate; there was no committee.

16,398. Mr. Sutherst also stated that this letter was submitted to a meeting of delegates, are you aware that that meeting took place?—I am aware of the meeting.

16,399. Were you invited to it?—I was there.

16,400. Was the agreement submitted?—No, there was no agreement submitted, certainly not.

16,401. When you complain of the companies having broken any promise, your only proof that there was an agreement was the statement of Mr. Sutherst?—That is so. We were certainly under the impression that at that time the Lord Mayor was a party to the agreement to concede 12 hours to the men. We certainly thought that the Lord Mayor was one of the gentlemen who was a party to the agreement. As I say, we never saw that agreement.

16,402. Of course you put a good deal of faith and confidence in Mr. Sutherst at that time, and accepted his statement?—Unquestionably.

16,403. Now, with regard to the letter which you read, addressed by the Lord Mayor to Mr. Pound, none of these cases within your knowledge have been inquired into?—That is so.

16,404. And of course you would expect that there could not be an efficient inquiry unless men who were interested were called in to state their case?—That is so.

16,405. They have not been called in?—Never.

16,406. You know, as a matter of fact, that none of the men have been sent for?—I do know it as a positive fact.

16,407. Previous to the strike a man scarcely got any time or any little privilege at all?—That is so.

16,408. Are they anything better now in that respect?—They are almost as bad at the present time.

16,409. Tell us what you mean when you say that the men previous to the strike were not allowed a day, for instance?—I mean to say this, that my own personal experience is that I have worked for 15½ hours a day for seven days a week for a matter of eight weeks without being allowed what we term ourselves a rest, that is to have an odd man come to work for you and receive the pay that you should have

Mr. Tait—continued.

received, that is paying for it. Upon one occasion, in the summer of 1890, I remember perfectly well, after having worked eight weeks, making a total of 840 hours, I asked the road inspector to whom I had to apply for a rest, and he said, "Ugh! eight weeks, I have got men " who have been working three months without " a rest."

16,410. Then the men were refused when they wanted a day at their own cost?—Yes that is so.

16,411. At that time you were working 15 to 16 hours a day?—Fifteen and a half hours for seven days a week.

16,412. Mr. Sutherst also told us this morning that there were reductions made from the wages of the men for accidents and things of that kind?—Yes.

16,413. Do you accept the statement made by him?—I speak now only of the district in which I work. Omnibus coachmen are stopped, or were at the time I was in their service, 1s. a week, and the conductors 6d., at all events the money was deducted from their wages, nothing was ever returned to them.

16,414. Have the men complained about it?—They have complained, but they have no redress. When a coachman meets with an accident the fund is supposed to pay two-thirds of the damage caused by the accident, and the other third he has to pay by having the money deducted from his wages so much per week in addition to the 1s. But the conductor, who has no possible chance of meeting with an accident, still has his 6d. deducted every Friday. I was working for 15 years in the western district, and I was paying 6d. a week the whole of the time and receiving nothing back.

Mr. Austin.

16,415. What was that 6d. a week for?—That was supposed to be an accident fund. I could not possibly meet with an accident, but still I had to pay it. We had no control over it.

Mr. Tait.

16,416. Has your organisation approached the companies with a view to creating amicable relations between your Union and themselves?—I might say I have a letter here in support of what I say as to the tyranny of some of the officials of the companies. It is a letter written to Mr. Duff on the 30th of September 1891. Mr. Duff is the manager of the London Road Car Company: "Mr. Duff, Manager, London " Road Car Company, Grosvenor Road, Pimlico. " Dear Sir,—I have refrained from writing you, " even against numerous applications from your " employe's and under the immediate supervision " of Mr. Dicks, until it has become an imperative " duty for me to do so. The men strongly " complain that they are being compelled to " work 16½ hours a day alternately with a 10 " hours' day, and further that Mr. Dicks is " continually threatening the men menacingly. " This conduct is not in accordance with the

10 March 1892.]

Mr. H. BOWBRICK.

[Continued.]

Mr. *Tait*—continued.

“promises made by your Company’s representatives in June last at the Mansion House. It is arousing a serious amount of discontent and general dissatisfaction; and as we are favourably inclined to a peaceable policy, I trust you will use your authority in establishing more amicable relations between the officials and employes of your company, by complying more closely with the spirit of public feeling and the accepted agreement they undoubtedly brought about in June last. I am instructed, in the interest of the bus men, to solicit your favourable consideration. I am, Sir, yours faithfully, Fred Hammill, Organising President.” That was to Mr. Duff, because we had a deputation of men from that particular company who were complaining of the conduct of Mr. Dicks, who was road inspector to the London Road Car Company.

16,417. Have your Union taken any steps to secure that the tramways and buses should be taken over by the municipal authorities, or assisted or promoted any such movement?—I cannot say that they have.

16,418. Have you taken the feeling of your members upon it?—Yes.

16,419. What is the feeling of them?—They are greatly in favour of it.

16,420. You can speak truly as representing more than yourself on that subject, and you say that the bus men in London are in favour of it?—That is the general feeling amongst the whole of the men.

16,421. You have also heard Mr. Sutherland give evidence; might I ask you if you agree to his proposals that the municipal authority should simply be the purchasers of the road and lease it to some other person?—No.

16,422. Or are you favourable to the municipality taking it up and working it by the local authority?—I am in favour of the municipal authority working it themselves.

16,423. The same as at Huddersfield?—Exactly.

16,424. When you speak of an eight hours’ day, do you mean it to be by legal enactment?—I do.

Mr. *Austin*.

16,425. As regards the accident fund, who has the control of that?—They have a secretary in the district. I am speaking of the district in which I worked, the western district. There is a secretary who is paid three guineas a week from the accident fund to control the fund generally and to pay the money out when accidents are met with.

16,426. Does the company contribute to this accident fund at all?—Not at all.

16,427. So that you have no voice in the disposal of the fund although you are the chief factors in making it?—Not any voice at all.

16,428. Have you demurred to paying this money before?—Yes, some of the men have refused point blank to pay it.

Mr. *Austin*—continued.

16,429. What was the result?—The result of that is that they were threatened that if they made any noise about it they would have to go, what was then termed, “on the carpet,” that is, to see the managing director. It was a rule, and they had to abide by it.

16,430. Did they see the director?—No, in all the cases that I remember where the men refused for a time to pay it they were fearful of going round, and consequently they allowed the money to be deducted as per usual.

16,431. Accidents are very few, are they not?—Very few indeed.

16,432. Have you any idea of the amount of money that has accumulated through this fund?—I have not the slightest idea, because of course we, as servants and omnibus drivers and conductors, had nothing to do with the management of it, and consequently we do not know anything as to the state of the fund, or did not when I was there.

Duke of *Devonshire*.

16,433. Your Union embraces the drivers as well as conductors does not it?—Yes.

16,434. And their grievances are very much the same?—Very similar.

16,435. The drivers have nothing to do with the ticket system?—Nothing at all.

16,436. Their complaint is long hours, is it not?—Yes, that is so, and I might say that although the omnibus drivers have nothing to do with the money business in connexion with the omnibuses, they have latterly taken to supersede the coachmen at the same time as the conductors if they think that the omnibuses are not earning the amount of money that they should do. In proof of that I have a notice here of the London General Omnibus Company which says:—“Notice to drivers. In consequence of continued complaints of drivers not noticing and stopping for persons desiring to ride, the directors have decided to deal severely with all such cases. For the future, when the conductors are ordered to attend the committees for low earnings, the drivers will attend with them and be dealt with in the same manner. By order, Robert Gresley Hall, Managing Director.” So that, although the drivers have nothing to do with issuing tickets and taking money, yet, at the same time, when the conductors are suspended now the drivers are suspended with them.

16,437. The drivers have something to do with the earnings?—They have nothing to do with the issuing of the tickets or collecting money.

16,438. But the earnings may depend upon the conduct of the drivers, may they not?—In a measure, but nothing as compared with the conductors.

16,439. I think you said that before the ticket system was introduced the conductors did appropriate a certain proportion to the takings?—I did. I said, I think, they were compelled to do so.

10 March 1892.]

Mr. H. BOWBRICK.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

16,440. Just explain that?—I mean to say that at the end of each journey there were men stationed there that were termed omnibus attendants, that is, men who watered the horses. Although recognised by the company's officials, and although it was necessary for these men to make application to the company's officials to be allowed to perform these duties, the company did not pay them anything.

Mr. Tait.

16,441. No wages?—No wages at all, and consequently the men had to pay them 2d. or 3d. per day out of their own pockets. It was an acknowledged fact at the time of the strike, and the companies knew it, that the coachmen and the conductors had to remunerate the horsekeepers who looked after the horses, otherwise the horses would go wrong. That was a fact of course, and it was impossible for a man who worked 16 hours in the street at 4s. a day to give any portion of that 4s. away to these men, whom the company did not pay, although they performed the company's work. That is what I meant when I said they were compelled to do so.

16,442. They made a certain deduction from their takings for the purpose of paying these men?—Yes, that is so.

16,443. But there was no check upon it, or was there any checking to prevent their taking more than that amount?—There was this check, there was the way bill, and of course if the men who were on these omnibuses did not return a fair average for their day's work or for their week's work of course they were discharged. I think it was calculated up every week, and consequently, the men, knowing they had to pay these small amounts away, worked the harder to keep their situations, and in fact the men generally, I might say, did not look upon it as dishonest because the companies were aware of it.

16,444. But on a particularly good day, or at a particularly good time, a man could, without being detected, appropriate a considerable proportion of the earnings?—Not necessarily so, because for years, until this ticket system came into operation, the buses had officials riding with them as passengers, and the companies

Mr. Tait—continued.

employed various means of checking the number of passengers carried, so that when a man did appropriate any of this money for the payment of these people he was undergoing a very great risk.

Duke of Devonshire.

16,445. Is the ticket system in force now?—Yes.

16,446. And have the wages been raised in consequence?—The wages were raised 6d. a day at the time of the strike, or rather a week before the strike.

16,447. Who pays these horse attendants now?—So far as I have been able to ascertain, I believe that the omnibus company now pay the men a small wage.

16,448. The servants are not expected to pay them?—They are not expected to pay them.

16,449. You admit, I suppose, it is quite within the right of the companies to decide whether they will work upon the ticket system or not?—Certainly.

16,450. But you do not put that forward as a grievance?—Not at all. I do not put that forward as a grievance at all, because at the time of the strike the men made no complaints against the tickets. They were working at that time 16 hours a day, and this ticket entails a great deal more labour, because the men have to attend earlier in the morning and they have to be later at night, because they have to go and have their tickets checked and so on, and that placed on the top of 16 hours a day does not give them much time for rest.

16,451. From what you have said, I need hardly ask you it, but I gather that the employers do not recognise the Union in any way?—They do not, and they oppose us in every possible way they can.

16,452. They decline to have any official communication?—They do. We have sent them communications which they have not answered, and whenever a man is known to have taken any prominent part in his Union he has been discharged.

16,453. Do you know what the alleged reason on the part of the employers is? Have they made any complaint on the subject of the proceedings of the Union?—No, none at all.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

11 March 1892.]

Mr. JOHN ATKINSON.

THIRTY-SECOND DAY.

Commission Room, Westminster Hall, Friday, 11th March 1892.

PRESENT :

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE.

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF DERBY, K.G. (CHAIRMAN).

The Right Hon. Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH,
Bart, M.P.
Mr. J. C. BOLTON, M.P.
Mr. H. TAIT.
Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, M.P.
Professor MARSHALL.

Mr. T. BURT, M.P. and Mr. E. TROW (Group A.),
and Mr. M. AUSTIN and Mr. G. LIVESEY
(Group C.) also attended.

Mr. GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary.

Mr. JOHN ATKINSON called and examined.

Earl of Derby,

16,454. You are the treasurer, as I understand, of the Amalgamated Omnibus and Tram Workers' Union?—Yes.

16,455. How long is it since that Union came into existence?—Last July.

16,456. It is the same, I suppose, as that of which we heard from the witnesses yesterday?—It is the same as you heard from Mr. Bowbrick, but not the same one as Mr. Sutherst said was in existence previously.

16,457. What, in your opinion, have been the causes of the disputes between the tram and bus men and their employers?—The cause of the disputes is, literally speaking, the long hours of labour and the precarious employment, that is, that there are so many fresh men. I might say that I took part in the agitation previous to this present Union being formed, and I must admit at once that the condition of the tramway workers at the present day is far better than it was three or four years ago. I have been at the omnibus and tramway work now for something over 25 years, and I have worked in Aberdeen, Liverpool, Sheffield, Hull, and London. But we will not travel so far back as that. I will give my experience since I came up to London. When I came up to London the hours of tramway men varied from 13½ hours to 16½ hours; and on some lines it would extend to 18 hours a day for the Saturday. Mr. Sutherst yesterday gave about the correct figures that we are actually labouring at the present time—11 hours 20 minutes to 12 hours a day, extending over 16 hours and 16½ hours. Also I might add that since I came to London the wages of most of the

Earl of Derby—continued.

tramway *employés* have considerably increased, so that the wage question is not so much in dispute now as the hours of labour and the precarious employment, that is, so many fresh men being taken on. I might tell you that I was one of the first to take a part in the agitation in 1889. At one time in 1889 we had a pretty powerful Union, numbering, in the tramway men alone, between 2,000 and 3,000 members, and we had a good strong committee, composed principally of tram men, but out of that committee I am the only one who has retained his service in the company. There is not another man who took a prominent part in that agitation but who has lost his position in the companies entirely. He has not only been driven from one company, but been entirely boycotted by the rest of the companies, so that he has had to seek his livelihood in another sphere of labour. Although these men have sacrificed their position, it has been absolutely beneficial to the men who are working at the present time in the employ of the tramway companies. For in 1889 most of the companies gave the men better conditions of labour, and the inspectors (that is the officials of the company) treated the men with more civility, and altogether better than they did previous to any union being formed, and, furthermore, the system that had been in vogue of fining the men excessive fines was practically abolished from the first agitation. I myself have driven a conductor, and an inspector jumped in and found 11 fares without tickets. The conductor proved that four of these passengers had only just got up,

11 March 1892.]

Mr. JOHN ATKINSON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

and he had not had time to give tickets to them. The other seven, it appears, had ridden only a short distance. The next day but one there was 7s. fine to pay for the seven fares neglected, and another fine for punches short. It brought it to 8s. 2d. that he had to pay, not the following morning but the morning after that, before he could go to work, and the whole of that man's wages at that time was 4s. a day. It is actions like this that we have to complain about, and which drove the men to organising in the first instance. This is an exceptionally hard case, but men would often have to pay as fine 1s., 2s., or 3s. before they went to work. You will see at once a man could not pay these excessive fines, which were regularly in vogue. A conductor, under these circumstances, could not be honest and live on 4s. a day, and continue every morning having to pay fines. This was the great complaint. Well, I must say the agitation in 1889 practically put a stop to this system of excessive fining. Of course, it is partly in vogue on some lines now, but a 6d. fine, practically speaking, is not so detrimental to the interests of the men as losing an entire day's pay to go to the office and explain the matter to the manager.

16,458. Let me understand, do you object to there being fines or penalties of any kind, where a driver or conductor, through negligence, has allowed the company to be defrauded?—I admit that the most stringent rules are necessary, in the interests of the men themselves, and the public, to keep proper discipline in the tramway companies. Where a man systematically neglects his duty, either in one way or another, I do not think fining has any tendency to make that man be a better servant. I would caution him, and tell him that if his conduct did not mend he might expect discharge, as he was not fit for that class of service. But when we were worked, as I have worked myself, 16½ hours a day, and 18 hours on Saturday, week after week, summer and winter, the condition of labour was such that no man could do the duty to the satisfaction of himself or the company, under such circumstances. I may say the companies have always been very much opposed to any organisation on the part of the men, although they were not in any way detrimental to the company. In my opinion a sound organisation managed by practical tramway men, would or might be even more in the interests of the company than of the men. I admit that in some cases the concessions that have been granted to the tramway men are very liberal. Take the case of the North Metropolitan Tramway Company, which claims to carry one-seventh of the whole of the tramway riders of the country. The chairman at the last half-yearly meeting had to confess that although the concessions granted to the men had cost the company during the half year 12,000*l.* additional in wages, yet he was honest enough to admit that the company's revenue had increased by 13,000*l.*, and therefore he reckoned that there was 1,000*l.* to the good through the better service which the men had

Earl of Derby—continued.

rendered. They had earned the company 13,000*l.* to pay the 12,000*l.* additional wages with.

16,459. What advantage do you say arises to the company through the men being organised?—We would not have men in the Union who persisted in any action which was detrimental to the best interests of the company. But at present whatever capabilities a man may have if he will only crawl, he will rise over his fellow men. If he is only a crawler, or a kind of a tyrant, he tyrannises over the men; he only assumes that position to stab the company in the back, in many cases more thoroughly than he could do were he to remain in a lower position. I have known myself, since I have been a tramway man, that it has been actually impossible for any man to retain his position on most of the lines in London without having blackmail levied upon him, and until he was ready to part with it, he could not get on. Now it is men like these whom we would boycott, and men like these who are most detrimental to the best interests of the company, because such men only study their own selfish ends, and do not study the interests of their fellow men, nor the interests of the company.

16,460. I suppose if a system of blackmailing exists it is clearly not for the interest of the company, and therefore the company would not allow of it, if they knew of it?—That I admit. But you see most of the companies are large, and there is no class of capitalists who are so much at the mercy of their servants as tramway companies are. The men are responsible for the whole of the takings, and the whole of the revenue of the company, and whatever check you may have on the men, still I admit there are men who will use their abilities so as to defraud the companies, such men in most instances make no attempt to organise, and in all cases use their influence on behalf of the present system. If 4s. a day was all the money they could get, and all the money they could make, they would not wish the day to extend over 16 or 17 hours, but they do not care how long they work, because they pay themselves for it. But this is detrimental to an honest man. An honest man only gets his 4s. or 4s. 6d. a day, and he does not want any more under such circumstances. Of course he wants more, if he can get it at as honest wages, but he does not want to take it by pilfering what actually belongs to the company.

16,461. I understand your complaint is that men are able to obtain employment and perhaps promotion, who are given to dishonest practices, but in what way does the organisation of the men in a union tend to prevent that?—We would prevent it in this way. A man who is well in with a few of the inspectors will sometimes manage to get two or three minutes allowed and you will see him, day by day, carrying more people than the car following, and yet at the end of the day you shall look at the takings of each car, and the man who has had two or three more minutes allowed will not

11 March 1892.]

MR. JOHN ATKINSON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

pay any more money than the other man, although he has been carrying more passengers.

16,462. I quite understand that one man does his work better than another, but do I understand you to say, under the system of organising in a union, the union would choose who should be employed?—No, but we would see that one man should not rob his fellows. A man has no right to hang his car on him and get him discharged through no fault of his own.

16,463. You think there is too much competition between the drivers of the different cars?—There is too much competition when the conductor and the driver of a car are taking something from the company which does not belong to them. They want more time allowed, and they want more passengers, because they want a certain section of the money to put into their own pocket, and I have no sympathy with these actions whatever.

16,464. Do I understand you rightly as saying that men who in any way produce what you consider an undue competition between different drivers, would not obtain employment if the Union had its own way; would the Union say to the employer: "You shall not employ such and such a man"?—We would caution him, and tell him he had no right to hang his car on another man—on his brother—and take passengers that the car ought not to take. We tell him he has no right to do that, because to do that persistently only means getting the innocent man behind into trouble. If he insists on doing that, we would say to the company: "That man does not run his car fair; he does not pay in above his average takings, and therefore there is something wrong in his conduct, and his persisting in this conduct only means getting the discharge of the innocent man that follows him."

16,465. If the Union excluded men on that account, you think there would be less competition among the different drivers?—Things would work with more satisfaction to the men, and it would stop half the discharges which are in vogue at the present time.

16,466. But before that could be done it would be necessary, I suppose, that the company should undertake to dismiss any man whom the Union wanted to dismiss?—Not without a thorough investigation, not unless it was a clear case that the men had done that which was not justifiable in the eyes both of the whole of the men and of the company likewise. It would not amount to what you suggest at all. I may say that for a tramway man to get employment with a tram company, whether he is a Londoner or whether he has come from the provinces, in the first instance, he must have his character inquired into by the police, in order to get a licence, and he must be strictly upright and honest, otherwise he could not get a licence. But that licence, although it is granted only after the strictest inquiry, has no effect whatever in getting a man a job. If that man presents himself with a new licence to any of the tramway companies they ask his name and address,

Earl of Derby—continued.

and he has to give references for the preceding six years, and they inquire into his character over again, and then, if those references are satisfactory he is employed by the company, and if not he is not employed by them, although he has got his licence.

16,467. Do you suggest that every man who obtains a licence should be guaranteed employment?—No, not necessarily that, but I say that a clear licence in all cases should, if the companies wanted men, be sufficient for them to take him into their service. If he has a clear licence, and there is nothing marked against him on that licence I think that ought to be sufficient.

16,468. You mean the fact of his having a licence ought to be sufficient to obtain him employment without any inquiry by the company?—Provided there is nothing on the licence which is detrimental to his character.

16,469. Then does it not come to what I suggested, that you argue that the licence ought to be a guarantee for employment?—Provided that the company want men. They inquire strictly into a man's character. And what do you find? Although there is no class of employers who have so good an opportunity of knowing the character of the men they employ, I will guarantee that the leading tramway companies employ as many conductors year by year as would man the cars three times over. Now there must be something wrong about a system which inquires so particularly into the character of the men employed, and still they are only retained in employment for such a very short time.

16,470. You say there are many more men holding licences than can find employment?—That is so.

16,471. That is, I presume, because the employment is thought, for whatever reason, to be a desirable one?—That is so.

16,472. You have done a good deal, you say, in the last year or two to improve the condition of the men?—That is so.

16,473. But does it not occur to you, the more you do to improve the condition of the men, and the more desirable you make the employment, the larger the number of people there will be who are anxious to get into the business, and who will seek to take out licences for that purpose?—I do not think so, because when the conditions of labour in the tramway company's service were worse than they are now, you would see from 100 to 200 men round the door trying to get employment, and it can be no worse than it has been. Now although they have these men there daily to choose from, the company advertise twice every week in London and provincial papers for men.

16,474. Do you complain of too many men being licensed?—It would not matter so much how many men were licensed, provided our organisation was strong enough, and provided the masters would recognise our organisation. Numbers of men are discharged through practically no fault of their own, and I say that this

11 March 1892.]

Mr. JOHN ATKINSON.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

system of having so many men is as detrimental to the best interests of the company in my opinion as it is to the men themselves. At the present time it is not so bad as it was. Three or four years ago, if a man went to any other employer and told him he had been in a tram or omnibus company's service, it was almost impossible to get a job at any other employment. They would say, "You are of no use to us."

16,475. I want to get at what it is that you object to, and what it is that you propose. Do I understand you think a man ought not to be dismissed without the consent of the Union?—The Union would have no interest in defending a man who had done anything to disgrace himself. To keep disgraced men in the Union would be detrimental to the best interests of the Union, and I would not in any case defend any man who had wilfully done anything detrimental to the interests of the company.

16,476. That is not quite the question; do you think that no man ought to be dismissed by his employer without the consent of the Union?—If it was a doubtful case I would have the report that is against him laid before the officials of the Union, and let the matter be inquired into by the Union, and then if the case was found to be a bad one against him, we could say to him that the company was justified in discharging him.

16,477. I am not suggesting that you would abuse the power, but the fact is you claim for the Union the power of exercising a veto upon discharges?—Yes.

16,478. There is something you have to tell us, I believe, about the payment on a sliding scale, what does that mean?—That is most detrimental to us. The companies use it in this manner. In all cases they have reckoned to have the first class pay, 6s. a day, and before there was any agitation, there were only one or two men on the line who were obtaining that 6s. a day. The rest got 4s. 6d., 4s. 9d., 5s. In all cases they would say that the men would rise to 6s. a day, but we always found that although a man might, practically speaking, have been very few times reported for any offence during the time he was working at 4s. 6d. a day, or during the time he was working at 4s. 9d., that as soon as the time arrived for him to have his 5s., some pretext was given for shoving him off, to make room for a 4s. 6d. man. That is the reason we object to the sliding scale in that manner.

16,479. Would you rather have all men paid equally?—Equally for the same amount of labour, and then if a man is not competent to do that amount of labour he would not be justified in retaining his position.

16,480. I understand you are in favour of a compulsory eight hours' day, with two shifts of men?—Yes, the majority of our men are favourable to that policy. But I may say this, that speaking for myself alone, provided the organisations were strong enough to treat with the masters on equal terms, I would prefer the

Earl of Derby—continued.

matter being arranged by the men and the masters themselves. However, you will see what a hopeless task we have before us. A certain section of the men always support the masters, and therefore we see it is a hopeless task to expect to get a reasonable number of hours of labour by organisation. Therefore what we cannot obtain by organisation we must look for by legislation only.

16,481. You want, then, legislation to regulate the hours of labour, but do you think that legislation should also undertake to regulate the wages?—By no means.

16,482. Therefore, if it so happened that wages were lower in consequence of the hours being shorter, would you accept that as a necessary consequence?—The companies and the companies alone are responsible for the present rate of wages in vogue. The men are not responsible. When we started the agitation four-fifths of the men were only receiving 4s. 6d. a day, and the conductors 4s. in most instances, and we never agitated for an increase of pay. We certainly referred to starvation wages, but what we meant by starvation wages was this, that what would be practically good wages for eight hours a day would be starvation wages for 16 hours a day. That is the way we took it. The starvation wages question only came in with the excessive number of hours that we had to work for that wage.

16,483. I think you suggest, then, in the first place, that there should be a limitation of licences, and in the next place you think that the Union ought to have a veto upon men being discharged?—Yes.

16,484. Then you think that the hours ought to be compulsorily reduced to eight hours per day, but you do not as yet propose to regulate wages?—Well, we should have a standard wage, what we call a Trade Union rate of wage. We certainly must have a voice in fixing the rate of wages. We would not entirely leave that in the hands of the masters. But what I want to point out is this. When we demanded shorter hours the company, in the first instance, did not grant us shorter hours. They only raised the wages without any reduction of the hours. But if, in all cases, the companies had met the men with a reduction of hours of labour, and kept the wages at the standard they were three years ago, the companies could to-day have been working the men on a double shift, which would have been about 8½ hours a day, and it would have involved very little, if any, more cost to the company than under the present circumstances. In fact, in my opinion, with the wages that we received three years ago, a double shift could be worked more to the interests of the company than the present system.

Mr. Tait.

16,485. Can you tell me the strength of the membership in your Union?—In 1889 it rose to about 2,500, but at the time of the omnibus strike it had literally collapsed. Although I constantly paid my contributions I resigned from

11 March 1892.]

Mr. JOHN ATKINSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

taking any part in that Union owing to the manner in which it was carried on.

16,486. Will you tell us the cause of the collapse?—The cause of the collapse was through the discharge of the men in the first instance, who took any part in the managing of the Union, and also from the fact of men being at the head of affairs who did not understand the organisation of men in a practical manner.

16,487. Then the company defeated the objects which the tramway men had by dismissing their men?—That is so.

16,488. How many members of the committee were there who were dismissed?—I am the only man who is not dismissed to-day.

16,489. Are you at present a tramway employé?—I am in the same employ as I have been the last eight years.

16,490. Did your old Society make any provision to assist these men who had been dismissed?—Yes, we assisted them as long as we had funds.

16,491. Are you satisfied that the present Union which you have which, as was stated in evidence here yesterday, has been organised by the Trades Council, is a better one than the old one?—Yes, it is managed in every way in a more successful manner.

16,492. Are the benefits to its members better than in the old one?—Better in every way. There are sick benefits and death benefits.

16,493. In answer to Lord Derby you said you thought the Union had not only benefitted the men but had also benefitted the companies?—I did.

16,494. Do I take it you mean that a contented staff of men would be more profitable to a company than a discontented staff?—That is so in every instance. A discontented man is no use at tramway work either for himself or the company.

16,495. You also said that blackmail had been levied upon men?—That is so.

16,496. Can you give us any instances?—Well, since the organisation of men most of the companies have put it down with a strong hand, but I can give plenty of instances where I have had it attempted to be levied on myself.

16,497. Give us one?—When I was in the employ of the North Metropolitan Tram Company there was a timekeeper at Nag's Head. In many instances he came to me demanding a drink. He would say it was a cold morning and would want to borrow 1s., saying that he had left his purse at home, and many other excuses. I told him I never bought my labour, and if I could not work in the company without giving the inspectors tips, my service would terminate.

16,498. You say the terms and conditions of work are better now than they have been before?—That is so.

16,499. Have you followed the management of the tramway companies very carefully?—Very carefully indeed. In fact, I may tell you at one time I had some few shares in a tramway company. I have none now, I may say.

Mr. Tait—continued.

16,500. Do you know whether the concessions which have been given to the men have in any way interfered financially with the interests of the company?—The reports of their chairmen at the half-yearly meetings show that the concessions granted to the men have not been in any way detrimental to the interests of the company. We admit that the companies have not paid such big dividends this last 12 months, but that is not in consequence of the concessions given to the staff, but is rather owing to the dear forage. Another thing helps to account for it. The tramway companies at the present day do not carry so many through profitable passengers. From Greenwich to Westminster Bridge the fare used to be 6d., now it is only 3d., and they carry no more through passengers, though it is at half the fare, because of the competition, and the cheap railway fares are cutting them out. Another thing is that on Bank Holidays for these last two years the takings of the tramway companies have been very bad, simply because the people now take the train further out into the country at very nearly the same cost as the short through journey of the tram car.

16,501. You heard Mr. Sutherst yesterday suggest to the Commission that there should be a raising of fares. Do you agree with that suggestion?—I do not agree in the manner Mr. Sutherst put it. The tramway companies must depend upon penny fares, because for long distances people do not ride in them. There must be reasonable penny fares for people to jump up and go to a station here and there.

16,502. Might I ask you whether you were a shareholder of the company with whom you were engaged?—No, I have had no shares in trams since I came up to London. It was in a provincial town, and I may say I was for a short time in the employment of that company although I do not think the manager knew I was so.

16,503. What class of men are tramway employés generally taken from?—Practically speaking they are men who through advertisements came up from the country.

16,504. Have you ever known companies attempt to introduce cheaper labour?—Yes. Here is an advertisement which appears in the "Chronicle" twice every week, "The North Metropolitan Tramways Company. Drivers and conductors wanted; none but respectable, intelligent, active men, of good character, employed; personal application indispensable; police licence required: wages 4s. 6d. per day to commence, 5s. per day after four months, 5s. 6d. per day after nine months, and 6s. per day after 12 months' service. Men over 40 years of age or under 5½ feet in height need not apply; drivers must be skilled coachmen, and pass a pair-horse driving test before appointment; conductors must write a good hand and be fair arithmeticians; there is a provident society for the employés, to which admission is gained after three months

11 March 1892.]

MR. JOHN ATKINSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

"service by men of good health. Forms of application to be obtained on Tuesdays and Thursdays between 12 and 2 p.m., third floor, Ropemaker Street, Finsbury Pavement, E.C." This appears twice a week, however many men there may be (*handing in advertisement*).

16,505. And your complaint is that under the sliding scale the older servants are liable to be dismissed for trivial matters, and their places taken by men who come in reply to such advertisements as these?—That is so. I will read you this extract from the report of the London Tramways Company,—Mr. Sellar, chairman. "The wonder was that politicians did not look at things as they were. They paid from 30s. to 40s. per week to a man who, were he a farm labourer in some parts of Essex, would earn 10s. per week. Why should the labourer remain in Essex at 10s. per week with little before him but the workhouse, and why with a field for cheap labour close to our work, should the company continue to pay extravagantly high wages" (*handing in extract*).

16,506. Are the qualifications for an agricultural labourer the same as the tramway companies require in their advertisements? An agricultural labourer is not a skilled coachman, nor a man who is half a clerk and a fair arithmetician?—That is so, but the companies continually engage these men partly to make the older servants contented with the long hours of labour, and so they always have a good few of them, although we say it is most detrimental to the best interests of the company.

16,507. What are your hours of labour just now?—I will give you the hours three years ago, and then I will give them now. Three years ago my day's work from the time of leaving the yard to returning to the yard at night would occupy 16 hours and 40 minutes. Out of that I would have two hours and 45 minutes rest during the day. But at that time, before there was any organisation, we were always running about an hour late, and sometimes more than that. Therefore that would make it about 17½ hours. That was three years ago. Now I work five days a week, 11 hours and a half a day of actual work extending over 16½ hours, but I never finish an hour late, as I did before there was any organisation, for the men do their work in a better spirit and finish up to time. The hours I have given are for five days a week, but on the Saturday I have longer time. I have an extra journey to do, and Sunday is my worst day, in the week.

16,508. Then you work seven days a week? Seven days in all cases, except a day off is granted. You can apply to the company for a day off, and if it is granted it is granted, and if not you must work on.

16,509. You heard the evidence of Mr. Bowbrick and Mr. Sutherst regarding the municipalities taking over tramways; are you in favour of that?—Yes, I am entirely in favour of the municipalisation of the tramways.

16,510. And their being worked by the muni-

Mr. Tait—continued

cipalities?—Yes, entirely by the municipalities—for the municipalities to employ the men. I may say that what makes me more favourable to the municipalities taking over the trams is this. Under the present system, although the companies have, some of them, been earning 8, 10, and even 12 per cent., and though, practically speaking, the wages of the men are not much to complain of, I am positive 90 per cent. of these men, as soon as they fall out of work, although they have been receiving what you may call, practically speaking, good wages, have nothing whatever to turn to. They are actually penniless, although they may have been with the company a number of years. They have no means of providing for the future; but under municipal authorities there could be established a fund whereby if a man had served the authorities faithfully for a certain number of years, or if he became too old to render proper service to the municipality, could either have a pension of some description, or be put to some labour which was not so tedious or laborious as tramway and omnibus work is at the present time. Tramway and omnibus work is more laborious in London than it is in most of the provincial towns.

16,511. Your complaint about the dishonesty of the conductors is based upon the statement that there are conductors and drivers in the tram service who carry more passengers than they ought to do, more than the registered number, and that they do this with a set purpose of taking money which does not belong to them, and that a man who goes into the tramway's company's service with the intention of serving them faithfully is by the force of these men who are in the service compelled to drop into the same groove, or else he will get what is known as low earnings, or low takings, which will carry with it either suspicion or dismissal? That is so. I may say the reason of that is this: people in the tramway company, or shareholders of the tramway company, may have friends who are permitted to be inspectors over practical tramway men. Such men have had no practice whatever, and they are only there because they are the sons of their fathers, put in there just for the billet, and it is these men who do not understand the work, who allow other men to trail and crawl. Some of them are indeed not honourable men, but will allow a man to do anything; it does not matter how detrimental it may be to the interests of the company, provided he gets a little something out of it for himself.

16,512. You have stated that if a man gets into mischief by an error of judgment, or something of that sort, and he has to appear before the managers; when he is called upon so to appear, although he is practically engaged on their business, he loses his day's wages?—Yes, in all cases.

16,513. Do you think that the directors are aware of that kind of work going on?—Yes, a man has not any pay unless he is actually

11 March 1892.]

Mr. JOHN ATKINSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

employed—that is, labouring for the company. Those are the rules.

16,514. Suppose a tram meets with an accident with a hansom in the street and you made a report, and then it was thought necessary that the driver or conductor should see that manager, do I understand from you that the driver or the conductor would not get paid?—He would not get paid.

Professor Marshall.

16,515. I should like to get from you a little more clearly what you mean by this “blackmailing”?—Blackmailing is not, I admit, so much in vogue as it was some time ago. There is an improvement in all companies, both omnibus and tramway, and I must take credit for the unions in this, that in all the instances where the Union had power it set its face dead against it, whether it was the servant giving it or an inspector or an official receiving it.

16,516. I want to get at the nature of the blackmail. Is it that a dishonest inspector, acting in collusion with a dishonest conductor, will allow a conductor to stay two minutes behind his time and get more than his share of the fares?—That is so.

16,517. But under the ticket system would that be of any avail to him?—It would.

16,518. Then you mean he evades the ticket system?—Yes. When leaving a terminus at certain times in the day, in the morning and evening especially, short riders (especially in a working class district where, as you will admit, the population as a rule is not very favourable to the tramways under present circumstances) are often in collusion with the conductors. The conductors let these passengers run a certain distance. The conductor, of course, knows a good many of the passengers, and if he knew how far a certain passenger was going he would, especially if he was on the top of the car, let him go on and not take his fare till just as he was going down the steps, when he would get the money without issuing a ticket; or on the other hand, a passenger who has had a ticket issued to him gets out and slips the ticket back into the conductor's hand, and he will re-issue it.

16,519. So that the ticket system is not an efficient check?—The ticket system appeals to the honesty of the public and of the conductor, but it is not an absolute check, not with the most stringent regulations.

16,520. If the ticket system is not an efficient check are not the companies bound to impose very heavy fines when they detect a case of tickets not being properly issued?—You see fines do no good whatever however much you may fine. I once drove a man myself in the employment I am now. He was discharged, I must admit, from the service of the company some four or five years ago now, but I have known that man, although only receiving 4s. a day as wages, working sometimes 16 hours, some days 18 hours; nay, I have driven him myself 20 hours a day, when the whole of

Professor Marshall—continued.

the wages that he was receiving was 4s.; and morning by morning he has paid 1s. 6d., 2s., and even 3s. 6d. for fines. Now any man must know that there is something rotten about a system when a man would pay those fines. He did not care about the fines because he paid them, and there is no doubt he paid them with the full intention of making them up out of the companies earnings.

16,521. Would a man be allowed to remain in the service of the company if he were continually fined?—They are hauled up. They are not so much now, because fines are practically abolished. They discharge the men now, or make them loose their entire day's pay by going to see the manager.

16,522. You gave an instance of an attempt by an inspector to blackmail yourself?—Yes.

16,523. But you do not receive the fares; what interest could he suppose you to have?—They think if a man is a worker he will receive something, and I must admit that at that time most of the drivers were in the habit of receiving something from the conductors.

16,524. It was stated to us by one of the witnesses as rather a grievance that if a conductor was brought up for short earnings his driver was brought up too?—Yes.

16,525. Your last answer would explain that action on the part of the company?—Yes, it would. The difficulty is because the companies do not employ an inspector because he is a thoroughly practical man, or because he is a thoroughly honest man; but it is, in most instances, because a man has crawling habits by which he rises, or else it is because he is the son of his father, or he is a friend of one of the directors, and so he is selected, although he has no practical knowledge. This system I have spoken of could not arise if the inspectors were in all instances practical men; and, on the other hand, were thoroughly honest men. I admit that the depredations, the peculations from the company, were at one time very excessive, but I attribute that more to the fault of the inspectors than of the men; because, if a man was dependent entirely upon his 4s. and was going to have nothing more, then, through these men wanting a fee for one thing and a tip for another he could not live; he could not exist in the service on the wages that were given at that time. But the system is far better now. It is wearing down, I am quite willing to admit that. The tramway companies have been more honestly dealt with by their servants since there has been an attempt at organisation. There has been a better understanding than at any time since I have known anything about tramway work.

16,526. You told the chairman that you were very anxious that the Union should have some voice in the dismissal of servants?—Yes.

16,527. You would not require an absolute veto?—No, that is so. The majority of the Union at the present time are steady men, who are anxious to serve the company faithfully, and

11 March 1892.]

Mr. JOHN ATKINSON.

[Continued.]

Professor Marshall—continued.

to do their duty to themselves and to the company. But if a man has lost his situation through the action of somebody who has not been thoroughly honest, then we should defend that man and should say that no one has a right to deprive that man of his livelihood.

16,528. Are you acquainted with the practice of other trade unions in cases where workmen are dismissed without their being, in their opinion, proper cause?—I could not give you any instances. In fact, a man who has got seven days a week, or even six days a week, to work on a tramway, and who gives over work at 11 or 12 o'clock at night, has not an opportunity to learn quite so much as a man who has leisure during the evening. I am not conversant at all with other trade unions. In fact, I have had nothing to do with any other union. At the time the omnibus strike was on I was not a member of the Union, and took no part whatever in that strike.

16,529. Without going in detail into the matter, I suppose you would be aware generally that many trade unions do enter a more or less effective remonstrance with regard to the dismissals of individuals under certain circumstances?—I believe they do.

16,530. But in order to get that right, they have first to earn it, have they not, by doing some service, by making the trade work in some way more easily than without the Union. Do not you think that it would be possible for your Union to get the employers to listen to what you have to say, if you could do them a certain service by enabling the tramways to work more easily?—I do not know what the companies might do if we were to get more powerful, but up to now they have not recognised us; in fact, they would not speak to a man if they thought he was in any way connected with the Union; at least, that is the case with the rich companies. The company which I have the honour to work for, which is only a small company, will listen to any remonstrance from the Union on behalf of any of the union men, who might be discharged. In fact, I have proof of that, because, since the Union was established on our line, the number of men discharged has been considerably less. In fact, I have been about eight years in the service of the company, and during this last 12 months there have been less men discharged than ever there were before since I have been in the service of the company.

16,531. You hold that the company suffers much from the improper action of certain inspectors?—It was so more than it is now. I do hold that the companies have suffered shamefully in times past at the hands of some of the officials. There is great responsibility and great trust put upon these inspectors, because you must know that the manager of a tramway company, extending over the radius which most of these tramway companies extends over, sees very little of the workings of the routes in general, or the actions of these men, and, candidly, I think if the men were to show a proper spirit and a bold front, there is not a tramway manager or a

Professor Marshall—continued.

tramway director in London, unless the mantle of Mr. Norwood has fallen upon somebody, but would be willing to meet the men in a proper spirit, provided the men would show a little more energy and organisation themselves, and approach their masters in a proper spirit.

16,532. My point was this: if the company suffers so much from irregularity of this kind, and if the unions could stop these irregularities, and if the Union did stop these irregularities, might it not hope to earn from the employers more consideration with regard to cases in which individuals are harshly treated?—That would be so if we could but get recognition from the different companies.

16,533. But does not the first step lie rather with yourselves?—The first step, I admit, does rather lie with the men forming themselves into a solid organisation, and the most practical, sober, and honest of the men themselves being the managers of that organisation, and for that organisation to be managed in the best interests of the men in the first instance, and in the best interests of the employers in the second instance.

16,534. Do not you think that you might make it more clear that you can be of service to the employers?—That has been entirely my aim since the organisation, not only to benefit the men but the company. Under the old system, when we were working such dreadfully long hours, the men had no care for their work. The only thing was to get through the 16 hours, without any regard to the best interests of the company. But since these concessions have been made, and since more liberty has been given them, they have taken a much greater interest in their work, to the absolute benefit of the company. If we had a stronger organisation we would take care that the inspectors of the men generally did that which was not detrimental to the interests of the company, and then if he did that which was detrimental to the interests of the company we would say the company was justified in removing such a man, unless he adopted a different policy, and one which was in the interests of himself, and the Union, and the company.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

16,535. If the law forbade you to work more than eight hours in the service of the tram company, do you think it should allow you to earn money in any other employment during the other hours of the day?—My opinion is this. If a man is receiving a fair rate of wages for his 8 hours or 8½ hours work, as the case may be, a trade union rate, he ought to be able in those 8½ hours to earn sufficient to support himself and those dependent upon him, that is living with economy. Then that man, seeing that so many of his fellow men were out of work, would be a very selfish man indeed if he took work which another man, who had nothing else to do was ready to take. He would be a very selfish man indeed if he did that, as long as he was earning a livelihood, because he would be depriving another man of the chance of

11 March 1892.]

Mr. JOHN ATKINSON.

[Continued.]

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—continued.

earning anything. So we condemn the action of such a man, provided there were men ready to do that, and who had no other work at all to do.

16,536. But if a man thought that the wages he would earn, in the eight hours were not enough to give him what he considered a fair livelihood, would you allow him to earn something more at some other work in the rest of the 24 hours?—I must admit this, that there are some men of the class that I belong to, who, if they were receiving 8s., 10s., or even 15s. a day, would think that was too little, and if he was only working eight hours he would deprive another man of a job, if he had the chance so to do. But we do not take any notice of men who are so selfish, men who will do all the labour and have all the money, and leave the rest of the men starving.

16,537. There are such men?—I admit there are such men, and those are the men that the companies depend upon. Such men are not only enemies to their fellow men, but they are enemies to the company, because it is the action of these men which has forced us to seek these legislative enactments.

16,538. Then you would forbid such men earning any money at any other work during the rest of the 24 hours?—No, not by law.

16,539. Then there would be nothing to prevent them earning such money would there?—There would be a certain amount of moral pressure brought to bear upon them by the different organisations if there were still men unemployed so that such action would be detrimental to the best interests of the whole community by depriving another man of work and practically making him a pauper. He would be doing work which it was not necessary for him to do, and which he was not compelled to do.

16,540. Your request for an eight hours' law is based on the ground that moral pressure is not sufficient to prevent these men doing what you complain of?—Under the present circumstances. But if an eight hours' day by law were passed there would be plenty of men at work, and I do not think a man should be so mean as to deprive his fellow men of the means of labour.

Mr. Bolton.

16,541. If the rate of wages for an eight hours' day were so high (seeing that you would have to employ more men) that the company could not pay it, and it brought the industry to a stand, what would you do?—I entirely deny that the eight hours' day would have that effect. If it was, it would be owing to the company's own action in forcing wages up when they ought not to have forced wages up, but to have lowered the standard of hours; I do not believe a double shift of men would cost the company one-half or even a third what most of you gentlemen think it would cost; you think a double shift practically speaking would mean double wages. But it would not mean any such thing. Now

Mr. Bolton—continued.

I do eight journeys a day, and for eight journeys a day I have 8½d. a journey. Now at 8½d. a journey there are three journeys done by another man on that car and he receives 8½d. a journey for the three journeys which he does. So that that means that it costs under the present circumstances about 8s. a day for the drivers for that car. Now if you had a double shift of men at 5s. a day (and the companies two years ago were only paying 4s. 6d.) a car would cost about 10s. for driving. Now that is only 2s. additional. But under a double shift of men the company would be able to get out of that car an extra journey which would more than recoup for any additional outlay which it would cost for drivers. If that car in the extra journey earned 6s. or 7s. it would more than recoup the company for the additional outlay.

16,542. Why do not they do the extra journey?—There are lines which owing to the hours being too long for one shift of men lose a great deal. In fact, they lose at times when there are most passengers. Mine is a working-class district and the first man takes his car out of the yard at a quarter past 4, or starts on his journey at the terminus at a quarter past 4, and the cars only run every half hour. But on our line there are lots more people who walk to their work between the hours of 5 and 7 in the morning than there are at any other time of the day, and yet the car is only running every half an hour, and after 7 o'clock when there are not so many people going to work the cars are running every five minutes.

16,543. But there is nothing to prevent the man who takes the three trips taking four. Why do not they run the four trips with that other man now?—Under the present circumstances, whatever trips they would run, the men would always be in the employ of the company for about 16½ hours. But if you have done your eight hours on a double shift a man would be a free man as are other classes of the community.

16,544. At any rate, even according to your own showing, it would add 2s. a day to the cost of driving of the car?—Yes.

16,545. Now I want to know what would be the result if by adopting your plan of a double shift of men the industry was to come to a standstill?—We have no reason to anticipate such a thing because we have found, and it is acknowledged by the companies that the concessions granted have in all cases increased the revenue of the company, and in those cases I am sure it would increase them to a greater extent, to such an extent in my opinion without the additional journey at all that the money earned by the servants would more than recoup for the 2s.

16,546. Just assume for a moment that you are, as you may possibly be, mistaken, and that this extra cost would bring the industry into difficulties, what would be the effect of that upon men?—There is no class of thoughtful men but would form a policy in concert with the masters which would carry it on to the benefit of all concerned.

11 March 1892.]

Mr. JOHN ATKINSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

16,547. You mean to say that the man would in that case agree to receive reduced wages?—I do not hold that that would be necessary. Under the direction of the municipal authorities, if there was some little loss in one district, the other districts would more than recoup that loss.

16,548. Supposing the increased expenditure had the effect I have suggested, would the men accept a lower rate of wage, on condition of having shorter hours?—The men would not accept a wage under the standard rate of wages, because they would have no right so to do, and in my opinion science would invent a system of running the cars, to the advantage of the public, and profit to the shareholders, provided the share capital was not something enormous, which it is in the case of some companies, so that if the men had to work for nothing, and the horses lived on stones, then even, in some cases, some of the companies could not pay interest on the present amount of subscribed capital. But we must not take such instances as that into consideration.

16,549. Your opinion is that the double shift, with the high rate of wages, would be an advantage to the company as well as to the men?—Yes, I am candidly of that opinion.

16,550. Have you in any way endeavoured to impress that upon the companies?—If I did, they would be hailing me off to a lunatic asylum. If I attempted to approach them in that manner they would say they knew quite as much about the company's affairs as I did.

16,551. But you would not believe them?—I should think I was fit to have my liberty, although I could not say I knew so much about the management of tramways as they did.

16,552. Do you think they know something about the management of tramways?—I admit that. They are very clever and shrewd men, but, as I have told you, the manager or director of a tramway has to frame a policy to suit the shareholders, to a certain extent. That policy may not be altogether his own policy, and I admit that a managing director could not adopt this system without the sanction of the shareholders, and when the men demand this, unless they are strongly organised, the shareholders could say to the manager of the company, "we have no proof that even the men demand it."

Mr. Tait.

16,553. You have stated that the company you are working with recognise your Union?—Yes.

16,554. Other witnesses have said that it has been impossible to get a recognition of their Union?—Yes.

16,555. In what way have they recognised you?—They recognised it by granting concessions. I will read you a letter which will show you what I mean, and it will show you likewise the policy which the Union have adopted towards the different employers, with a view to establish better relations between the men and them. Here is a copy of a letter which our president wrote to the manager of our company: "Amalgamated Omnibus and Tram

U 79729.

Mr. Tait—continued.

"Workers' Union, 30, Fleet Street, London, "E.C., 22nd October 1891. T. Prior, Esq. "Southwark and Deptford Tram Co. Dear "Sir,—I am requested to write on behalf of "your *employés* to acknowledge the liberal "concessions granted to them by your company. I may inform you that the men are "generally satisfied, but not all of them, and I "have to ask you to consider the advisability of "granting to them one journey off on Sundays, "making an eight journey day instead of a nine "journey day. This, from an approximate "calculation, would only cost the company "46*l.* 16*s.* per year, and would give satisfaction "to all. I trust that your endeavour to deal "liberally with the men in ratio to your own "financial position, that of the company, may "be the means of more closely cementing the "relations between employers and *employés*, "which we are striving to establish, and which "is our only endeavour. Yours faithfully, on "behalf of the men, Fred. Hammill, organising "president" (*handing in copy of letter*).

16,556. And the concessions which the company gave to you were given after your Union had applied direct to them?—Yes.

16,557. And your officials were recognised?—Yes.

16,558. You have said here that if all the tramway companies would recognise the Union, you would not put forward the claim for a legislative eight hours' day, at least that that was your personal view?—Yes.

16,559. Provided the whole of the tramway companies in London were to recognise your organisation as your company has done, that at least would minimise the importance of the subject of a legislative eight hours, in your estimation?—It would do so considerably.

Mr. Trou.

16,560. Were those conductors against whom you have made such a serious charge of being in collusion with the passengers, and issuing tickets a second time to defraud the tramway company, members of your Association?—Very few of them.

16,561. Would some of them be?—Personally I could not say one would be, not of our company. In fact we would not have them, because to carry out such a policy as that is very detrimental to our own members.

16,562. Is your Association powerless to prevent this?—It is not powerless in the case of our company, but it is where the men are not so organised.

16,563. Then there is nothing of this kind in the case of your company?—There is not at the present time, I am happy to say. But there was before there was any organisation, to as great an extent, if not more so, than in the case of many other companies.

16,564. Has the introduction of the ticket system had anything to do with the increase of the receipts of the company?—The ticket system has been in vogue, to my knowledge, this last 16 years, on all tramways. There is no

Z z

11 March 1892.]

MR. JOHN ATKINSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Trow—continued.

different system of checking now to what there was, I can say personally, 20 years ago.

16,565. You are in favour of a legal enactment of an eight hours' day?—I am in favour of a legal enactment on this ground, that in the present disorganised state of labour, they cannot get that which is in their own interest by organisation.

16,566. Is the State to say what the hours shall be?—I would have a double shift of men, there would be an early shift and a late shift.

16,567. But should Parliament say when the early shift was to commence, and when the late shift was to commence?—No, not by any means. That would rest with the management of the Association and the company.

16,568. Suppose a man stopped in an hour, or two hours, in the morning, who ought to have been on the first shift, what would you do with him. Should he make his time up?—That man would lose a day's pay. There would be what we call odd men, as there are at present, to take his place, and he would lose his pay, and he would lose his place unless he explained to someone in authority why he was absent on that occasion.

16,569. How would you enforce an eight hour day, by penalty?—I am in favour of a double shift. There would have to be a penalty, of course. I candidly admit that in tramway company work or omnibus company work it would be arbitrary, both to the men and to the masters to enforce a legal enactment of eight hours in the strict letter of the law. We only come with this demand as a last resource, because we cannot get reasonable hours otherwise, but I admit it would be arbitrary both to men and masters, because you see tramway work or omnibus work is such that at the expiration of the eight hours' day a man might be at the opposite end of the journey to where he would be expected to leave off, or he might be in the middle of a journey.

16,570. Then is the Commission to understand that you cannot carry out the eight hours?—Oh, it could be carried out. But like all law it might be a little bit detrimental to some part of the community. It could be carried out, but I mean it would be rather arbitrary. There is nothing to prevent its being carried out, but still the legislative enactment would, I admit, be arbitrary.

16,571. Could your Union deal with the wages?—For my own part, provided the hours were reasonable, I should not complain of the wages.

16,572. But if there is a legal enactment of eight hours then the question of wages would arise; would you want Parliament to deal with that?—By no means.

16,573. Could your Union deal with it?—We should certainly demand a standard rate of wages.

16,574. But if you are not strong enough to demand and enforce shorter hours how could you demand and enforce wages?—Because we find this, that there is not a majority, but a large

Mr. Trow—continued.

minority, of the tramway companies' servants who do not care about the hours of labour so long as they can recoup themselves for those hours. But provided the hours were established by legal enactment the men would organise themselves on behalf of claiming proper wages.

16,575. You are in favour of the municipalisation of the tramways?—I am.

16,576. What principle would you adopt in valuing the tramways?—The principle I should adopt would be to let three competent valuers make a valuation. They should be impartial valuers. I do not mean that they should take into any account what the subscribed capital of the different companies might be, because the subscribed capital varies so much.

16,577. You stated here that some companies were so overburdened with capital that if the men worked for nothing, and the horses ate stones, the company could not make it pay?—That is so.

16,578. Now, if Parliament passed a compulsory law to compel these people to sell, what kind of value are you going to give them?—The value should be determined by competent valuers, after taking into consideration everything.

16,579. But what would be the guide to the valuers except the capital that had been invested?—The valuers would come in as impartial valuers, and ascertain the value of the horses, the rails, the cars, just the same as a broker would do in valuing furniture. It would be entirely on that principle. If a valuer was going to value some furniture he would not ask how much the owner had given for it; he would value it according to what he would reasonably expect to give for it.

16,580. And assuming that the trams were municipalised, do you think the men would be able to secure shorter hours and the present rate of wages?—That is so.

16,581. And in addition to that I understand your statement is that either pensions or easy berths should be provided for the men when they become old. Would you tell us from what source you would make provision to meet the pensions?—I would make provision in this way. The municipal authorities should contribute a little, and on the other hand the men should contribute during their service so as to provide a pension for the time when they became too old to fulfil their services to the municipal authorities.

16,582. But if the income received from the tramway did not enable the municipality to make any provision, what other sources would you make provision from?—Science would invent a policy which would enable the lines to be run to a profit, and the community being more interested in the trams, the riders would be more friendly, and they would protect the interests of the municipalities more than they care to protect the interests of shareholders or directors.

16,583. Would you touch the rates in any way?—I would not, because there is no doubt about this, that the tramways would be a source

11 March 1892.]

Mr. JOHN ATKINSON.

[Continued.]

Mr. Trow—continued.

of assistance to the rates instead of becoming a burden upon the rates. The public being the owners of the tramways would adopt a policy which would make them a source of revenue to the ratepayers.

16,584. Would you in any case increase the fares?—I think to increase the fares to the extent that some people recommend would be most ruinous, either to the best interests of the shareholders in the present companies, or to the municipal authorities. I admit that in some special instances the 1d. fare is too long under present circumstances, but to make the 1d. fare into a 2d. fare would be more detrimental to the interests of the company. The 2d. fare would have to extend far beyond the bounds where the 1d. fare terminates at the present time.

16,585. If a tramway company are not to dismiss a servant without full inquiry by your Association, and without your admission that they are justified in so dismissing him, are the company to have the same right to compel you to show that a man is justified in leaving, before he leaves the service of the tramway company?—I never knew a tramway company yet, which, if a man had a chance of bettering his position, would object to his going. If he was leaving voluntarily in that way, the officials would not object to him, but, on the other hand, they would assist him in getting the position he is seeking.

16,586. If the company are not to have a right to dismiss without your sanction will you refuse the men the right to dismiss themselves without the sanction of the company?—You see the agreement specifies that a man shall terminate his services to the company in all cases at seven days' notice; and I must admit that the tramway companies when there has been a voluntary termination of the agreement have always assisted the men to get any other employment which they might have in view.

Mr. Austin.

16,587. I think you stated that your organisation was re-formed last July?—That is so.

16,588. Now, do you think you have had sufficient experience, after that lapse of time, to warrant the statement that it is necessary for Parliament to interfere to regulate the hours of labour?—I do not take my experience from this present organisation. I take it from 1888 and 1889.

16,589. I think you have stated you are not acquainted with the work of other organisations?—Very little.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. EDWIN DYKE called and examined.

Earl of Derby.

16,595. Will you tell us what you are by occupation?—Cabdriver.

16,596. In London?—In London.

16,597. Are you connected with any union or

Mr. Austin—continued.

16,590. It being only after years of energy and perseverance that they have produced the results which they have accomplished, without asking Parliament to interfere, but relying rather upon their own efforts, would you not also prefer to rely upon yourselves for a little while longer and see what your own organisation can produce rather than go to Parliament?—That might be so; but, on the other hand, taking the amount of unemployed labour into account, and the competition there is for tram work at the present time, and the policy which the rich companies have adopted towards the Union, I must admit that the small companies have shown a far greater disposition to meet us, and in view of the fact that they discharge members of the Union if they find out that they belong to the Society, I am sure it is, under present circumstances, absolutely hopeless ever to expect to reduce the hours of labour to any reasonable amount by organisation.

16,591. But other unions had the same difficulties to contend with. They had to remain for very long periods without being recognised, but eventually they succeeded?—No class of servants have had the same difficulties in organising that the tramway men have had; because the very earliest hour at which you can hold a meeting would be half-past 12 or 1 o'clock in the morning; and other classes of men can meet at reasonable times during the evening or during the day. But such a thing cannot be in tram or omnibus work, and that is one of the difficulties that we have to contend with. A man who has been on service from 7 o'clock in the morning till 12 o'clock at night has not much energy to go and spend two hours at a tramway meeting when he has to be back at the yard next morning at half-past 6, and if he were to do so for two or three nights a week he could not then give proper service to his employers.

16,592. Would you enforce an eight hours' day on all classes of labour?—I am favourable to that. I am favourable to an eight hours' day in all cases, practically speaking.

16,593. Although it may not be practicable?—I admit that with tramway work it would be most unpractical.

Earl of Derby.

16,594. Did I rightly understand you to say that a considerable minority of the men do not object to very long hours, because they made a profit out of it?—I admit that it is so. I might say in order to settle the eight hours' question we got up this organisation, of which I hand in prospectus (see Appendix 114).

Earl of Derby—continued.

organisation of labour?—With a cabdrivers co-operative company, the Hyde Park Cab Company, that is all.

16,598. I think you have something to tell

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

us as to the mistaken ideas on the part of the cabdrivers as to large profits made by owners?—The disputes that have existed in the cab trade during the last 20 years have to my own personal knowledge centred largely on the question of the price to be paid by the driver to the owner for the hire of the cab. The driver has generally taken, and I plead guilty to having done so myself, an exaggerated idea of the profits derivable from the business. He has based his calculations of profit on the cost of provender, wages, price of cab, rent, but generally speaking there has been absent from the calculation of the driver the question of depreciation, and as a consequence, what would otherwise be a true statement, is rendered more or less incorrect. For instance, there are, as you may have noticed, in the metropolis, a first, a second, a third, and a fourth class vehicle, and by vehicle I of course include the horse that draws the cab as well as the harness. There is of course a price fixed by legislation for the hire of that vehicle. Well, some cabs will cost twice as much as others. The same remark applies to horses and harness. Consequently if men do not take a comprehensive view of the case they must naturally fall into error, and, as a consequence, an exaggerated idea of profit must continue to be held, because the men will base their argument on the price charged for a superior cab and the cost of an inferior cab. That has been a misleading argument throughout. But it is not only the driver who has made a mistake. He has sinned undoubtedly in this way, but the master has sinned, and to a larger extent. The masters say that the drivers wage is double, what, if you take the average, it really is.

16,599. What is it really?—You cannot fix a standard wage for the cab trade, you must take the average. A man in London is not working under the same conditions as a man in provincial towns. In the provincial towns a man receives not only nominal but actual wages. But in London he has to pay himself. Of course when I say "wage" I do not mean wage in the common acceptation of that term. By wage I mean the amount of money that a man takes home. He does not get it in a lump sum at the end of the week, or at the end of the day as another servant does. He pays himself, less the amount he pays for the cab. That is not quite a clear and concise statement. The driver pays so much a day for the hire of the cab. He is looked upon by the whole of society as a servant to a master, but really he is exactly in the same position as a person hiring land from a landlord; he is a tenant and the owner of the cab, is, if I may use such a term (and possibly it is a confusing one) the landlord; or rather I will say the owner of the cab lets that cab to the driver, and the driver in the metropolis pays so much for the use of that cab (which, of course, includes horse and harness) for a day. The amount varies according to the number of horses worked. There are morning men and night men. I have been a morning man, what is termed a showful,

Earl of Derby—continued.

or a hansom driver. I have been morning man as a four-wheel driver, and I have been night man as a hansom driver and night man as a four-wheel driver, and I have been what is termed a long day man, that is a driver of two horses, both in a hansom cab and in a four-wheeled cab. The price paid for the use of the vehicle differs of course. If he is a four-wheel morning man his price generally ranges 1s. more than if he is a four-wheel night man, and the four-wheel morning man's price generally runs 1s. less than the hansom morning man, and 1s. less than the night hansom man. Then the man driving two horses, whether he drives a hansom cab or a four-wheel cab, pays not double the amount, or not as much as a morning man and a night man combined, but, on an average a price and a half, if I may use such a term, that is to say, suppose a morning man pays 7s. a day, then the average price for the two horses would be 11s. a day. Under existing circumstances the drivers complain, and I think with force that while the legislature fixes their mileage, it gives them no control and does not guarantee that they shall get an equivalent article, for it does not put them on a fair and legitimate trading basis with the owner of the vehicle. For this reason. There are a much larger number of drivers licensed than the requirements of the trade necessitate. There are more drivers licensed than are required in proportion to the number of cabs, and the consequence is the owner of the vehicle can charge a much bigger price than a legitimate one, because of the competition among the drivers for the use of the vehicle. Or to put it in another way the competition among the drivers for the service becomes necessarily so keen that more than a just price is wrung from the driver as a consequence. Well this has necessarily created during the last 20 years disputes in the cab trade, and the disputes will, I am afraid, continue to periodically arise unless something more than has hitherto been done can be brought to bear, some sort of pressure I mean is brought to bear on the masters and the men alike. The development of the disputes in the cab trade resulted in the formation in 1874 of a society which I took a somewhat prominent part in. That was the Amalgamated Cab Drivers' Society. In the early part of its history that Society had an income of something like 100*l.* a week, and that was largely expended in providing funeral benefit, sick benefit, and, if I may use such a term, educational influences were brought to bear upon the drivers. That Society existed for about 14 years. I was a member of it up to its demise. I believe that the cause of that Society dying was the internal bickerings and jealousies of the men, who required an extraordinary amount of management, simply because the cabdriver, speaking roughly, is a migratory animal. That is possibly a curious phrase to use. Cabdrivers are a fluctuating population. A person who is out of employment as a carpenter, house painter, decorator, carman, bus driver or bus conductor, finding a difficulty in

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

obtaining employment in his own particular calling, has simply to go down to Scotland Yard, and, if his character will bear investigation, he is supplied with a cabdriver's licence, and as a general rule, especially if the men are Londoners, they have friends who can recommend them to a cab yard, and the consequence is that next day they become fully-fledged cabdrivers. Therefore the term "migratory animal," although it seems a curious one, is the most appropriate I can coin to explain my meaning. So that an organisation in the cab trade, designed to protect the drivers' interests must necessarily have larger difficulties to contend against than an organisation in what I may term legitimate trades. By legitimate trades I mean such as compositors or painters, who have to spend a certain number of years in acquiring education and skill sufficient to carry on their calling. Of course it may be, and undoubtedly is necessary for a person to serve a sort of apprenticeship in the cab business in order to carry on that business successfully and well, but I may have been 20 years a cabdriver, while another man has been but 20 minutes in that calling, and I go down one street and he another, and I take 1s. fare and he takes a 10s. fare, so that he stands as good a chance of getting as good wages as I, in spite of the fact that I have been licensed 20 years to his 20 minutes.

16,600. Do you consider it unjust that a man who has very lately entered the business, but who knows how to drive, and who knows his way fairly about London, should compete with you on equal terms?—No; I do not think that. I will point out what I mean by giving an example in point. I knew a person who was a compositor, who worked as a compositor the whole week through until Saturday, and on the Saturday afternoon he drove a cab for Thomas Gunn, in Doughty Mews, and on the Sunday he drove a cab. Then on the Monday he was a compositor, and he was a compositor all the week. That man's name was Hart. Whether he was a member of the Compositors' Society or not, I do not know. I only cite him as a sample of a good number who heavily handicap the cabdriver and make it difficult for him to receive anything like sufficient to maintain his wife and children in respectability. The reason I touch upon that point is to show that a man should have, as I heard it expressed in reference to some other calling, One ticket: he should have one calling. If a man is a cabdriver let him remain a cabdriver, but not be three or four days in the week a printer, or a bookbinder, or a bootmaker, and then for two days drive a cab.

16,601. You wish to confine every man to one trade?—Undoubtedly. I merely mention that to point out the difficulties that lie in the way of cabdrivers organising. During the 10 years from 1882 to 1892 strikes in the cab trade have cost masters and men, at the very least, 50,000*l.* I do not mean in actual cash, although I believe it would amount to that. Let me take last year. I have not myself seen the figures, but I have had it from very good authority, that

Earl of Derby—continued.

the cost of the strike last year was on the masters' side, very nearly 20,000*l.* The cost to the cabdriver and the cab owner have been so much that I do not wonder at these disputes continuing, because the men are harassed to pay their rent and to pay their way, and so are the masters. But, unfortunately, as far back as my memory carries me, they have fought bitterly against each other, and have not realised that their interests are in many ways identical. The interests of the masters and the men are in every respect identical with the exception of the question of the price to be paid for the cab, and if those engaged in the trade were to use the same amount of energy, the same amount of brain power, the same amount of money, to alleviate their condition, that they have done to destroy each other, I believe the cabdriver's life would be as liveable as that of any other person following any other calling in England.

16,602. You have not yet explained what the disputes are about. The cabs, as I understand, in every case are the property of the cab owner?—Yes.

16,603. Then he makes his bargain with the man who hires a cab for a day, a week, or a month?—For a day.

16,604. I presume you do not consider that the price to be paid daily for a cab is a matter which should be regulated by any external authority?—It is a matter of bargain between the two individuals, undoubtedly.

16,605. Is not that the point upon which the dispute arises?—That is the point upon which the dispute arises. That point could not very well be settled by outside authority. No legal enactment could settle that point, simply because the value of the cab differs at different seasons, and what might be a cheap cab at 10s. in 1892 might be a dear cab at 8s. in 1893; and, as a consequence, it is a matter for the masters and the men to amicably arrange among themselves. But what could be brought about is the formation of a board of arbitration and conciliation, consisting of a representative number of drivers and masters, with one or two persons representing the interests of the public. I believe, my Lord, a letter from you as Chairman of this Committee, addressed to persons whose names I could give you, and they could, of course, have power to add to their number, would bring about the formation of such a board, and this would prevent strikes in the future, and thus confer a boon, not only upon the metropolitan cab masters and cabdrivers, but, as provincial towns copy, in the tram and omnibus business, the rules and regulations started in the metropolis, so, I believe, they would copy this method of preventing strikes, and this would be of national benefit and importance. Until some such policy as that is adopted, this may appear an egotistic statement on my part, but it is the result of a great deal of careful deliberation with other sections of the hackney carriage trade, both masters and men; these strikes will occur, and I believe all that is

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

required to prevent this is an initial movement.

16,606. What is this board of arbitration to do? Suppose the owner of the cab objects to hire it out at less than 10s. a day, and suppose that the driver who goes to him does not think it worth more than 6s. or 7s., how can that question be settled except by bargain between the two?—That is just where the value of a board of arbitration or conciliation, consisting of representatives of masters and men, would be seen in a concrete form. The master would say the cab was worth, say, 12s. The driver would adduce evidence to prove it was not worth 12s., that it was only worth 9s. or 10s. Then, I believe, after due discussion by representatives of the drivers and the masters they would be able to settle on a price that would be looked upon as fair all round by all *bona fide* drivers as well as cab masters. But there is this difficulty staring them in the face; I referred to it in my preliminary remarks. There is not one set quality of cab. There are about four different classes of vehicles. Persons in the business notice it immediately; and the riders notice it too. I can assure you that gentlemen walking down St. James's Street can see the difference between an inferior fourth-class vehicle and a first-class vehicle. Yet the price is exactly the same so far as the legislature is concerned; but it is different so far as the hire is concerned on the part of the men and the masters. A cab at the present moment can be had for 10s., but other cabs cannot be obtained under 14s. 6d. Consequently I fail to see how any person other than the drivers and the masters themselves can settle such a matter as that.

16,607. But then I do not quite follow you. You admit it can only be a matter of bargain between the individual owner and the individual driver, in that case what room is there for the board of conciliation and arbitration? What is there to arbitrate upon?—The price, which is just the cause of the difficulty. It has cost the trade thousands of pounds. I say that the board of arbitration should consist of members of the trade, with one or two persons representing the public.

16,608. Then do you propose that such a board should compel a man to let out his cab at less than he thinks it worth, or that on the other hand a driver should pay more for it than he thinks it worth?—I should not use any legal enactment or any penalty to enforce a matter of that kind. I do not see the advisability of doing that. But if a price is set by this board of arbitration, say in April 1892, it would prevent dispute. The Amalgamated Cab Drivers' Society themselves tried to establish some sort of regulation, and sent round a list of dates during the year when the price should rise and fall, though they left it to the masters to say what should be charged at those times. They wanted to fix the time when the price of the cab should rise or fall. The value of a

Earl of Derby—continued.

cab to the driver undoubtedly increases and decreases according to the time of the year. In the cab season a cab is worth 5s. a day more than in what is termed the bad time; but there is a difference of opinion among the masters as to when the time for raising the prices should commence. They endeavoured to fix a list of dates, but the price was left open. Just about now there is a dispute as to what should be paid for a cab. When the season commences the cab costs 10s. per day, and it goes up 1s. a week until it reaches in some cases a guinea a day. Consequently the disputes arise with the marking up of the increased price on the wall or door of the cab owner. He marks his price up that on and after a certain date the money will go up from 10s. to 11s., or from 12s. to 14s., or whatever the cost may be. Then the men, perhaps, say that they cannot earn it, and hence disputes, strikes or locks-out arise. The men find it absolutely impossible for them to pay the price demanded, and it is much better for them (to use a north country expression) to play than to work; because if they work they get into debt, and if they play they cannot do any worse.

16,609. You think then that a board of conciliation and arbitration, whichever you call it, with no compulsory powers, but merely undertaking to give good advice to both parties, would help them to make their bargains fairly with one another?—It would help them undoubtedly out of this present difficulty. Then I wish to speak of the codification of the complicated and contradictory cab law. But before dropping the question of price, and as there is a divergence of opinion, probably something in a concrete form will be regarded as more cogent evidence than a mere idea or statement. I have here the rules of an association called the Improved Cab's Club, consisting of Forder cab owners. In the newspapers a day or two ago we saw that a deputation waited upon the Home Secretary, Mr. Matthews, and these rules which I have, will, combined with what was said before the Home Secretary, make it very clear that there is an exaggerated idea as to the wage the men receive. It was there stated that the men paid 8s. up to 10s. per day for cabs. Now here are the printed rules (*see Appendix 115*), quoting prices, of an associated body of cab owners, and this is, I consider, very important evidence. "The minimum price per day to be charged by members," that is by members of this cab's club, "to drivers shall be as follows:—From "January 1st to March 14th, or boat race "day"—that is a fixture which varies in different years,—"as the case may be, till April 1st, inclusive, 16s." That is a very bad time, and this is the minimum price which the cab owners are to charge during that period. They can charge as much more than that as they like; but, according to their own printed rules that shall be the minimum charge. "From "April 1st to April 14th, inclusive, 17s. From "April 14th till Monday of Derby week, 18s. "From Monday of Derby week till August 1st

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

“ inclusive, 19s. From August 1st to August 14th inclusive, 18s. From August 14th to August 21st” (it is dropping again), “ inclusive, 17s. From August 21st to August 28th, 16s. From August 28th to September 4th, 15s. From September 4th to cattle show day, 14s. From cattle show day to end of year, 15s.” I have made a mistake. I said the minimum price was 16s., but I see the minimum price is 14s. But that 14s. does not cover all. In all cab yards there is an unwritten law, but a very strong and a very cogent law, which compels a man, in addition to paying that standard rate of hire for his cab, to pay what is termed yard money, that is fees to horse keepers, and fees to washers, and in consequence of these fees the minimum would be really about 16s., to a maximum; they say 19s.; but the yard fees generally run to 2s.; and that would make it a guinea. Now this disproves the statement that cabs are let at 8s. or 10s. a day. I have here also a statement by a representative man. It is lengthy, but I will only read two lines of it. He says, “ although the price charged for hansoms appears to persons not in the know to be very excessive, when a person takes into consideration the fact that a driver can ‘trouser’—that is, put into his pocket 5*l.* for one day’s work, the charge is not so extraordinary as it appears.” This man was manager of a rather interesting firm, a firm which has a history now, for he was the manager to Lord Shrewsbury at the time, and that yard is one of the largest yards in the metropolis. The number of cabs held by the Shrewsbury and Talbot Company, Limited, is largely above the number held by an average proprietor, so you see I have already told you that the drivers had exaggerated ideas of profits, and this gives you the other side of the case, and shows that representatives of the masters have similarly exaggerated ideas as to the wages of the men. “ I assure you” he says, “ it is a fact that men will come in here having 5*l.* in their pockets which they earned through a day’s work, and then will say that they cannot pay us and that we cheat and defraud them.” That shows me that not only do the drivers have exaggerated ideas as to the profits derivable on the owners side in the cab business, but that the proprietors also have exaggerated ideas as to the amount of money earned as wages by the cabdriver. Now if the Commission would, through its chairman write to three or four, or half a dozen representative masters, and representative men, and they were to establish a board of arbitration and conciliation, which need cost no one outside the trade anything whatever, I believe that the constant and continual bickerings which take place periodically would be done away with, and that would, in my opinion, be some reason for the Labour Commission having sat.

16,610. Is there a dispute going on now?—There will be in another fortnight or three weeks, or as sure as May comes round. As soon as the time comes round for raising the price of the cabs this periodical strife must take place,

Earl of Derby—continued.

unless something is done in the meantime to prevent it. And if this Commission has sat for no other purpose but to establish a board of some sort as that which I have foreshadowed it will have done most valuable work because that court or board whatever you may term it will be copied in all other industries, throughout the country if it is found useful as I feel certain it will be.

16,611. All you have to recommend to us on that subject is that persons should voluntarily come together and form a board of conciliation which should have the power to give advice, but not to enforce decisions?—Not to enforce. They could, however, set the price.

16,612. When your evidence was taken before I think we had exhausted the subject of courts of arbitration and conciliation. We understand what you have to say about them. I see in the paper before me that you also suggest as desirable a limitation of licences to the requirements of the trade. Will you explain what you mean by that?—Yes, I have already referred to the fact that the competition amongst the drivers for the loan of cabs was very excessive. Anterior to the year 1833 cabs were limited in number; at that time there were 1,200 allowed for the streets of the metropolis. At the present time I think there are between 12,000 and 13,000 cabs, and that shows a rapid growth, although, of course, the population has increased wonderfully during that time. Still, I think any person who carefully thinks the matter out will admit that cabs have increased in a much more rapid ratio than the population or that portion of the population who indulge in the luxury, if I may so term it, of a cab.

16,613. Is it a business easy to learn. If a man has learnt to drive, and knows his way fairly well about London, he is competent to get a licence, is he not?—That is a matter of opinion. My opinion is that a cabman learns something fresh every day. It is the generally accepted opinion that any person who can drive can drive a cab. That is true to a certain extent, but a cabdriver must not only be in a position to drive a cab, but must also have the knowledge sufficient to enable him to know where he can best place that cab to advantage to himself and to his employer, or the owner of the property he drives. As a consequence, a man really learns something almost every day of his life. Any person that knows how to drive could take a Member of Parliament from Palace Yard, say, to Fulham, given the knowledge of London necessary for him to get about; but then, concurrently, with that knowledge, it would be necessary for the man to be a practical driver to know where to place his cab when he got to the end of his journey so that he would stand a chance of getting a fare back, otherwise there would be a great increase of the already unnecessarily heavy wear and tear of roads and vehicles that is daily taking place, caused largely by the unlimited licensing of drivers as well as cabs. There are too many cabdrivers, and there are too many cabs, but the proportion

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

of drivers to the cabs certainly requires some modification, otherwise an average cabdriver is on the verge of bankruptcy, in fact, I do not suppose that you will find 5 per cent. of the cabdrivers of London solvent. I do not believe 5 per cent. of them are in a position to say that they have a second suit of clothes, or that they do not owe several weeks' rent.

16,614. Would you apply that to other businesses besides your own? Would you say when there is a sufficient number of carpenters and bricklayers in London that that number should be fixed by law, and that they should not be allowed to be increased unless all of these men are sure to find work?—If the carpenters, bricklayers, housepainters, and decorators, &c. paid for the privilege of carrying on their calling in the metropolis from 30,000*l.* to 60,000*l.* per annum, I should certainly say that they paid for the limitation of their business, but any person can follow the occupation of a painter and house decorator without paying money to the Revenue, but the cabdrivers and proprietors of London pay, I suppose, between 35,000*l.* and 45,000*l.* per annum to some persons or other. I am told it is not the Revenue; in fact, people do not seem to know where the money goes to, but it is the fact that the money is paid.

16,615. Then, if the licences cost nothing, and if they were granted without any expense to the holders, but only on proof of good character, then your objection to an unlimited number of them would not exist, would it?—Under those circumstances, undoubtedly, there would be freedom of contract; but, under existing circumstances, persons pay for the privilege of carrying on a certain avocation, and they pay an extraordinary amount of money. I think, if it was accurately gauged, the cab business is taxed to the amount of between 100,000*l.* to 120,000*l.* per annum, and that is an extraordinary amount of money for a local industry to bear; because I am talking about the metropolis. I am not talking about a national industry. I have previously referred to the fact that the drivers and proprietors pay to somebody at Scotland Yard; where the money goes to I do not know. I have tried to ascertain and cannot; but I am told it is an accumulating fund, but whether it is so or not I do not know; the fact remains that they do pay now something like 35,000*l.* to 40,000*l.* per annum, that is combining master and man; and I think for that amount of money they should have some protection.

16,616. You put it on this ground, I understand, that if a man is to pay for the possession of his licence, and if it is to be treated as a privilege it ought not to be granted to any man who is not likely to be able to make any profit out of it?—I think that a man who pays for a licence and follows the avocation of a cabdriver should have some sort of adequate remuneration for the labour he throws into the business, and for the capital he throws into the business. Under existing circumstances some men make fortunes in the cab business, certainly,

Earl of Derby—continued.

because it is a speculative business, if I may so term it, in fact it is almost as much a matter of speculation as backing horses, to use a sportsman's phrase, because a proprietor may go to a cab sale and purchase half a dozen horses, each horse averaging 20*l.*, and out of that half dozen horses only one horse will become what is technically known in the trade as a "cabber," and consequently he may lose largely on that purchase, and on the other hand he may purchase for half their value, that is, given the market value of the horses—but they may turn out twice as valuable as the price he and the market itself put upon them; consequently in that way it is a very speculative business. But the business is very largely handicapped by the fact that any person can come into the trade and leave it the following day if he likes. I pointed out I think previously in the earlier part of my evidence, the fact that I could cite as a sample the fact of a man whose name I mentioned working five days a week as a compositor, and on the Saturday afternoon, after having received his wages as a compositor, driving a cab for Mr. Thomas Gunn, of Doughty Mews, one of the largest proprietors in London, and on the Sunday also, and on the Monday following he worked as a compositor. Of course the man must have been physically strong, otherwise he would have been naturally unable to perform the double work.

16,617. He made more money than other workmen, but he made it by working harder and longer?—He did; but I think it is an unfair handicapping of the cabdriver to allow outside men to drive when they please, because a person driving for a living is not like another driving for pleasure. I mean a person following the avocation of a baker or printer is in a very different position from that of a cabdriver; supposing he gets a wage on his own calling, and then to handicap the driver he gets a cab to drive for health or pleasure, it is a very unfair system to tolerate. It may not largely exist, but I know several cases, and I have cited one as a sample.

16,618. You think it ought to be a condition of the licence, or a condition imposed in some way, that a man should not follow any other occupation?—Undoubtedly, I should say that a man following the occupation of a cabdriver should confine himself to the trade, and I may say that Scotland Yard has recognised that difficulty by making it compulsory, on the part of a driver who has left his occupation for two months during the twelve for which he has been licensed, to fill up a statement certifying how that two months of his time has been occupied. Therefore they recognise the difficulty, but my contention is this: that under existing circumstances there are too many men licensed for their calling, and as a consequence those persons who have been licensed for a number of years, and have paid for the privilege of driving through the streets of London are so heavily handicapped that they cannot honestly make both ends meet.

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

16,619. Of course if the number of licences was strictly limited, as you propose, that would give the men a great advantage in dealing with the cab owners?—I should say that a limitation of cabs as well as drivers is absolutely necessary. Any person taking a walk, say from Trafalgar Square to where Temple Bar stood at the Law Courts, must acknowledge that London is overcrowded. I have been myself eight hours standing on a prominent rank in London without a single question being asked me, and I am sure any man driving as I have driven as a night cabman within half a mile of this very room, can stand for over eight hours without moving a wheel, as we technically call it, proving conclusively, in my opinion, if there were any other proof required, that there are really too many men really licensed to get a living.

16,620. You would restrict that by legislation and put it within certain limits?—I cannot see that it would be possible to do it by legislation. I mean by legislation Act of Parliament. I believe now the Home Secretary has power to make Orders in Council, and I think if an Order in Council were to issue on the 1st of May next, or the 1st of May 1893, or at any other definite time given, that on and after that date, until 12 months thence, no new licences should be granted either to cab proprietor or driver, everything that is necessary in the matter of limitation of licences would be accomplished. I think it is almost as simple a matter as drinking a glass of water. That is how it strikes me.

16,621. Supposing three men were applying for a licence, and that in pursuance of some such regulation as you propose, only one man was allowed to receive one, would not there be a good deal of favouritism and preference in such a case if no man could obtain such a licence except by special favour?—Pardon me, my Lord, I suggested that no issue whatever should be granted from a given time to a given time; for a certain period there should be no re-issue, but only a renewal. The already existing licences should be renewed by those who require the renewal, but no new issue of licences should be granted. I think in fairness to the Courts of Justice, which are crowded, this should be done. Mr. Newton, at Marlborough Street, the last time I paid a visit there, had 90 cases to adjudicate upon, and how is it possible for a gentleman, however able and clever, and whatever his forensic ability may be, to get through 90 cases in about an hour or an hour and a half.

16,622. Cases of what kind?—Cases of summoning for frivolous and vexatious things that daily and hourly occur in the streets of the metropolis consequent on the unlimited licensing of drivers.

16,623. I do not see how those two things follow as cause and effect?—The cause of the vexatious summoning is excessive licensing, and that is so for this reason, that if there are six men to one job, that is, one fare, those six drivers will beat up (I am using a term I will explain in other language, only it is the language that comes clearest to me), and there is a

Earl of Derby—continued.

struggle as to which of these six men will get that one fare, and, as a consequence, that causes a congestion of the traffic. A cabdriver is in everybody's way barring the person who wants to ride in his cab. The vestries abolish ranks wherever they possibly can. Although I may say that Scotland Yard, whenever I have written myself as an individual, pointing out to them that at this place or that place, for instance, the World's End, Chelsea, a number of men were summoned there for going home to their dinners, and the rank space was sufficient to accommodate eight cabs though only four were allowed; Scotland Yard has replied courteously to my communication, and eight cabs were granted. But unfortunately, Scotland Yard, and by that I mean the Police Commissioners (I say police because it is easier understood) have not only to consider the cabdriver but they also have to consider the householder, and it is not every householder that cares to have a cab rank outside his door; they like a cab when a cab is required to take them to a railway station, or to a theatre, or anywhere else, but a cab rank is detestable in the eye of the average householder. Therefore, these men being more than the requirements of the trade find necessary, have to loiter and congest already overcrowded thoroughfares. That means vexatious summoning at Marlborough Street and Westminster, and other police courts. The last time I paid a visit to Marlborough Street there were 90 summonses to be adjudicated upon by Mr. Newton, who, I think, gets through his business as quickly as most gentlemen. There were 90 cases for him to adjudicate upon, and, as a consequence, they had to be hurried through very much; in fact, in my time, the police court being crowded, an order to the drivers has been issued that if they pleaded guilty, whether guilty or not, to the offence charged they would be let off by paying costs. That was to save the time of the court, simply because it was absolutely impossible for the court to get through the whole number of vexatious summonses against the drivers who had been dragged up there, and who as a consequence had lost a day's work.

16,624. If I understand you now your complaint is in fact that there are too many cabs. I thought it was that there were too many drivers of cabs?—Undoubtedly, there are too many drivers, and that has been caused largely by the dispute I referred to in my preliminary statement as to price. The masters have advertised largely in the provincial papers as well as in the London papers that the cabdrivers had a very easy life, and their net earnings were 3*l.* per week. As a consequence that has had a tendency to induce a large number of persons who were possibly following more comfortable situations to apply at Scotland Yard for licences and the licensing is certainly absolutely unbearable.

16,625. But if I understand your last answers your present objection is not to the number of drivers who cannot find cabs, but to the number of cabs that are about the streets and, as you

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

say, causing an obstruction, and sometimes getting summonses issued against them for being in the way?—I say that the cabs are too many, but the drivers are too many for the cabs. Undoubtedly that is so, because a driver is charged more than the legitimate price for the hire of the cab, must work early and late, must go where there is an opportunity or chance of getting a fare, and he, as a consequence, causes, through no fault of his own, a lot of obstruction. He is blamed for it. That is so especially in the West End streets and thoroughfares.

16,626. Then in short you propose not merely to limit the number of drivers to the possible number of cabs, but you would limit the number of cabs altogether?—My opinion is that if the drivers' licenses were limited, if it were possible for me to-morrow to issue an Order in Council, supposing I were the Home Secretary, that no driver's licence should be issued for six months, then my opinion is that the same amount of money would be earned because the same amount of money would be expended in the cab business. The same number of persons would ride, but the men would be able to work less than the 15 or 16 hours a day which they have to work now, and the master would find his business not less profitable but I believe more profitable. That seems a curious remark to make, but I will tell you why I think so. There would be less wear and tear and there would be less accidents, because the men could carry on their business in a more legitimate way, in a more easy way, and, as a consequence, there would be less wear and tear and not one-half the accidents that now take place would occur. There would be no necessity for those accidents.

16,627. Of course, people who could not get licenses to drive cabs would be thrown upon some other employment, and so would overcrowd the market in some other direction?—Unfortunately there is no market more overcrowded than the cab market, because it seems to be the refuge for persons who are unable or unfortunate in their own particular callings. That is the crux of the question. It is a most unfortunate thing for the cabdriver, but possibly it is a fortunate thing for other workmen. I do not see that it would be unfair on the driver supposing he did not pay for the privilege. Supposing the driver paid nothing for the privilege their freedom of contract would exist, but seeing that he is compelled to charge only a certain mileage, that he is bound by legislative enactment to act as a thoroughly sober, honest, and obliging servant to the public generally, I think that as he is compelled by a legal enactment to study the interests of the whole community, the community should study cabbly a little, and he certainly is not being studied under existing circumstances, for his life is one of the hardest imaginable.

16,628. I think we understand what you have to say upon that point. Now, there is a suggestion in the paper which you have put before me, which is headed "Encouragement to

Earl of Derby—continued.

"drivers to capitalise their labour." Will you explain what you mean by that?—Yes. I feel firmly convinced that the co-operative idea might be largely adopted by the cabdriver. I am connected with a small co-operative association that has existed since 1882, but it started as most of the cab owners start, on credit, and, as a consequence it has been heavily handicapped since that time. But tracing its history during this decade I feel absolutely convinced that if the legislature helps the driver a bit by seeing that he has an opportunity of earning an honest crust he may better his condition very largely by capitalising his labour.

16,629. You mean taking shares in a co-operative society?—By taking shares in a co-operative association.

16,630. But why need the Government interfere for that purpose. Are not there co-operative associations in every kind of business existing to a very large extent, and many of them extremely prosperous?—Yes, of course, the Rochdale Wholesale Association and others have in a distributive sense been productive of material good to the workers generally, but I do not know that there ever has existed a co-operative cab company in England up till the time of the one I have referred to. There is this little difficulty staring the cabdrivers in the way of their capitalising their labour. Under existing circumstances the cabs are under (I do not know why) police regulations and the cabdriver wearing a badge is looked upon by a largish section of the community as a sort of convict. He is treated, in my opinion, almost as a dishonest man. I do not see why that should be so, but it is, and the co-operators, like the cabdrivers, have been handicapped, in my opinion, a little by the police authorities. The cabdrivers in 1879 started a club in Poland Street, Oxford Street, and the men who pulled up at their club house with their cabs, were summoned for leaving their cabs unattended to, and, as a consequence, that club failed. The Co-operative Cab Company doing what 99 out of 100 other cab owners do, having their cabs outside their stables, have been summoned. There are two or three sections of the cab law that require modification in the interest, not only of the driver, but of the cab proprietors also, and that is where the cabdriver has been a bit handicapped. You know, or it is known generally that a cab has to undergo an annual inspection, that is to say, it has to have the Commissioners' approval mark put upon the back of it, certifying that it is fit for public use. I myself think that it would be to the interest of the driver, to the interest of the public (I do not know whether it would be to the interest of the proprietor altogether, but it would not be much out of his interest, and I speak knowing something of his position), that that annual inspection should be bi-annual, rather, there should be inspection half-yearly because the public are very generous, as a rule. The riding public are generally very generous to the driver; I feel absolutely certain that if you take 10 thinking men in the cab trade as drivers,

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE

[Continued.]

Earl of Derby—continued.

and ask them the question nine out of that 10, if the whole 10 will not admit it, will admit that if they were under existing circumstances paid their legal fare, it would be absolutely impossible to pay for the hire of the cabs, let alone the driver having any wage himself. The public are very generous, and, as a consequence, I think that the public should be studied, and I think the annual inspection of the cab is too infrequent.

16,631. But I do not see how all this bears upon the question. I daresay there is a great deal in what you say, but I do not see how it bears upon what we are speaking of, the difficulty of establishing a co-operative society?—There is not a very great difficulty in establishing a co-operative association, in fact the one already in existence could be, I believe, developed largely, and by settling the price charged for cabs. I believe that it would have a vast tendency to improve the condition of the driver and the condition of the cab trade all round. I do not see very clearly how the legislature can help co-operation, but I merely pointed out that fact that, given a limitation of licences for drivers, which I place first, and the vehicles which must necessarily follow, give the partial limitation of licences co-operation would naturally follow, because I believe then the improvement in the condition of the driver would enable him to save a little; it would enable him to co-operate; it would enable him to capitalise his labour a little, and, as a consequence, enable him to improve his condition.

16,632. What do you mean by speaking as you do in this paper of the removal of the control of the business from a criminal to a civil tribunal?—I had in my mind then a number of conferences which have taken place in connexion with the hackney carriage trade, and I think the late Mr. Firth in a volume (I forget the title at the present moment, dealing with our municipal life) points out the advantages that would accrue to the cab trade from its removal from a criminal to a civil tribunal. But not taking all that Mr. Firth says, I believe myself, by practical experience, that it would tend to benefit the hackney carriage traffic, and the trade generally if the business was taken from Scotland Yard and handed over to a body like the county council. I believe that the centralisation of the hackney carriage traffic is detrimental to the best interests of the riders, of the proprietors, and of the drivers. For instance, one of the burning questions in the cab trade is with regard to the insufficiency of cab stand accommodation. That is one, and always has been one of the most burning questions in the hackney carriage trade. A man as soon as he comes out of a cab yard to ply his vocation commits an offence against the hackney carriage laws because he is plying for hire off an authorised standing, and yet the authorised standings or cab ranks in the metropolis are not sufficient to accommodate one-tenth of the number of cabs that are licensed.

Earl of Derby—continued.

16,633. Insufficiency of cab stands therefore is one of the evils?—That is one of the things I complain of. Of course there is a centralisation now in the county council, but the representatives of the county council are local men, and as a general rule I find that a county councillor is a vestryman, or he is very well acquainted with vestry business. Those persons would know where ranks were required, and if the licensed drivers and proprietors of any given district were able to point out to their representatives on the county council that insufficient stands for hackney carriages existed in the east, west, north, or south of the metropolis, whatever constituency it was, I believe that those representatives could explain the matter to the county council or board, or the section of the county council appointed to regulate that portion of its business, and they would put cab stands where needed. Under existing circumstances for every one cab rank placed where required there are 19 placed where it is absolutely ridiculous to think of placing them.

16,634. I think I understand you. You consider that the Scotland Yard authorities are too much inclined to listen to objections to placing of cab stands in new localities?—That is only one point. There are several other points in which I think that Scotland Yard or the police would be biased, independently of other things. I do not wish to make any charges of bribery or anything of that kind. I would rather let other persons refer to that, and I daresay somebody will do so, and some unpleasant things may be said at this Commission, possibly in respect to the annual inspection of cabs. Independently of that, I think, supposing the Home Secretary wanted to know whether there was an excess number of licences, or whether the licences were under the required number, the police, under existing circumstances would be rather bad authorities to guide the Home Office; but supposing the cabs were taken from Scotland Yard and placed under the control of a board like the county council, the police then would be in an independent position, and they would give better evidence and stronger evidence than I could as to the fact that there are a greater number of drivers and a greater number of cabs than are necessary. But there are a number of reasons, and I do not wish to enlarge upon them so as to occupy your time, because I am afraid I am tedious, but there are a number of reasons applying to the cab trade, and I believe I am expressing the opinion of the drivers and proprietors who tell us this, why they think the control should be taken from a criminal, to a civil tribunal. I believe I am expressing the concurrent opinion of the proprietors and drivers when I refer to that fact.

Mr. Tail.

16,635. What would you do with the persons refused a licence; you suggested that the Commission should suggest to Parliament that for

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

a certain period there should be no licences granted, what would you do with a man who had asked for a licence and had been refused?—Save their coming into the cab business and starving themselves and other people who are already starving in it.

16,636. Can you mention to me any trade in the country at this time in which there are not more *employés* than can find employment?—I have had sufficient trouble unfortunately to study my own business without troubling myself with other people's business. I cannot answer that question.

16,637. But are you aware of it?—That may be so.

16,638. But are you?—Are there a greater number in excess in other businesses do you ask?

16,639. Yes?—Possibly that may be so and I daresay it is so.

16,640. And if you were to refuse those men a licence who are making a certain kind of living, though it may be not satisfactory, in London, you would throw them on to some other trades which have at the present time too many men in them?—Other trades unfortunately have a glut so far as labour is concerned, but that labour is trying, and you know that better than I do myself, to make their life more liveable by shortening their hours of labour, they have a perfect right to do so. I cannot follow the occupation of a carpenter or any other person you wish to cite, simply because I have been ever since I was 21 years of age a cab driver, consequently it would be absolutely impossible for me to take up a plane or a chisel and follow some other occupation. Therefore having been connected with the business so long I think it is very unfair that a man who thinks he would like to drive a cab because he is tired of using a pick or shovel, should come and crowd me off my seat. What is to become of me supposing he comes away from his business where he can earn a partial living, what is to become of me and the people I represent, supposing he comes and crowds me out. He drives for pleasure, while I drive for bread and butter, and boots for my wife and children and myself.

16,641. Do you think that a man who leaves the pick and shovel and goes into the cab business does it for pleasure?—Undoubtedly, if a man did not do that, I could have no objection to that man at all. Supposing it were possible to obtain a living for us both I should welcome him, but if you carry your mind back to my preliminary remarks you will bear in mind that I have mentioned the name of a man and I could mention several other names of men, who follow other occupations other portions of the year, and who when cab driving is a little bit of pleasuring, and not when it is as now, difficult to get about in the cold weather and the frost, which make the calling unpleasant, who, when it is a pleasure to drive through the streets of London, come and take the bread out of the mouths of the *bond fide* cab drivers. That is the thing that I complain about.

Mr. Tait—continued.

16,642. You have laid down certain propositions that you are desirous that Parliament should put into operation on your behalf?—Quite so.

16,643. And you have also told us that you do not belong to any trades union at present?—That is right.

16,644. And that you are simply giving evidence here to-day on your own behalf?—That is so.

16,645. Might I ask you if you think that the views that have been enunciated by you would be accepted by the majority or by a large number of cabmen in London?—I believe by 90 out of 100.

16,646. What grounds have you for making that statement?—The common every day conversation that I have with them, and have had with them for the last 20 years.

16,647. Have the proposals which you have submitted to us been before meetings of cabmen, and discussed by them, and have resolutions been framed upon them?—Yes; for years discussion has been carried on in our own paper, on public platforms, in the regular cab rank, in shelters, and in public-houses and coffee-houses, and I gauge the opinion by that expressed by the men that I have conversed with.

16,648. Now, regarding the Co-operative Cab Company?—I should like to make myself clear on one point. I said I was not a member of a trades union. My sympathies are with the trades union, or with any body of men who try to elevate their condition and the condition of their fellows; but I have given 15 of the best years of my life to the cabdrivers of London, and I have neglected my home in doing so; and I want to look after the wife and babies now. Let youth serve as I have served. My sympathies are with the unions, but I do not belong to any trades union.

16,649. We are quite well aware that while your sympathies may be with them you believe in organising. In my opinion it is, at least necessary if you want to move Parliament you will have to do it through organisation, so that you must belong to an organisation in order to do it, but that is for yourself?—May I point out this. I think a board of conciliation, representing the collective drivers and proprietors, would stand a much better chance of moving Parliament than any disintegrated or disorganised mass, and I have already suggested that a board of conciliation discussing questions as they arise affecting the trade should be a *sine quâ non*.

16,650. How are you going to make the cab proprietors on the one hand, and the cabmen on the other, acquiesce in what you may agree to if you have no organisation?—I do not say that there should be no organisation.

16,651. I thought you put forward a board of conciliation as being a better means than an organisation for doing those things?—I think that is the crowning means. I think it is absolutely necessary on the drivers' part that they should have an organisation, and it is just as

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Tait—continued.

necessary on the cab proprietors' part that they should have an organisation.

16,652. If you have a board of conciliation, how are you going to make either party carry out what may be agreed upon. Do you propose to penalise them and fine them?—No, I should have no penalising. They do not require any penalty in the cab trade. If I have made myself, as I have done, obnoxious to the cab proprietors, they have a certain mode of punishing me, although I am independent of the cab master or cabdriver. But they have a mark and a red book for a man who does not pay, and they have their association meetings once a week, and, as a consequence, if a man is what is termed a scourger, that is one who unduly severely treats his horse, he soon gets penalised. But do you mean in the matter of prices, or what?

16,653. I mean in the matter of prices, strikes, or anything of the kind. When you say you would have a board of conciliation what is the crowning means of organisation. How are you going to get carried out what that board agrees upon if you do not penalise them?—I believe that the mere matter of discussing a supplement by man and masters representatives would be sufficiently binding on the majority to compel the minority to act in accordance with them.

16,654. Have you ever known a case where a minority of masters refused to carry out the agreement of the Masters' Association in the same way as you have known members of trades unions refuse to carry out what has been agreed upon by their executive?—I have known splits to occur in trades unions. Splits may occur and must occur. We cannot all think alike, or the world would be very smooth if we did. But I am merely suggesting a board of conciliation, not to have drastic powers to chop off the head of any persons that disobeyed its behests, but a board of conciliation for the purpose of removing the friction that exists, and that I believe could be smoothed down much better if the men met and discussed points of disagreement. I feel as sure as I am of my own existence that a cab strike is inevitable within the next month or six weeks unless the representatives of the men and the representatives of the masters can come together and discuss their questions amicably, and in a friendly sense settle the matter of prices.

16,655. About this Co-operative Cab Society. You said in answer to Lord Derby that you admitted that the wholesale societies had made co-operation and co-operative societies a success from its distributive phase?—Quite so.

16,656. You did not say anything about co-operative production. Do I take it that you think they have not been successful in co-operative production?—Co-operative production is, comparatively speaking, a baby. Distributive co-operation has been many years in existence. Productive co-operation, so far as my knowledge goes, although I have studied the co-operative question as well as my little amount of leisure will allow me, so far as I know it is in its infancy, but I hope that I am wrong. I hope

Mr. Tait—continued.

that productive co-operation is spreading, and I feel absolutely convinced that if it does it will be beneficial all round.

16,657. Yes, but you have no knowledge whether there has been a success or not?—I believe that in one or two cases there has. For instance, I recollect at Wolverhampton the lock makers had a strike, and the masters locked them out for a considerable time. They started a little co-operative venture themselves, and the masters sold under cost prices, but the men lived on wholemeal bread and water, and under-sold the masters, and ultimately they became one of the largest productive agencies in the Midlands. But when I say productive co-operation it is only a baby comparatively speaking. The distributive results of co-operation are gigantic. The history of the Wholesale Co-operative Association will prove that.

16,658. How many cabmen have shares in this Co-operative Cab Society?—Unfortunately very few. I should say less than 100.

16,659. Who furnishes the capital; is it people outside the cab trade?—Of course they have had no capital since about 1883 or 1884, otherwise I believe they would be growing with great rapidity, because the little jealousies and bickerings that they had in the earlier stages of its development, have, I believe, been largely toned down, and they are on the high road I believe to success, but unfortunately the number of cab driving co-operators is something like only 100.

16,660. You further said that you thought Parliament could not assist the co-operative movement?—Parliament could, undoubtedly.

16,661. But you said it could not?—If I said it could not I, of course, said what was untrue. I did not mean to say it could not. I understood Lord Derby's question to mean—did I suggest that Parliament should assist it.

16,662. Are you acquainted with the Provident Societies Act under which co-operative societies are registered?—The little association I am connected with has been formed under the Limited Liabilities Acts, and although I have read Vansittart Neale on the Friendly Societies Act I have not had much reason to study that question. As a consequence at the time I was strongly in favour of registering under the Friendly Societies Act. I think that if there is any little difficulty that occurs in a court of justice, or if persons are summoned, if you are a liability company, there seems, I do not know why, but I have had that little experience myself, there seems to be a sort of feeling against the company.

Mr. Bolton.

16,663. Your remedy for the unfortunate state of the cab market at present is the prevention of any increase of cabs or drivers for a considerable period?—For a certain period.

16,664. Would you extend that principle to other trades?—Where they pay for the privilege, yes.

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

16,665. What privilege do you mean?—We pay, as I have said, between 35,000*l.* and 45,000*l.* (it differs, of course, in different years) for the privilege of plying in the streets of London. There are, I suppose, about 11,000 or 12,000 vehicles, and each vehicle pays so much.

Duke of Devonshire.

16,666. Vehicle or cabdriver?—Each cab and driver. The cab costs 2*l.* per annum. Then there is a wheel duty of 15*s.*, and the driver pays 5*s.*; that makes 3*l.* So that, taking the very lowest number of cabs possible, in order to get it in a round form, say that there are 10,000 (there are over that number of cabs) then that is the 30,000*l.* set apart for the privilege of applying for hire.

Mr. Bolton.

16,667. Would you allow cabs to be built all this time?—I do not think the builders would care much about building a public cab if they did not think there would be a chance of getting it licensed.

16,668. What is to become of those men who are employed in building cabs?—I do not think it would make such an extraordinary amount of difference in the work of people building cabs, because I think that the difference between a sufficiency and a glut in the cab trade would not mean much more than at the very outset 500*l.* distributed throughout the metropolis in the building of cabs.

16,669. You mean the excess of cabs at present is so very trifling?—No.

16,670. What then?—The excess of cabs is not trifling or else the grievance would not be so sore, but comparatively speaking, the number sufficient to make the difference between a sufficient supply and a glut is trifling. I think that could be rectified. Supposing the limitation was in operation for, at the outside, 12 months, I believe that it would rectify itself.

16,671. And you think that the number of cabs necessary to bring the glutted state of the cab market down to a proper state, according to your view, would be represented by an annual payment for the manufacture of cabs of 500*l.*?—I understood you to say the making of cabs.

16,672. Yes?—500*l.* would not be much.

Duke of Devonshire.

16,673. What does a cab cost?—It differs, the average price of a cab would be 50*l.*, some run up to 100*l.*, but that is a fancy cab with india-rubber tyres, and so on.

Mr. Bolton.

16,674. The restriction in the cab trade would be 10 cabs?—No, I think I have understated it, it is not a question I have had before me of course. Perhaps 500*l.* would not be sufficient to cover the whole of the metropolis, but when you take into consideration this fact that the increase of new cabs is comparatively speaking, very small, and has been very small, no person could answer the question better than the firm

Mr. Bolton—continued.

of Messrs, Forder & Co., cab builders. I am told by the foreman of that firm that the number of cabs built by them since the recent strike in the cab trade has, been next to nothing. In fact, any person passing the firm would see (and that might answer your previous question), that their business has developed into a dog cart building, and carriage building, and brougham building, and landau building business.

16,675. Then I suppose the cab building business is not increasing?—The number of cabs.

16,676. Yes?—The strikes certainly had a tendency to diminish the number of cabs.

16,677. And on the whole you are of opinion that the limitation of licences to cabs and the limitation of licences to drivers for a limited period would not affect the building of cabs?—It would affect the building of cabs to a very small extent.

16,678. But you now depart from the 500*l.* theory?—A question like that comes as a surprise; it might strike you from your point of view.

16,679. It struck me (and perhaps you will answer it), that you would throw out of employment a number of people who are at present employed in building cabs. What would become of those people?—I do not think there would be anybody thrown out of employment.

16,680. You think the cabs would still go on being built?—The cabs must necessarily wear out; the life of a cab is about seven years, and as a consequence the cabs must undergo a state of repair. I think I have already shown why the persons that you think would be displaced would find their business increase. I previously pointed out the fact that an annual examination of the cab property was, taking the riders point of view, insufficient, and that it should be bi-annual.

Duke of Devonshire.

16,681. You mean half-yearly?—Yes, if you had a half-yearly examination. Then supposing there was any displacement of labour consequent on the limitation of cabs that half-yearly examination would more than counterbalance any displacement of labour.

Mr. Bolton.

16,682. You mean that that would result in more repairs to cabs than at present?—Undoubtedly.

16,683. And that would necessitate, I should presume, the proprietor of the cabs charging a somewhat higher price to recoup himself, would not it?—My opinion is that the price charged need not necessarily be higher, but he would get the price charged.

16,684. But why should not it be higher if he is subjected to greater expense in providing the cabs?—The expense would not amount to more than I should say 2*d.* per day, because the annual inspection generally means what is termed touching up and varnishing.

16,685. 2*d.* a day is 14*d.* a week?—Yes.

16,686. You do not object to that being added to the price of the cab?—Not in the least. It

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Bolton—continued.

would not be an increased charge really; it would really mean that a proprietor would not now charge 12s., and take 10s. as some do, acting on the principle of the persons selling the coat who charge a higher price than they intend taking. Where he asks 12s. and takes 10s. he could ask 12s., and he would have a better opportunity of getting it, and the man would be able to pay the 12s.

16,687. Do you look upon your occupation as a skilled occupation?—Undoubtedly I do, but the world unfortunately looks upon it as unskilled.

16,688. It requires a certain amount of skill and knowledge?—Certainly.

16,689. How do you account for the fact that men whom you asserted had no knowledge of cab driving, paying for a licence to compete in a trade which is in such a bad state, while other trades which you evidently think not so badly off do not require a licence?—That is a very small question, but it needs a very large answer. Unfortunately, very young men are sometimes licensed, in fact, you will see some licensed at 16 or 17 years of age, what they term juvenile licences. These people being in the habit of receiving 8s. or 9s. a week as van boys, such as Carter, Paterson, and other firms, become full-fledged cabdrivers, and think they have sprung a gold mine, comparatively speaking. When their 10s. is raised in one jump to a guinea or 25s., as the case may be, then they cut a dash; they very possibly have a lucky day or a couple of lucky days, if I may use such a term, and go into a coffee-house or public-house and get talking to one another, and onlookers, with ears open, listen to what is said; they do not know the difficulties of cab driving, they hear that this young fellow had got off a fare 5s. somewhere down the road, and had picked up 10s. somewhere else, and had altogether, with 2s. 6d. and so on, made up a sovereign, more or less, and was only paying 10s. out of it. These people hear this lad talking in this way, and seeing him smoking his cigar and drinking something, and not knowing the difficulties, but only seeing the fruits of his industry, possibly come to the conclusion that cab driving is better than carpentering. That is the reason for my previous remark that a cabdriver is a migratory animal. The cab population is a fluctuating one. If I leave the cab trade through illness, or for any other cause, for only a month or six weeks, and drive out of the same neighbourhood through the streets of London the number of new faces I meet is astonishing, and another cabdriver will tell you the same thing. No person could prove that better, of course, than, say, Inspector Pearson at Scotland Yard, or anybody dealing with the issue of licences. I suppose that the number of fixtures to the cab business, and by that I mean to say *bona fide* cabdrivers who stick to their business in the metropolis, in my opinion, cannot be much more than, if as much, as 25 per cent., one fourth.

Mr. Bolton—continued.

16,690. Is it the case that men, when they first get licensed, are invariably fortunate?—I believe it is so; I was fortunate myself. I will tell you why that is. The man does not understand the police regulations, and, as a consequence, the newly-fledged driver pulls up where he has no right to pull up—in front of the first man on the rank, who has been there two or three hours, not knowing he is doing wrong till he receives one or two summonses to attend before the magistrate, and that teaches him he is doing wrong. A new beginner is more fortunate generally than an old stager, and that is the reason for it.

16,691. Do the police not interfere?—They do interfere undoubtedly, but I believe the police are human; they interfere, but I believe that the majority of us, if we saw a person doing wrong ignorantly, would tell him of it.

16,692. Then the policemen see at a glance that he is a new driver?—Some policemen can. I could. If the Lord Mayor's coachman was on a showful cab, or an hansom cab for the first time, and he had been driving, though he would be an experienced and thoroughly capable coachman, yet I could tell he was a new beginner. I believe there is another cabdriver in the room, and he could tell that the other man was what we call a gardener, or whack, that is, a newly-fledged cabdriver.

16,693. The board of conciliation which you recommend is an association of some kind or other to help the cabdrivers and the cab owners to make a bargain, is not it?—That would be the main reason of its existence in my opinion.

16,694. You suggest that that should be the county council, I think?—Oh, no.

Duke of Devonshire.

16,695. Will you state what are the usual terms of employment of cabdrivers or cab owners?—The usual terms are these. In the metropolis, of course, it differs from the provinces. In Brighton or Eastbourne, or other provincial towns the proprietor pays a small wage.

16,696. But in London?—In the metropolis the cabdriver pays a certain price for the loan of his cab, and, as a consequence, he really is not a servant, although the law in some instances considers him such; he is really not a servant; he is merely in the same position as a person who goes to a livery yard and charters a brougham or carriage.

16,697. And pays so much a day?—So much a day for the hire of the cab. All over that is his earning.

16,698. And as to the horse?—It is a cab and two horses, as a rule there are different drivers. This requires explanation, and I will give it as briefly as possible. There are morning and evening men, and there are long-day men, with both four-wheel cabs and hansom. The morning men drive one horse, and the night men drive one horse, and the long-day men drive two horses. The price charged varies with the number of horses the men drive.

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

16,699. How long is the bargain made for?—For the one day or for the section of the day, according to whether they are morning men, long-day men, or night men.

16,700. You mean every man hires his cab for the day?—Every man hires his cab for the day.

16,701. A fresh bargain every day?—Oh, no. Supposing you were a cab proprietor and I was to go down for service to-morrow I should ask you what your price was.

16,702. How does a cabdriver get his employment?—A cabdriver goes to a cab yard and inquires. The general term is, "Anything going governor," that means is there a vacancy. The proprietor says "Yes, let me have a look at your bill." The bill is the licence, and you hand the proprietor your licence and he looks at it. The licence has various margins showing the date of your last service, when you entered it, and when you left it; and, on the back of it, if you have any summonses the fines are placed on the back.

16,703. I do not want all that. I want to know the length of time for which the engagement is made?—The proprietor says to the man, "Yes, your bill will suit, you can go with that lot." That is a cab, and I as a driver say to him at once, "what is the price," that is supposing I do not know it, but as a general rule we know, and the price varies according to the time of the year and according to the quality of the article the man drives. At the present moment a four-wheel cab varies from 9s. to 12s. a day. A hansom cab varies, at the present time, which is considered to be the very worst period of the year, or a section of the worst, period in the cabdriver's life, from 10s. to 15s.

16,704. You have not told me the length of time for which the engagement was made?—The length of time varies, of course.

16,705. Is this bargain made by the day or for a week; for what period?—It is made periodically.

16,706. What is the period?—You have to pay every day.

16,707. How long are you engaged for?—As long as the proprietor likes; he raises the price when he thinks fit. If it is 10s. 6d. a week he can put the price up 1s. next week if he thinks fit.

16,708. If you get a cab you can go on till one side or the other gives notice of an alteration in the terms?—Quite so; the driver leaves if he thinks fit at the end of his day's work.

16,709. And the proprietor can give him notice?—The proprietor can dismiss him at the end of the day if he thinks fit.

16,710. Or alter his terms?—Or keep him on from day to day for years. I think I begin to understand your question now. The proprietor alters his terms periodically by the increase or reduction in business. For instance, through the bad time, as it is termed, the price of the hire of a cab is at a minimum, but after the boat race day, or just before the boat race, or about the boat race day the price of a cab goes

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

up 2s. generally. It rises 1s. a week until it gets to its maximum price.

16,711. What are the trade disputes?—The trade disputes generally centre on the question of the price, on the price charged by the proprietor for the hire of a vehicle. The disputes generally almost invariably centre on that question of price.

16,712. What was the strike about?—There have been several strikes, but they have always been, with the exception of one in my time, that is the lamp strike, the whole of the strikes have, with that exception, originated in the question of price, the proprietor attaching what the men considered too large a value for the hire of the vehicle, and the man on the contrary considering that the value is not so much as he wants.

16,713. You have not stated the result of the strike, I think?—The results of the strikes have been disastrous in my opinion to the cabdrivers and proprietors alike.

16,714. How to the drivers? The drivers have got no good out of them, have they?—They have been disastrous to the drivers; the drivers have won their point temporarily, but there has been no cohesion.

16,715. That is to say, they have got better terms?—They have got better terms for the time being, but they have been satisfied with winning the victory, if I may use such a term, and having done so they have left their organisation, not being capable of any sustained effort, so that what little concession they have won has been lost to them a very little while afterwards. The labour market, that is the driving market, has been, on account of the advertisement of the cab owners, glutted, and as a consequence the strikes have, as I said previously, been absolutely disastrous alike to the cab owner and cab proprietor.

16,716. Have you already stated whether any union of cabdrivers exists?—Yes. There are several cabdrivers' unions in existence. What I should term the most advanced, the most able, the most efficient, and the best managed association, looking at it from a labour point of view, is the Metropolitan Cabdrivers' Trades Union.

16,717. Have they any regulations as to the terms on which their members are allowed to work. Have they a list of prices?—No, they have no list of prices. The only list of prices that I have noticed has been the minimum charge that I referred to previously that the Improved Cabs' Club wanted its members to charge drivers. There is no set price fixed by the Metropolitan Trades' Union or any other union, simply because it would be absurd to fix a price because they would have to regulate that price, possibly either to lower it or raise it, within a week or two of their settling it. The only way in which the price can be settled in my opinion, is for representatives of the masters and men to agree, and in friendly consultation to regulate the price periodically.

16,718. Well, I suppose that is practically done?—No, unfortunately not.

11 March 1892.]

Mr. E. DYKE.

[Continued.]

Duke of Devonshire—continued.

16,719. The men and masters bargain?—They bargain individually unfortunately, and that leaves the matter open.

16,720. You complain that there are too many cabdrivers?—There are certainly too many cabdrivers.

16,721. And, therefore, too much competition?—Too much competition.

16,722. And you wish to reduce that competition?—Undoubtedly.

16,723. You say there are too many cabs?—Yes.

16,724. But your complaint is rather as regards the excessive number of cabdrivers than the cabs, is not it?—Certainly. I think that the cabdrivers are in proportion much more excessive than the cabs.

16,725. Do any proprietors of cabs drive their own cabs?—Oh, yes. There is a large number of what we technically term little mushes, those are, one-numbered men, that is men who drive their own horse and cab, or what is nominally their own horse and cab. There are also a number of men who have two, three, and sometimes six cabs that drive, and they as a general rule are what is known as cheap and easy masters, men that keep their drivers for years without any disputes whatever.

16,726. Have you any knowledge of the condition of the men who own one cab and drive it?—The condition of the men who own one cab and drive it is worse as a general rule than that of the man who drives for a master, much worse. If the one-numbered men were to associate together so that they could take a yard and buy their fodder, and share their cost of management between them, then my opinion is that a man owning his own number would be in the most favourable position possible.

16,727. But as a rule their expenses are relatively higher?—Their expenses are much higher than those of a man driving for a master.

Earl of Derby.

16,728. Just one question. You say that there is a large excess in the number both of cabs and drivers over what is required?—Yes.

Earl of Derby—continued.

16,729. You have also said that you feel sure that a cab strike would occur within the next few weeks?—Unless something is done.

16,730. Do you think that a condition of things where there were two or three men wanting employment and one got it, is a condition of things in which a successful strike is possible?—I do not know that the strike would be successful. I have already admitted that strikes have been disastrous in the cab trade to master and man alike. I do not think that they could be more than temporarily successful under existing circumstances. You pointed it out by your question much more clearly than I could do. The most important point of all, if you will pardon me going on, is the codification of the cab law. I mentioned in my statement the codification of the cab law, because the cab law is in such a contradictory state. There have been since 1860 or 1868 a large number of enactments in St. Stephen's dealing with the hackney carriage traffic, and I think that if the whole of those Acts were codified into one, and the glaring inconsistencies and contradictions that now exist dealt with, it would be largely beneficial. In fact, until we get an amelioration and modification of our cab law, I think we shall be tied, handcuffed, and not able to move in any direction.

16,731. As a matter of fact, are there not unofficial summaries stating what is the present condition of the laws relating to cabs?—Yes; there is what they term an abstract of the laws. That abstract is really obsolete and effete; it is absolutely useless. I will give you a case in point if you will allow me.

16,732. No; you need not do that. We are quite willing to admit that the codification of the law might be an advantage, and the codification of many other laws might be an advantage?—But this is very pressing, my lord. I may tell you that Mr. Dixon Hartland and several other members, as Sir William Vernon Harcourt and others, have admitted the inaccuracies; but they all seem to be backward in moving anywhere. It is generally admitted by both sides of the House that something is absolutely necessary in reference to the codification and amelioration of the cab law, but nobody seems to take any further notice of it.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Tuesday, the 29th March 1892, at 11 o'clock.

GROUP B.

TRANSPORT AND AGRICULTURE

(The term "Transport" including Railways, Shipping, Canals, Docks, and Tramways).

LIST OF DOCUMENTS.

Document handed in.	No. of Appendix (Vol. II., Evidence, Group B.)	No. of Question (Vol. II., Evidence, Group B.)	Witness.
Written copies of manifest issued from a "bogus" meeting called by the Shipping Federation, and of newspaper report of a meeting. (<i>These documents were unavoidably omitted from the Appendix to Vol. I. See note under heading "Appendix LVI, Vol. I., Group B."</i>)	56	8634	Mr. Clem Edwards.
Copy of Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act, 1862, with Schedule repealing Sections 170, 171, and 172 of the Customs Consolidation Act, 1853	—	11,261	Mr. S. Plimsoil.
Manuscript return prepared by the Board of Trade, showing the number of ships and lives lost in timber-laden ships reported as foundered or missing in each of the years 1873 to 1889 inclusive.	—	11,281	"
Specifications and forms of tender from prisons, asylums, work-houses, and from the Army and Navy specifying the nature of the provisions supplied to seamen, and the general conditions of contract.	—	11,295	"
Return (August 1876) "of all Sales of Provisions, being Naval Stores, by or for the Admiralty, for the two years ending 31st December 1875, showing when each parcel sold was bought, of what it consisted, whether beef, pork, or biscuits, and the price paid for it, also the date of its sale, the prices for which it was sold, and the name of the purchaser." (No. 445 of 1876.)	—	11,299	"
Return by the Board of Trade (August 1890) "of the names and descriptions of the members of all the Local Marine Boards (for each port separately), distinguishing as far as possible those members who do not own ships, or shares in ships, from the others." (No. 372 of 1890.)	—	11,310	"
Prospectus of the Tyne Co-operative Stevedore Company, Limited.	—	11,402	Mr. I. Allman.
Price lists of the Tyne Co-operative Stevedore Company, the Tyne and District Master Stevedores' Association, and the Tyneside and District Labourers' Association.	—	"	"
Table of rates of wages paid to seamen, firemen, engineers, &c. in the chief rivers and ports of the United Kingdom (May 1891), showing rates of payments for overtime.	72	11,532	Mr. J. Morrison.
Letter from Messrs. Fisher, Renwick, and Co., enclosing statement showing sums paid by them to and in aid of the relatives of officers and seamen lost or injured whilst in their employ.	—	11,533	"
Handbills showing the privileges under the Benefit Fund of the Shipping Federation offered to Naval Reserve men of the first class.	73	11,537	"
Extract from the "Newcastle Evening Chronicle" (January 9th, 1892) giving speech by Mr. J. Havelock Wilson concerning the Shipping Federation, the Cardiff strike, and Local Marine Boards.	—	11,541	"
Rules of the National Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union of Great Britain and Ireland.	—	11,559	Mr. J. Heron Wilson.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS—*continued.*

Document handed in:	No. of Appendix (Vol. II., Evidence, Group B.).	No. of Question (Vol. II., Evidence, Group B.).	Witness.
Return showing rates of wages since 1885 for steam vessels—Mediterranean trade, Port of Cardiff.	74	11,628	Mr. J. Heron Wilson.
Circular (dated May 27, 1889) issued to shipowners by the National Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union, giving the scale according to which the men request to be paid.	75	11,686	Mr. J. Cormack.
Copies of report of a meeting between the Leith Shipowners' Society and the Sailors' Union.	—	11,708	"
Correspondence concerning the blocking of the steamship "Britannia" and the Leith strike.	—	11,715	"
Papers concerning blocking of steamship "Moravia"	(See Evidence.)	11,716	"
Letters stating the facts of a case which occurred during a strike at the Hermitage Wharf concerning the steamships "Iona" and "Marmion."	—	11,725	"
Copy of Notice issued by the stevedores of Leith (March 17, 1891).	(See Evidence.)	11,728	"
Memorandum of the Leith Maritime Disasters' Fund showing the amount subscribed and expended to July 2, 1891.	—	11,731	"
Sixth Annual Report (1891) of the Leith Sailors' Home	—	11,732	"
Report (1874) made by Messrs. Janson and Wakefield, appointed by the Lloyd's Committee, with regard to deck-loading and loss of life and ships.	—	11,764	Produced by Mr. Plimssoll.
Rules of the Southampton Free Labour Association	76	12,164	Mr. T. Morgan.
Rules of the Accident Fund, the Savings Bank, and the sea-going section Sick Fund of the Southampton Free Labour Association.	77	12,172	"
Table showing number of casual men employed by the Southampton Dock Company on the first six working days in each month of the year from November 1890 to 1891.	78	12,175	"
Extract from the "Southampton Times" (July 11, 1891) of an "Interview with Mr. Tom Mann" concerning the strike.	(See Evidence.)	12,214	"
First Annual Report (1890) of the Dockers' Union	—	{ 12,276 12,405	Mr. T. MacCarthy.
Statements showing how men were treated by strikers	79	12,794	Mr. J. Smith Park.
Form of Return List of crew of ship and <i>pro forma</i> disbursement account which the masters send from their various ports of sailing to meet the Board of Trade requirements.	—	12,829	"
Copy of a ship's articles showing provision scale	—	12,847	"
Scheme for a National Insurance and Provident Fund for British Mariners.	80	{ 13,275 13,277	Capt. E. B. Hatfield.
Pamphlet with regard to the Government contributing to the proposed seamen's insurance fund.	81	13,278	"
Proposed manning scale for sailing ships and steamers	82	13,290	"
Copy of provision scale issued by the committee of the General Shipowners' Society in 1844.	—	13,285	"
Victualling bills showing the variety and cost of food supplied to the crew of the steamship "Lamington" at Glasgow, London, and Gibraltar.	—	{ 13,431 13,477	Mr. W. H. Raeburn.
Victualling bills of the whole voyage of the steamship "Lamington" from Glasgow to the East, and thence to America.	—	13,477	"

LIST OF DOCUMENTS--*continued.*

Document handed in.	No. of Appendix (Vol. II., Evidence, Group B.).	No. of Question (Vol. II., Evidence, Group B.).	Witness.
Copy of award of the arbitrators appointed by the Hull, Keel and Lighter Owners' Association and the Amalgamated Watermen of the River Humber.	83	13,695	Mr. A. A. Bird.
Letter issued by the Bute Docks Company to their customers in connection with the strike on February 3rd, 1891.	(See Evidence.)	13,750	Captain Pomeroy.
Circular issued by the above company to their men	"	"	"
Census of workmen entering the Bute Docks from noon on February 11th to noon on February 12th, 1892.	—	13,752	"
Draft of rules of the Bristol Channel Docks Association of employers and workmen.	(See Evidence.)	13,757	"
Report of the committee of the Cardiff Incorporated Chamber of Commerce with regard to the formation either of conciliation boards or of a general board for the settlement of disputes.	84	13,789	"
Letter from Mr. H. J. Byrne to Mr. J. Tookey concerning the issue by the employers of an alternative price lists of freights.	(See Evidence.)	13,914	Mr. J. Tookey.
Circular issued to the captains of six barges in one firm by the owner, instructing them to abide by the orders of Messrs. Lawrence & Co., a firm of middlemen.	"	"	"
Famphlet, "Our Sailors,"—a speech by the Right Hon. J. Chamberlain, M.P., in the House of Commons, May 19, 1884.	—	14,087	Mr. T. Scrutton.
Table (I.) showing variation in sail and steam tonnage by comparing the years 1860, 1875, and 1890.	(See Evidence.)	"	"
Table (II.) Return of accidents to British timber-laden ships 1873 to 1889.	"	"	"
Table (III.) Extracts from reports of the London and Hartlepool Port Sanitary Authorities.	"	"	"
Table (IV.) Return as to loss of life from British ships, 1871 to 1882.	"	14,091	"
Rules of the Glasgow, Greenock, Liverpool, and London Ship Riggers' Associations.	—	{ 14,372 14,384 14,400	Mr. J. Stanbury.
Copies of the Wade's Arms manifesto and of the manifesto of the United Riggers' Association of London (December 6th, 1890).	85	14,373	"
Copy of letter addressed to the United Labour Council from the United Riggers' Association concerning the action of the Sailors and Firemen's Union.	86	14,380	"
Circular issued to master riggers by the London United Riggers' Association with regard to the increase of pay for the winter months.	87	14,384	"
Verbatim copy of the agreement with the Allan Line Steamship Company.	88	14,531	Mr. E. Newman.
Letter (dated October 15, 1891) from Mr. Newman to Mr. Devitt of the Shipping Federation, asking for employment.	(See Evidence.)	14,564	Produced by Mr. Trow.
Report from Messrs. Cochran and Walker, chartered accountants, Liverpool, on the annual report of the National Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union.	—	14,695	Mr. G. J. Hornsby.
Thirteen official protests against Mr. J. Havelock Wilson's strike policy from officers of his Union.	—	14,707	Mr. A. R. Abbott.
Letters, &c., re charges made by Mr. J. Havelock Wilson (in evidence) against witness.	—	14,720	"

LIST OF DOCUMENTS—continued.

Document handed in.	No. of Appendix (Vol. II., Evidence, Group B.).	No. of Question (Vol. II., Evidence, Group B.).	Witness.
Board of Trade instructions (revised September 1891) to superintendents of mercantile marine offices relative to the engagement and discharge of seamen on board ship.	89	14,752	Mr. C. Laws.
Manifesto issued by the Amalgamated Stevedores	—	"	"
Printed copy of correspondence with Mr. Clem. Edwards and memorandum of deputation <i>re</i> the London Shipping Dispute.	—	"	"
Forged certificates (or discharges) presented by seamen at Federation registry offices.	—	14,752	"
List of cases of assaults upon free labourers by Union men	90	"	"
Extract from "Seafaring" (July 25, 1891) giving report of a speech made by Mr. J. Havelock Wilson.	91	14,754	"
Extract from the "Hartlepool Mail" (October 20th, 1891) with reference to the conviction of the local secretary of the Sailors' Union for persuading a seaman to desert.	(See Evidence.)	"	"
Copies of Mr. Champion's speeches on Trades Unionism and other works circulated by the Federation to the registry offices.	92	"	"
Specimen of literature circulated by the Sailors' Union at the formation of the Federation.	93	"	"
Board of Trade receipt for 3 <i>l.</i> 15 <i>s.</i> 4 <i>d.</i> , being the payment of passage home of a man who was injured whilst working on a vessel, and letters from the owners and from Her Majesty's Consul at Constantinople bearing on the subject.	—	"	"
Letter (dated January 4th, 1892) from Her Majesty's Consul at Constantinople to the shipping agents at Galata in connection with the question of hospital dues.	(See Evidence.)	"	"
Copy of extract from the "Northern Daily Mail" (October 24th, 1890) West Hartlepool, reporting the case of the "Bavaria" and stating the amount of fines.	94	14,755	"
Copies of letters and extracts from letters from the agents to the owners concerning the case of steamship "Bavaria."	95	"	"
Letter from the captain of the "Bavaria" to the owners	—	"	"
Letter from Local Marine Board, in reply to a letter from the Shipping Federation, with reference to the blocking of the Tower Hill Shipping Office by unionists.	(See Evidence.)	"	"
Table A., showing the number and net tonnage of sailing and steamships on the register of the United Kingdom and Isle of Man during years 1875-1890.	96	14,758	Sir H. G. Calver K.C.B.
Table B., showing the number and net tonnage of vessels registered in the United Kingdom and Isle of Man which were employed at sea at some time during each year.	97	"	"
Table C., showing the total number of persons forming the crews of the vessels employed.	98	"	"
Table D.—Constitution of the crews in C.	99	"	"
Table E., showing rate of loss of life amongst seamen (excluding fishermen) in recent years as compared with the year 1881.	100	"	"
Table F., showing classification of wrecks and casualties in which lives were lost during years 1875-91.	101	14,759	"

LIST OF DOCUMENTS—*continued.*

Document handed in.	No. of Appendix (Vol. II, Evidence, Group B.)	No. of Question (Vol. II, Evidence, Group B.)	Witness.
Table G., showing for years 1875-91, number and tonnage of British merchant vessels totally lost; nature of the casualties by which they were lost; and number of lives lost; (a) sailing ships, (b) steamships, (c) sailing and steamships.	102	14,760	Sir H. G. Calcraft, K.C.B.
Table H. (a and b), relating to losses of timber-laden British ships (1873 to 1891).	103	14,763	"
Table I.—Return of prosecutions by Board of Trade during the years 1865 to 1892 for improper deck-loading.	104	14,764	"
Table J.—Quotations in full of sections 170, 171, and 172 of the Customs Consolidation Act, 1853.	105	14,765	"
Table K., showing entries of tonnage at London, Liverpool, and Glasgow.	106	{ 14,770-1 14,842-4	"
Table L.—Extract from report of Commission on Loss of Life at Sea, with regard to employment of foreigners.	(See Evidence)	{ 14,776-8 14,841	"
Table M.—Extract from report of Commission on Loss of Life at Sea, with regard to the examination of seamen.	"	14,779-80	"
Table N.—Return of recent proceedings by Board of Trade under sections 147 and 148 Merchant Shipping Act, 1854. (Crimping.)	107	14,787	"
Table O.—Return of prosecutions under sections 28 and 34 Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, between the years 1883 and 1892.	108	14,819	"
Copy of circular issued to the Leeds and Liverpool Canal Company, giving the decisions upon points discussed and arranged by the chairman and vice-chairman at the Canal Office, Liverpool, 6th September 1890.	109	15,553	Mr. W. Turner.
Document issued by the London General Omnibus Company and the London Road Car Company to the <i>employés</i> at the termination of the strike of June 1891, showing concessions granted.	(See Evidence)	15,766	Mr. T. Sutherst.
Copy of proposal for municipalisation of 'buses and trams	110	15,775	"
Copy of Bill concerning a 12 hours' day	111	15,864	"
Balance sheet of a tramway municipality at Huddersfield	112	16,078-83	"
Letter from the Lord Mayor to the London General Omnibus Company, together with reply thereto, concerning the discharge of conductors.	(See Evidence)	{ 16,322 16,334	Mr. H. Bowbrick.
Extract from the "Evening Standard" giving report of an intended meeting of omnibus workers on November 27th, 1891.	113	16,362	"
Advertisement by the North Metropolitan Tramways Company for drivers and conductors appearing in the "Daily Chronicle" twice weekly.	(See Evidence)	16,504	Mr. J. Atkinson.
Extract containing report of the 21st half-yearly meeting of the London Tramways Company and comparing wages paid to 'busmen and to agricultural labourers.	"	16,506	"
Copy of letter to the Southwark and Deptford Tram Company from the Amalgamated Omnibus and Tram Workers' Union concerning eight journeys instead of nine on Sunday.	"	16,555	"
Prospectus of the Workers' Co-operative Omnibus Society	114	16,594	"
Rules of the Improved Cabs' Club	115	16,809	Mr. E. Dyke.

APPENDIX LVI.

COPIES of MANIFESTO issued from a "BOGUS" MEETING called by the SHIPPING FEDERATION, and of NEWSPAPER REPORT of a MEETING.

THE WORKING CLASSES AND THE MAINTENANCE OF THE
BRITISH SHIPPING TRADE.

To the Sailors of London and the Outports.

MEN.

At last many of the leaders of the Trades Unions of the country have turned their attention to the crisis in the British Shipping Trade, and the tactics of the so-called "National" Sailors and Firemen's Union.

At a conference of 60 trade delegates held at the Trades Union Club-house at the "Rose Tavern," Old Bailey, E.C., on February 24th, the action of this organisation and those who guide and inspire it was unanimously condemned as "being subversive of the true principles of Trades Unionism."

The leading officer of the organisation (Mr. J. H. Wilson) declared at a recent meeting held at Deptford that the "National" Sailors and Firemen's Union now counted amongst its members 18,000 foreign sailors.

18,000 foreign sailors in British "National" Trades Union!

Mr. Wilson's official documents show that he and his "National" Union of Sailors and Firemen have opened branch offices of this combination at the foreign rival ports of Amsterdam, Antwerp, Hamburg, Copenhagen, and Gotenburg.

Now, what does all this mean? It means that the object of this "National" Union, controlled by Mr. Wilson and his advisers, is to dislocate the shipping and maritime industries of Great Britain in the interest of foreign trade and foreign labour. The past and present strikes in the shipping industry, which have been fomented by the "National" Sailors and Firemen's Union, has driven an enormous amount of tonnage in shipping to these foreign rival ports, where Mr. Wilson's combinations has opened branch offices of this British Trades Union. British Labour Loses. Foreign Labour Gains.

What does the employment of 18,000 foreign sailors in British bottoms mean? It means the gradual substitution of foreign seamen for British seamen. It means, practically, that in the near future, foreign labour will have a controlling power in our great mercantile marine, to the hurt and disadvantage of common country; yet Mr. Wilson proudly boasts at Deptford, the home of British shipping, that 18,000 foreign sailors have joined his "National" Union.

The senseless strikes, which are now going on in the shipping trade, are said to be in defence of trades unionism. It is nothing of the kind. This statement is a fraud and a delusion. A bricklayer, a mason, or an engineer, who holds his trades union ticket, is content

to work side by side with his fellow mechanics, who hold no union tickets. What satisfies old trades unionists, who have made heavy sacrifices in the past for the maintenance of trades union principles, should in all conscience satisfy Mr. Wilson's Union, which was created but yesterday.

All working men should become unionists, but coercion, which is the basis of the existence of the National Sailors and Firemen's Union, never succeeded in making men loyal to any cause, and must fail in the case of the Sailors and Firemen's Union.

To the Stevedores and Dockers of all Sections.

We would say, remember that every ton of shipping, which is driven to the foreign ports, which is advancing in prosperity by leaps and bounds, through the senseless strikes now going on, you will be the greatest sufferers. Foreign labour will gain what you lose, and foreign homes will be comforted at the expense of the sufferings of the British women and children.

By order of the Board of Delegates, who met at the "Rose Tavern," Old Bailey, E.C.

March 4th, 1891.

(True copy.)

Last night an adjourned meeting of trade and labour delegates was held at the "Rose," Old Bailey, to further discuss the industrial situation, especially in relation to the Royal Commission on Labour. Mr. W. Watson (London Riggers' Society) presided. Mr. Mark Mildred (West End Builders) moved:—"That while this conference of London Trade Unionists regard with satisfaction the appointment of the Royal Commission on Labour, we, as earnest working men, hope that Her Majesty's Government will probe the labour strikes down to the ground, so as to expose the foreign and socialistic agencies which have fomented many of the recent senseless strikes, which have terribly injured British labour and commerce." Mr. Chandler (Riverside Workmen) seconded, and Mr. Dixon (Railway Waggon Workers) and others supported the motion, which was unanimously passed. A second resolution was passed to the following effect:—"That this conference hereby elects three delegates to give evidence before the Royal Commission, with a view to show how the public funds were distributed—as we allege, to the hurt of our order—and that copies of the foregoing resolution be sent to the Prime Minister, Lord Hartington (chairman of the Royal Commission), Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. John Morley." With thanks to the chairman the meeting was closed.

APPENDIX LXXII.

RATES OF WAGES of SEAMEN, FIREMEN, &c. in the chief RIVERS and PORTS of the United Kingdom current in May 1891.

Rating of Seamen.	TYNE.				CARDIFF.				CLYDE.				DUNDEE.				HUMBER.				FORTH.				MERSEY.				THAMES.						
	Steamers.		Sailors Per Month.		Steamers.		Sailors Per Month.		Steamers.		Sailors Per Month.		Steamers.		Sailors Per Month.		Steamers.		Sailors Per Month.		Steamers.		Sailors Per Month.		Steamers.		Sailors Per Month.		Steamers.		Sailors Per Month.				
	Month.	Week.	South.	West.	Month.	Week.	South.	West.	Month.	Week.	South.	West.	Month.	Week.	South.	West.	Month.	Week.	South.	West.	Month.	Week.	South.	West.	Month.	Week.	South.	West.	Month.	Week.	South.	West.			
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.				
Sailors	4 15	1 12 8	3 10	4 0	4 10	1 12 8	3 10	3 10	4 10	1 12 8	3 10	—	4 5	1 10 0	3 10	4 15	4 10	1 10 4	3 10	3 10	4 10	1 10 0	4 15	11. 10s. to 17. 12s. 8d.	3 10	4 0	4 0	1 10 0	3 10	3 10	4 0	4 10	1 12 8	3 10	4 0
Firemen	4 15	1 12 8	—	—	4 15	1 12 8	—	—	4 10	1 12 8	—	—	4 10	1 10 0	—	—	4 15	1 10 4	—	—	—	—	4 15	11. 10s. to 17. 12s. 8d.	—	—	4 10	1 10 0	—	—	4 10	5 0	1 12 8	—	—
Boatwains	5 10	—	4 10	4 15	5 10	1 17 6	4 10	4 10	5 10	1 14 8	4 0	—	5 0	1 15 0	4 10	4 15	5 10	1 11 4	4 10	4 10	5 5	17. 11s. to 17. 12s. 8d.	In lieu of 2nd Mate.	4 10	5 0	5 0	1 15 0	4 10	4 10	5 10	6 0	1 16 0	4 10	5 0	
Quartermasters	—	—	—	—	4 10	—	—	—	4 15	—	3 15	—	4 10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Stewards	6 5	1 16 0	5 10	5 15	6 10	1 16 0	5 10	5 10	6 10	1 15s. to 17. 12s. 8d.	11. 10s. to 17. 12s. 8d.	6 10	—	—	5 15	6 0	1 4 4	5 10	5 10	6 10	1 5 0 and found.	1 15 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cooks	5 10	1 16 0	4 10	4 15	5 10	—	4 10	4 10	5 10	17. 12s. to 17. 12s. 8d.	4 10	—	5 5	—	—	4 15	5 0	1 4 4 and found.	5 0	5 0	5 10	1 2 0 and found.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cooks and stewards.	—	—	—	—	6 10	1 16 0	5 10	5 10	6 10	17. 12s. to 17. 12s. 8d.	11. 10s. to 17. 12s. 8d.	5 10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Assistant stewards.	2 10	—	—	—	2 10	0 18 0	—	—	—	2 10	15s. to 17. 12s. 8d.	—	3 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Carpenters	6 5	1 16 0	6 0	6 0	6 5	—	6 0	5 10	6 10	—	5 0	—	6 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sailmakers	—	—	5 0	5 5	—	—	—	—	—	4 10	3 15 to 5 5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Grossers	5 10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lamp trimmers	5 5	1 15 0	—	—	5 0	1 14 8	—	—	—	4 15	1 14 8	—	4 10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Donkeymen	5 10	1 16 0	—	—	5 10	1 16 0 and overtime. 1 17 6 no overtime.	—	—	—	5 10	1 15 0	—	5 10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Storekeepers	5 10	—	—	—	5 0	—	—	—	—	4 15	—	—	5 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ordinary seamen (above 2 years service).	3 0	—	2 10	3 0	3 0	1 10 0	3 10	3 0	3 0	2 10	1 5 0	1 10 to 2 10	3 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ordinary seamen (under 2 years service).	2 10	—	—	—	2 5	1 0 0	1 10	2 0	1 10s. to 2 10s.	—	—	—	2 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Particulars as to overtime, &c.	In British ports after 6 p.m. and before 6 a.m. 6d. per hour. After 1 p.m. on Saturdays, and on Sundays, 1s. per hour.				Overtime from 6d. to 9d. per hour from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m.				Overtime to donkeymen from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. 6d. per hour.				Overtime 6d. per hour from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. Sundays, 9d. per hour.				Overtime 6d. per hour from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m.				Overtime usually paid at 9d. per hour from 6 p.m. to 7 a.m. Sundays, Good Friday, and														

* The North Atlantic mail

RATES of WAGES of SEA-GOING ENGINEERS in the chief RIVERS and PORTS of the United Kingdom current in May 1891.

Trade.	Class.	TYNE.		CARDIFF.		OLYDE.		DUNDEE.		HUMBER.		FORTH.		MERSEY.		THAMES.	
		Monthly.	Weekly.	Monthly.	Weekly.	Monthly.	Weekly.	Monthly.	Weekly.	Monthly.	Weekly.	Monthly.	Weekly.	Monthly.	Weekly.	Monthly.	Weekly.
Steamers carrying oil in bulk—All trades.	Chief	£ s. d. 20 0 0	£ s. d. 5 7 6	£ s. d. 20 0 0	—	£ s. d. —	£ s. d. —	£ s. d. —	£ s. d. —	£ s. d. —	£ s. d. —	£ s. d. —	£ s. d. —	£ s. d. 20 0 0	£ s. d. —	£ s. d. 20 0 0	£ s. d. 5 0 0
	2nd	14 0 0	4 0 0	14 10 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14 0 0	—	14 0 0	8 10 0
	3rd	10 0 0	3 0 0	8 0 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10 0 0	—	10 0 0	2 10 0
	4th	8 0 0	2 12 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8 0 0	—	8 0 0	3 0 0
Suez Canal, South Atlantic, East and West Indies.	Chief	17 0 0	4 17 6	15l. to 18l.	—	16l. to 20l.	—	16l. to 18l.	—	18 0 0	—	14 0 0	—	18 0 0	—	18 0 0	—
	2nd	12 0 0	3 15 6	10l. to 12l.	—	11l. to 13l.	—	10l. to 12l.	—	13 0 0	—	9 0 0	—	13 0 0	—	13 0 0	—
	3rd	8 0 0	2 15 0	7l. to 10l.	—	9l. to 10l.	—	7l. to 8l.	—	9 0 0	—	5 10 0	—	9 0 0	—	9 0 0	—
	4th	7 0 0	2 10 0	6l. to 8l.	—	7 0 0	—	6l. to 7l.	—	7 0 0	—	—	—	8 0 0	—	8 0 0	—
North Atlantic	Chief	16 10 0	4 11 0	16l. to 17l.	—	16 0 0	—	17 0 0	—	17 0 0	—	16 0 0	—	18 0 0	—	16 10 0	—
	2nd	12 0 0	3 10 0	12l. to 15l.	—	11 0 0	—	11 0 0	—	12 0 0	—	11l. to 12l.	—	18 0 0	—	12 0 0	—
	3rd	8 0 0	2 12 0	7l. 10s. to 8l.	—	8 0 0	—	8 0 0	—	9 0 0	—	—	—	8 0 0	—	8 0 0	—
	4th	7 0 0	2 7 0	6 0 0	—	7 0 0	—	8 0 0	—	7 0 0	—	7 0 0	—	8 0 0	—	7 0 0	—
Mediterranean and Black Sea, above 600 tons nett.	Chief	15 0 0	4 4 0	15 0 0	£ 15 0	12l. to 15l.	—	12l. to 14l.	—	15 0 0	—	15 0 0	—	15 0 0	—	15 0 0	4 10 0
	2nd	11 0 0	3 0 0	11 0 0	£ 15 0	8l. to 11l.	—	8l. to 9l.	—	11 0 0	—	11 0 0	—	11 0 0	—	11 0 0	3 10 0
	3rd	7 10 0	2 9 0	7 10 0	—	5l. 10s. to 7l.	—	6l. to 7l.	—	7 10 0	—	7 0 0	—	8 0 0	—	7 10 0	2 15 0
	4th	7 0 0	2 7 0	—	—	6 0 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7 0 0	—	7 0 0	—
Mediterranean and Black Sea, under 600 tons nett.	Chief	14 0 0	4 0 0	—	£ 15 0	13 0 0	—	12 0 0	—	14 0 0	—	—	—	14 0 0	—	14 0 0	3 15 0
	2nd	10 0 0	3 0 0	—	£ 15 0	7 10 0	—	7l. to 8l.	—	10 0 0	—	—	—	10 0 0	—	10 0 0	2 15 0
	3rd	6 10 0	2 5 0	—	—	—	—	6 0 0	—	7 0 0	—	—	—	7 0 0	—	6 10 0	2 0 0
Baltic, Bilbao, and Bay Ports, over 750 tons nett.	Chief	14 10 0	4 0 0	15l. to 17l.	£ 15 0	14 0 0	£ 17 6	13 0 0	—	—	£ 12 6	14l. to 16l.	£ 15. to 16l.	18 0 0	—	15 0 0	4 0 0
	2nd	10 10 0	3 0 0	11 0 0	£ 15 0	9 0 0	£ 5 0	8 10 0	—	—	£ 12 6	9l. to 9l. 10s.	£ 11. to 12l.	11 0 0	—	11 0 0	3 0 0
	3rd	7 0 0	2 5 0	8 0 0	—	7 0 0	£ 1 15 0	7 0 0	—	—	£ 10 0	8 0 0	£ 8 0 0	8 0 0	—	7 10 0	2 5 0
Baltic, Bilbao, and Bay Ports, under 750 tons nett.	Chief	14 0 0	3 15 0	—	—	18 0 0	£ 10 0	18 0 0	—	—	£ 10 0	—	£ 8 0 0	14 0 0	—	14 0 0	3 15 0
	2nd	10 0 0	2 15 0	—	—	9 0 0	£ 5 0	8 0 0	—	—	£ 10 0	—	—	10 0 0	—	10 0 0	2 15 0
	3rd	6 10 0	2 0 0	—	—	6 10 0	—	6 0 0	—	—	—	—	—	7 0 0	—	6 10 0	2 0 0
Coasting, and found	Chief	—	£ 10 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	4 0 0	—	8 0 0	—	—	—	£ 15s. to 4l.	—
	2nd	—	2 10 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	3 0 0	—	2 0 0	—	—	—	£ 15s. to 3l.	—

APPENDIX LXXIII.

THE SHIPPING FEDERATION, LIMITED, BENEFIT FUND.

NOTICE.

The Shipping Federation, Limited, being anxious to promote good feeling and accord between their members and the seamen employed by them, and to encourage and assist steady and reliable men, have established a benefit fund for masters, officers, engineers, petty officers, sailors, firemen, and others serving in vessels entered with the Shipping Federation for participation in this benefit fund.

There is no charge whatever made for participating in the advantages of this fund.

On and after the 1st January 1892, ANY PERSON WHO IS THE DULY QUALIFIED HOLDER OF A PARCHMENT FEDERATION CERTIFICATE, and can prove to a district registrar six months' faithful service in Federation vessels, and Naval Reserve men of the first class with a Reserve certificate, shall be forthwith entitled to the benefits of the fund, and shall be duly enrolled and receive a benefit certificate containing the rules to be observed, so as to entitle him, or his relatives, to the following benefits in the event of an accident happening to him whilst serving with a Federation vessel, and arising out of his said employment.

ON DEATH OR TOTAL DISABLEMENT BY REASON OF SUCH ACCIDENT.

	£	s.	d.
The master - - - - -	100	0	0
The chief officer, chief engineer, surgeon, and purser - - - - -	75	0	0
The second officer and the second engineer, and uncertificated master of sailing craft - - - - -	50	0	0
Any other certificated officer (on articles) - - - - -	40	0	0
Petty officers, and other members of the crew above the rating of A.B. or fireman - - - - -	35	0	0
Sailors, firemen, and all other members of the crew - - - - -	25	0	0
Asiatic seamen - - - - -	12	10	0

Or alternatively, with the object of meeting the case of any seamen who may have no relatives whom they wish to participate in the benefits of the fund.

SICK ALLOWANCE IN CASE OF SUCH ACCIDENT.

For a period not exceeding 13 weeks, whilst incapacitated from work and not on pay.

	£	s.	d.
The master - - - - -	40	per week	
The chief officer, chief engineer, surgeon, and purser - - - - -	30	"	
The second officer and the second engineer, and uncertificated master of sailing craft - - - - -	20	"	
Any other certificated officer (on articles) - - - - -	16	"	
Petty officers, and other members of the crew above the rating of A.B. or fireman - - - - -	14	"	
Sailors and firemen, and all other members of crew - - - - -	10	"	
Asiatic seamen - - - - -	5	"	

Every person when applying for a benefit fund certificate shall declare whether he selects the benefits provided for—1st, death or total disablement; or 2nd, allowance in case of accident; or 3rd, half of the amount payable in each case.

In case any district registrar shall refuse to issue a benefit certificate, the applicant may appeal to the district committee, whose decision shall be final.

The rules of the benefit fund, which are simple and only framed to prevent misconduct and fraud, are appended to each benefit certificate, and should be carefully read and obeyed by the holders of the certificates.

By order of the executive,
G. A. LAWS,
General Manager.

APPENDIX LXXIV.

PORT OF CARDIFF.—RETURN showing Rates of Wages for Steam Vessels (Mediterranean Trade) since 1885.

Period.	A.B.'s.		Firemen.		Remarks.
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	
1885. January to April - - - - -	3	10 0	3	15 0	
" May - - - - -	3	10 0	4	0 0	
" June to December - - - - -	3	10 0	3	15 0	
1886. January and February - - - - -	3	10 0	3	15 0	
" March to December - - - - -	3	5 0	3	10 0	
1887 - - - - -	3	10 0	3	15 0	
1888. January to November - - - - -	3	10 0	3	15 0	
" November and December - - - - -	4	0 0	4	5 0	
1889 - - - - -	4	5 0	4	10 0	
1890 - - - - -	4	10 0	4	15 0	
1891 - - - - -	4	10 0	4	15 0	

APPENDIX LXXV.

NATIONAL AMALGAMATED SAILORS AND FIREMEN'S UNION OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Executive Committee, Central Offices,
174, High Street East,
Sunderland, May 27th, 1889.

GENTLEMEN,

I AM directed by the executive council of the National Amalgamated Sailors and Firemen's Union of Great Britain and Ireland, respectfully to request that, on and after Monday, the 3rd day of June, proximo, the following rates of wages will be paid out of all ports of the United Kingdom, viz.:

SCALE OF WAGES.

WESTERN OCEAN.

STEAMERS—Passenger Boats.

	£	s.	d.
Sailors	-	-	5 0 0
Firemen	-	-	5 0 0
Trimmers	-	-	4 10 0

BRAZILS—West Indies and Suez Canal.

Sailors	-	-	4 5 0
Firemen	-	-	4 10 0
Trimmers	-	-	3 15 0
Donkeymen	-	-	5 10 0
Boatswain	-	-	4 15 0

MEDITERRANEAN.

Sailors	-	-	4 10 0
Firemen	-	-	4 10 0
Trimmers	-	-	3 15 0
Cooks	-	-	5 5 0
Stewards	-	-	6 5 0
Donkeymen	-	-	5 10 0
Boatswain	-	-	5 5 0

BALIC—Voyages not extending over 1 month.

Sailors	-	-	5 0 0
Firemen	-	-	5 0 0
Trimmers	-	-	4 10 0
Cooks	-	-	5 15 0
Stewards	-	-	6 15 0
Donkeymen	-	-	6 0 0
Boatswain	-	-	6 0 0

WEEKLY STEAMERS—COASTERS—Colliers.

Sailors	-	-	1 12 8
Firemen	-	-	1 12 8
Stewards and cooks	-	-	1 16 0
Where no engineer's steward is employed	-	-	2 0 0
Donkeymen	-	-	1 16 0

CHANNEL—Passenger Boats.

	£	s.	d.
Sailors	-	-	1 10 4
Firemen	-	-	1 10 4
Cooks	-	-	-
Stewards	-	-	-

SAILING SHIPS.

WESTWARD.

Sailors	-	-	4 0 0
Cooks	-	-	4 15 0
Stewards	-	-	5 15 0

MEDITERRANEAN.

Sailors	-	-	4 0 0
Cooks	-	-	4 15 0
Stewards	-	-	5 15 0

BALIC.

Sailors	-	-	4 0 0
Cooks	-	-	4 15 0
Stewards	-	-	5 15 0

SOUTHWARD.

Sailors	-	-	3 10 0
Cooks	-	-	4 10 0
Stewards	-	-	5 10 0

COASTERS.

Sailors	-	-	4 0 0
---------	---	---	-------

You will observe that the rates for the Baltic trade are a little higher than those of the Mediterranean and Brazil trades. Our reason for this is that sometimes the Baltic voyage does not extend over 28 days, and men are compelled, when paid off at the port of discharge, to pay their train fare to their respective homes, which causes a considerable reduction in their wages. We trust you will see your way to adopt this scale of wages for the future, so as to prevent any inconvenience arising either to owners or men through the stoppage of work.

I am, Gentlemen,
Your obedient Servant,
J. H. WILSON,
General Secretary.

To the Shipowners of
the United Kingdom of
Great Britain and Ireland.

APPENDIX LXXVI.

RULES OF THE SOUTHAMPTON FREE LABOUR ASSOCIATION.

An Association consisting of Workmen and Employers in the Port of Southampton, for their mutual benefit, and for maintaining and promoting the trade of the Port.

Objects:

- (a.) To maintain and increase the trade of the Port by securing freedom of agreement between workmen and employers.
- (b.) To prevent strikes and other serious hindrances to the welfare of the Port, by promoting mutual discussion and consideration of all differences between workmen and employers.

1. *Membership.*—All workmen and employers of labour in the Port and Town of Southampton are eligible for membership.

2. *Council.*—The Council of the Association shall be formed of workmen and employers in equal numbers, and shall consist of not less than 20 members, each

member shall have one vote only, a quorum to be equal numbers of workmen and employers. The Council shall be chosen in the month of March, at the annual meeting of the Association, and shall, as far as possible, consist of the representatives of the Steam Shipping Companies, the Dock Company, and the various trades of the Port. The council shall appoint the necessary officers of the Association.

3. *Committees.*—There shall be two Committees, one shall consist of workmen and the other of employers, and there shall be joint meetings of the two Committees for consultation and counsel. Each Committee shall appoint its own chairman and secretary, and meet as it may from time to time decide, five to form a quorum.

4. *Election of Committees.*—Each section or sub-section of the Association shall annually, in the month of January or February, elect its representatives on

the Committee. No member of the Committees shall sit for more than two years in succession, but this regulation may be suspended by the vote of the annual meeting of the Committee.

5. *Vacancies.*—Any vacancies on the Council or Committees shall be filled up by those bodies at the next or subsequent meeting.

6. *Register of Workmen.*—All workmen joining the Association to be registered, and to receive a certificate of membership.

7. *Employment.*—The secretary shall at all times upon application afford assistance to any employer requiring workmen, and also aid members of the Association to obtain employment.

8. *Funds.*—All employers joining the Association shall contribute to its working expenses, and mercantile firms indirectly employing labour are eligible as members.

9. *An Accident and Benevolent Fund* to be established.

10. *Joint Conference.*—A member desiring to bring before the Association any matter (within the objects of the Association), shall make a statement to the Committee of his section, and the committee shall decide whether the matter shall be further considered, and if thought desirable the two Committees shall meet for conference thereon.

11. *By-laws.*—The council shall have power to make, amend, or cancel by-laws, and generally conduct the business of the Association.

12. *Alteration of Rules.*—No rule shall be altered except at a general meeting of the Association.

March 20th, 1891.

APPENDIX LXXVII.

SOUTHAMPTON FREE LABOUR ASSOCIATION.

RULES OF THE ACCIDENT FUND (1891).

1. All registered members of the Association are eligible.

2. The subscription is 1*d.* per week per member.

3. A payment made on any day will entitle the member to benefit should an accident occur to him within seven days.

4. On each payment of 1*d.* a member will receive a ticket which must be produced in the event of a claim on the fund. Special arrangements will be made, if desired, for the collection of the subscriptions at the places where members are employed.

5. Members may pay in advance 1*s.* per quarter, which shall entitle them to benefit for 13 weeks from such payment.

6. In case of accident during work, a member shall be entitled to receive the following payments:—

(a) Total disablement	-	10 <i>s.</i> per week.
(b) Partial	"	5 <i>s.</i> "

Payments to cease on recovery, or at the end of 10 weeks from accident.

7. In case of fatal accident, a member's family shall be entitled to receive the sum of 8*l.*, payable in such manner, or in such instalments as the Committee may decide.

8. The Committee shall consist of six members, of whom three shall be employers and three shall be workmen, two to form a quorum, to be elected annually from the Joint Committee of the Association.

9. Notice of accident must be given at the office of the Association within three days.

10. The Committee shall have power to decide whether benefit payment is due and whether for total or partial disablement, and in special cases they may extend the period of accident pay if a majority of each section of the Committee so agree.

11. The Committee shall have power to make necessary by-laws, and to adjust any matter in dispute.

12. The members shall assist the Committee when requested in sick visiting, or otherwise.

RULES OF THE SEA-GOING SECTION SICK FUND (1891).

1. All sea-going members of the Association are eligible, subject to satisfactory medical examination.

2. A subscription of 2*d.* per week entitles a member, provided he is already enrolled in a benefit society and has, in sickness, the attendance of its medical officer, to receive during sickness on shore, 10*s.* per week, for a period of 10 weeks, to be reduced to 5*s.* per week for a further term of 10 weeks.

3. A subscription of 3*d.* per week will entitle a member to the privileges named in Rule 2 with the further benefit of the attendance of the medical officer of the Association.

4. Payments of the weekly subscriptions shall be made during office hours at the office of the Association, and entered upon a card provided for that purpose. Payments may be made in advance.

5. Any member in arrears six weeks shall not be entitled to benefit under these rules unless he can give reasons, for his being in arrear, satisfactory to the Committee.

6. The Committee shall consist of six members, to be elected annually from the Joint Committee of the Association, of whom three shall be employers.

7. Notice of sickness must be given at the office, accompanied by medical certificate.

8. The Committee shall appoint sick visitors, and shall have full power to decide as to payment of benefits, &c.

9. The committee shall have power to make necessary by-laws.

10. The committee shall have power to appoint a medical officer.

RULES OF THE SAVINGS BANK (1891).

1. Deposits of 1*d.* and upwards may be made by members at any time during office hours.

2. Every depositor will be furnished with a bank book free of charge.

3. Withdrawals will be paid on Saturdays, if notice of the amount required is given not later than Thursday. Under special circumstances this notice may be dispensed with.

4. A bonus will be added to deposits at the rate of 1*d.* per pound per month. The bonus will be paid only on completed sums of 5*s.*, and no fraction of a 1*d.* will be allowed.

5. The committee of the Association reserve the power

to decline deposits, and to fix the maximum upon which the bonus named in Rule 4 will be given.

6. The money received shall be paid into the Post Office Savings Bank in the name of two trustees.

7. No person will be allowed to have in this bank at one time more than 5*l.* in all. So soon as the amount paid by any depositor reaches 1*l.* he will be assisted to open a separate account in his own name at the Post Office Savings Bank; and he will thus be able, if he wish it, to make his subsequent payments direct to the Post Office. As, however, no deposit of less than 1*s.* can be received at the Post Office Savings Bank he may continue to pay into this bank as before.

APPENDIX LXXVIII.

TABLE showing NUMBER of CASUAL MEN employed by the SOUTHAMPTON DOCK COMPANY on the FIRST SIX WORKING DAYS in each month, commencing November 1890 and ending October 1891.

Date.	Six Days.	Six Nights.	Average per Day of 24 hours.
1890—November - -	1,948	506	409
December - - -	1,936	414	393
1891—January - - -	1,596	209	301
February - - - -	1,805	213	336
March - - - - -	1,816	401	286
April - - - - -	1,203	385	248
May - - - - -	1,304	472	296
June - - - - -	2,440	699	523
July - - - - -	3,791	1,896	948
August - - - - -	1,883	492	396
September - - -	1,542	491	339
October - - - -	1,457	506	327

APPENDIX LXXIX.

STATEMENTS showing how MEN were treated by STRIKERS.

WITH THE STRIKERS.

The following narrative was taken down by the Allan Line Dumfries agents from a very quiet decent labouring man whom they had engaged to work at the Allan vessels:—

"On Thursday last the agents for the Allan Line in Dumfries engaged and sent off four of us by the 8.38 train. We were to get 23s. a week and our board and lodgings during the strike. We all thought that a labouring man who struck for 23s. a week deserved to starve. We arrived at St. Enoch's all right about half-past 11 in the forenoon, and were met by two gentlemen at the station. One of them wore spectacles, and they took us into the refreshment room before we started and gave us a little refreshment, then we walked off towards the office in Great Clyde Street. But we had scarce got 200 yards out of the station when we were surrounded by a crowd of about 500 men. The two gentlemen were attacked and I saw the one with the spectacles get his hat knocked off and his spectacles broken. We four men were seized hand and foot and carried off, the crowd cheering loudly. After a bit we were set down and dragged along by the crowd to a place which looked like a large empty house of two apartments, a dingy looking place. Here we were imprisoned. There were a couple of forms and two or three old chairs, a tin can of water with a tin ladle. The secretary, a fellow that I once saw spouting in the square at Dumfries about Home Rule or Land Restoration or something, came forward and looking me contemptuously in the face said 'Do you know where you will be shortly? In h— at the bottom of the Clyde. Your fare was to be kept off your first pay, but we'll see that you don't get your first pay you—'. There were men in there from London, Birmingham, and Dundee to whom he spoke. Some had been in a week, some two days and they could not get away. They only got one meal a day and had to sleep where they sat night and day. It was something awful. One poor foreigner, who could not speak a word of English, I was very sorry for. They were saying that if the authorities in Glasgow knew of it they would have the place cleared out quick. They seemed in great straits for money and had telegraphed to all the unions in the country to help them. They seemed to be quarrelling among themselves, and some of them seemed to be getting plenty of drink wherever they got it. They are a rough lot I can tell you. However, we kept bothering the secretary, or whoever he was, to give us something to eat, or let us out, till he seemed worried to

death, and at 10 o'clock at night us Dumfries fellows were marched out till we were about a mile out of the city, and there left, with the warning that if we came back again they would kick us to death. We walked on to Galston before we stopped. Then two of our number decided to go back, but I came on tramping all the road. A big Irishman took my letter of agreement and went down with it to the quay to get in and see what he could, and perhaps get some of them there to desert, but he was turned by policemen and came back swearing and cursing and telling us the men on board were working in chains. They kept swearing at the Dumfries agents and telegraphed to somebody in Dumfries to prevent any more men coming on."

Messrs. Allan confirm the man's statement as to his being brought down to their office and as to him and his comrades having been dragged from the custody of their staff as they were marching to a tug at the Broomielaw.

HOW THE LABOURERS' UNION TREATS THOSE WHO TRUST IT.

I, Joseph Wood, of Leeds, hereby declare that I came from Leeds to work for the "Anchor" Line, but the union secretary, Mr. McHugh, said he would pay our fare back to Leeds if we stopped work; and on the faith of this we did so.

Instead of doing this, Mr. McHugh marched us about three miles out of Glasgow to Bellgrove.

He then told us that the reason he had brought us there was that his men were so excited that they had got revolvers (loaded), and he was afraid for our lives.

He said "I am sending you home," and put us in carriages at Bellgrove, not giving us tickets, but giving these to his own man that he sent with us.

When we got to Coatbridge, the railway station master and guards turned us out, stating that we were not booked any further.

The union man who was with us said he couldn't help it, but he would give us a shilling, but he only gave this to some. A lot have started to walk to Leeds, and a number are still at Coatbridge; I have come on to Glasgow, and am prepared to start work.

I solemnly swear that the foregoing statement is true.

(Signed) JOSEPH WOOD.

Glasgow, 15th June 1889.

The authorities at Coatbridge have been communicated with, and confirm the statement as to the men being booked only to Coatbridge and getting only a shilling.

APPENDIX LXXX.

NATIONAL INSURANCE AND PROVIDENT FUND for BRITISH MARINERS,
by Captain E. B. HATFIELD.

From the hazardous nature of their calling, mariners have their minds distracted from the subtle pursuits of business; they are debarred from the opportunities of meeting night after night in clubs, and following up the necessary arrangements of provident societies.

My proposition is that a national insurance and Provident Fund for British Mariners be founded, to be managed by a Committee of gentlemen representative of the various interests concerned, that is to say, the Government, the Shipowners, and the Mariners.

Every certified master or officer pay at the rate of 5s. per month, unless he quits the sea service and relinquishes his claims upon the Fund. Every seaman, other than master or officer, employed on board of vessels in the merchant service pay to the Fund at the rate of 2s. 6d. per month, which shall be deducted from his wages at any place where he may be paid off. Petty officers without B.T. certificates, stewards, cooks, pay and rank as seamen. Boys and apprentices shall pay half, and rank half as seamen in the Fund. Every foreign seaman sailing in British vessels shall pay the same as British seamen to the Fund, but unless he is married to a British woman and domiciled in this country, he shall not be entitled to any of the benefits of the Fund until he has served continuously in the British merchant service and paid to the Fund for 10 years, after which he shall be entitled to all the benefits of the Fund as a British seaman.

During the last 30 years about 300,000l. (unclaimed wages and effects) have been appropriated by the Government for various uses. The Government should refund that amount and pay it to the credit of Seamen's Fund to help to make a start.

Shipowners pay each voyage equal to whatever their crews pay. This system would form a Seaman's Accident Indemnity for Shipowners, except in cases of criminal culpability.

SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTIONS.

200,000 seamen at 2s. 6d. per month, pay annually -	£ 300,000
50,000 masters and officers at 5s. per month -	150,000
Dead seamen's effects, annually -	10,000
Fines, forfeitures, sea service, overloading, &c. -	10,000

Aggregate from sea service -	470,000
Contribution from shipping -	450,000
Say, in round figures -	920,000

The benefits proposed are:—Every British shipmaster or certified officer, having paid at least two years to the Fund as such, and being otherwise qualified, shall be entitled at the age of 55 or upwards, to 3l. per month. In case of death at any time after paying two years, his widow (if any) shall be entitled to 30s. per month for herself until she ceases to be his widow by death or marriage. His children (if any) under age shall each be entitled to 15s. per month until the age of 18. If there be no widow nor children, and there be depending upon and receiving assistance from the deceased, other near relations, it shall be optional with the Committee to grant an allowance according to circumstances.

Every British seaman in the service shall, after having paid at least two years to the Fund as seaman and being otherwise qualified, be entitled at the age of 55 or upwards to receive 30s. per month. In case of death at any time after having paid two years to the Fund his widow (if any) shall be entitled to 20s. per month for herself until she ceases to be his widow either by death or marriage. His children (if any) shall each be entitled to 15s. per month until they are 16 years of age. If there be no widow nor children, and there be depending upon and receiving assistance from him, other near relations, it shall be optional with the Committee, to grant an allowance according to circumstances.

Every applicant who claims the annuity at 55 years, or upwards, of age, shall show that he has served at least 10 years of his life at sea, in the British merchant service. He shall continue his payments to the Fund while receiving the annuity.

ACCIDENT OR RELIEF FUND.

Every British seaman, including masters and officers, having served and paid at least two years in the British merchant service, shall be entitled to assistance in cases of personal injury or sickness incurred while in service, in the execution of his duty; such injury or sickness shall be duly certified by a doctor, and, when practical, by the master or officer in charge of the vessel, or some other person on board.

The pay to be, in case of master or officer, 3s. per day.

In case of all other seamen, 2s. per day. And it shall be optional with the managing Committee whether, upon application, the necessary medical expenses be defrayed out of the Fund, or any part thereof.

The Committee may also, if they think fit, compromise or settle any sick or accident claims by payment of a lump sum. It shall also be optional with the Committee (in cases of shipwreck and loss, when seamen and officers lose their clothes and effects) to grant to seamen a sum not exceeding 3l., and officers not exceeding 6l. and masters 10l.

COMPUTATION FOR SAILORS' ANNUAL BENEFITS, WITH THEIR WIDOWS AND ORPHANS.

Sailors -	200,000
Less foreigners not in benefit -	30,000
British sailors entitled to benefit -	170,000
Deaths from all causes, at 2 per cent. -	3,455
Deduct one-seventh having no claims.	
Claimants, say, in round numbers -	3,000
Say one third leaving widows, at 12l. per annum -	£ 12,000
2,000 orphans at 9l. per annum -	18,000
Sailors arriving at the age of 55, and becoming annuitants, say, 1,000 at annuity of 18l. -	18,000
	£48,000

COMPUTATION OF BENEFITS TO OFFICERS, THEIR WIDOWS, AND ORPHANS, &c.

Masters and officers certified in -	
British ships -	50,000
Deaths from all causes, 2 per cent. -	1,000
Say one-half married and leaving widows, 500 claiming 18l. per annum -	9,000
1,000 orphans at 9l. per annum -	9,000
Those arriving at 55 years of age, becoming annuitants, say, 300 at annuity of 36l. -	10,800
	£28,800

SUMMARY.

Masters and officers, say, roundly -	£ 28,800
Sailors -	48,000
Annuitants first year -	76,800
Annual grant to other dependent relatives, at discretion of Committee -	10,000
Accident and sickness, say, per annum -	20,000
Shipwreck Ins. -	20,000
	£50,000

The annuities would be cumulative by having to provide for the widows and orphans of the dead seamen annually, and live ones passing the age of 55, but there would also be a falling-off on the back years annually, which would bring the requirements of the annuity fund to a level at the end of about 40 years, so that the amount would not increase after that. Upon this basis, the amount required at the end of 40 years would be about 800,000l. annually for the annuities of old mariners, their widows and orphans. The grant to

other dependent relatives and the sickness and accident expenditure would be separate accounts, not cumulative; those claims would be dealt with off-hand, and settled up every year, which in this scheme would be fully provided for with an accumulation of the first years of unexpended balances, which at the end of 40 years would amount to 5,000,000L or more as a reserve, the interest of which would produce 150,000L which, added to 920,000L will furnish 1,070,000L annually. All over the age of 55, still going to sea, would become annuitants all at once after the first two years; the fund should have the two years' start to provide for that contingency.

The working expenses of the scheme would be very light, working in connection with the Board of Trade offices, say, 5,000L per annum. As British colonial ships and seamen trading here are necessarily included in these calculations, the figures admit of grants being made to their principal localities on an equitable basis,

Even if Government should refuse to assist to the full extent we ask for, the scheme is feasible, and ought to be carried out by contributions from the sea service and upon employers.

As there are some reasons why Brethren should also be included in this scheme, they might be admitted on the seaman's scale. Engineers might also pay and rank the same as captains and officers.

I believe if this system were adopted, there would very soon be a better class of contented British seamen on board of ships, with a good supply of boys growing up in the service.

My advice to the British seamen is, hold themselves ready to form a national union with their employers, the latest and highest form of unionism; uphold their calling and profession as British seamen. The practised, skilled sailor will always be wanted on the sea, as a man of experience and knowledge of sea life, who can turn his hand to anything as emergency may require for the navigation of the ship. Be it steamer or sailing craft, open boat or common raft, skilled seamen are necessary the moment it goes afloat. Let me put it in rhyme for you:—

As long as the winds do blow,
And the tides do ebb and flow;
As long as there are fogs and mists,
And gravitation's law exists,
There must be skilled seamen.

And I strongly urge upon shipowners to stand by the sailors of this country; not let them drift away into the control of hostile unions, but establish a National Insurance and Provident Fund, by which a supply of good British seamen would always be maintained, and their families made comfortable.

Yours, &c.,
E. B. HATFIELD.

April 1891.

APPENDIX LXXXI.

EXTRACT from PAMPHLET showing an alternative proposal by Captain E. B. HATFIELD with regard to the Government contributing to the proposed Seamen's Insurance Fund.

My proposition is a National Insurance and Provident Fund for British Mariners, to be under the government of the Board of Trade, and to be managed by a Committee of practical gentlemen representative of the various interests concerned, that is to say, the Government, the Shipowners, and the Mariners.

The Committee to be composed of 21 members, five of whom shall form a quorum; there might also be a sub-committee. A chairman to be chosen by the Committee, who may be one of their number, he may also be removable by the Committee, subject to sanction of the President of the Board of Trade, the chairman to be paid a salary to be fixed by the Committee, and devote his time to the matters of the Fund.

There shall also be a secretary appointed by the Committee whose salary shall be fixed by them; there shall also be a treasurer to look after the receipts and expenditures of the Fund; he shall be appointed by the Committee at a fixed salary.

The office to be in London, the Committee to be chosen by election as follows: the Government appoint seven, the Shipowners appoint seven, the Mariners appoint seven, the kingdom to be divided into seven sections, each of which shall elect two members, a shipowner and a mariner, the mariners' representative shall have been in active sea service not less than 10 years, three years of which he must have been a master in the merchant service, he shall be elected by votes of certificated masters, officers, and seamen of not less than five years' standing in their respective districts. Incorporated Mariners' Societies shall have one vote for every 10 of its absent *bona fide* members, to be given by secretary or chairman, as authorised by their Committees.

Members of the London Committee shall receive no pay, but shall have their expenses paid when going to London to attend to the business of the Committee, the times of meetings, and personal expenses to be fixed by the Committee.

Every master, officer, and seaman employed on board of vessels in the merchant service shall be subject to a compulsory contribution from his wages, if not otherwise paid, towards a British Mariners' Insurance and Provident Fund. That is to say, every certified master

shall pay at the rate of 4s. per month until the age of 60, unless he quits the sea service and relinquishes his claims upon the fund. Every certificated officer shall pay at the rate of 2s. per month until the age of 60, which may be deducted from his wages, if not otherwise paid. Every seaman, other than master or officer, employed on board of vessels in the merchant service shall pay to the fund at the rate of 1s. per month until the age of 60, which shall be deducted from his wages at any Board of Trade, Consular, or Agent's office, or other place where he may be paid off. If a seaman quits the sea service, and wishes to avoid further payments, and disconnects himself from the fund, he may do so by giving written notice of that same to any proper authority and if he afterwards joins the sea service, he shall pay his arrears of contribution, and be entitled to all the benefits of the Fund; this same rule shall apply to all ranks in the service; petty officers without B.T. certificates, stewards, cooks, and all boys and apprentices shall pay and rank as seamen in the Fund; every foreign seaman sailing in British vessels shall pay the same as British seamen to the Fund, but unless he is married to a British woman, and domiciled in this country, and having paid to the Fund for at least two years, he shall not be entitled to any of the benefits of the Fund until he has served continuously in the British merchant service, and paid to the Fund for five years, after which he shall be entitled to all the benefits of the Fund.

Government should pay equal to whatever shipping pays, because shipowners and masters, who are also subject to pay poor rates, submit to this tax to assist in improving the condition of a most important class in the country, and thereby the poor rates will be relieved to a corresponding extent, which would be a sufficient reason if no other could be adduced; but seamen have other special claims for consideration. They are practically the bridge by which means the inhabitants of these islands are enabled to travel and trade—all over the world—and should be kept up even at some public expense, otherwise these islands would become mere isolated fragments of creation. Besides, the naval supremacy of this country depends to some extent upon having a large and efficient merchant service of British seamen as a nursery to the navy.

CONTRIBUTION FROM SHIPPING.

	£
British and foreign tonnage coastwise enters United Kingdom ports annually 40,000,000 tons; say, at 1d. per ton	41,666
British and foreign tonnage from foreign ports and long voyages enter United Kingdom annually 30,000,000 tons; estimate half on short foreign voyages this side of the Equator 15,000,000 tons, at 1d. per ton	62,500
15,000,000 tons long voyages south of the Equator at 2d. per ton	125,000
Aggregate from tonnage	229,166
Say, in round figures	£230,000

No British ship to pay more than 3d. per ton register annually.

SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTIONS.

	£
200,000 seamen at 1s. per month, pay annually	120,000
30,000 officers at 2s. per month, pay annually	36,000
20,000 masters at 4s. per month, pay annually	48,000
Dead seamen's effects annually	10,000
Aggregate from sea service	214,000
Contributions from shipping	230,000
Government pays equal to shipping	230,000
	674,000
Interest, say, at least on first year's contributions	26,000
	£700,000

The benefits proposed are:—Every British shipmaster having paid at least one year to the Fund as master shall be entitled, at the age of 50, to 2l. per month, to be increased by 4s. per month for every additional year of his age until 60, when he will be entitled to 4l. per month, or 48l. per annum, which is to be the maximum; he shall continue his contributions between the ages of 50 and 60, which may be deducted if not otherwise paid. In case of death, at any time, his widow (if any) shall be entitled to two-thirds of the maximum annuity, for herself and children (if any). If she ceases to be his widow, by death or marriage, his children (if any) under age shall be entitled to one-half the annuity until the age of 18. If there be no widow nor children, and there be father or mother, or young brothers and sisters, depending upon and receiving assistance from the deceased they shall be entitled to one-half the maximum annuity.

Every certificated officer, as mate or second mate, in the British merchant service shall, after having paid at least one year to the Fund as officer, be entitled at the age of 50, to receive 30s. per month, to be increased by 3s. per month for every additional year of his age, until the age of 60, when he shall be entitled to 3l. per month, 36l. per annum which is to be the maximum; he shall continue to pay his contributions between the ages of 50 and 60, which may be deducted if not otherwise paid. In case of death, at any time, his widow (if any) shall be entitled to two-thirds of the maximum annuity. If she ceases to be his widow by death or marriage, his children (if any) under age shall be entitled to receive one-half of the maximum annuity until they are 18 years of age. If there be no widow nor children, and if there be father, mother, young brothers, or sisters depending upon and receiving assistance from him, they shall be entitled to one-half the maximum annuity.

Every British seaman, boy, or apprentice in the British merchant service, shall, after having paid at least one year to the Fund as seaman, be entitled at the age of 50, to receive 1l. per month, to be increased by 2s. per month for every additional year of his age until 60, when he will be entitled to 2l. per month, or 24l. per annum, which is to be the maximum annuity. He shall continue his contributions to the fund between the ages of 50 and 60, which may be deducted if not otherwise paid. In case of death, at any time, his widow (if any) shall be entitled to two-thirds of the

maximum annuity. If she ceases to be his widow by death or marriage, his children (if any) shall be entitled to one-half the maximum annuity, until they are 18 years of age. If there be no widow nor children, and there be father, mother, young brothers, or sisters depending upon and receiving assistance from him, they shall be entitled to one-half the annuity.

Every applicant who claims the annuity at 50 years of age shall show that he has served at least 10 years of his life at sea, half of which at least must have been in the British Merchant Service.

ACCIDENT OR RELIEF FUND.

Every British seaman, including masters and officers, having served and paid at least one year in the British merchant service, shall be entitled to assistance in cases of personal injury or sickness incurred while in service in the execution of his duty; such injury or sickness shall be duly certified by two doctors, and, when practical, by the master or officer in charge of the vessel, or some other person on board.

The pay to be, in case of master, 4s. per day.

In case of officer, 2s. per day.

In case of all other seamen, 1s. per day.

And it shall be optional with the managing Committee whether, upon application, the necessary medical expenses be defrayed out of the Fund, or any part thereof.

The Committee may also, if they think fit, compromise or settle any sick or accident claims by payment of a lump sum. In all cases these claims shall run off at the end of each year and half year; but fresh applications may be made and considered; it shall also be optional with the Committee in cases of shipwreck and loss, when seamen and officers lose their clothes and effects, to grant to seamen a sum not exceeding 5l., and to officers not exceeding 5l., and masters (if not otherwise insured) 10l.

COMPUTATION FOR SAILORS' ANNUAL BENEFITS, WITH THEIR WIDOWS, ORPHANS, AND OTHER DEPENDENTS.

Sailors (of all kinds)	200,000	
Less foreigners not in benefit	30,000	
British sailors entitled to benefit	170,000	
Deaths from all causes at 2 per cent.	3,400	
Deduct one-seventh having no claims.	3,000	
Claimants, say, in round numbers	3,000	
Say one-half leaving widows and orphans claiming two-thirds maximum annuity, 16l. per annum to 1,500	16	
	24,000	£ 24,000
Say those who leave no widows, but have children and other relatives dependent, claiming half annuity, 1,500 at 12l. per annum	18,000	42,000
Sailors arriving at the age of 50 and becoming annuitants $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. yearly on 170,000, 850, say, 1,000 at medium annuity of 18l.	18,000	£60,000

COMPUTATION OF BENEFITS TO OFFICERS, THEIR WIDOWS AND ORPHANS, &c.

	£
Officers certified in British ships, say	30,000
Deaths from all causes, 2 per cent.	600
Say one-half married, and leaving widows and orphans claiming two-thirds maximum annuity, 300 at 24l.	7,200
Those who leave no widows, but have children or other dependent relatives claiming one-half annuity	5,400
Those arriving at 50 years of age, becoming annuitants $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. on 30,000 = 150, say, 150 at medium annuity, 27l.	4,000
	£16,600

COMPUTATION OF BENEFITS FOR MASTERS, THEIR WIDOWS AND ORPHANS, &c.

Masters in service, say	-	-	20,000	£
Death-rate, 2 per cent.	-	-	400	
Say three-fourths masters married, leaving widows and orphans claiming two-thirds maximum annuity, 300 at 32L	-	-	9,600	
One-fourth claiming half, 100 at 24L	-	-	2,400	
Annuitants arriving at the age of 50, say 1 per cent. on 20,000 = £200, annually at medium annuity of 36L	-	-	7,200	
				£19,200

SUMMARY.

Masters	-	-	19,200	£
Officers	-	-	16,800	
Sailors	-	-	60,000	
			95,800	
Say	-	-	100,000	
Accident and sickness, say, per annum	-	-	50,000	

The annuities would be cumulative by having to provide for the widows and relatives of 3,000 dead seamen annually, and 1,000 live ones passing the age of

50, but there would also be a falling off on the back years of about 10 per cent. annually, which would bring the requirements of the annuity fund to a level at the end of 10 years, so that the amount would not increase after that. Upon this basis the amount at the end of 10 years would be 550,000L. annually for the annuities.

The sickness and accident expenditure would be a separate account not cumulative; those claims would be dealt with off-hand and settled up every year. So if we add from 50L. to 100,000L. to the other expenditure, the ultimate requirements would be between 600,000L. and 700,000L. per annum, which in this scheme would be fully provided for, with an accumulation of the first years of unexpended balances, which at the end of 10 years would amount to upwards of 2,000,000L. as a reserve. I have taken no account of the working expenses of the scheme, which, however, should be very light, working in connection with the Board of Trade, say, from 3,000L. to 5,000L. per annum.

Even if Government should refuse to assist to the full extent we ask for, the scheme is feasible, and ought to be carried out by contributions from the sea service and upon tonnage, and possibly other maritime interests might be made to contribute, if required, which I do not think would be necessary.

E. B. HATFIELD.

January 1685.

APPENDIX LXXXII.

PROPOSED "MANNING SCALE" FOR SAILING SHIPS AND STEAMERS.

There seems to be a general tendency to reduce the number of seamen on board of ships and steamers, and however reasonable that may have been in times past in the economy of labour by mechanical appliances which have been introduced into the sea service, the numbers now appear to be reduced to what is barely sufficient to attend to the various posts of duty in the watches.

MEMO.

Standard for manning sailing vessels—100 register should have not less than five men, including captain, and one man for every additional 50 tons up to 700 tons, including captain; above 700 tons there should be one additional man for every additional 100 tons.

Sailing.	Crew.	Sailing.	Crew.	Sailing.	Crew.	Sailing.	Crew.
Tons.	All told.	Tons.	All told.	Tons.	All told.	Tons.	All told.
100	5	500	13	1,100	21	1,900	29
150	6	550	14	1,200	23	2,000	30
200	7	600	15	1,300	23	2,200	32
250	8	650	16	1,400	24	2,400	34
300	9	700	17	1,500	25	2,600	36
350	10	800	18	1,600	26	2,800	38
400	11	900	19	1,700	27	3,000	40
450	12	1,000	20	1,800	28	3,200	42

In the manning of steamers I will only deal with the navigating crew, viz., captain, officers, and deck-hands or seamen, leaving the engineers, firemen, and all the engine crew to be supplied according to custom and requirements of each vessel, to allow for improvements which are continually going on. But there is a feeling abroad that many collisions and other accidents might occur from want of sufficient deck-hands to attend to the necessary duties promptly. I suggest the following rules for manning steamers, say, vessels of 100

tons net register shall have at least five men, including captain, in the navigation department, excluding those required for the engine department, and one additional man for every additional 50 tons net register up to 300 tons; and one additional man for every additional 100 tons up to 800 tons; and one additional man for every additional 200 tons above that, as per annexed scale. This is only intended for cargo steamers of the ordinary kind, the large ocean passenger steamships have their own special arrangements, which, in many instances, exceed these requirements.

Steamers	Navigating Crew only.	Steamers	Navigating Crew only.	Steamers	Navigating Crew only.	Steamers	Navigating Crew only.
Nett Tons.		Nett Tons.		Nett Tons.		Nett Tons.	
100	5	500	11	1,400	17	2,600	23
150	6	600	12	1,600	18	2,800	24
200	7	700	13	1,800	19	3,000	25
250	8	800	14	2,000	20	3,200	26
300	9	1,000	15	2,200	21	3,400	27
400	10	1,300	16	2,400	22	3,600	28

And, in order to encourage the carrying of boys and apprentices both in steamers and sailing ships, one-fifth of the total number may be boys upwards of 15 years of age. It is said that boys will not become seamen on board of steamers, but surely every service will produce skill after its kind, and steamers can bring up seamen skillful enough for their service if they will carry boys for that purpose.

I hope these suggestions may be of some utility in arriving at a standard sufficient, and not excessive, and check the tendency towards undermanning.

E. B. HATFIELD.

NOTE.—This amended scale has been approved of by the Liverpool Seamen's Protective Association.

E. B. H.

APPENDIX LXXXIII.

COPY of AWARD of the ARBITRATORS appointed by the HULL KEEL LIGHTER OWNERS' ASSOCIATION and the AMALGAMATED WATERMEN and LIGHTERMEN of the River Humber with regard to Hours and Wages.

We, the undersigned having been appointed by the Hull Keel and Lighter Owners' Association and the Amalgamated Society of Lightermen and Watermen of the River Humber, to arbitrate between these bodies on a dispute in wages and other terms,

After most careful consideration of the various clauses, have come to the following determination, which by agreement is to be binding on both parties.

First.—WEEKLY MEN.

26s. per week, and $\frac{1}{2}$ d. (three farthings), per last-dust money on cargoes of grain and seed in bulk, to be divided amongst lightermen filling out.

Second.—SHIFTING LIGHTERS.

Between 5 and 6 o'clock a.m., also between 6 and 7 p.m., 1s. (one shilling) each man, and between 7 p.m. and 5 a.m., 2s. 6d. (two shillings and sixpence) each man, this for weekly men and casual men engaged in working the lighter. All casual shifts to be 2s. 6d. (two shillings and sixpence) night or day.

Third.—CASUAL MEN.

5s. (five shillings) per day, if set on after 9 a.m. and before 12 o'clock noon to receive $\frac{1}{2}$ day, if set on after 12 o'clock noon $\frac{1}{2}$ day, and from 6 a.m. to noon $\frac{1}{2}$ day, no man to be set on for less than $\frac{1}{2}$ day. Dust money when filling out grain or seed in bulk to be paid at the same rate as weekly men.

Fourth.—PIECE-WORK.

To be at the option of owner, and small craft under 20 (twenty) tons cargo not to be subject to the above regulations.

Fifth.—OVERTIME.

When working at docks 3d., say, (threepence) per hour to be paid by owner, and when discharging at mills or warehouses owners to guarantee 9d. (ninepence) per hour.

Sixth.—MEAL HOURS.

Dinner one hour, breakfast one hour, if meal hours worked the time to be taken as soon after as possible.

Seventh.—NIGHT PUMPING.

1s. (one shilling) each time a man visits a lighter or lighters to pump them, town docks and harbour to form one pump—Alexandra Dock one pump—and Albert Dock one pump.

Eighth.—SUNDAY PUMPING.

4s. (four shillings) to be allowed each Sunday for pumping, owners to have the option of arranging for pumping at a fixed weekly wage. The question of two men to each lighter not to apply to light lighters or vessels loaded with not exceeding 40 (forty) tons of cargo, excepting when working to or from the Alexandra Dock.

Each party to bear its own expense of arbitration.

(Signed) EDWARD N. HILL,
JOSEPH D. WELCH.

Hull, 9th October 1890.

APPENDIX LXXXIV.

REPORT of the COMMITTEE appointed on the 20th August 1890 to consider with the REPRESENTATIVES of CAPITAL and LABOUR in the DISTRICT, the FORMATION either of CONCILIATION BOARDS, or of a GENERAL BOARD for the SETTLEMENT of DISPUTES.

To the Cardiff Incorporated Chamber of Commerce.

The Conciliation Committee think it well to preface their report by a statement of the circumstances in which they were appointed by the Chamber.

On the 7th August last, all work on the Taff Vale, Rhymney, and Barry Railways was stopped by a strike of their workmen. A meeting of the Chamber was held on the following Wednesday, by which time, the collieries served only by these railways, and from which nearly all the coal shipped at Cardiff and Barry is drawn, were at a standstill. The enormous losses and inconvenience resulting from this state of things need not be enlarged upon. By that time, however, the representatives of the companies and of the workmen were in frequent communication with a view to settling the matters in difference, and it had become abundantly clear that a settlement (actually arrived at on the following day) could not be far distant.

There was, at the same period, grave reason for anticipating a similar strike amongst the workmen at the Docks, a strike which would have for effect an even more complete cessation of coal shipments and other work than had been caused by the railway strike.

It was in view of these circumstances, a strike which had stopped the staple trade of the Port, a probable settlement, the result of communication between the parties, a further strike in anticipation, that the Chamber passed the following resolution:—

“That a Committee be formed to consider with the representatives of capital and labour in the district,

the formation either of Conciliation Boards, or of a General Conciliation Board for the settlement of disputes.”

And, in pursuance of that resolution, your Committee were thereupon appointed.

It was, of course, apparent that the wishes of the Chamber could not be met unless the operations of the Committee included the three companies affected by the strike, and also the Bute Docks Company. On reflection, it appeared desirable that, to begin with, only the representatives of these companies, and of their workmen, should be asked to confer. Some limitation of the Committee's invitations had to be fixed, and it was thought that any scheme acceptable to the four companies would command general acceptance, the directors of the companies being connected, directly or indirectly, with all the great industries of the district.

It should here be remarked that the committee had reason to know that a mere invitation to a conference of the representatives of the employers and workmen, would have met with a wholly insufficient response.

Accordingly the following circular letter was, on the 23rd August, addressed to the managers of the four companies and to the officials of the labour unions of workmen in and about the railways and docks. A general invitation was also made through the local press on the 30th August. The Committee had no desire to exclude non-unionists from the proposed conference, but it was, in the nature of things, impossible to deal with them in the preliminary inquiries which the circular was designed to set on foot.

CARDIFF INCORPORATED CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

DEAR SIR, 23rd August 1890.

You are probably aware that following upon the late strike the Cardiff Chamber of Commerce appointed a Committee for promoting the formation of a Conciliation Board in order to the amicable settlement of future labour disputes.

The Committee consist of Messrs. William Riley, president of the Chamber; E. R. Moxey, John Gunn, and Lewellen Wood. At a meeting held this morning I was instructed to bring the matter under your notice.

The Committee are fully alive to the great difficulties which have to be disposed of before the object of the Chamber can be attained, but the existence and successful working in many instances of Conciliation Boards justify the belief that these difficulties are not insurmountable. The Committee are at present of opinion that the Board in its inception should be representative only of the undertakings and industries affected by the late strike, provision, however, being made for the formation of subordinate boards similar in character, and in relation to the parent body, to the trade Conciliation Committees affiliated to the London Conciliation Board.

The Committee are now collecting particulars of the constitution and functions of existing Conciliation Boards, and hope that they may further the object of the Chamber by placing these particulars and suggestions arising out of them at the disposal of the parties interested. The Committee also hope that they may be of use as an intermediary, and possibly as affording a means by which a meeting of the representatives of the capital and labour in question may be arranged.

If you are favourable to the formation of such a board, and if you consider that the Committee can assist in its formation, I shall be glad to hear from you, whether you think that the next step of the Committee should be to call a meeting of the representatives of the undertakings in question and of their workmen, or whether the Committee, or some members of it, should first see you and confer personally on the matter.

I enclose copy of circular issued under similar circumstances by the Committee of the London Chamber, and which very closely describes the objects which the present Committee have in view.

I am, yours faithfully,
W. L. HAWKINS, Secretary.

EXPLANATORY CIRCULAR.

The Council has had particularly in view the necessity of giving capital and labour an equal representation and equal voting power in the organisation of the proposed London Conciliation Board and Committees.

Attention is specially called to the fact that this Board will not in itself be primarily, or of necessity, an arbitrating body, but its main object will be to bring the interested parties together for purposes of discussion and explanation at the earliest stage of any difficulty, with the view of preventing that difficulty reaching the acute stage of strike or lock-out; arbitration being only suggested in the last resort. It is hoped that the existence of a permanent board, composed of experienced and impartial representatives of both capital and labour, to whom any difficulty arising in the labour market can be referred for discussion and consideration at an early period may, by intervention in a friendly and disinterested manner, enable points of difference to be settled by mutual consent, without any stoppage of trade. Should the difficulty, however, prove to be acute, or not one of a nature for settlement on general grounds, the board will have power to assist the disputants in nominating special arbitrators. One very important function of the board will be to assist in promoting the formation of separate Trade Conciliation Committees for the various industries carried on in the metropolis, to whom all disputes affecting those particular industries will in the first instance be referred.

Taking the employers first, the Rhymney Company wrote on the 27th August that the circular would be laid before the directors at their next meeting to be held in October. Some further correspondence resulted in a letter from the Company, dated 8th October, stating that they were not disposed to take any action in the matter.

Your Committee's circular letter was addressed to Mr. Inskip and Mr. Geo. Fisher, as representing the Taff Vale Railway. No direct reply was received from them, but, at a meeting with Sir William Thomas

Lewis (to be referred to hereafter), Mr. James Hurman was present on behalf of the Taff Company.

The Barry Company also returned no direct reply to the circular letter, but Mr. Edward Davies and Mr. Hood were present at meetings with the Committee, or some members of it, invited by Sir William Thomas Lewis, who had very promptly responded to the committee's inquiries.

Speaking generally, your Committee were received with every form of courtesy, but indications were not wanting that these gentlemen did not regard the intervention of the Chamber as likely to result in advantage. The loss and inconvenience occasioned by the recent strike, the general belief that the strike might have been prevented by timely negotiation, and the apprehension of further similar labour troubles, had induced a wide-spread opinion that the relations between the four great companies and their workmen (of so much import to the community at large) were susceptible of improvement, towards which such a body as the Cardiff Chamber of Commerce might fairly hope to contribute. That opinion, was to all appearance, not shared by the companies' representatives who met your Committee. Recent events had perhaps caused them some uneasiness, but had not troubled the serenity of their minds by any sense of deficiency.

On the other hand, several meetings, at the instance of Sir William Thomas Lewis, actually took place; the subject was very fully discussed, and the Committee were made aware of Sir William Thomas Lewis's scheme, the Bristol Channel Docks' Association of employers and workmen, which was made public through the "Times" on the 8th September. That scheme (a copy of which is at the disposal of the Chamber), whatever may be its merits or defects, was so far encouraging as it showed that one of the most able and powerful employers of the district proposed to do something in the direction contemplated by your Chamber. It moreover furnished a useful indication of the lines on which your Committee's further inquiries should be conducted.

At the meeting before alluded to as attended by Mr. Hurman, Sir William Thomas Lewis's scheme (then made public) was very fully discussed, and it was admitted, in general terms though not specifically, that his proposals met with the concurrence of both the Taff and Barry Companies. At this meeting, as at other meetings, the companies were represented as averse to any Labour Board or Association, composed of other persons than the employers and their workmen's representatives and as determined to sanction no scheme for a Board, the workmen's representatives on which, should be elected by unionists only. Sir William Thomas Lewis also declared that he would be no party to a scheme apart from a benefit fund, to which employers and workmen should alike contribute. Sir William was on the point of leaving for America, and, although the companies' pretensions appeared altogether irreconcilable with the known views of the workmen, the Committee resolved, during Sir William's absence, to bring themselves into close touch with the workmen's leaders, and if possible, arrive at some basis of conference which would leave hope of ultimate agreement.

By way of clearing your Committee of any blame for delay, it may be stated that, with one or two exceptions, meetings with the workmen's leaders could not be arranged until the last week in September. It appears that this was due in great part to the Trade Union Congress in Liverpool.

Meetings eventually took place as follows:—

- On the 24th September, with Mr. H. Orbell and Mr. T. Grant, Dockers' Union.
- On the 26th September, Mr. Harford, Amalgamated Railway Servants; Mr. Davies, Trades Council Chairman; and Mr. Gardiner, Seamen and Firemen's Union.
- On the 29th September, Mr. Stephens and Mr. Morgan, Cardiff, Penarth, and Barry Coal Trimmers' Association.
- On the 14th October, Mr. T. Davies, Mr. T. Sullivan, Mr. Alfred Woodman, Mr. H. Holborn, Mr. Alfred Chubb, and Mr. George Stephens, deputation from the Trades Council.

Full reports of these meetings are in the possession of the secretary for future reference. Present purposes will be sufficiently served by a summary of the material views of the various delegates.

In the first place, it is pleasing to state that, to a man, they expressed themselves as grateful for the intervention of your Chamber. They were all agreed that the formation of a Conciliation Board was most desirable; that the original Board might with advantage be confined to the railways and docks, and the industries connected therewith; that provision for extension should be made by way of subsidiary boards; and that both employers and workmen connected with the Board should be bound, before taking part in lock-out or strike, to refer matters in dispute to the arbitration of the Board, to accept its decision.

As to the constitution of the Board, they were, substantially, agreed that it should consist of representatives of employers and workmen, in equal number; that the chairman should be an employers' representative, the vice-chairman a workmen's representative; that the chairman (or vice-chairman presiding in the chairman's absence) should have a second or casting vote, except in cases where there should be an equality of votes, with all the employers' representatives on one side, and all the workmen's representatives on the other, such cases to be provided for by arbitration; that the Unions, parties to the Board, should be bound to enforce the Board's decisions by such penalties as may be at the command of the Unions, and, particularly, by withholding union pay during the strikes resulting from non-compliance with the Board's decisions.

With one exception, the delegates were of opinion that the employers should select their own method of electing their own representatives to the board, and that no objection could be taken to a board largely composed of representatives of the four railway and dock companies.

There was a remarkable unanimity of opinion against the introduction of any "outside" or neutral element. No one was prepared to accept any *ex-officio* representatives, such as Members of Parliament, nominees of the Cardiff Council or Cardiff Chamber of Commerce, or ministers of religion. Eminent persons have been at great pains to make public very lenient views of the conduct of the working classes, and very liberal views of the rights and obligations of those classes towards others; but it is interesting and encouraging to note that, in this district, whatever may be the case elsewhere, the workmen's leaders are at one in preferring the employers themselves to any other individuals, however distinguished by position, philanthropy, or declared sympathy with popular pretensions.

To indicate the real nature of the differences and difficulties which now have to be described, the Chamber should know that, with one exception, all the Unions represented at the Committee's meetings are connected with the Cardiff Trades Council, which is described as an organisation for inter-communication and united working of all classes of associated labour. The exception is the Cardiff, Penarth, and Barry Coal Trimmers' Association, and the Committee understand that there are other important labour associations not affiliated to the Trades Council.

All the delegates considered that the workmen's representatives on a Conciliation Board should be elected by the labour unions embracing the workmen of the employers to be represented on the Board.

With the exception of the Trimmers' Association, all the delegates considered that the election of the workmen's representatives should be made by means of the Trades Council.

As the delegates claimed that their unions included a vast majority of the workmen, it was put to them that they need not object to an election of representatives by all the workmen of the employers represented, seeing that the unionists, being in a majority, could always ensure return of their nominees. The objections, from the employers' point of view, to creating a disability in respect of free labour were pointed out, and it was made apparent to the delegates that the formation of a board would be rendered impracticable if election by unionists alone were insisted upon. The delegates, for the most part, seemed disposed to agree that this pretension might be withdrawn, and that, provided the separate representation of certain classes of labour were safeguarded, election of workmen's representatives by all classes of the workmen interested might be conceded. At the last meeting, held on the 14th October, this question was agreed to be referred back to the Trades Council, and with the result conveyed by the following letters :—

CARDIFF INCORPORATED CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

DEAR SIR, Cardiff, November 7th, 1890.
REFERRING to the meeting on the 14th ultimo, wherein you were good enough to promise, that you would group the different trades, with the view to assist my Committee in their efforts to form a Board of Conciliation which would be satisfactory to all concerned, I shall feel obliged, if you will let me have this at your earliest possible convenience, seeing that as little time as possible should be lost in such a cause.

Yours faithfully,
T. Davies, Esq., W. L. HAWKINS.
Chairman, Trades Council.

CARDIFF INCORPORATED CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

DEAR SIR, Cardiff, November 8th, 1890.
My letter of yesterday's date was this morning brought under the notice of the president of the Chamber of Commerce, and he points out that it only deals with one of the questions which were referred back to the Trades Council.

The other question arose out of the determination of the Trades Council, which you communicated to my Committee, to be no parties to the formation of a Board unless all members were trade unionists, and elected by the Trades Council. My Committee asked you to reconsider this matter, and it was arranged that the Trades Council should be called together on the following Thursday to decide whether they would agree to the election of the men's representatives by the various bodies of workmen, including unionists affiliated to the Trades Council, other unionists, and non-unionists.

Yours faithfully,
T. Davies, Esq., W. L. HAWKINS.
Chairman, Trades Council.

CARDIFF TRADES COUNCIL.

13, Mark Street, Cardiff,
November 15th, 1890.
DEAR SIR,
I AM desired to inform you that the Council, having fully considered the question of the formation of a Conciliation Board, have finally decided not to take any part in such board which would be composed of unionists and non-unionists, as they feel they cannot concede to that principle.

I remain, yours faithfully,
J. RICHARDS,
W. L. Hawkins, Esq. Secretary.

The position, therefore, is that powerful bodies of workmen, whose co-operation is, in the judgment of your committee, absolutely necessary to the formation and successful working of a conciliation board, will be no parties to a board, the workmen's representatives on which are not wholly elected by the members of unions affiliated to the Trades Council.

Your Committee have now satisfied themselves that, not only the directors of the great companies, but most, if not all, of the other large employers of labour in the Port of Cardiff will never agree to such a partial representation.

Moreover, Sir William Thomas Lewis makes the creation of a benefit fund, to which employers and workmen should alike contribute, a *sine qua non* condition of his co-operating with any scheme for the regulation of wages disputes. To such a benefit fund no union leader, met by your Committee, is prepared to agree.

Your committee have further satisfied themselves that, with these radical differences in view, no such conference as was contemplated by your resolution, is now practicable, and that, if practicable, it could not result in advantage.

Your Committee are reluctant to own that they have failed to accomplish their mission. But, thus far, such is the fact, and so long as the parties directly interested preserve their present attitude, accomplishment will be impossible. Your Committee can only hope that their labours may have somewhat cleared the way to eventual realisation of the Chamber's wishes, and, if so desired, they will not object to continue in existence, watching the course of events, and prepared to act should an opportunity for successful action present itself.

It is perhaps necessary to add that the Committee have thought it inadvisable (if, indeed, unanimity had been possible) to express any opinion as to who is right or wrong on the questions raised by this report.

The proposals of Sir William Thomas Lewis are for an Association of the employers and workmen of the Bristol Channel. They have not as yet taken effect, and your Committee think it premature to consider the

federation of such an association with the proposed labour union. They, therefore, advise that Mr. Capper's invitation to Mr. Hawkins be declined.

WM. RILEY,
JOHN GUNN,
E. R. MOXEY,
LEWELLEN WOOD.

W. L. HAWKINS,
Secretary.

APPENDIX LXXXV.

MANIFESTO!!!

UNITED LABOUR COUNCIL of the PORT OF LONDON, "Wades' Arms."

To all whom it may concern,

The shipowners of London having broken through the custom of shipping their crews at properly constituted shipping offices, and decided to sign on board to the detriment of unionism generally, the above Council have decided to call upon workmen represented here to abstain from doing any work either direct or indirect that will conduce to the sailing of the vessels of

MESSRS. SHAW, SAVILLE, & Co.,
NEW ZEALAND SHIPPING Co., AND
BRITISH INDIA STEAM NAVIGATION Co.,

until they give an undertaking that for the future they will sign and discharge their respective crews at the regular shipping offices provided by the Board of Trade, and sign no other than members of N.A.S. & F.U.

This manifesto to take effect on Friday morning December 5th, 1890.

By order of the above Council,
December 3rd, 1890.

The RIGGERS' OPINION on the PROPOSED STRIKE.

We, the undersigned, are hereby instructed by the members of the London United Riggers' Association to inform the United Labour Council of the Port of London that after having duly considered the reasons set forth in the manifesto issued by the council calling upon all workmen affiliated therewith to leave work on and after the 5th instant, in support of the National Amalgamated Seamen and Firemen's Union, our members have unanimously come to the conclusion that the grounds set forth in the said manifesto are utterly insufficient to call for such extreme measures, inasmuch as signing articles on board ship is in accordance with the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854, is always done in the presence of Board of Trade officials, and has been carried out for many years in certain firms with advantage to the crews and without any objection by the N.A.S. & F.U.; or any other body, consequently we cannot consider this a just ground for a strike, especially as the shipowners pay the full wages of the port, which we learn they have done in every case. The other reason given, viz., that owners should guarantee that none but members of the N.A.S. & F.U. should be shipped is equally absurd, inasmuch as many of our best sailors are not members of that particular union. The riggers of London, members of an old-established association, and sailors to a man claim the

ancient right and privilege to go runs, or even voyages, without being compelled to pay subscriptions into another union recently established.

We also maintain that the N.A.S. & F.U. has been very aggressive to other and smaller unions, and we have grave cause to complain of their treatment of the riggers of the Thames, members of the N.A.S. & F.U. doing rigging work under price and at the same time denying us the right to live by our legitimate calling.

They have declined to meet us on fair and equitable terms, and as they have never shown any spirit of friendship to our members or even unionism as between man and man, our members failing, as practical seamen, to see any reasonable grounds for a strike hereby emphatically decline to leave their work, with a view to support the N.A.S. & F.U.

Signed on behalf of the London Riggers,
JAMES STANBURY,
President.
WILLIAM WATSON,
Delegate.
WILLIAM PATTERSON LIND,
General Secretary.

APPENDIX LXXXVI.

"LONDON UNITED RIGGERS' ASSOCIATION."

Established 1853.

COPY of DRAFT of the RIGGERS' DEMANDS for remedying the existing GRIEVANCES between the MEMBERS of the above ASSOCIATION and the "NATIONAL AMALGAMATED SEAMEN AND FIREMEN'S UNIONS" to form the basis of negotiations between the accredited delegates of both Unions.

We demand of the "National Amalgamated Seamen and Firemen's Union" the following:—

1. That it shall not in any way interfere with *bona fide* members of the "London United Riggers' Association" going runs in vessels or doing tide-work, such being the legitimate and recognised work of ship-riggers.

2. That its members, unless *bona fide* members of a ship's crew, shall not be permitted to work at rigging work for more hours or less money than the recognised scale of riggers' pay, viz., 6s. per day from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. including 1½ hours for meals, and 1s. per hour overtime, Sundays, Good Friday, and Christmas Day counting double time and overtime.

3. We also claim the right of our members going to sea in vessels, as occasion arises, without first having to take up a N.A.S. & F. ticket.

And we hereby request and expect, the "United Labour Council of the Port of London" to assist us in the above demands to the utmost of their ability and power.

(Signed) JAMES STANBURY,
President.

(Seal) WM. PATTERSON LIND,
General Secretary.

August 29th 1890.

APPENDIX LXXXVII.

LONDON UNITED RIGGERS' ASSOCIATION.

Established 1853.

NOTICE TO MASTER RIGGERS.

The Committee of the above-named Association beg to inform Master Riggers and others employing Working Ship-riggers, that, in accordance with a resolution unanimously passed at a special general meeting of members, held on September 3rd, 1891—"The wages of Riggers employed at out-door rigging work during the four winter months between the last day of October and the first day of March of each year, shall be 7s. for the ordinary working day."

Considering the arduous and trying work performed by Riggers on board ship during the winter months, when aloft amongst rigging covered with snow and ice; together with the fact that the principal employers have themselves instigated this resolution by expressing

their ready willingness to pay the extra shilling for out-door rigging work, providing it was made a general rule for all to pay alike, the Committee sincerely trust that all our employers will as readily agree to the terms of the above resolution, which will come into operation on the morning of November 1st next.

The Committee will be glad to receive communications upon the subject from the employers, addressed to—

The General Secretary,
London United Riggers' Association,
The Blue Posts Tavern,
West India Dock Road, E.

October 1st, 1891.

APPENDIX LXXXVIII.

VERBATIM COPY (supplied by Mr. NEWMAN in a Letter to the Secretary, dated June 29th, 1892, in reply to an application for the document referred to in question 14,531) of the AGREEMENT with ALLAN BROS. & CO.

30/11/91.

You are appointed to look after the Shipping of our Crews—All so will Engage Suitable men and attend Punctually at the time of Signing on—And also be present when the Vessel Sails with Substitutes—Present Weekly Wages 20/.

ALLAN BROTHERS Co.

To Mr. Newman.

APPENDIX LXXXIX.

Consecutive Office No. 313 b.
Departmental, 1066,
Superintendents, 74.

Board of Trade,
Marine Department,
Revised September 1891.

INSTRUCTIONS TO SUPERINTENDENTS OF MERCANTILE MARINE OFFICES.

(In substitution of Circular of the same number dated March 1887. Previous editions of this Circular should be destroyed.)

ENGAGEMENT AND DISCHARGE OF SEAMEN ON BOARD SHIP.

Officers and seamen may be engaged and discharged on board ship under the following conditions:—

Engagements.

1. A form of application for the engagement to take place on board must be filled up by the master or agent at least 24 hours before the time fixed for the attendance of the deputy, except in special cases of urgency in which the superintendent can make arrangements in less time. Form Eng. 12 should be used for this purpose.

2. The ship's articles, showing the conditions of agreement, the officers' certificates, and the other documents usually required, must be lodged with the superintendent with the application.

3. When the articles of agreement are signed on board, a fee of 1s. is to be paid at each visit for every man who signs the articles, but if more than 40 sign at one visit, not more than 2l. are to be charged for that visit. The receipt for the fees paid should be given on Form 7.

4. When an officer of one of the Board's steam launches attends for the purpose of witnessing the engagement of officers and seamen including substitutes, the same fees are to be charged.

Steam Launches.

5. The steam launches are not to proceed beyond the following limits when employed in the engagement and discharge of seamen under this instruction, viz:—

Thames.—Between Greenhithe and the powder buoys in Gravesend Reach. If the service of the launch is required between the Powder Buoys and Lower Hope Point an additional charge of 6s. will be made. Between that point and Hole Haven, 1l.

Clyde.—Between the tail of the bank off Greenock including the Gareloch, and Dunoon, including Holy Loch.

Bristol Channel.—Between Walton Bay and Sharpness, including King Road, a distance of 80 miles.

In cases where the services of a deputy superintendent are required beyond these limits, a vessel for the purpose of his conveyance must be supplied by the shipowner.

Discharges and Re-engagements.

6. Discharges on board can be allowed to take place only under special or urgent circumstances, which must be made out to the superintendent's satisfaction.

The fees for seamen discharged will be the same as for engagements; but if, at the time a crew is discharged, any of the seamen are re-engaged or any new men are put on the articles, no fee is to be charged for such re-engagements or new engagements.

7. Any seamen subsequently engaged (including substitutes), should be charged for at the rate of 1s. per man up to 40s.

8. Engagements and discharges on board can only take place when the work of the superintendent's office permits. Applications should be dealt with in turn.

9. The above are the charges for the work if done during the office hours of the Port.

Overtime.

Shore Staff.—If attendance is required out of the usual office hours of the Port, the following overtime charges should be made in addition to the above fees:—

1. From 8 a.m. to the usual hour for opening the office, and from the usual hour of closing the office to 6 p.m., 10s. per hour.

2. Between 6 p.m. and 8 a.m., 20s. per hour.
 3. On Sundays and public holidays, 20s. per hour.
 Time occupied in travelling between office or home and ship, is not to be deemed overtime, but the time the officer is required to remain on board is to be charged for at the usual scale.
Boat Staff.—No overtime fees are to be charged by the staff of the river launches.
 10. Any travelling or other expenses to which the office may be put must be repaid by the owner of the ship for which they have been incurred; except in the following case. Where an officer is travelling out of office hours between the ship and the Mercantile Marine Office for more than half an hour beyond the time charged to the ship, his allowance at the usual overtime rates for each additional hour or part thereof is to be charged to the Board of Trade. No remuneration can be allowed for fractions of half an hour, and if an officer proceeds direct to his home instead of to the office, and the time taken is longer, the charge should be limited to the time that would have been occupied had he returned to the office. The superintendent should be satisfied that the travelling allowance is due before he makes the payment, and a note of the circumstances of

- the case should be added to the voucher, together with the distance the ship was from the office.
 11. All the rules contained in the Merchant Shipping Acts as applying to engagements and discharges in the mercantile marine offices are to be observed in engagements and discharges taking place on board. It is to be clearly understood that the seamen's rights with regard to wages and freedom of action must in no way be prejudiced.
 12. A return of the work performed under this instruction should be made to the Board as hitherto (on Form Eng. 4 or Eng. 12).
 13. Paragraph 85 of the Superintendents' Instructions, 1879, is cancelled:

HENRY G. CALCRAFT,
 Secretary.
 GEORGE J. SWANSTON,
 Assistant Secretary.
 M. 17,892.
 1890.
 M. 11,228.
 1891.
 M. 13,663.
 1891.

APPENDIX XC.

A FEW, OF MANY, CASES OF ASSAULTS UPON FEDERATION CREWS.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1890.
 Nov. S.S. "Kaikoura," several of the crew assaulted in the Royal Albert Docks.
 " S.S. "Upupa," and other steamers of the Cork Company, members of the crew assaulted in the streets and at railway stations en route to join their respective vessels.
 " S.S. "Mamari," a serious assault on Federation officer, and several minor assaults on crew both on days of signing and on joining vessel; some had clothes stolen.
 Dec. S.S. "R. W. Boyd," intimidation and assault on members of crew in the Millwall Docks.
 " S.S. "Tongariro," assault on men in Royal Albert Docks, two brothers, trimmers, were knocked down and their advance notes taken from them.
 " S.S. "Jama," several serious cases of assault upon crew in dock.
 " S.S. "Damascus," several serious cases of assault upon crew in Royal Victoria Docks.
 " S.S. "Michigan," several serious cases of assault upon crew in dry dock.
 " S.S. "Murrumbidgee," several serious cases of assault upon crew in South-western Dock.
 " S.S. "Maraca," several serious cases of assault upon crew in East India Docks.</p> | <p>1890.
 Dec. S.S. "Tekoa," several serious cases of assault upon crew in South-western Dock.
 " S.S. "Arawa," several serious cases of assault upon crew in Royal Albert Docks.
 1891.
 Jan. S.S. "Dorunda," several serious cases of assault upon crew in Royal Albert Docks.
 " S.S. "Aorangi," serious assault, and robbery, on donkeyman (Adams), and minor assaults on others.
 " S.S. "Merkara," several of the crew assaulted, Royal Albert Docks.
 " S.S. "Beatrice," several of the crew assaulted, Royal Victoria Docks.
 " S.S. "Hubbuck," several of the crew assaulted, South-western Dock. Two men's bags of clothes stolen and seven men "spirited" away.
 " S.S. "Coptio," several cases of assault on crew.
 " S.S. "Richmond Hill," several cases of assault on crew in Royal Albert Docks.
 " S.S. "Ludgate Hill," several cases of assault on crew in Royal Albert Docks.
 " S.S. "Jolunga," several cases of assault on crew in Royal Albert Docks.
 &c. &c. &c.</p> |
|---|---|

APPENDIX XCI.

EXTRACT from "SEAFARING" (July 25th, 1891) giving REPORT of a SPEECH made by MR. J. HAVELOCK WILSON.

MR. J. H. WILSON, who was

HEARTILY GREETED,

thanked them for the welcome they had given him, and ironically expressed his surprise that they should have so cordially received a person who had been a sojourner in one of Her Majesty's hotels (laughter). He was the more surprised at it, considering the statement that had been made by Mr. Laws (groans) that trades unionism in Hull was dead and a thing of the past (laughter). Judging by that large meeting, and the enthusiasm of those assembled there, they were able to throw the lie back into Mr. Laws' face (applause) and tell him that trades unionism was more in force to-day in the port of

Hull than ever it had been (applause). Dealing with the question of his imprisonment he said that prison was no deterrent. The magistrate who sent him to prison for doing what he considered he had a perfect right to do, never made a greater mistake in his life (applause). He had some respect for Her Majesty's hotels before he went to one; but having been there and enjoyed what he had seen there, he was now

PREPARED TO DO SIX MONTHS,

instead of six weeks at any time (laughter and applause). He had also discovered a few things, and one was that many an unfortunate sailor was not afraid to go to prison for daring to tell the owner that he would not

riak his life by going to sea in a ship that was not seaworthy, or that was undermanned. Mr. Laws had described him to the Labour Commission as an agitator, which he (Mr. Wilson) considered to be one of the greatest compliments that could be paid him. Mr. Laws also told the Commission that their Union was the Union, and that it was a tyrannical Union—one that was fighting and doing all the mischief. He also said that the secretary was a man who went round the country telling the unfortunate men that the shipowners were trying to murder and rob them; and stated that he could, if necessary, produce about a hundred speeches delivered by the secretary of that Union—that was himself (Mr. Wilson)—in which he had accused the ship owners of, being

ROBBERS AND MURDERERS.

(Applause.) Had Mr. Laws only asked him he would have given him a copy of those speeches, because what he said with reference to the shipowners at any time in their absence he was prepared to repeat to their face on any public platform. He said that many of these were guilty of deliberate and wilful murder. (Hear, hear.) He said that many of them had for years systematically robbed their sailors. (Hear, hear.) He said that some of them had robbed the widows and orphans of the seamen; and if they wanted proof he was quite prepared to bring it, and point to the men who dared to rob those widows and orphans. (Applause.) There were various ways of killing a cat. They could either drown it in the rainwater butt, or chop off its head, or strangle it, or send it to sea in an unseaworthy ship with a lot of iron attached to it, and sink it. (Applause.) Of all kinds of murderers he would rather meet the man who would attack him openly in the street, where he could defend himself. But

WHAT COULD SAILORS AND FIREMEN DO

to save their lives when there were men employed before a ship left the harbour to punch a hole in the bottom of the vessel so that as soon as ever it got outside she would founder, because an extra dose of insurance had been put upon it. (Applause.) A book was about to be published, which would not give names of persons or ships, but anyone who had a knowledge of shipping circles would be able to find the respectable shipowners who had a ship that was insured for 60,000l. that was not worth 30,000l.; and how when an officer went down into the stoke-hole, when the vessel was in the London Dock, he found the chief engineer in the act of making small holes in the bottom of the ship; and further, how that after the ship had got to sea from three to four hundred miles from land, they discovered that the stoke-hole was filling with water and that the water was coming through in the place where these holes had been bored. Did not that look suspicious? That second officer was

OFFERED MONEY

if he would not give evidence at the inquiry that was held into the loss of the ship. Fortunately, the men did not lose their lives in the ship; but if they had done—and the owners had made no extra provision, nor taken any extra precaution for the saving of life—the owners would have been guilty of as deliberate a murder as was ever committed. (Applause.) He was reminded of another shipowner who was a strong advocate of the pension fund for seamen; he was the owner of a ship that sailed from a port in Scotland. The men had been 12 hours on board, when it was found that the boilers were absolutely rotten. The crew refused to go any further, and they put into harbour, the men being threatened with imprisonment. Some temporary repairs were done to the boilers, and she went out again; but before they had got a few more hundred miles they were compelled to put into another harbour, where more temporary repairs were done. She was then again sent on her voyage, and was never heard of again. She

FOUNDERED WITH ALL HANDS.

Two of the men, sooner than go in that ship, committed a crime when in harbour—they stole a piece of rope so that they would be sent to prison. They told the magistrates why they had done it, and he sent them to six days' imprisonment, and as soon as the vessel had gone they were released. These men were there to tell the story of the rotten boilers. The vessel was worth 16,000l., but the owner got 30,000l. upon her loss. If that was not murder, he did not know what was. A

man who did that—it was not to prison he should go, but should be hung. (Applause.) Ships were foundering every day, and they were told it was the act of God. What a mockery! Now for the robbery. He believed there were honourable men engaged in the shipping industry. At the same time he knew there was a gang of cut-throats and robbers engaged in the business. (Hear, hear, and a voice: "They all are.") No; they were not. There were bad men amongst sailors and firemen. There were bad men amongst all classes of society, and they had no right to condemn the whole of any portion of the community because there were black sheep in their midst. (Applause.) He went on to say that there were respectable shipowners in Hull who had been guilty of

ROBBING THE MEN;

and he referred to a case of reward for salvage, in which he said the amount obtained came to 12l. per man, but they only got 30s. apiece. ("Shame.") With reference to robbing the dead, he said there was a shipowner in Scotland who bought an old crank ship and sent her to sea, when she foundered with all hands. The men's wages, after deducting their half-pay, amounted to 27l. What did this respectable owner do? He made up an average account, in which he charged some of the men with drawing 7l. in one week when abroad. (Cries of "Shame.") He knew his hearers would smile at that. The usual sum they drew was 5s.—(laughter) and then they were jolly lucky to get that. (Applause.) But this owner so accounted for the money that he left only 3l. for each of the widows, and sent the account into the Board of Trade, who passed it as correct. ("Shame.")

FORTUNATELY THERE WAS THE SAILORS' UNION,

and they said they did not believe in the average account, for they knew the men had never drawn so much money when abroad. So they went for the full amount, and the owner, after twisting and wriggling, offered first 10l., then 15l., then 20l., but eventually he had to disgorge the whole lot. (Applause.) But this did not teach him a lesson, for in about nine months the same thing happened, and he had again to disgorge. He (Mr. Wilson) was collecting evidence of these facts to lay before the Labour Commission, and he should be able to prove them up to the hilt. Proceeding to refer to the question of more direct labour representation in the House of Commons, he said he wished to deal with Mr. C. H. Wilson, one of their Hull members, and the Cattle Trade Bill. Something, he said, ought to be done in the interest of the lives of the men to regulate the

ATLANTIC CATTLE TRADE.

Mr. C. H. Wilson posed as the friend of the workers, but he did not call any man a friend of the workers because he put his hand in his pocket and gave them a share of what actually belonged to them. If this man was a friend of the workers, how came it that he had opposed the Bill to regulate the ocean cattle trade, a Bill which did not restrict or prohibit the importation of cattle? It was a reasonable Bill, and he did not think that it would have been opposed by any man who posed as a friend of the workers. It was "blocked" by

MR. C. H. WILSON, M.P.

If he said he was opposing it in the interests of the working men of Hull, he (Mr. J. H. Wilson) denied that it was anything of the kind, because it did not matter a straw to the workers of Hull. Mr. Chaplin received a deputation of shipowners to lay before them his intended proposals with reference to the trade. Mr. Chaplin had no objection to his being present, and promised to lay his application before the deputation. To his surprise and disgust the word came out that the shipowners objected to him being present. He waited three hours until the meeting had finished, and then approached Mr. C. H. Wilson, asking how it was he could not be admitted. Well, Mr. Wilson shuffled off by telling him that he was making exaggerated statements with reference to the trade, and that, if he had been admitted, the discussion would have been prolonged considerably. (Laughter.) He did not believe that these men would guard their interests; they would guard them as long as it did not affect them, but as soon as ever it came home to their own pocket, then they looked after No. 1. (Applause.) In conclusion, Mr. Wilson said that it was time that they had two labour candidates in the field in Hull to be returned at the next general election, and he urged them to stand true to their Union to gain this end. (Applause.)

APPENDIX XCII.

SPECIMENS of LITERATURE circulated by the FEDERATION to the REGISTRY OFFICES (taken as types).

"HEADS" WHO WINS? "TAILS" YOU LOSE!

A LETTER to BRITISH WORKMEN.

FRIENDS,—

Who are they who oftenest attempt to create dissatisfaction amongst workmen? Are they the old steady going and sober men? Are they the men who have most to make a sacrifice of? Are they the most trustworthy and painstaking, or are they not rather the most careless and unsteady—those who are generally found inside the ale-shop—those who are always changing their places, here this week, somewhere else the next? Are they not oftenest those who, if paid according to the quality and quantity of the work passing through their hands, would be receiving the lowest rate of wages?

If such is the case, are those the men who are to be blindly obeyed and followed in every dispute they may please to create with their employers, and then expect their fellow workers to support them in their demands?

These are questions which deserve the attention of all our British workers at the present time, as there is a Spirit of unrest abroad, not only in this country but in other countries, and unless a man is willing to look beyond the end of his nose, or in other words, to look ahead, he may get landed into troubles out of which he cannot release himself.

At this time, strikes seem to be going over the country like the influenza. We hear of them in London to day, then in Hull, now in Scotland, again at Cardiff; at another time in Liverpool, and then back again to Bradford.

Possibly the next strike may affect us, and in case it does, let us just think out this question—

Will we Gain anything by a Strike?

There are two sides to every question, and if we do not care to admit this, surely there are two sides to our side of this great question. The question we have just asked is one side, and the other is—

*Have we anything to Lose?**First, by Failure; secondly, by Success?*

Because we know that even strikes are not always successful.

We will look into the other side first.

Have we anything to lose—by success?

Well, to-day we have our regular work and regular pay; we have our wife and children provided for, and a home over our heads; and though we may not have abundance, yet there is sufficient food and clothing to satisfy and clothe us decently, and may be a shilling or two over to spare to pay the sick or burial club; or, if more fortunate, to keep the insurance going.

If this strike takes place, why of course it means no mere work—no work, no pay; and then, when all the money is spent, which will be very quickly (when no more is coming in), it means a stoppage of meat, grocery, and all oddments. The wife cannot have that other gown she so much wants; the children cannot get the old shoes mended, much less new ones. It means having a lot of time on hand which cannot be turned to account; it means waiting, loafing about, till the strike is over.

How many are there who, doing the best they can—during a strike—to pay their way to get even food, begin by pawning watch, wedding ring, clothes, furniture, and by having no home left, or any hope of ever getting another one together? There is no doubt that it is possible to lose all this even before the end of a successful strike.

"Ah!" but you say, "There is the strike pay, and things are not so bad as that." Well, wait a bit.

It is true there is the strike pay. How much is it? 10s. a week? Well, say 15s. What wages are you getting? 25s., say, 20s., which is a low average wage. Well then, you as a workman are actually sacrificing 10s. a week. Why a man in a good way of business could not afford that. In such a case is it any wonder that this loss means ruin?

U 72729.

However could we lose if we succeed? Gaining one's end is not always success, for the thoughtful man will calculate on the consequences of his success. And to illustrate this, let us glance at the results which would have followed supposing that every strike during the last 10 years had succeeded.

Many classes of men would have had much higher wages and shorter hours.

The higher wages would have attracted great numbers of men in the same way as when, about 20 years ago, the wages of the miners were so high that all sorts and conditions of men flocked to the pits to go underground on account of the money which could then be earned in the mine. The supply of labour would soon be greater than the demand for it, and this would at once reduce wages again.

Then about the shorter hours.

This is a most delicate point for the worker, and one upon which he must be very careful. In the first place, shorter hours must mean less work, and less work means shorter supply; short supply would cause things to get dearer; and when prices rise, in steps the foreigner with a cheaper article; and as folks will, right or wrong, have cheapness, the home trade gets gradually less and less; and when once a hold is gained on the market by a cheap article, it is very, very difficult to replace it by a dearer, even if much superior one.

In the second place, it must not be contended that the same amount of work can be done in eight hours as is now done in 10 or even nine, for if such an argument is put forward it stamps the worker as a dishonest man for taking 10 or nine hours money for work which could have been done in eight hours, and this must have been going on for years.

And now on the side—

Have we anything to Lose by Failure?

Why, of course, if we lose we lose, and there is an end of it.

Not so fast, my friend; there's not an end of it by any means.

There is a feeling of having failed, and this is not pleasant to any man. Then there is all the time the strike lasted worse than wasted; there are all the privations we have suffered gone for nothing; there is a feeling of discontent at having to go back on the old terms, or perhaps at reduced pay; and then, not the least, there is the loss of all the money which might have been earned during these weeks of strife.

How long will it be before we can pull up to where we were before the strike commenced? That is about the sum of the loss if the strike should prove a failure. Now we turn to the brighter side—

If the Strike should be a Success.

It has not been without a bitter struggle between employers and employed, causing much ill-feeling, and possibly a reduction of the number of those who were formerly employed.

The gain of 1d. per hour, or the reduction of the hours of work, means in one case, say, 1s., or even 2s., a week more money to the worker; or in the other, say the loss of 1s. or 2s. a week to the employer. To the worker, if the strike has lasted only a few weeks, it means a decided loss of 10s. a week at the low average wage of 25s. and the strike pay (if it holds out) at the highest figure of 15s., and this difference must be made up by the worker to himself before he can reckon that the strike has done him any good, he say nothing of the misery which he, his wife, and family have had to endure, which is inseparable from the most successful strike. It will take the bread-winner months to recover his lost wages if he goes on strike for that, but if for shorter hours, it is very questionable if he will ever be able to put the time gained to any profitable account. Ask the wives of those who have been on strike what is their opinion of the matter, and then ask yourself by how much will you be the gainer by succeeding through a strike?

Just one more question, and I have done. Have you ever thought how strange it is that these champions of

3 E

the striker, whether they were miners, engineers, blacksmiths, dock labourers, or anything else, never seem to go back to their own work, either when a strike has been successful or not?

Why is this?

They seem to get up in the world and stay there, at somebody's expense. Is it at yours? Do they starve with the striker? Do they live on strike pay? Is it by self-sacrifice that they manage to make a name, or is it because there are men who are so stupid as to take everything for gospel that falls from their *disinterested* lips.

Men, think over these things, and though surely few people will be willing to say that the workers' lot may not be made happier and brighter, yet all sensible workers must confess that the best way of attaining to this is not by a strike.

We have also heard of men who have gone on strike on principle. Do you understand that? I confess I don't.

Yours very faithfully,
A THINKING OBSERVER.

MASTER AND MAN *versus* NEW UNIONISM.

By J. STAFFORD RAMSOME, Assoc. Memb. Civil Engineers.

Comprising two articles reprinted from the "Globe."

- 1.—The Shipping Federation's programme.
- 2.—The Federation's victory: Its future effects.

INTRODUCTION.

This pamphlet is in a measure a sequel to "On Principle Strikes," by the same author, which was published last year. The former pamphlet dealt with the abuses of trade unions, and the present one may be said to deal with the practical results of these abuses, in that the federation of master and man is the direct and natural outcome of the new union policy.

How far federation will extend depends on the future attitude of the unions. Now that it has been practically proved to be possible, it would be absurd to suppose that other trades will not follow the example of the shipowners when the occasion requires it.

It is possible, however, that union agitators will tone down their policy for a time, with a view to obviating the development of federation, as they are admirable hands at throwing themselves on the ground when they are getting the worst of a fight, in the hope that their adversaries will not "hit them when they are down."

To adapt federation to the various trades necessitates a somewhat different scheme for individual cases. But within broad lines, certain of the leading features could be identical. The basis of all trade federation must be the protection of its men, a proper registration of the working men in the trade, with an agency for finding employment for them, and for facilitating their moving from one part of the country to another, when local slackness, or other causes, necessitates their changing neighbourhood.

In France and certain other countries the Government obliges every working man to carry his *livret*, or official registration book, as much for his own protection as for that of his employer. When taking work the man hands in his *livret*, and when he changes his employment his master is obliged to write in particulars as to the work he has done, also when he came to the situation and when he left it. Were such an arrangement come to between masters and men in a federation, it would be of the utmost service to both. It would facilitate also the working of a general trade benefit scheme, as it could be arranged that in whatever part of Great Britain or elsewhere a man might be working, under different masters in the federation, he would be enabled to draw his sick benefits when required, and that however many times he might change employment, his superannuation allowance would not be affected.

It is now generally recognised that the professional agitator neither represents the working man of Great Britain, nor even the majority of the unionists, but this recognition has been long in taking root in the public mind, and meanwhile, until it did take root, real labour has had its interests entirely disregarded.

Were the union agitators representative of the ideas of the working man, trade federation would not only be

unnecessary, but impossible. As matters now stand, something of the sort is fast becoming imperative in certain trades, and unless new unionism is checked or suppressed, and ordinary unions will study more the interests of their men, we shall doubtless have a considerable development of federationism, or its equivalent, in the immediate future.

Trades unions, when properly worked, have been of undoubted service to labour in preventing oppression by a certain class of employers, and if they would stick to even a tolerably straightforward line of action, they could yet do some good. But of late certain trades unions have been developing into colossal machines for the manufacture of starvation and outrage, and are serving as the happy hunting grounds for socialistic orators who do not attempt to study the interests of trade, and whose object is to utilise them as a means of support to themselves, and as a stepping-stone to personal notoriety. Consequently, other solutions of the labour problem are necessary, and there are various schemes and suggestions in the course of consideration.

To quote the words of Mr. George Livesey, who is an undoubted authority on the subject of modern labour, in that he was the first to grapple successfully with the new unionism in London—"What is wanted is a real union of community and interest between capital and labour, and so far as I can see trades unions not only cannot accomplish such an end, but on the contrary are diametrically opposed to it, particularly the latest development in the shape of new unionism, which produces a state of war, by the best only an armed truce. Their teaching is that the employer is the enemy. Such conditions and relationship cannot produce community of interests." Mr. Livesey then explains that in his opinion, in trades where it is feasible, profit sharing promotes this mutual interest, and continues, "A very good piece of evidence that profit sharing is likely to succeed is to be found in the determined opposition of unionists, particularly the new unionists. They see, and say, that with such a system the man will not want or support the union, which means loss of place and power to the leaders, who therefore oppose the system."

In certain trades no doubt profit sharing, though very desirable, could not work practically, but in such cases equivalents could and would be found when necessity demands it.

Simultaneously with the Shipping Federation, a free labour revolt has taken place in engineering trade. Though little has been said about it as yet, it bids fair to strike a severe blow at unionism as now carried on, and it is all the more significant in that it is an uprising of the men on their own initiative, and up till now the new organisation, which numbers some thousands of members, is said not to have received any outside support of an official nature from the employers' associations in the trade. In spite of this, it is rapidly increasing in strength, and popularity, and should it be able to come to an understanding with the employers there would be a ready made federation, as all the materials are to hand. Its avowed object is to protect its men "from the tyranny of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers," and it has so little in common with the orthodox trades societies that it goes so far as to encourage piece-work, and allows the really good workmen a chance of coming to the front.

All this tends to show how at the present day the real working man is thoroughly tired of union tyranny, and that with even slight encouragement from employers, he is willing to co-operate with them against it.

If trade unions wish to obviate extended federation, let them follow the advice of one of their own leaders, Mr. H. H. Champion, who, in addressing the strikers in Australia, when the union was getting beaten all round, said (according to the "Melbourne Age")—

"Now as a trade unionist of the most extreme school, I ask trade unionists in this country to agree with me:

1st. "That no trade unionist should claim the right to dictate to an employer whom he shall employ."

2nd. "That no trade unionist should claim the right to demand that an employer before taking on a man shall ask him if he belongs to the union or not."

3rd. "That a non-unionist has a right to take work where he can get it."

4th. "That no trade union claims the right to apply force or threat of force, or any form of persuasion other than that permitted and defined by law, to men who are not unionists."

This sound advice, if followed, would ruin new unionism on the face of it, and consequently new labour federations would not be called into life. But though Mr. Champion describes himself, and has usually been looked upon as a "unionist of the most extreme school," and although his speech took place only six months ago (September 1890), such doctrines from the mouth of a unionist leader are already out of date and old-fashioned, *except when the union has been, or is about to be, defeated.*

THE SHIPPING FEDERATION'S PROGRAMME.

(From the "Globe.")

It is almost impossible at the present day to open a newspaper without coming across some reference to the doings of the Shipping Federation in its columns. But as a rule the information is scanty or vague, and again it is the habit of certain journals, either wilfully or through ignorance, to systematically misrepresent its motives and actions. The consequence is that the public has had but little opportunity of forming a clear opinion as to its importance and effect on trade.

There is one point, however, on which everyone who has either written or spoken on the subject is agreed, and that is, that it is an immensely powerful organisation. This is true, but not unusual. Associations of masters have existed from time immemorial, and very powerful bodies they are. But the Shipping Federation differs from them in that it undertakes the engagement and management of its own labour, and guarantees its *employés* every security from molestation which the law will allow. This is the important feature about it, and the advent of the federation may be said to mark an era in the labour world, for it is the first organisation of master and man, on a large scale, to resist, in a methodical and business-like manner, not trade unionism, but the abuses of trade unionism. It is merely the simple and natural outcome of the tyranny which has been carried on, and it was merely a question of time as to when man and master would join hands to revolt against it and suppress it.

The Shipping Federation was incorporated under the Companies Act in September last, and started without flourish of trumpets in a business-like manner, with business men to work it. It laid down for itself a plain, straightforward, and, as regards the labour question, distinctly moderate programme, but with a firm determination to carry out that programme. In the few short months that have elapsed since its incorporation it has obtained the control of vessels of which the tonnage in the aggregate amounts to about 7,000,000. It is said that the total registered tonnage of Great Britain is about 10,000,000, of which at least three-quarters of a million is represented by ships which do not touch at English ports, and considerably more than another 1,000,000 tons are absorbed by small craft which it would not be worth the Federation's while to take up. Thus the total tonnage, as far as the Federation is concerned, may be said to amount to 8,000,000, of which it already commands 7,000,000. Therefore the organisation is thoroughly representative of the trade, and proportionately powerful, and as its members are liable *pro rata* on the tonnage of their vessels, and this to no small extent, the funds at its disposal are enormous, and it could certainly buy up any trade union in England over and over again.

Under the circumstances such an organisation might have imposed very hard and even unreasonable conditions on the trade societies with which it has to deal, but it has not done so, and its moderation is to be commended. It merely says to the men, "You may belong to any union you like, but if non-unionists work for us to they must be unmolested, and any man molesting another must go." The union agitators knowing that their union, as now run, could not exist on its merits for six months, and that the relaxation of systematic intimidation and violence would be immediately fatal to it and them, re-new their usual pitiful whine about the Federation being a plot against their union. But it is without importance to the Federation whether the union is broken or not, as in no case will it consent to be dictated to by the union. But thousands of the unionists themselves devoutly hope that their union will be broken.

There is no doubt that the Federation was hailed by the real dock worker as a means of escape from his union fetters. Let anyone who thinks otherwise explain away the innumerable applications for work with which

the Federation is inundated. Let him explain why the men tore up their union tickets in the presence of the union spies, and took work with the Federation against union orders. The real reason is this, to quote from the Federation documents:—"The Federation intends primarily to secure to every man freedom of work on his own terms without interference. . . . Will protect those who are threatened. . . . Will prosecute those who threaten." Thus at the outset it pledges itself to protect its men as far as the law allows. This, after all, is but imperfectly, but it is sufficient to enable the Federation to command all the labour it requires, and to increase its staff in an unlimited manner and at short notice.

The Federation has already the whip-hand at the docks, and as long as it continues to carry out its present firm, but moderate policy, and to study the real interests of its men, its position must continue to be strengthened. It is a sign of the times that it should become necessary to form an association as powerful as the Shipping Federation in order to insure to the working man the right of working in comparative security. But such is the case, for although it has other objects, its chief *raison d'être* at present is to enforce the working of the law, to the protection of the working man, and to do this, all the energies of its representatives, and all the complicated and expensive machinery of its organisation must be kept in motion and taxed to the utmost.

It would be an insult to common sense to suggest that the movement was set on foot from any philanthropic motives. The Federation is purely a business institution from beginning to end, and is run in the interests of trade. If it is prepared to spend thousands of pounds in the protection of the working man that is because it recognises that master cannot do without man any more than man without master, and that, this being the case, sympathetic and proper relations between them are essential. The union leaders naturally object to this, as anything in the shape of capital and labour joining hands is death to their policy. It is well that philanthropy has no corner in the scheme, for philanthropy and well-meant interference have played a sorry and degrading part in recent labour troubles, and have been responsible for much misery alike to unionist and to non-unionist.

We are glad to learn that the authorities of the Federation are now studying a comprehensive sick benefit and pension scheme, of which we hope to give some details in a forthcoming article. Such a scheme should have the effect of further strengthening the relations between them and their men.

It should be remembered, that, although the Shipping Federation is the first large association representing an entire trade, which has decided to protect its men at all costs, several strikes have been fought and won by master and man against union during the last year or two, but only where masters have adopted an absolutely firm policy, and stuck to their new men through thick and thin.

The most notable example of this was the South Metropolitan gas strike, than which there has never been a more severe struggle. The Shipping Federation, operating on a far larger scale, will not have a worse battle to fight, and it is starting under more favourable circumstances, with the experience of the others at its back, and with the sympathy of the public and of the average working man.

If in the end it succeeds in establishing the feeling of confidence and mutual respect between itself and its men that now exists at the South Metropolitan Gasworks, it will have done a great deal towards the solution of the labour problem, and conferred a lasting boon on the public and on trade. If, again, it can devise a safe and practically working benefit and pension fund for its men, it will have done for the docker what he could never have hoped for under trade unionism in his wildest dreams.

THE FEDERATION'S VICTORY—ITS FUTURE EFFECTS.

(From the "Globe.")

The last 12 months have done more towards educating the public mind on the labour question than any 12 years had previously effected, and they have certainly proved most disastrous to the new trade unions. The reason for this has been that the public has been gradually but surely grasping the meaning

of trade unionism as now applied, and having learned what it does mean, condemns it.

Twelve months ago people were under the impression that most of the working men in Great Britain belonged to one or other of the trade societies. Now they know that unionists are merely a minority, and further that many thousands of the men who are said to belong to the unions are only nominally attached to them.

Twelve months ago there was a general, though hazy, notion that the working man wished for a legal eight hours' day. Now it has been ascertained that not only do non-unionists object to it, but that the members of the unions when appealed to by ballot have recorded their votes dead against such legislation, and this in spite of their so-called demonstrations, the fiery oratory of their leaders, and the immense pressure brought to bear on them in the matter.

Twelve months ago the term "blackleg," as applied to the working man, carried with it, though nobody knew exactly why, a certain amount of vague opprobrium. But now it is understood to mean merely a man who has sufficient courage and spirit of independence to insist on selling his own labour at his own price, and to claim his right to serve one master instead of two.

Twelve months ago the suggestion that the capitalists in any one of our large trades could unite, and come to an understanding with their own labour, would have been scoffed at as the height of absurdity; for it had always been considered that the conflicting interests of the masters would alone more than suffice to render any really concerted action on a large scale impossible. But now we have before us in the Shipping Federation the practical proof not only that this can be done, but that it can be carried out in a trade where the interests of the masters clash at every step in ordinary business, and where competition between them is accentuated to the last degree.

We have already dealt with the working of this organisation in a recent article, and it is not necessary to say much more about it here. Its successful policy has day by day been making itself more apparent, and each step is duly marked and reported on. The Dockers' Union, seeing that the game is up, have deserted the Seamen and Firemen's Union, on the plea that it is not the docker's business to fight the sailor's battles. Nobody ever thought it was. But why did they waste their time by trying to do so in the first place? Other unions, now that the day has been lost, are censuring what they term "the senseless" strikes which are now going on in the shipping trades. Why did they not follow the example of the Riggers' Union, and say this at the beginning of the fight, and use their influence to prevent some of the distress which has been occasioned?

These "moderate" unions, as they are called, now profess to be shocked that unionists should demand the exclusion of non-society men. Yet these same "moderate" unions know well how to make the same demands themselves when the occasion requires, and they are adepts at hounding the non-unionist out of employment. But the reason why these "moderate" unions withheld their excellent advice until the dockers had lost the day is that it is in their interest that the quarrel between the union and the Federation should now be patched up at once, and as little said about it as possible. Had the Federation been defeated, it would have been another matter, and we should have heard another tale from the leaders of the "moderate" unions.

It is an open secret that these men are at the present time doing their best to bring about in the immediate future a series of strikes in more than one of the skilled trades. So far the hands have not risen to it all, and now that the dockers have been so ignominiously beaten, they are all the more shy. The success of the Federation's policy has been the very worst advertisement that trade unions have had, and on the attitude of the Federation at the present time depends in a great measure whether these strikes will take place or not.

The lesson which the Federation is teaching alike to man, master, and the public is having its natural effect. If the shipping trade can unite and manage its own labour what is to prevent masters in other trades entering into similar compacts with their men? This is the question which is being asked. In some trades it could be much more easily effected. In none would it be more difficult.

It is only natural that employers in many industries should be taking the matter into serious and practical consideration, and it is now merely a question as to when they will be forced into taking action. Nothing will be so likely to precipitate this as a series of unreasonable strikes at the present time.

The effect of extended Federation on the lines already commenced could only result in the natural deaths of such of the trade unions as have for their sole object the setting of labour against capital. On the other hand, any unions which are conscientiously representative of their men, or of the working man generally, need have nothing to fear, as in such trades no federation of master and man will become necessary, and consequently will not be formed. For as long as men are even partially satisfied that their interests are represented by their union they will not co-operate with employers against it.

The difficulties in the way of federating are so great, that nothing but a widespread feeling, shared alike by man and master, that unionism is ruining a trade, can call into life a federation or support it.

Organisations of this description cannot get on without men to work for them, and this is the great safeguard against their making a bad use of their power. For directly they lose the sympathy and support of the working man they must collapse. It is only because unionism has failed, and failed in a disgraceful manner, to be representative of the working man that federations have become necessary.

For federations of master and man to be successful in the long run, the interests of both must be equally and permanently studied. The scale of wages, and systems of work must be placed in the proper hands, and carefully managed on a fair basis. The benefits and superannuation fund (for it has now become a firm conviction among employers that these must form an essential feature in any federation scheme) must be worked out in a business-like and practical manner.

That a federation is in a far better position to provide in this way for its *employées* than any trade society is evident on the face of it. In such of the societies as profess to have benefits, so great a portion of the subscriptions is expended on supporting strikes, labour agitations, and union officials, that a man can only stand to receive a miserable superannuation pittance, which, under the most favourable circumstances, if he has no one dependent on him, may serve to keep him from actual starvation. This, too, is saddled with the unjust condition that he may not do any work which would enable him to add to his allowance.

A benefit scheme under a federation would be a very different matter, as it could be managed with but little expense, none of its funds need be misapplied, and, above all, it could be made absolutely sound, and the men would have a certainty of a substantial pension, untrammelled by unfair conditions.

As an example of what master and man can do in this way when they work together, we may mention that the superannuation scheme in vogue now at the South Metropolitan Gasworks, insures to the men when they are past work an annuity which is equal to about four times the amount they could hope to draw from the best of trade unions for a similar expenditure of money.

Whatever the upshot of extended federation may be, and whatever its greatest enemies may have to say against it, it has already rendered a great service to the community. It has shown the public that independent or free working men exist in large numbers. It has shown that with a little encouragement and a firm promise of protection, so-called unionists are only too glad to escape from the clutches of their union. It is no longer possible to pool-pooch the existence of the non-unionist, or to deny his claims to consideration in all matters connected with labour.

Certain new union agitators have recently claimed the right to membership on the forthcoming Parliamentary Commission on the labour question. If their demand is granted then real labour should also be adequately represented.

In any case it is to be hoped that the Commission in the course of its work will investigate the claims of the non-unionist, and arrange for him to be allowed to do his work according to his own ideas, and without molestation. Then federations will be unnecessary.

APPENDIX XCIII.

SPECIMEN of LITERATURE circulated by the SAILORS' UNION at the FORMATION of the SHIPPING FEDERATION (taken as a type).

Mr. J. H. WILSON on the SHIPPING FEDERATION.
Great Meeting at Newport.

Extract from the "South Wales Daily Telegraph,"
November the 7th, 1890.

A largely attended meeting of workmen employed in shipping circles and around the docks and wharves of Newport, was held in the Temperance Hall last night, to consider the question of the shipping crisis and the establishment of what are called "Free Labour" unions. Mr. Frank Gillman, secretary to the Newport Trades Council, and to the Newport branch of the Seamen and Firemen's Union, occupied the chair and was supported by Mr. J. H. Wilson, general secretary to the Seamen and Firemen's Union; Mr. J. Gardner and Mr. Albert Kenny, Cardiff; Mr. Orbell, Mr. W. Gibbs, Mr. W. Davies, chairman of the Newport Trades Council, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Vicory, and others.

The chairman, who arose amid loud cheers, said the meeting, over which it was an honour to preside, was called for the purpose of considering the present shipping crisis and the conduct of the Shipping Federation (laughter) in forming an alliance with those low rowdy boarding masters. (Laughter, and hear, hear.) Everyone there would be prepared to support true trades unionism (hear, hear) and to denounce to the best of their ability anything of a bogus nature. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. J. H. Wilson, general secretary of the Seamen's Union, who spoke first, was received with enthusiastic cheers. After some prefatory remarks respecting the splendid meeting being evidence of the fact that the men of Newport were determined to stand by the principles of trades unionism, he said they were there to consider the question of the free labour union. No doubt many of them had read in the papers that the shipowners of the country had formed themselves into what they called a shipping federation, with which, according to their talk in the newspapers, they intended to sweep the whole of the working-men's organisations out of sight. For years the working men had been at the mercy of these men, and yet these people, although they were aware of the fact that they were suffering many injustices, had never once come forward to champion their cause. Why were the employers taking such a kindly interest in their welfare to-day? They told them in the press, in the many interviews which they had with the newspaper reporters, that the working men were complaining about coercive measures which were adopted by the trade organisations. They also told people through the papers that there were thousands of their working men who, if they only had the opportunity, would sever their allegiance to the trades unions, and

GO BACK ONCE MORE TO THE FOLD

of their employers (laughter). Why should the working man sever his connection with his union that has done so much for the working men in the past, and more especially within the last two years, and which had secured for them increases of wages ranging from 10 to 50 per cent. in the case of seamen and firemen? (Hear, hear.) What inducement could the employers possibly offer to convince the working men that it was to their benefit to disband their organisation, and to go back once more to their tender mercies? Had the employers ever been merciful to the working men? Never. (Hear, hear.) The employers had never shown any mercy to the working men. In times of depression, no matter whether the particular industry in which they were engaged was profitable or not, as soon as ever the labour market was overstocked, as soon as ever there were 300 idle and only employment for 50, the employer stepped in with the cry of supply and demand, and so it was no good to pay 2s. when there were hundreds of men willing to accept employment at 18s. (Hear, hear.) They had never encouraged the working men to depend upon their generosity. There never was in any country in the world a more cruel set of back masters than the shipowners. If the employers had dealt justly with them in the past there would have been no employment for such vile agitators as himself.

(Laughter, and hear, hear.) Freedom of labour was what the masters said they were fighting for. What did they mean by freedom of labour? That was what they wanted to find out. If they called it freedom of labour where there were 100 men seeking employment where there was only work for 10, a circumstance in which employers could attempt to reduce wages, and get some portion of the 100 to out each other's throats, and accept employment at rates which were not sufficient to keep body and soul together, if that was

WHAT THEY CALLED FREEDOM OF LABOUR

he was convinced that the working men of Newport, and every town in the country, did not require any of their assistance, and especially if it was offered through a free labour union. (Cheers.) They never had had freedom of labour till this year. (Hear, hear, and applause.) They had always been at the mercy of the employers; but since the working men of the country, and especially the working men of the Bristol Channel, had had sense to combine together, making common cause with each other, and not standing disunited as they did in days of yore, they had compelled the employers to double down and got what they might term freedom of labour. (Loud applause.) Now that they had got freedom of labour were they prepared to sever their connection with their unions and tell the vile agitators (laughter) that they had no further use for them, because at last the employers had got into a reasonable frame of mind and were in the future going to deal justly with them if they would only go back into the arms of those sweat-loving creaturcs? (Laughter and applause.) This mighty federation reminded them of the story of the spider and the fly. With this mighty federation they were going to put the world to rights. He wanted to tell the shipowners that he was not opposed to their starting 20 mighty federations. As long as they combined for just and honest purposes, he, as one who had combined certain sections of working men, had no right to object; but when they told them, as they had done through the press, that this federation had been established for no other purpose than to bring working men into subjection, and by subjection they meant bringing them back once more to slavery (hear hear) he asked were they as free-born Britons, who never tired of proclaiming in all parts of the world "Britons never shall be slaves," going to allow this mighty syndicate to bring them back into slavery and make a mockery of that cry all over the world? (Cries of "No" and cheers.) Some of the shipowners had said they did not form the federation to injure the men of the union (laughter), but unfortunately all the members of the mighty body were not quite of one opinion on the matter. They had watched very closely the action and tactics of those gentlemen, and in their district they had allied themselves with

A GANG OF RUFFIANS

who had been a disgrace to this country for many years, (Cheers and laughter.) He need scarcely mention the names because he believed every working man in the hall knew to whom he referred. (Hear, hear, and applause.) They had allied themselves with these people, and yet they had told the press that they had no objection whatever to the unions, and were only determined to have perfect freedom in engaging whomsoever they liked. But what were the facts? They had ships arriving daily in Newport, Cardiff, and Swansea in which the captains had express instructions that they were to discharge all the members of the National Union and employ "scab" union men in their places. (Shame.) Did it appear as if they were not working in opposition to the unions? Their sole object and desire was to create an army of blacklegs in this country (hear, hear) and as soon as ever they had got their horde of scabs and blacklegs collected from the workhouses, the convict settlements, and other places they would turn round and say "We have got plenty of free and respectable labour and it is with

"these men, these honest English toilers, that we intend to carry on our work in the future, and you idlo vagabonds, who have been led astray by those vile agitators (laughter) we intend to dispense with your services and employ these free labourers." (Hear, hear.) The prosperity of the country had not been built up by men from prisons and workhouses, tramps picked up in the lanes; but it was the honest working men who had built it up, who had created the wealth, and who could not be done without. (Cheers.) As long as the working men had the intelligence to stand by their organisations they had no need to be afraid of any combination of capitalists, for after all their labour was of more value to the country than the shipowners' capital. The shipowners he was bound to say had other intentions in building up the federation than to deal with the wages. They had, some of them, sent their ships to sea in the hope that they would never return again (hear, hear, and "shame"), and some of them who had made such large piles of money in that way were the very men who were promoting the Shipping Federation to-day. Why were they floating the Shipping Federation? It was not because the unions had compelled them to pay fair and reasonable wages; but it was because after having allowed systematic murder to go on for years they had determined that they should cease, and it was because they had such a champion of the rights of the working men as Mr. Samuel Plimsoll (cheers) who brought in a Load Line Bill to check the murderous career of unscrupulous men, many of whom were so prominent in rendering assistance to the Shipping Federation. (Hear, hear, and applause.) It was in consequence of their having stopped the source of income from over insurance, and because they knew that as long as seamen and firemen and working men were combined they would be able to induce Parliament not only to prevent shipowners from overloading but also to stop undermanning, and to compel them to feed men like Christians and not like pigs (applause), and because they intended to have better accommodation on board of ships for the men. (Cheers.) These were some of the reasons why these pettyfogging, backsliding cut-throats were leaning on the Shipping Federation. (Hear, hear.) It was a large syndicate formed, not with the intention of fighting them on the wages question, but to give them freedom to once more

SEND MEN TO THEIR DOOM

in the old cold-blooded way. (Hear, hear and "Shame.") He was not going to say that all shipowners were the same. He knew he would be told, after that appeared in the press, that these were wild and extravagant statements. They had proof, however, that all shipowners were not honest and fair. The shipowners knew in their hearts that there were men of the character he had described, and they knew further that there were many men amongst the shipowners who would not deal honestly with each other. (Hear, hear.) These men were continually cutting down freights and wages in order to outdo each other. Mr. Wilson denounced the refusal of the shipowners to grasp the hand of labour when it was offered them some time ago for the foolish reason that it would be boycotting some of their number. The shipowners were going to starve them into subjection, and make them go down on their knees and beg, for God's sake, for them to set their tonnage afloat again. (Laughter and "Never.") They were going to starve their wives and families so that the men might have to crawl back to those merciful men and ask forgiveness for their past sins. (Renewed laughter.) If it came to a question of starvation it would be a general one. (Laughter and hear, hear.) When it came to a question of starvation who would come out first? Had they not learnt the working man to live on the smell of an oil rag? (Loud laughter and hear, hear.) If they laid up the whole tonnage of the country they would find in a short time that they

themselves would have to face starvation (hear, hear); and if they could do one week he was prepared to say that the working men could do five. (Cheers.) They were not afraid of threats of starvation. (Renewed cheers.) Working men did not intend to allow them to bounce them with that sort of talk into submitting mildly and meekly to their tactics. The employers would have to recognise this fact that the working men of this country had rights equally as well as they had. They would also have to recognise this fact, that the working men had a right to some share of the enjoyments of this world. (Cheers.)

THEY DID NOT WANT A LEVELLING DAY.

They did not advocate a levelling day; but they did want a levelling up (loud cheers and laughter), and what was more they were going to have it. (Renewed cheers.) They had no objection to the free labour men if they could find sufficient of them; but they had a perfect right to choose with whom they were going to work. The Shipping Federation would have to realise the fact that the Sailors and Firemen's Union was quite as strong as they were. (Hear, hear.) They had determined that in every case where they tried to persecute their men they would defend them inch by inch. (Cheers.) He did not see why the Shipping Federation should make itself so busy. They said they had been compelled in consequence of their coercive policy to adopt the mighty federation. Why did they not tell them where they had been coercive? Why did they not point out the cases and give the names of the owners and state the circumstances? If they did that the unions would be able to show the public that it was not the working men who were to blame, but the employers themselves. After giving particulars in the local case of a ship, where the master, either at Rotterdam or Hamburg, put up a notice, "No English need apply," he asked the working men to continue to use the tactics they had followed in the past. He hoped to see a federation of workers of every trade throughout the country. He might even go further than that and say they would hail with delight the day when working men of every country in the world would join hand in hand and say "We are brothers although we may not be of one colour." (Cheers.) There was no difference between the foreign sweater and the English one, and, therefore, the working men of this country as well as other countries must learn to combine and fight for each other, and then they might be able to tell capital its duty and be able to perform their own. (Hear, hear.) It was evident they would have to stand up and defend their rights. If not the employers would crush them, as they had done in days of yore; but once let them see that they were able to defend their own and then he believed they would come round to a more reasonable state of mind and concede to the working men what properly belonged to them. He urged them not to leave their organisation. The more the capitalist denounced their leaders and the organisation the more closely should the working men stand by them. (Cheers.) If he thought any number of capitalists were to praise him and recommend him to the working men as a right good fellow he would say to the working men "Write out my discharge and send me about my business." (Hear, hear.) The louder the capitalists denounced him the better he liked it, because then he knew he was doing justice to his fellow working men who employed him to look after their interests. (Hear, hear.) There was a poor look-in here for the Shipping Federation and their "scab" unions. (Cheers.) He did not think they were going to score a goal (laughter), and if there were any goals scored it would be the working men's organisations who would score them. (Hear, hear.) He would ask them to stand together, pull together, work together, and stand by their leaders, and then he felt certain the victory would be for labour. (Loud cheers.)

APPENDIX XCIV.

COPY of EXTRACT from the "NORTHERN DAILY MAIL" (October 24th, 1890), West Hartlepool, reporting the case of the "Bavaria," and stating the amount of fines.

"FRAGAS ON BOARD SHIP."

"To-day, at West Hartlepool Police Court, before Alderman G. Pyman (presiding) and Mr. B. C. Walker, three young men named George Kinnersley, John Allan, and Thomas Jordison, the latter a fireman on board the S.S. 'Bavaria,' of Dundee, were charged with assaulting John Simpson, mate of the same vessel, about twelve o'clock last night.

"Complainant, who appeared with his face covered with plaster, said about twelve o'clock last night he went forward for the purpose of calling the men on duty. He shouted several times but as there was no response he descended into the fore-castle where he found Kinnersley and Allan quarrelling with some of the crew. The two men named had no business on board but Jordison was a member of the crew. While endeavouring to pacify them the latter prisoner struck him (the prosecutor) several times on the face. He was assisted on deck by some of the crew who came to inquire into the cause of the disturbance. On arriving on deck the assault was renewed. He was kicked on the body and otherwise maltreated.

"Jenkin Rees, captain of the 'Bavaria,' said about the time named his attention was drawn to a disturbance in the fore-castle and hearing the mate was being murdered he entered the fore-castle. He saw all three prisoners knocking the mate all over the place and kicking him when he was down. During the melee the lamp was knocked down and they were left in the dark, but prisoners and the crew afterwards came on deck. By the assistance of the carpenter he carried complainant on deck and the disturbance was renewed during which complainant received several nasty blows.

"Thomas Dick, carpenter of the 'Bavaria' corroborated.

"Defendants, with the exception of Jordison, pleaded not guilty, but they were each fined 40s. and 8s. 4d. costs, or one month's imprisonment with hard labour."

[I certify the above to be a true extract from the 'Northern Daily Mail,' published at West Hartlepool, October 24th, 1890.

Signed,
JOHN McLEAN, Sub-Editor.]

APPENDIX XCV.

COPIES of LETTER, and EXTRACTS from LETTERS, of the AGENTS TO THE OWNERS concerning the case of the S.S. "BAVARIA."

West Hartlepool,
23rd October 1890.
DEAR SIR,
Your favour of yesterday, and telegram of last evening, are to hand.

The trouble and worry caused by the Union has been endless. The "Bavaria" will be bunkered by 6 p.m., and could have sailed this evening. Owing, however, to the disgraceful interference of the Union officials her crew cannot be completed, and a message has been despatched to Shields at 3 p.m., to procure four hands to make up the complement. The customs will be kept open till 11 p.m., to enable all necessary clearances, &c. to be effected to enable her to sail by the morning tide.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) MACLEAN, DOUGHTY, & Co.

Messrs. D. Scott and Sons,
Dundee.

P.S.—We have not yet got the surveyor's report, but we expect she will be about 60 stels; stowage deficient.

EXTRACT from LETTER from Messrs. MACLEAN, DOUGHTY, & Co., to Messrs. DAVID SCOTT & SON, Dundee.

West Hartlepool,
24th October 1890.

"We are in receipt of your esteemed favour of yesterday, and have exchanged messages to-day. We are

glad we were able to wire you the 'Bavaria's' departure at 2 p.m. The difficulties we have had with the Union have been beyond description, and it is a great relief the steamer has at length got away. When the men arrived from Shields last night they were willing to sail, but the other hands declined to go until to-day. The upshot was a general fight, in which the police interfered, and took three men as prisoners. The chief mate was injured about the head, but able to proceed in the ship. The captain will be writing you fully when he has time to do so. A more disgraceful exhibition of tyranny and bad conduct on the part of a labour organisation it would be difficult to conceive."

EXTRACT from LETTER from Messrs. MACLEAN, DOUGHTY, & Co., to Messrs. DAVID SCOTT & Co., Dundee.

West Hartlepool,
31st October 1890.

"The local secretary of the Shipowners' Society is in communication with Mr. G. A. Laws, re the trouble with the 'Bavaria's' crew.

"We do not consider it worth while to think about taking any further steps in the matter as the ringleaders in the disturbance on board were punished by the magistrates."

APPENDIX XCVI.

TABLE A.

STATEMENT showing the NUMBER and NET TONNAGE of SAILING and STEAM VESSELS on the REGISTER of the UNITED KINGDOM in each of the years from 1875 to 1890 inclusive.

Year.	Sailing.		Steam.		Total.	
	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Vessels.	Tonnage.
1875	20,849	4,153,688	4,167	1,945,492	25,016	6,099,180
1876	20,710	4,205,694	4,331	2,005,235	25,041	6,210,929
1877	20,740	4,210,402	4,560	2,139,058	25,300	6,349,460
1878	20,636	4,186,998	4,822	2,316,362	25,458	6,505,355
1879	20,131	4,022,544	5,024	2,511,132	25,155	6,533,676
1880	19,554	3,808,555	5,244	2,723,367	24,798	6,531,922
1881	18,566	3,649,286	5,502	3,003,987	24,468	6,653,173
1882	18,553	3,586,103	5,811	3,325,114	24,364	6,921,217
1883	18,089	3,480,191	6,258	3,728,115	24,345	7,208,306
1884	17,745	3,433,895	6,596	3,944,107	24,341	7,378,002
1885	16,727	3,426,458	6,638	3,973,304	23,365	7,399,757
1886	15,827	3,368,391	6,646	3,965,121	22,533	7,333,512
1887	15,217	3,223,497	6,653	4,084,921	21,870	7,308,418
1888	14,789	3,091,652	6,862	4,349,467	21,651	7,441,119
1889	14,413	3,019,659	7,132	4,717,465	21,545	7,737,124
1890	13,954	2,915,455	7,403	5,042,285	21,357	7,957,740

NOTE.—The foregoing table includes vessels registered in the Isle of Man but not vessels registered in the Channel Islands.

APPENDIX XCVII.

TABLE B.

STATEMENT showing the NUMBER and NET TONNAGE of VESSELS REGISTERED in the UNITED KINGDOM which were EMPLOYED at some time during each of the years 1875 to 1890 inclusive.

Year.	Sailing.		Steam.		Total.	
	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Vessels.	Tonnage.
1875	16,779	3,991,295	2,967	1,847,110	19,746	5,838,405
1876	16,794	4,073,766	3,117	1,869,982	19,911	5,943,748
1877	16,672	4,087,859	3,214	1,977,377	19,886	6,065,239
1878	16,282	4,026,399	3,386	2,169,916	19,668	6,196,315
1879	16,042	3,872,478	3,577	2,331,056	19,619	6,203,534
1880	15,799	3,707,952	3,786	2,594,034	19,585	6,301,986
1881	14,864	3,580,446	4,085	2,921,684	18,949	6,452,130
1882	14,246	3,388,608	4,378	3,290,774	18,624	6,679,382
1883	13,872	3,337,582	4,749	3,655,950	18,621	6,993,532
1884	13,610	3,228,739	4,864	3,825,459	18,474	7,054,198
1885	13,507	3,289,689	5,011	3,889,432	18,518	7,179,121
1886	12,740	3,204,601	4,914	3,911,697	17,654	7,116,298
1887	12,448	3,088,176	5,020	4,088,983	17,468	7,177,159
1888	12,076	3,031,022	5,283	4,597,613	17,359	7,328,634
1889	11,765	2,954,746	5,577	4,644,481	17,342	7,599,227
1890	11,365	2,871,755	5,848	5,021,532	17,213	7,893,287

NOTE.—The foregoing table does not include vessels belonging to the Channel Islands and only foreign-going vessels belonging to the Isle of Man, for which crews were engaged in the United Kingdom. Yachts have not been included in recent years.

APPENDIX XCVIII.

TABLE C.

STATEMENT showing the NUMBER of PERSONS employed in VESSELS registered in the UNITED KINGDOM which were employed at some time in each of the years 1875 to 1890.

Year.	Sailing.		Steam.		Total.	
	Crew employed (including Masters).		Crew employed (including Masters).		Crew employed (including Masters).	
1875	-	-	104,068	76,357	-	216,420
1876	-	-	139,745	75,925	-	215,670
1877	-	-	137,441	76,186	-	213,627
1878	-	-	133,675	78,859	-	212,534
1879	-	-	128,552	81,924	-	210,476
1880	-	-	121,960	88,066	-	210,026
1881	-	-	115,015	94,466	-	209,481
1882	-	-	109,353	103,090	-	212,343
1883	-	-	107,748	110,143	-	217,890
1884	-	-	103,689	113,106	-	216,795
1885	-	-	103,179	112,789	-	215,968
1886	-	-	96,964	123,923	-	220,887
1887	-	-	92,764	126,064	-	218,828
1888	-	-	89,397	133,011	-	222,408
1889	-	-	86,649	142,420	-	229,069
1890	-	-	83,079	151,831	-	234,910

The foregoing table includes a full crew and a master for every vessel included in Table B irrespective of the time the vessel was employed.

APPENDIX XCIX.

TABLE D.

NUMBER of PERSONS employed in VESSELS (registered under the Merchant Shipping Acts) belonging to the UNITED KINGDOM and the ISLE of MAN (but exclusive of the CHANNEL ISLANDS), which were returned as employed in the Home and Foreign Trades in each year from 1886 to 1890.

NOTE.—Persons employed in vessels engaged in inland navigation and in yachts are not included.

Year.	British Seamen.	Foreign Seamen.	Lascars.	Masters.*	Fishermen (including Skippers).	Total.
1886	144,332	24,767	16,673	13,917	21,203	220,892
1887	141,884	23,657	17,533	13,553	22,149	216,776
1888	144,201	24,937	18,437	13,390	21,958	222,923
1889	147,612	26,598	19,949	13,582	21,828	229,569
1890	151,133	26,998	23,734	13,563	20,483	236,911

* The number of masters is estimated at the rate of one for each trading vessel employed.

Note 1.—The number of persons employed in each year is the sum of the number of persons engaged for the first crew of each vessel employed during the year.

Note 2.—The above table only includes crews for such Isle of Man vessels as shipped their crews at ports in the United Kingdom for foreign voyages.

APPENDIX C.

TABLE E.—LOSS OF LIFE AT SEA.

STATEMENT showing the LOSS OF LIFE at SEA (in continuation of Parliamentary Papers C.—3875 and 150/91 to the latest date for which returns are made):—

Board of Trade,
12th January 1892. }

TABLE showing the LIVES lost by Wreck, Drowning, or other Accident in British Merchant Ships registered in the United Kingdom,

Calendar Years 1883 to 1891 inclusive.

Year.	Masters and Seamen employed.	Masters and Seamen lost.					Per-centages and Proportions.			Lives lost in Merchant Ships registered in United Kingdom.		
		Drowned.			By Accident other than Drowning.	Total Number lost by other Accident.	Masters and Seamen lost to Masters and Seamen employed.			Masters and Seamen.	Passengers (lost by Wreck only).	Total.
		By Wrecks and Casualties.	When Vessel was not damaged.	Total.			Number lost by Wrecks and Casualties to number employed.	Number lost by Wrecks and Casualties and other than by Drowning or Accidents to number employed.	Number lost by Drowning and other Accidents to number employed.			
1883	191,110	2,023	666	2,689	210	2,899	1'06 or 1 in 94	1'41 or 1 in 71	1'52 or 1 in 66	2,899	89	2,988
1884	189,056	1,186	530	1,766	189	1,935	'63 or 1 in 159	'93 or 1 in 107	1'03 or 1 in 97	1,935	227	2,162
1885	195,717	1,189	469	1,658	192	1,850	'91 or 1 in 165	'85 or 1 in 118	'95 or 1 in 106	1,850	54	1,904
1886	190,689	1,092	500	1,592	186	1,778	'85 or 1 in 183	'80 or 1 in 125	'89 or 1 in 112	1,778	63	1,841
1887	196,679	1,242	534	1,776	218	1,994	'83 or 1 in 153	'90 or 1 in 111	1'01 or 1 in 99	1,994	329	2,323
1888	201,165	968	535	1,531	209	1,760	'43 or 1 in 208	'77 or 1 in 130	'87 or 1 in 114	1,760	774	2,534
1889	207,741	794	517	1,611	236	1,847	'38 or 1 in 262	'66 or 1 in 147	'79 or 1 in 126	1,847	31	1,878
1890	214,427	1,166	*	*	*	*	'54 or 1 in 184	*	*	*	161	*
1891	*	836	*	*	*	*	'39 or 1 in 255	*	*	*	539†	*

† Including 531 lost in "Utopia."

NOTE.—The figures in column 1 of the Return C.—3875, 1884, for years prior to 1883 included some Lascars and a large number of men employed in fishing vessels, and the figures in columns 3, 5, and 6, included some duplicate entries, a few deaths of Lascars and a number of deaths in colonial vessels and fishing vessels. A detailed examination of the figures for the year 1881 showed that these errors balanced each other, and that the proportions given in columns 8, 9, and 10 were therefore substantially accurate.

The uncorrected and corrected figures for 1881 were as follows:—

1881 Uncor- rected.	209,481	2,352	1,123.	3,475	273	3,748	1'12 or 1 in 89	1'66 or 1 in 60	1'79 or 1 in 56	3,748	231	3,979
1881 Cor- rected.	186,719	2,352	732	3,084	194	3,278	1'36 or 1 in 79	1'65 or 1 in 60'64	1'78 or 1 in 56'96	3,278	231	3,509

The process of correction is fully set forth in Appendix D. to Parliamentary Paper C.—5094, 1887.

The figures for recent years include no duplicate entries, nor any returns relating to deaths in colonial vessels, nor employment or deaths in fishing vessels, and have been compiled on precisely the same lines as the corrected figures for 1881, except that the returns relating to Lascars have been more complete in recent years, and that since the year 1886 returns relating to employment and deaths in yachts have been omitted. Column 2 includes only deaths at sea, but columns 3 and 5 include not only deaths at sea, but also some deaths in rivers and harbours.

NOTES.—The loss of life other than by wrecks and casualties for the last two years cannot yet be inserted.

The figures in column 2 for 1890 and 1891 are subject to correction.

The per-centage for 1891 is worked on the "Employed" figures for 1890, the Navigation and Shipping Return for 1891 not being published.

APPENDIX CI.

TABLE F.—LOSS OF LIFE IN SHIPS registered in the UNITED KINGDOM by "WRECKS" and "CASUALTIES." Calendar years 1875 to 1891.

Ships registered in the United Kingdom only. No Fishing Vessels.

Whole NUMBER of LIVES lost by WRECKS and CASUALTIES to Sailing and Steamships registered in the United Kingdom, whether attended with total loss of Ships or not, and showing also the headings under which the Wrecks and Casualties are classed.

Year.	Classification.											
	(1.) Grand Totals.		(2.) Collisions.		(3.) Strandings.		(4.) Foundering.		(5.) Missing.		(6.) Other Causes.	
	Crew.	Passen- gers.	Crew.	Passen- gers.	Crew.	Passen- gers.	Crew.	Passen- gers.	Crew.	Passen- gers.	Crew.	Passen- gers.
1875	1,299	193	52	2	314	122	154	5	670	39	109	25
1876	1,650	178	107	22	343	6	96	1	1,018	147	86	2
1877	1,233	208	97	65	317	119	113	9	628	15	78	—
1878	1,131	60	40	10	279	87	78	2	639	8	95	3
1879	1,338	218	107	15	195	17	107	117	851	61	78	3
1880	1,691	98	44	1	399	11	171	62	997	11	130	13
1881	2,352	231	104	3	585	162	145	19	1,414	30	104	17
1882	1,568	84	91	10	844	30	114	2	916	10	103	2
1883	2,023	89	33	6	357	16	114	56	1,946	11	123	—
1884	1,186	227	143	96	253	117	113	2	682	5	7	—
1885	1,159	54	61	31	147	11	100	1	770	19	111	2
1886	1,092	53	25	4	171	38	89	4	709	6	98	1
1887	1,245	359	85	269	246	57	122	23	701	7	91	3
1888	966	774	147	7	208	6	57	—	491	756*	63	5
1889	771	55	175	4	101	32	40	2	377	24	78	3
1890	1,166	161	98	5	228	99	90	38	670	16	80	3
1891†	896	535	104	525†	252	9	71	1	319	—	90	—

* Including 703 lost in the S.S. "Vaitarna," trading in India. † Including 521 lost in the S.S. "Utopia" at Gibraltar.
‡ The figures for 1891 are subject to correction.

APPENDIX CII.

TABLE G. (a).—SAILING SHIPS: "Wrecks" (i.e., total losses only) Calendar years 1875 to 1891 inclusive.

Ships registered in the United Kingdom only. No Fishing Vessels.
NUMBER OF VESSELS, TONS and LIVES lost by each description of Wreck.

Year.	(1.) Grand Totals.												Classification.											
	Vessels lost.		Lives lost.		(2.) Collisions.		(3.) Strandings.		(4.) Foundering.		(5.) Missing.		(6.) Other causes.		Vessels lost.		Lives lost.							
	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.				
1875	490	144,303	921	84	43	6,805	22	2	290	78,706	223	62	33	20,769	137	4	55	17,603	534	26	20	11,931	—	—
1876	407	100,842	1,119	78	30	5,554	49	—	131	71,009	274	6	86	36,347	72	1	64	36,727	716	70	37	20,333	10	1
1877	435	133,333	753	90	34	10,059	71	65	295	89,228	170	5	63	23,744	75	9	45	13,731	436	11	26	14,523	1	—
1878	446	141,384	743	34	35	6,200	30	1	247	65,746	177	24	93	31,019	46	2	44	17,940	479	7	27	16,979	11	—
1879	420	139,304	747	78	40	8,150	40	3	236	71,348	89	7	84	24,905	53	2	45	22,654	562	60	14	8,510	4	—
1880	623	193,119	1,119	17	31	8,974	34	—	253	88,220	201	2	123	46,545	90	—	78	23,138	759	9	42	31,242	35	6
1881	645	198,476	1,004	17	47	12,223	71	1	343	84,911	379	6	103	37,331	79	—	112	35,226	1,036	10	41	25,632	9	—
1882	463	154,012	871	16	33	7,836	35	3	254	81,651	153	4	80	23,571	33	—	61	26,267	610	7	25	16,537	29	3
1883*	470	152,103	1,123	31	20	7,350	31	2	296	74,420	191	6	80	25,580	63	—	33	31,545	838	11	23	15,908	—	—
1884	334	107,009	997	75	30	3,255	28	—	190	63,016	161	68	51	14,802	37	—	20	17,984	440	5	23	12,943	1	—
1885	304	107,609	634	17	37	5,941	33	3	178	37,272	93	6	43	14,149	37	—	40	19,540	464	9	16	10,727	27	—
1886	391	132,272	630	15	42	4,618	13	—	213	38,090	119	5	66	15,321	79	4	33	15,302	411	6	42	25,263	17	—
1887	263	94,909	313	207	29	3,343	61	353	134	44,566	111	—	41	14,040	33	2	26	13,229	309	2	26	14,126	5	—
1888*	297	110,056	547	26	23	10,894	73	6	157	30,969	116	2	46	12,041	14	—	39	15,321	346	45	31	21,551	1	—
1889	215	83,415	391	30	26	3,117	68	—	122	40,131	76	16	29	7,533	6	1	34	12,869	297	1	14	8,693	13	—
1890	276	89,694	637	16	33	3,150	35	1	156	44,990	146	1	42	13,026	7	—	34	20,021	441	14	9	8,439	9	—
1891*	275	79,501	431	7	29	4,301	33	3	137	43,070	131	4	49	15,506	30	—	40	8,330	214	—	19	10,205	13	—

* The figures for the year 1891 are subject to correction.

TABLE G. (b).—STEAMSHIPS: "Wrecks" (i.e., total losses only). Calendar years 1875 to 1891 inclusive.

Ships registered in United Kingdom only. No Fishing Vessels.
NUMBER OF VESSELS, TONS, and LIVES lost by each description of Wreck.

Year.	Classification.																							
	(1.) Grand Totals.				(2.) Collisions.				(3.) Strandings.				(4.) Foundering.				(5.) Missing.				(6.) Other Causes.			
	Vessels lost.		Lives lost.		Vessels lost.		Lives lost.		Vessels lost.		Lives lost.		Vessels lost.		Lives lost.		Vessels lost.		Lives lost.		Vessels lost.		Lives lost.	
	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.
1875	69	44,140	307	106	10	4,613	24	—	47	32,045	83	70	5	940	17.	1	6	4,044	136	13	1	1,598	47	25
1876	78	65,299	443	90	14	9,500	47	22	44	26,987	66	—	6	5,402	24	—	10	9,896	304	77	4	3,415	2	—
1877	79	48,543	379	85	9	4,077	24	—	47	27,838	123	91	10	4,130	38	—	9	5,421	192	4	4	2,077	2	—
1878	90	68,485	280	18	10	7,365	7	9	58	38,423	87	8	11	5,822	32	—	8	5,580	160	1	3	1,296	—	—
1879	107	78,632	502	137	12	9,614	59	12	64	45,323	97	9	14	10,591	55	115	13	12,508	239	1	4	746	2	—
1880	90	64,937	466	71	14	10,844	6	—	49	39,081	130	7	15	10,602	81	69	10	8,346	233	2	2	914	1	—
1881	135	91,779	636	106	14	9,061	23	1	83	57,635	194	156	18	11,090	69	19	17	12,946	348	20	3	1,047	—	—
1882	146	105,003	601	14	19	13,006	49	7	92	63,293	171	2	17	10,226	81	9	13	11,898	309	3	6	4,590	—	—
1883	142	101,388	772	67	19	13,934	45	3	86	80,911	164	8	8	6,602	51	56	24	17,909	508	—	6	3,027	4	—
1884	146	118,877	377	129	31	23,652	90	62	89	74,939	60	47	12	6,015	76	—	9	4,260	142	—	5	4,711	—	—
1885	126	106,635	460	33	23	13,889	37	17	74	69,837	44	5	14	9,364	78	1	11	11,344	306	10	4	1,011	—	—
1886	127	99,735	340	32	16	12,730	1	—	80	80,515	40	32	10	4,616	10	—	16	12,292	298	—	6	1,592	—	—
1887	128	98,725	633	86	17	8,605	20	3	68	56,129	130	66	22	10,987	80	21	16	18,709	392	5	5	4,335	—	—
1888	109	73,100	361	71	25	18,389	73	1	66	39,570	89	3	15	10,714	43	—	6	8,695	147	706*	7	892	—	—
1889	105	80,731	301	51	24	13,872	138	3	60	46,173	20	4	11	5,005	32	1	5	5,745	110	23	5	4,376	1	—
1890	130	110,694	427	141	21	14,307	39	2	70	72,205	35	98	17	8,674	32	38	9	9,613	220	3	7	6,195	1	—
1891†	116	91,652	277	53	32	24,592	71	52†	54	46,547	73	—	16	9,366	52	—	4	4,123	81	—	10	7,324	—	—

* Including 708 lost in the S.S. "Vaitarna" trading in India. † Lost in the S.S. "Utopia" at Gibraltar.

‡ The figures for the year 1891 are subject to correction.

TABLE G. (c).—STEAM AND SAILING SHIPS: "Wrecks" (i.e., total losses only). Calendar years 1875 to 1891 inclusive.

Ships registered in United Kingdom only. No Fishing Vessels.
NUMBER OF VESSELS, TONS, and LIVES lost by each description of Wreck.

Year.	Classification.																							
	(1.) Grand Totals.				(2.) Collisions.				(3.) Strandings.				(4.) Foundering.				(5.) Missing.				(6.) Other Causes.			
	Vessels lost.		Lives lost.		Vessels lost.		Lives lost.		Vessels lost.		Lives lost.		Vessels lost.		Lives lost.		Vessels lost.		Lives lost.		Vessels lost.		Lives lost.	
	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Passengers.
1875	559	188,403	1,228	193	53	10,818	53	2	337	111,651	305	123	88	30,690	154	5	61	21,646	679	39	21	13,680	47	25
1876	575	216,141	1,592	177	44	16,043	96	22	325	98,896	340	6	91	41,839	96	1	74	30,683	1,018	147	41	23,740	12	1
1877	536	194,870	1,132	193	43	14,127	95	65	342	117,133	293	96	93	29,874	113	9	57	19,103	628	15	29	16,000	3	—
1878	594	200,369	1,029	129	45	13,694	37	10	305	103,167	294	32	104	36,834	78	2	82	23,539	639	8	30	18,275	11	—
1879	627	211,446	1,340	200	52	17,794	96	16	300	110,663	186	16	98	35,406	107	117	69	34,962	851	61	18	6,536	6	—
1880	715	258,106	1,276	88	45	19,618	40	—	401	122,501	331	9	137	57,447	171	62	86	54,484	907	11	44	22,166	36	6
1881	780	290,255	2,240	213	61	21,347	90	2	480	142,546	673	163	130	46,451	145	10	129	51,242	1,414	30	44	20,669	9	—
1882	804	297,015	1,472	30	67	20,643	84	10	346	144,944	329	6	97	34,097	114	2	74	37,165	916	10	30	20,197	29	2
1883	612	256,486	1,895	89	39	21,294	76	5	346	134,331	355	10	89	32,432	114	66	100	49,454	1,346	11	33	18,935	4	—
1884	460	220,879	1,044	804	61	32,007	127	89	279	127,665	221	113	63	20,817	113	2	40	22,444	582	5	28	17,666	1	—
1885	490	213,704	1,094	60	60	19,880	60	10	253	127,509	137	11	57	23,513	100	1	51	30,884	770	19	20	12,378	27	—
1886	518	218,077	988	47	53	17,338	14	—	298	117,014	150	37	66	19,637	89	4	40	30,594	708	6	47	27,324	17	—
1887	360	198,634	1,158	332	43	16,863	81	268	202	100,695	243	66	63	25,937	122	23	62	31,998	701	7	30	18,991	5	—
1888	390	188,816	893	768	30	20,253	141	7	215	10,459	294	5	61	22,755	67	—	34	19,916	491	756*	38	22,453	1	—
1889	320	169,147	693	51	30	27,989	106	3	182	93,354	66	22	40	17,598	40	2	20	18,698	377	24	10	14,568	13	—
1890	408	200,818	1,084	157	50	23,460	54	8	232	117,105	230	69	59	21,600	89	36	43	29,624	604	17	16	8,654	10	—
1891†	339	171,053	793	628	61	28,493	60	624†	101	80,617	234	4	65	25,071	72	—	44	9,443	295	—	28	18,029	19	—

* Including 708 lost in the S.S. "Vaitarna" trading in India. † Including 821 lost in the S.S. "Utopia" at Gibraltar.

‡ The figures for the year 1891 are subject to correction.

TABLE H. (b).—TIMBER LADEN SHIPS, &c.—continued.

MISSING.																						
Year.	Bound to the United Kingdom from Foreign or Colonial Ports.				Bound between Ports Abroad.				In United Kingdom Coasting Trade.				In Foreign and Colonial Local Trades.				Total.				Grand Total.	
	Steam.		Sailing.		Steam.		Sailing.		Steam.		Sailing.		Steam.		Sailing.		Steam.		Sailing.		Vessels.	Lives lost.
	Vessels.	Lives lost.	Vessels.	Lives lost.	Vessels.	Lives lost.	Vessels.	Lives lost.	Vessels.	Lives lost.	Vessels.	Lives lost.	Vessels.	Lives lost.	Vessels.	Lives lost.	Vessels.	Lives lost.	Vessels.	Lives lost.		
1873	—	—	9	115	—	—	1	8	—	—	3	15	—	—	1	10	—	—	14	148	14	148
1874	—	—	5	85	—	—	2	13	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	4	—	—	8	102	8	102
1875	—	—	2	44	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	5	—	—	3	40	3	40
1876	—	—	1	8	—	—	2	36	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	13	—	—	4	56	4	56
1877	—	—	2	34	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	2	34	2	34
1878	1	20	2	24	—	—	1	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	30	1	20	5	59	6	79
1879	—	—	1	10	—	—	1	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	18	2	18
1880	—	—	6	109	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	6	—	—	9	115	9	115
1881	—	—	10	148	—	—	5	73	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	9	—	—	16	229	16	229
1882	—	—	1	17	—	—	1	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	8	—	—	4	32	4	32
1883	—	—	5	97	—	—	1	9	—	—	2	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	113	8	113
1884	—	—	2	36	—	—	2	16	—	—	1	5	—	—	2	9	—	—	7	66	7	66
1885	—	—	3	42	—	—	2	21	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	63	5	63
1886	—	—	6	83	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	83	6	83
1887	1	18	2	25	—	—	2	16	—	—	1	2	1	6	2	12	2	24	7	55	9	79
1888	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1889	—	—	2	33	—	—	2	16	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	40	4	40
1890	—	—	1	9	—	—	2	13	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	15	—	—	5	36	5	36
1891	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	9	1	9

TOTAL.

1873	—	—	27	137	—	—	5	18	—	—	4	15	—	—	5	12	—	—	41	177	41	177
1874	—	—	10	114	—	—	7	13	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	4	—	—	29	131	29	131
1875	—	—	11	60	—	—	5	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	3	6	—	—	20	67	20	67
1876	—	—	9	36	—	—	4	36	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	30	—	—	18	102	18	102
1877	—	—	13	39	—	—	5	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	20	40	20	40
1878	1	20	10	24	—	—	7	11	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	30	1	20	21	66	22	88
1879	—	—	3	26	—	—	7	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	—	—	13	33	13	33
1880	—	—	32	164	—	—	5	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	7	—	—	43	174	43	174
1881	—	—	29	137	—	—	10	75	—	—	1	—	—	—	5	13	—	—	45	275	45	275
1882	1	—	3	18	—	—	3	7	—	—	1	1	—	—	6	8	1	—	13	34	14	34
1883	—	—	10	113	—	—	6	32	—	—	3	7	—	—	3	—	—	—	22	151	22	151
1884	—	—	6	46	—	—	3	16	—	—	2	5	—	—	5	9	—	—	16	75	16	75
1885	—	—	5	42	—	—	4	31	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	10	74	10	74
1886	—	—	13	86	—	—	4	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	21	86	21	86
1887	1	18	8	25	—	—	12	25	—	—	1	2	1	6	7	12	2	24	28	64	30	88
1888	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	4	1	—	3	—	2	—	5	4	7	4
1889	—	—	4	36	—	—	7	18	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	4	—	—	18	58	18	58
1890	1	—	11	9	—	—	4	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	16	1	—	19	36	20	36
1891	—	—	5	9	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	11	9	11	9

APPENDIX CIV.

TABLE I.

RETURN of CASES from 6th May 1885 to 3rd February 1892, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have proceeded summarily against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, Section 24, for improper DECK-LOADING.

1885.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1885, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, Section 24, for DECK-LOADING.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
PART I. (English.)							
"Cambrian"	Master	Deck-loading	Lowestoft	6 May	Convicted	£ s. d. 25 0 0	£ s. d. 0 8 6

1887.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1887, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, Section 24, for DECK-LOADING.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
PART I. (English.)							
"Commonwealth"	Master	Deck cargo, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	Sligo	21 December	Convicted	£ s. d. 10 0 0	£ s. d. —
"Louise"	"	"	Hull	30 December	"	1 0 0	1 6 0
PART II. (Foreign.)							
"Waldimir"	"	Deck cargo, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	Hull	21 December	"	1 1 0 to include costs.	—

1888.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1888, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, Section 24, for DECK-LOADING.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
PART I. (English.)							
"Talbot"	Master	Excessive deck cargo	Cockermouth	9 January	Dismissed	£ s. d. —	£ s. d. —
"Empress"	"	Deck cargo, Merchant Shipping Act, 1875, section 24.	Liverpool	14 February	Convicted	10 0 0	2 18 1
"City of Lincoln"	"	"	"	23 February	"	2 0 0	3 1 4
"Rogerson"	"	"	Barrow	29 February	"	3 0 0	1 18 0
"Capulet"	"	"	Liverpool	20 March	"	10 0 0	2 18 0
"Niobe"	"	"	Londonderry	26 March	"	1 0 0	1 0 0
PART II. (Foreign.)							
"Stanley" (Norway)	"	Deck cargo, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	Liverpool	28 February	"	2 0 0	2 18 0

1889.

RETURN of CASES, for the Year 1889, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, Section 24, for DECK-LOADING.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
PART I. (English.)							
"Bron Hambro"	Master	Deck-loading, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	Cardiff	13 February	Convicted	£ s. d. 10 0 0	£ s. d. 0 18 6
"Westella"	"	"	Hull	12 December	"	1 0 0	1 6 0
"Mojjam"	"	"	Liverpool	7 December	"	2 0 0	2 19 4
PART II. (Foreign.)							
"Commerziawith Fowler" (German).	"	Excessive deck cargo, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	Boston	15 January	"	5 0 0	1 11 6
"Artushof" (Germany).	"	"	Cardiff	27 February	"	2 0 0	0 14 0
"Noah" (Norway)	"	"	Goole	27 March	Summons dismissed.	But with no costs.	—
"Gioja" (Norway)	"	"	Blackpool	8 April	"	—	—
"Magnus Barford" (Norway).	"	"	North Shields.	11 April	Convicted	5 0 0	1 15 9

1890.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1890, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, Section 24, for DECK-LOADING.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
PART I. (English.)							
"Ione"	Master	Deck-loading, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	London (Bow Street).	6 May	Convicted	£ s. d. 3 0 0	£ s. d. —
"Ione"	Owner	Being party to above	"	"	Withdrawn	—	—
"Norway"	Master	Deck-loading, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	West Hartlepool.	23 May	Convicted	10 0 0	0 9 0
PART II. (Foreign.)							
"Uguzeems" (Russian).	"	Deck cargo, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	Leith	17 January	"	5 0 0	1 1 0
"Lamiter" (Russia).	"	Deck-loading, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	King's Leith	10 March	"	5 0 0	3 9 0
"Hooding" (Norway).	"	"	Liverpool	16 April	"	25 0 0	2 14 8
"Orne" (Norway)	"	"	London (Bow Street)	6 May	"	5 0 0	2 2 0
"Viktoria" (Norway).	"	"	"	"	"	5 0 0	2 2 0
"Padre Angeno" M. 9238/90 (Italian).	"	Deck-loading, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	Goole	4 June	"	0 10 0	0 9 0
"Lindsholmer" (Sweden).	"	"	West Hartlepool.	12 December	"	2 0 0	0 9 0
"Pollux" (Russia)	"	"	Plymouth	16 December	"	10 0 0	2 12 0

1891.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1891, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, Section 24, for DECK-LOADING.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
PART I. (English.)							
"Laneberg"	Master	Deck cargo, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	West Hartlepool.	9 January	Convicted	£ s. d. 5 0 0	£ s. d. 0 11 0
"Ruth"	"	"	Glasgow	4 February	"	5 0 0 to include costs.	3 12 4
"Eugene Gasta"	"	"	Haverford-west.	8 January	"	5 0 0	2 3 0
"Mark Curry"	"	"	Liverpool	24 March	"	40 0 0	0 6 6
"Mary Lobden"	"	"	West Hartlepool.	25 March	"	5 0 0	0 7 6
"Tanored"	"	"	Cardiff	6 May	"	5 0 0	2 2 6
"Celesto"	"	"	Newport	27 July	"	15 0 0 to include costs.	—
"Panther"	"	"	Hull	8 December	"	1 0 0	0 5 0
"Thyra"	"	"	"	"	"	2 0 0	1 6 0
"Zeriba"	"	"	Falkirk	14 December	"	5 0 0	—
PART II. (Foreign.)							
"Sigva" (Sweden)	"	Deck cargo, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	London (Bow Street).	7 February	"	5 0 0	1 1 0
"Bravo" (Sweden)	"	"	Goole	25 February	"	0 10 0	0 13 0

1891.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1891, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, Section 24, for DECK-LOADING.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
PART II. (Foreign.)							
"Gustavo" (German)	Master and owner.	Deck cargo, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 24.	Falkirk	24 March	Convicted.	£ s. d. 4 4 0	£ s. d. —
"Alexander II." (German).	Master	"	Hull	23 March	"	1 0 0	1 8 0
"Uhlenhorst" (German).	"	"	Newcastle	2 March	"	10 0 0	7 18 0
"Lamek" (Russia)	"	"	Goole	25 March	"	0 5 0	2 4 0
"Elgor" (Norway)	"	"	Edinburgh	7 April	"	5 0 0	—
"Clarkour" (Denmark).	"	"	Hull	29 April	"	2 0 0	1 6 0
"Lahneck" (German).	"	"	"	17 April	"	1 0 0	1 6 0
"Christian Johnson" (Norway).	"	"	Newcastle	16 April	"	5 0 0	2 11 0
"Framet" (Sweden)	"	"	Hull	23 November	"	2 10 0	1 8 0
"Henry F. Smith" (U.S.A.).	"	"	Liverpool	3 December	"	10 0 0	0 4 6
"Progress" (Norway).	"	"	Edinburgh	28 December	"	3 0 0	—
"Charles Devouport" (U.S.A.).	"	"	Falkirk	29 December	"	10 0 0	—
"Litonia" (Russia)	"	"	"	30 December	"	15 0 0	—
"Pietronella" (Denmark).	"	"	Cupar Fife	7 December	"	7 0 0 or 30 days' imprisonment.	2 0 0
"La Rochelle" (France).	"	"	Newport (Mon.).	"	"	20 0 0	0 16 0

1892.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1892, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, Section 24, for DECK-LOADING.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
PART I. (English.)							
"Cardiff Castle" -	Master	Deck-loading	Liverpool	3 February	Convicted	£ s. d. 1 0 0	£ s. d. 2 18 0
PART II. (Foreign.)							
"Max" (Russia) -	"	Deck-loading	Falkirk	29 January	"	9 0 0	—

APPENDIX CV.

TABLE J.

CUSTOMS CONSOLIDATION ACT, 1853.

Section CLXX.—Before any clearing officer permits any ship wholly or in part laden with timber or wood goods to clear out from any British port in North America or in the settlement of Honduras for any port in the United Kingdom at any time after the 1st day of September or before the 1st day of May in any year, he shall ascertain that the whole of the cargo of such ship is below deck, and shall give the master of such ship a certificate to that effect, and no master of any ship so laden shall sail from any of the ports aforesaid for any port of the United Kingdom at any such time as aforesaid until he has obtained such certificate from the clearing officer.

Section CLXXI.—No master of any ship in respect of which such certificate as aforesaid has been obtained shall place or permit or cause to be placed or remain upon or above the deck of such ship any part of the cargo thereof until such ship has arrived at the port of her destination. Provided always that if the master of

any such ship consider that it is necessary, in consequence of the springing a leak or of other damage received or apprehended during the voyage, to remove any portion of the cargo upon deck, he may remove or cause to be removed upon the deck of such ship so much of the cargo and may permit the same to remain there for such time as he considers expedient, provided also that the store spars or other articles necessary for the ship's use shall not be taken to be the cargo for the purposes of this Act.

Section CLXXII.—If any master of any ship for which such certificate as aforesaid is required sails or attempts to sail without having obtained such certificate or places or permits or causes to be placed or to remain or be upon or above the deck of such ship any part of the cargo thereof, except in the cases in which the same is not hereby forbidden, he shall for every offence forfeit and pay any sum not exceeding 100*l.*

APPENDIX CVI.

TABLE K.

The ENTRIES of TONNAGE coming into the PORTS of LONDON, GLASGOW, and LIVERPOOL in the last five years were as follow, in thousands of tons:—

	1886.	1887.	1888.	1889.	1890.
Glasgow - -	2,586	2,713	2,685	2,789	2,874
Liverpool - -	7,566	7,940	8,104	8,445	8,408
London - -	11,986	12,307	13,114	13,662	13,141

Omitting the COASTING TRADE, the entries were, in thousands of tons:—

	1886.	1887.	1888.	1889.	1890.
Glasgow - -	918	972	994	1,058	1,121
Liverpool - -	5,017	5,186	5,368	5,789	5,789
London - -	6,810	6,880	7,470	7,550	7,708

APPENDIX CVII.

TABLE O.
CRIMPING.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1854, SS. 147 AND 148. RETURN OF PROCEEDINGS UNDER.

No.	Ship.	Defendant.	Port.	Result.	
1889.					
23,419/88	"Edna" -	C. Hansen -	Hull -	Acquitted.	
4,970/89	"Marabout" -	C. Soley -	Liverpool -	Convicted.	
5,792/88	"Abyssinia" -	W. Palmer -	London - (Bow Street).	"	
10,520/89	"Knight of St. Michael." -	J. Jenkins -	Cardiff -	"	
11,816/	"Salham" -	D. Coniston -	" -	Acquitted.	
11,815/	" -	H. J. Harwood -	" -	"	
12,706/	"Adriatic" -	G. Howil -	Liverpool -	Convicted.	
No. M. No.	"Favonian" -	J. Langdon -	" -	Acquitted.	
15,312/89	"Lydie" -	A. Roderick -	Cardiff -	Convicted.	
1890.					
370/90	"John Smith" -	E. Webby -	Plymouth -	Convicted.	
4,143/	"Sirocco" -	M. Page and E. Webby.	" -	Acquitted.	
5,542/	"Anglia" -	J. E. Shore -	Greenock -	Convicted.	
5,542/	" -	J. Gallagher -	" -	"	
19,470/	"Godrevy" -	P. B. Sutcliffe -	Glasgow -	"	
1891.					
M. S. 538/91	" -	J. H. Lamb -	Liverpool -	Convicted.	Receiving money for procuring employment.
15,001/	"Lux" -	J. J. Johns -	Cardiff -	Acquitted.	
15,861	"Nairnshire" -	J. Niel -	London - (Bow Street).	Convicted.	

APPENDIX CVIII.

TABLE P.

RETURN OF CASES from January 1883 to January 1892 inclusive, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have proceeded summarily against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for OVERLOADING their VESSELS so as to submerge in Salt Water the Centre of the Disc or for proceeding to SEA after VESSEL had been detained.

1883.

RETURN OF CASES for the Year 1883, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for taking their VESSELS to SEA after DETENTION.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs.
"Orguelle" -	Master	Taking vessel to sea whilst under detention, section 34.	Bristol	18 January	Convicted	£ s. d. 20 0 0	£ s. d. —
SS. "Black Diamond."	"	"	"	17 March	Acquitted, but costs refused.	—	—
"Gracie" -	"	"	London	9 April	Convicted.	100 0 0	25 0 0
"Christian" -	"	"	Portsmouth	23 May	"	50 0 0	19 6 0 or 6 months' imprisonment.
"President field." Gar-	Managing Owner.	Sending vessel to sea whilst under detention, section 34. (Vessel overloaded.)	Renfrew	3 July	"	80 0 0	—
"President field." Gar-	Cashier to above.	Sending vessel to sea whilst under detention, section 34.	"	"	"	20 0 0	—
"Arthur" -	Master	Taking vessel to sea whilst under detention, section 34.	Hull	16 July	"	100 0 0	19 15 0
"Arthur" -	Owner	Being party to taking vessel to sea whilst under detention, section 34.	"	"	"	100 0 0	—

1884.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1884, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for OVERLOADING their VESSELS so as to Submerge in Salt Water the CENTRE of the Disc.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
SS. "Walney" -	Owner	Submersion of disc, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 28.	Whitehaven	24 January	Convicted	£ s. d. 10l. including costs.	
SS. "Strathnairn" -	"	"	Glasgow	15 September	"	10l. to include costs.	
SS. "Nar" -	Master	"	Edinburgh	22 November	Not proven	—	—
SS. "Northcote" -	"	"	Sunderland	29 December	Convicted	1 0 0	0 9 6
SS. "Rosebud" -	"	"	Swansea	30 December	"	20 0 0	6 0 6

1884.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1884, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for taking their VESSELS to SEA after DETENTION.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
SS. "Hibernian" -	Master	Taking to sea after detention, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 34.	Sunderland	29 August	Convicted	£ s. d. 20 0 0	£ s. d. 1 12 6

1885.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1885, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, Section 28, for OVERLOADING their VESSELS so as to Submerge in Salt Water the CENTRE of the Disc.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
SS. "Grandholm" -	Master	Submersion of disc, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 28.	Falkirk	23 February	Convicted	£ s. d. 2 2 0	£ s. d. —
"Harrogate" -	"	"	Plymouth	28 March	"	5 0 0	19 6 0
"Senator" -	"	"	Newport (Mon.).	29 April	"	10l. to include costs.	
"Isle of Arran" -	"	"	"	22 June	"	10l. to include costs.	
"Presto" -	"	"	North Shields	2 September	"	10 0 0	1 11 6
"Elsmere" -	"	"	"	10 September	"	1 0 0	0 15 0
"Ecosaise" -	"	"	Newport (Mon.).	2 October	"	5 0 0	0 14 6
SS. "Radyr" -	"	"	Cardiff	11 December	"	50 0 0	2 8 6

1885.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1885, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for taking their VESSELS to SEA after DETENTION.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
SS. "Pierrmont" -	Master	Proceeding to sea after detention and before release, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, sections 6 and 34.	—	26 October	Convicted	£ s. d. 5 0 0	£ s. d. 1 4 6

1886.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1886, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for OVERLOADING their VESSELS so as to Submerge in Salt Water the CENTRE of the Disc.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
"Sicilian"	Master	Submersion of disc, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 28.	North Shields	4 January	Convicted	£ s. d. 5 0 0	£ s. d. 1 2 6
"Agnes & Louisa"	"	"	"	"	"	5 0 0	0 13 6
"Alacrity"	"	"	"	"	"	5 0 0	0 14 6
"Troqueer"	"	"	South Shields	18 January	"	10 0 0	0 15 6
"Ecosaise"	"	"	North Shields	10 January	"	20 0 0	0 12 6
"Benamain"	"	"	Cardiff	29 January	"	2 0 0	0 15 6
"Iron Prince"	"	"	North Shields	22 March	"	5 0 0	0 18 6
"Iluna"	"	"	West Hartlepool.	26 March	"	2 0 0	0 8 0
SS. "Ulleswater"	"	"	North Shields	18 May	"	10 0 0	0 17 0
"Flaxmoss"	"	"	London	5 and 14 May	"	8 0 0	0 2 0
"Agenoria"	"	"	North Shields	23 June	"	10 0 0	1 3 6
"E. S. Jobson"	"	"	"	29 June	"	1 0 0	1 18 0
"Smeaton Tower"	"	"	Cardiff	30 July	"	5 0 0	0 6 6
"Northcote"	"	"	Newport	24 July	"	5 0 0	2 2 0
"Blencowe"	"	"	North Shields	20 October	"	5 0 0	1 15 0
"J. A. Harley"	"	"	Dublin	16 October	"	20 0 0	—
"Kingscote"	"	"	North Shields	8 November	"	10 0 0	1 4 6
"Cairngowan"	"	"	"	23 November	"	10 0 0	1 10 6
"Mabel"	"	"	"	20 December	"	10 0 0	0 10 6

1886.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1886, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for sending their VESSELS to SEA after DETENTION.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
"Elisa Gulton"	Owners	Sending vessel to sea after detention and before release, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 34.	Sunderland	30 July	Convicted	£ s. d. 5 0 0	£ s. d. 1 3 6

1887.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1887, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for OVERLOADING their VESSELS so as to Submerge in Salt Water the CENTRE of the Disc.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
"Pontypridd"	Owner	Submersion of disc, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 28.	Newport (Mon.)	25 January	Convicted	£ s. d. 3 10 0	£ s. d. 1 10 0
"Portugalete"	Master	"	Cardiff	4 February	Acquitted	—	—

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.		Costs imposed.			
						£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.		
SS. "Newminster"	Master	Submersion of disc, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 28.	North Shields	27 January	Convicted	10	0	0	1	1	0
"Beryl"	"	"	Hull	21 February	"	10	0	0	1	10	0
"Talabot"	"	"	Workington	23 March	Acquitted	—	—	—	—	—	—
SS. "Draymon"	"	"	London	25 April	Convicted	10	0	0	0	10	0
"Arranmore"	"	"	Liverpool	29 April	"	10	0	0	9	15	2
"Tredegar"	"	"	Newport	25 April	Acquitted	—	—	—	—	—	—
"Incemore"	"	"	Liverpool	12 May	Convicted	10	0	0	2	18	0
"Ella Constance"	"	"	Cardiff	24 July	"	5	0	0	0	6	6
"Allonby"	"	"	Sunderland	15 September	"	10	0	0	1	5	6
"Gwnyfaur"	"	"	Liverpool	29 October	"	1	0	0	2	14	8

1888.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1888, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for OVERLOADING their VESSELS so as to Submerge in Salt Water the CENTRE of the DISC.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.		Costs imposed.			
						£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.		
"Otto McCrombie"	Master	Submersion of disc, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 28.	Aberdeen	16 February	Convicted	5	0	0	0	18	0
"Joshua Nicholson"	"	"	Newport	3 April	"	Fined in costs.	—	—	0	8	6
"Hayburn"	"	"	Liverpool	19 June	"	10	0	0	10	0	11
"England"	"	"	Newport	6 July	"	25	0	0	2	4	0
"Minnie Irvine"	"	"	"	18 August	"	5	0	0	1	0	0
"Sir Galahad"	"	"	Liverpool	31 December	"	10	0	0	2	14	8

1889.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1889, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for OVERLOADING their VESSELS so as to Submerge in Salt Water the CENTRE of the DISC.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.		Costs imposed.			
						£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.		
SS. "Brittany"	Master	Submersion of disc, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 28.	Newport (Mon.).	8 March	Convicted	5	l.	to include costs.	—	—	—
"Nant Gwynant"	"	"	Edinburgh	29 March	"	5	0	0	1	0	0
"Alassio"	"	"	Hull	30 March	"	25	0	0	1	12	6
"Calabria"	"	"	North Shields	28 May	"	2	0	0	1	4	0
"Kent"	"	"	"	3 July	"	10	0	0	1	6	0
"Tay"	"	"	Swansea	6 July	"	10	0	0	10	2	0
"Coramaria"	"	"	North Shields	25 October	"	8	6	6	1	13	6
"Allonby"	"	"	Fenarth	28 October	"	5	0	0	2	2	9
"Glen Tilt"	"	"	Aberdeen	7 November	Acquitted	—	—	—	—	—	—
"Ariel"	"	"	Cardiff	27 November	Convicted	100	0	0	0	15	0

1889.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1889, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for sending their VESSELS to SEA after DETENTION.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
"Thor"	Master	Proceeding to sea after detention and before release, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 34.	Newcastle	19 November	Convicted	£ s. d. 25 0 0	£ s. d. 3 18 6
"Thor"	Owner's Manager.	Being privy to above	"	"	Acquitted	—	—

1890.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1890, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for OVERLOADING their VESSELS so as to Submerge in Salt Water the CENTRE of the Disc.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
"Musgrave"	Master	Submersion of disc, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 28.	Runcorn	3 February	Convicted	£ s. d. 10 0 0	£ s. d. 0 8 6
"Sir Galahad"	"	"	Birkenhead	4 February	Acquitted	—	—
"Creadon"	"	"	Llanelly	13 February	"	—	—
"Swallow"	"	"	Sunderland	21 March	Convicted	5 0 0	0 17 6
"Rydal Hall"	"	"	Cardiff	22 June	"	100 0 0	0 12 6
"Leda"	"	"	Newport (Mon.)	21 July	"	10 0 0	1 12 0
"Norberto"	"	"	"	23 July	"	10 0 0	0 7 6
"Derwentwater"	"	"	North Shields	26 July	Acquitted with a caution.	—	—
"Reggio"	"	"	Newport (Mon.)	28 July	Convicted	20 0 0	2 12 0
"Glassett"	"	"	Aberdeen	4 September	"	7 0 0	1 0 6
"Thetford"	"	"	London	9 October	"	5 0 0	5 0 0
"Rheubina"	"	"	Newport	12 November	"	25 0 0	2 5 0
"Humber"	"	"	Penarth	24 November	"	25 0 0	5 11 9
"Cairngorm"	"	"	Llanelly	1 December	"	10 0 0	3 7 6
"Domira"	"	"	Middlesbrough.	14 March	"	25 <i>l.</i> including costs.	

1890.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1890, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for sending their VESSELS to SEA after DETENTION.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
"Vivo"	Master	Proceeding to sea after detention and before release, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 34.	Newcastle	21 January	Convicted	£ s. d. 25 0 0 reduced on appeal to 12 10 0	£ s. d. 1 0 8
"Vivo"	"	Carrying to sea detaining officer, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 34.	"	"	"	25 0 0 reduced on appeal to 12 10 0	1 0 8

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
"Vivo"	Owner's Superintendent.	Party to above offence	Newcastle	21 January	Convicted	£ s. d. 50 0 0 affirmed on appeal.	£ s. d. 1 0 8
"Vivo"	Owner	"	"	"	"	50 0 0 reduced on appeal to	0 19 8
"Wilhelm"	Master	Proceeding to sea after detention and before release, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 34.	"	21 June	"	5 0 0 5 0 0	7 5 3

1891.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1891, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for OVERLOADING their VESSELS so as to Submerge in Salt Water the CENTRE of the DISC.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
"General Roberts"	Master	Submersion of disc, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 28.	Newport (Mon.).	23 February	Convicted	£ s. d. 10l. to include costs.	£ s. d. —
"Rayner"	"	"	Newcastle	6 March	"	10 0 0	16 8 8
"Rapid"	"	"	Cardiff	18 March	"	20 0 0	3 15 3
"Denia"	Owner	"	Swansea	6 April	"	2s. and Court fees.	
"Denia"	Master	"	"	"	"	2l. and Court fees.	
"Moss Rose"	Manager of vessel.	"	Liverpool	14 April	"	20 0 0	3 19 2
"Gledholt"	Master	"	Newcastle	11 May	"	8 0 0	1 10 6
"Era"	"	"	Cardiff	22 May	"	5 0 0	0 7 0
"Magda"	"	"	"	27 May	"	100l. and costs.	
"County of Lancaster."	Owners	"	Liverpool	11 June	Acquitted	—	—
"County of Lancaster."	Master	"	"	"	"	—	—
"Dunvegan"	"	"	"	12 June	Convicted	5 0 0	0 6 6
"Leechmere"	"	"	London	20 June	"	15 0 0	10 0 0
"Aros"	"	"	Newcastle	10 August	"	10 0 0	3 0 3
"Gwenllian Thomas."	Master	"	Liverpool	8 August	"	25 0 0	2 14 8
"Activity"	"	"	"	10 August	"	10 0 0	1 10 9
"Fannie"	"	"	Newcastle	28 August	"	20 0 0	2 14 0
"Britannia"	"	"	Cardiff	—	Case dropped on payment of costs.	—	3 0 0
"Egremont Castle"	"	"	Hull	31 August	Convicted	12l. 7s. to include costs.	
"Utopia"	"	"	Poole	3 September	"	5 0 0	0 8 6
"Rosebud"	"	"	Glasgow	10 September	"	5 0 0	3 3 0
"Thomas Parker"	"	"	Newcastle	29 September	"	10 0 0	5 10 2
"Mary Ellen"	"	"	Ayr	13 October	"	5 0 0	3 15 6

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
"Horneberg"	Master.	Submersion of disc, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 28.	Liverpool	23 October	Convicted	£ s. d. 20 0 0	£ s. d. 3 4 8
"Isle of Dursey"	"	"	"	"	"	1 0 0	3 15 3
"Lavinia"	"	"	"	3 November	Acquitted	—	—
"Roseland"	"	"	Glasgow	6 November	Not proven	—	—
"Achilles"	"	"	Ardrossan	12 November	Convicted	2 0 0	1 1 6
"Kate Forster"	"	"	Cardiff	12 November	"	20 0 0	0 7 6
"Vascongada"	"	"	Glasgow	"	"	2 2 0	3 3 0
"Sailor Prince"	"	"	Liverpool	16 November	Dismissed on payment of costs.	—	2 18 0
"San Hanford"	"	"	Glasgow	22 November	Acquitted	—	—
"Cassia"	"	"	Liverpool	"	Convicted	5 0 0	2 18 6
"Oria"	"	"	Cardiff	23 December	"	10 0 0	1 7 6
"Clunie"	"	"	Newcastle	28 September	"	10 0 0	10 16 3
"Duke of Portland."	"	"	Cardiff	30 December	"	50 0 0	0 7 6 or 1 month imprisonment.
"Nellie"	"	"	Newcastle	3 November	"	10 0 0	1 19 0
"Lord Aberdeen"	"	"	Liverpool	31 October	"	10 0 0	4 1 10
"Confidence"	"	"	Londonderry	3 December	"	5 0 0	0 13 6
"Trio"	"	"	Newcastle	27 December	"	5 0 0	1 18 6
"Dora Ewing"	"	"	Sunderland	30 October	"	2 0 0	0 15 0
"Foyle"	"	"	Liverpool	27 October	"	5 0 0	4 6 8
"Chatsworth"	"	"	Newcastle	25 October	"	5 0 0	3 9 0
"Sir Drake."	Francis	"	Cardiff	23 July	"	100 0 0	0 10 6
"Werfa"	"	"	"	11 March	"	20 0 0	1 10 6

1891.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1891, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDINGS against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for sending their VESSELS to SEA after DETENTION.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
"Mary Loiden"	Master	PART I. (English.) Proceeding to sea after detention, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 34.	West Hartlepool	25 March	Convicted	£ s. d. 5 0 0	£ s. d. 0 7 0
"Andriana" (Greek).	"	PART II. (Foreign.) Proceeding to sea after detention and before release, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 34.	Cardiff	23 December	"	25 0 0	—
"	"	Taking to sea an officer of Her Majesty's Customs.	"	"	"	23 0 0	2 15 0
"Ariadne" (Dutch)	"	Proceeding to sea after detention.	Newcastle	29 September	"	25 0 0	25 4 9

1892.

RETURN of CASES for the Year 1892, in which the BOARD OF TRADE have instituted PROCEEDING against SHIPOWNERS and SHIPMASTERS under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, for OVERLOADING their VESSELS: so as to Submerge in Salt Water the CENTRE of the Disc.

Name of Vessel.	Person proceeded against.	Offence.	Where prosecuted.	Date of Hearing.	Result.	Penalty imposed.	Costs imposed.
" Cairnglen "	Master	Submersion of disc, Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, section 28.	Newport (Mon.).	4 January	Convicted	£ s. d. 20l. to include costs.	£ s. d.
" Holme Force "	"	"	Liverpool	5 January	"	5 0 0	2 18 0
" Diamond "	"	"	Newcastle	12 January	"	15 0 0	1 0 6
" Broughshane "	"	"	Newport (Mon.).	18 January	"	10l. to include costs.	
" Springhill "	"	"	East Hartlepool.	15 January	"	10 0 0	9 9 4
" Benan "	"	"	Newport (Mon.).	"	"	10l. to include costs.	
" Aycliffe "	"	"	Middlesbro'	22 January	"	25 0 0	4 5 0
" Miranda "	"	"	Cardiff	25 January	"	20l. and costs.	
" Opah "	"	"	Hull	"	"	10 0 0	1 8 0
" Townley "	"	"	Penarth	"	"	20l. and costs.	
" Hajeen "	"	"	Cardiff	29 January	"	100l. and costs.	
" Hajeen "	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Ely Rise "	"	"	"	"	"	"	"

APPENDIX CIX.

LEEDS AND LIVERPOOL CANAL COMPANY.

POINTS DISCUSSED and ARRANGED by the CHAIRMAN and VICE-CHAIRMAN at the CANAL OFFICE, LIVERPOOL, 6th September 1890.

BOWING, HAULING, AND DELAY AT BLACKBURN LOCKS.

It has been decided to place an additional horse and man at Blackburn Locks.

BOWING, HAULING, AND DELAY AT WIGAN LOCKS.

A telephone is to be fixed between the top locks and the stables, and provision will be made for the stationing of two horses and a marine at the top locks.

SUNDAY WORK.

This cannot be paid for, but the men will receive a general advance of wages of 5 per cent. or 1s. in the £ to cover week of seven days.

FLY BOATS TRAVELLING AS SLOW BOATS.

The demand for certain men always to be paid fly wages was not granted.

PORTERAGE IN WAREHOUSES.

Payment for working in the warehouses at the current rate of porters' wages will be made to the men when

called upon to work in the warehouses in the daytime, excepting when the boats are lying under cargo or empty at the station and the men would otherwise be upon half pay.

HALF PAY WHEN LYING AT A STATION.

Present arrangements not to be disturbed.

TOWAGE THROUGH GANNOW TUNNEL.

The charge for towage will be discontinued.

EXTRA PAYMENT FOR THE TOWAGE OF MORE THAN TWO BOATS.

No extra payment can be made.

These arrangements will come into force on the 1st October 1890.

Signed on behalf of the Leeds and Liverpool Canal Company.

September 6th, 1890.

ALFRED WILLIAMS,
General Manager.

APPENDIX CX.

MUNICIPAL TRAMS and 'BUSES.—REMEDY FOR OVERWORK.

The following is a copy of a letter which Mr. T. Sutherland, president of the Tram and Bus Union, has addressed to the London County Council:—

" It is the intention of a group of persons interested in the question, to urge upon the ratepayers the desirability of establishing, on some such basis as suggested, municipal trams and omnibuses, in order to effect the reforms indicated."

To the Right Honourable Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart.,
M.P., Chairman of the London County Council.

SIR,

HAVING been for some time concerned with yourself and other social reformers in promoting the interests of the men employed in connection with the tramways and omnibuses of the metropolis, and fully realising the difficulties there are to be overcome, I have been led to

study the working of the different companies and interests involved, with a view to finding a remedy for the many evils which are incident to the system, to the detriment of the man and the public generally. The result being that I have resolved with, I trust, a becoming deference, to lay before you and the members of the County Council, as representatives of the ratepayers and travelling public of London, my observations and suggestions, in order that prompt action may be taken to make the lives of the human agents of street locomotion more endurable, and to secure the safety and convenience of the public.

The way in which the vehicular traffic of the metropolis is managed is simply chaotic. I do not allude to the control so judiciously exercised by a splendid body of police, but to the headlong rush and competition by a plethora of vehicles for passengers. The streets are blocked with half-filled omnibuses. Pedestrians are delayed and their lives endangered. The vehicles of the different companies dash at and past each other in dangerous proximity, and at a speed which results in maiming and killing every year between five and six thousand people, whose escape at the crossings and in the open streets is, in existing circumstances, almost impossible. The public should, of course, be amply supplied with the means of transit, but there is no reason why, with proper management, and of course, making a due allowance for the difference in the surroundings, the passenger traffic of the metropolis should not be carried on with approximately the same regularity as the underground railway.

The tramways are subjected to different regulations, but with regard to them the interests of the public are not consulted as they should be. Each company is absorbed in its own little self, and is jealous of every other. Connections with other lines, continuous, cross, or circular routes are not arranged, however much they may be required. Early and cheap omnibuses and cars are few and far between, yet they are wanted in abundance to convey men to their work. Why are the public so flagrantly neglected? Because the traffic of the metropolis is managed by and in competing sections and sub-competing sections for the benefit of different sets of monopolists. If the interests of the public harmonise with those of the companies, well and good, but the moment they diverge the public are sacrificed.

Such a condition of things is bad enough for the public, but what of the many thousands of men who work the traffic? They are the worst paid, the most overworked, and the most harshly treated sections of the wage-earning class. The majority of drivers and conductors are absent from their homes at the disposal of the companies for periods varying from 13 to 15, and often 16 and 17 hours a day. Their meal-times are inadequate and irregular. They are almost strangers to the pleasures of home and domestic comforts. With no fixed system of Sunday relief, on these men go, week after week, through the long monotonous days, merely to obtain the barest subsistence by serving employers and a public apparently equally indifferent to their condition.

The existence of these evils—one and all are decreedible alike to the humanity and administrative capacity of the people's representatives, because the irregularities of the system are as preventable as they are unnecessary. But so long as different companies with conflicting interests are allowed to exploit the travelling public and to "sweat" their men, no substantial reforms can be expected, for dividend, dividend, dividend is the everlasting end and aim of the majority of these cast-iron corporations.

I therefore contend that the only proper course to adopt is to vest the control of the metropolitan street passenger traffic in a central authority. This is the proposition I venture to submit for the consideration of the County Council, upon the principle that the people who own, use, and repair the streets should participate in the profit and management of their use, in order to protect the interests of all concerned. It is not, however, sufficient to enunciate an acceptable principle, I therefore propose to demonstrate its utility and practicability.

Parliament has already conferred upon local authorities powers by virtue of which tramlines may be taken over at fixed periods and under stipulated conditions. These powers have, however, in many instances, accrued, but there is nothing to prevent the County Council from obtaining any supplementary parliamentary aid that may be necessary to enable them to deal with the whole of the tramways and omnibuses of the metropolis. This assumption

leads to the consideration of ways and means, which roughly might be arranged on the following lines:—

1. The County Council should take over all the tram lines, with or without the rolling and live stock, in complete working order, upon similar terms to those laid down in the General Tramways Act, 1870.

2. The cash required to purchase the whole of these properties would be from three and a half to four and a half millions sterling, dependent upon whether the line and rolling stocks were taken over or not, as well as the tram lines. This sum could be obtained by the County Council on the open market, at, say, 3 per cent. per annum.

3. Having acquired the properties with money obtained at 3 per cent., they should then be leased, as a whole, for, say, 14 or 21 years to an approved company at a rental equal to $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. upon the purchase price. The board of the lessee company should be composed of capable men approved of by the County Council, which body should appoint a certain number of directors from the Council to represent the public and the workmen.

4. The lease should contain conditions providing that the men should not work more than 12 hours a day, that they should have two hours for meals, that Sunday reliefs should be arranged, and that they should be paid a fair wage, taking a married man with a family as the standard.

5. A maximum dividend to the shareholders should be fixed, and all profits in excess of that, after providing for an adequate reserve depreciation fund, should be divided by giving, say, two-fourths to the County Council, one-fourth to the workmen, and one-fourth to the company. Other general provisions as to fares and control might also be embodied in the lease.

It is not necessary at this stage to do more than bring before the Council the bare proposal with its cardinal features. Details can follow. But the advantages of such a transformation in the management of the passenger traffic are not far to seek. The metropolis would be worked as a whole, and due attention would be given to the wants of every locality. Circular, transverse, and oblique routes would be arranged. Tram lines, instead of stopping short to avoid contact with the lines of other companies, would be continuous. Early and cheap services of trams and omnibuses would be run to meet the requirements of the working classes. Racing and rushing by competitors for given points would be avoided, many accidents prevented, and many lives saved. A steady two or three minutes' service could be kept up by one continuous stream of vehicles, directed to and from different points and termini. The men, working in relays, fairly paid, and not overworked, would be interested in, and satisfied with, their work, besides being interested to the extent of one-fourth of the surplus profits as a bonus. The public would have a reliable and well-managed service, in which they would be interested as ratepayers, the County Council taking, for the general exchequer, two-fourths of the surplus profits. The arduous duties of the police would be made easier, and the streets would assume a more orderly aspect. And an efficient control would be exercised by the County Council imposing equitable conditions for all concerned upon the Lessee Company, and by deputing members of its own body to sit on the board of the company to represent the public and to correct any irregularities.

Moreover, by the economies effected in various ways, the travelling public would derive considerable pecuniary advantages. Zone fares might be established; books of tickets might be issued at given centres; waiting-rooms might be provided at given points, and, beyond doubt, although on many routes the fares are exceedingly low, a general reduction of rates would eventually be made all over the metropolis. Why? Because all recent experience proves that those who in these matters study the wants and interests of the masses, obtain their confidence and support. Efficiency, economy, despatch are the orders of the day. The third-class fare and carriage reforms introduced by the Midland Railway Company and successfully acted upon by the other companies prove this, and that numbers and convenience are more profitable to all than exclusion and indifference. Then, until within the last few years, tram and omnibus fares were from 3d. to 6d., but now they are from 1s. to 3s. The pioneers of this reform, and in justice it should be mentioned, are the London Road Car Company, who have by improved methods of management, reduced the fares from 7s. to 200 per cent., yet they are able to pay a dividend of 77 per cent.

Their example has been followed by others who pay higher dividends and accumulate large reserve funds. But when the County Council takes the control, the surplus dividends and reserve funds, after making a fair provision for the capital employed and other contingencies, will go to reduce the rates, and to give the workmen a bonus upon their earnings. This is, I take it, in accordance with the spirit of the age in which we live, the manifest tendency of which is to distribute the wealth and comforts of life over the largest possible area.

It is not necessary in a preliminary communication of this kind to elaborate the proposition at any greater length, as my immediate aim is to induce the County Council to forthwith inaugurate a system which shall meet the increasing requirements of the public by giving cheap and ready access to every part of this great metropolis; by protecting the lives and limbs of pedestrians, by doing justice to the workers, and generally by harmonising all the interests concerned in one broad, comprehensive, and statesmanlike policy.

Plans and details have been carefully studied and prepared by some of the most competent men in London, who are ready at any time to confer with any committee the Council may choose to appoint.

In conclusion, permit me to say that something must speedily be done for the many thousands of men who are so shamefully overworked and underpaid; something must be done to prevent the annual maiming and slaughter of from five to six thousand persons every year in the open streets of London; and something should be done to enable the ratepayers, who own, use, and maintain the streets to control their management, and participate in profits which have hitherto been monopolised and absorbed by too many discordant interests.

I am, &c.

(Signed) THOMAS SUTHERST,
2, Dr. Johnson's Buildings, Temple, E.C.,
February 13, 1891.

APPENDIX CXI.

[55 VICT.]

TRAMCAR AND OMNIBUS MEN.

A BILL to LIMIT the HOURS of WORK of TRAMCAR and OMNIBUS MEN.

WHEREAS the health of many persons employed upon tramcars and omnibuses is seriously injured by the length of the period of employment thereupon, and it is expedient to provide for the limitation of such period:

Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

1. This Act may be cited as the Tram and Omnibus Men's Act.

2. No person shall be employed in, upon, or in connexion with the working of a tramcar for a longer period than twelve hours in any one day.

3. No person shall be employed in, upon, or in connexion with the working of an omnibus for a longer period than twelve hours in any one day.

4. These periods shall include two hours rest for meals for each person, so that the actual work shall not exceed ten hours per day.

5. Any corporation, company, manager, or other person who employs any person falling within the provisions of this Act shall upon demand, when any workman leaves his employment, give to such workman a writing containing a true description of his conduct, ability, truthfulness, and honesty.

6. Every corporation, company, manager, or other person who employs any person falling within the provisions of this Act shall affix a copy of the Act in a conspicuous part of every tramcar and omnibus within his control, and he shall keep a time-book containing a true daily record of the hours at which every person in his employment begins and finishes his work.

7. Every corporation, company, manager, or other person falling within the provisions of this Act shall upon demand show to any local chief constable, superintendent, or inspector of police, and to any person in the employment of the said company or person, the time-book referred to: provided that the request be made between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., and that not more than one request per month be made.

8. Any corporation, company, manager, or other person who employs any person for a longer period than twelve hours contrary to clauses three and four shall be liable to a penalty of forty shillings, and any person who fails to obey the provisions of clauses five, six, and seven shall be liable to a penalty of forty shillings for each and every offence.

9. All offences under this Act shall be prosecuted, and all fines under this Act shall be recovered, before a court of summary jurisdiction; and any justice of the peace, or any stipendiary magistrate having jurisdiction in the place or district in which it is alleged any offence under this Act has been committed, shall grant a summons against any employer who has violated any of the provisions of this Act at the request of any person who can establish a *prima facie* case.

10. It shall be the duty in England and Ireland of every chief officer of police, and in Scotland of every procurator fiscal, to cause the provisions of this Act to be duly enforced throughout the area in which he has authority.

11. This Act shall apply to every tramway, omnibus company's and proprietor's plant in the United Kingdom, as to tramcars and as to omnibuses shall apply only to places with a population exceeding one hundred thousand.

12. This Act shall come into operation on the first day of January one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one.

APPENDIX CXII.

BALANCE SHEET OF A MUNICIPAL TRAMWAY AT HUDDERSFIELD.

[Several applications have been made to Mr. Sutherst for a copy of this Balance Sheet, but up to the time of going to press no copy had been received.—G. D.]

APPENDIX CXIII.

EXTRACT from the "EVENING STANDARD," November 27th, 1891.

THE LONDON 'BUSMEN.

SCENE AT AN INTENDED MIDNIGHT MEETING.

A special license to remain open until 2 a.m. had been obtained by the proprietor of the "Windsor Castle," public-house, King Street, Hammersmith, in view of a meeting of omnibus men which had been announced to

take place there last night, and which had been convened by the Amalgamated Omnibus and Tram Workers Union, for the purpose of opening a new branch in the district, and also to hear an address by Mr. Fred. Hammill, the organising president of the Union, on the subject of the proposed scheme of running omnibuses on the co-operative principle. The meeting, however,

had to be abandoned. The organisers of the meeting allege that a system of espionage has been introduced with a view to detecting the men who belong to the Union or attend its meetings with the object of becoming members, and that officials of the London General Omnibus Company were present last night for that purpose. The meeting was announced for 10.30 p.m., but as usual on such occasions it was not intended to open the proceedings until much later. In the meantime Mr. Hammill observed that four of the officials of the London General Omnibus Company—three road inspectors and a timekeeper—had stationed themselves in and about the house. The officials of the Union at once despatched pickets to the yards from which the men were expected to arrive, in order to warn them from attending the meeting, as, it was stated, they would by so doing render themselves liable to dismissal. This it is said had the effect of deterring the majority of the men from attending the meeting, but some who had not been so cautioned entered the premises. On being informed or seeing for themselves the state of affairs they retired. At the time when ordinarily the house would have been closed the four officials made no attempt to leave. Mr. Hammill accosted them, and pointed out that, though the landlord had received a permit from the authorities to remain open until 2 a.m. for the purpose of the

meeting, they would have either to leave the house or go upstairs to the meeting. A heated discussion ensued. Mr. Hammill addressing the four men, said they ought to be ashamed of themselves for attending the meeting for the purpose of "spotting" men and reporting them. Mr. Hammill added that if they did not attend the meeting or leave the house he would fetch the police and charge them with being on licensed premises after hours. One of the men replied that they were only doing their duty, they had been sent to the meeting, while another said he had been asked to come by the landlord, a statement which was not corroborated by the landlord. After some further conversation, Mr. Hammill said that the behaviour of the men amounted to intimidation. They were men who would lead themselves to do dirty work of a company, and try to get their fellow men the "sack," regardless of whether their wives and children starved or not. The men replied that they were not present for the purpose indicated by Mr. Hammill, and that they had as much right to be present as he had. Mr. Hammill: I am here to attempt to organise the 'busmen in a perfectly legitimate manner, and this, despite all the watching, I shall do. Finally the four officials elected to leave the house; but it was then deemed too late to commence the meeting with the few men that had remained.

APPENDIX CXIV.

THE WORKERS' CO-OPERATIVE OMNIBUS SOCIETY, LIMITED.

The subscription list was opened on December 1st, 1891, and the shares are allotted in priority of application.

	£	s.	d.
Payable on application	0	5	0
" on allotment	0	5	0
" 2 weeks after allotment	0	2	6
" 4 " "	0	2	6
" 6 " "	0	2	6
" 8 " "	0	2	6
	£1	0	0

P.S.—Many intending shareholders who have promised to take one or more shares, and who can pay more than the above-named sum on allotment are requested to do so, as the above distributive payments are only to give an opportunity for the less fortunate omnibus employé to avail himself of becoming a member.

It is further requested that all who can constitute themselves members of the Society by paying one full share of 1l. will do so at once.

Bankers.

National Bank of Scotland, 37, Nicholas Lane, E.C.

Consulting Engineer.

Mr. J. G. LORRAIN, M.Inst., E.E., M.Inst., M.E.,
Norfolk House, Norfolk Street, Strand.

Solicitor.

Mr. H. C. KNIGHT, B.A., 2, South Square, Gray's Inn,
W.C.

PROSPECTUS.

This Society is being formed for the establishment of a first-class service of omnibuses, to be owned, and its operations controlled by, its members, all of whom must be bona fide members of the organisation of their own particular trade or calling, or be known friends of labour.

The credentials and antecedents of every applicant for shares will be strictly investigated by the managing committee.

The Society proposes to acquire improvements in omnibus traffic that will materially add to the comfort of the omnibus travelling public, being of opinion that the comfort and convenience of the omnibus passenger should be more generously considered than has hitherto existed, and worked on a system by which we hope to create a fellow-feeling between the employé and passengers, and which we trust will be equally

interesting to all concerned, by endeavouring to make travelling a pleasure, and placing labour in the true position it ought to hold—that of dignity and liberty in the place of wage slavery, which has so long been the reward of the omnibus employé.

This Society commences under the auspices of the Amalgamated Omnibus and Tram Workers' Union, which, since its establishment four months ago under the auspices of the London Trades' Council, has made such rapid progress with the organisation of the best, the oldest, the most respected and intelligent of London 'busmen, that many of them are prepared to risk all they possess in forming, by genuine combined action, a true Co-operative Society with every hope of success.

The determination of the London 'busmen to raise themselves from the thralldom of tyranny and degradation which has been daily imposed upon them by the capitalistic companies since the late omnibus strike can be easily understood when we state that more than fifteen hundred men have been discharged, many of them with 10, 15, and 20 years' service. Under-handed tyranny has been practised and inflicted in every way imaginable, and they have been finally discharged and their characters gone on the most paltry and flimsy reports of the companies' inspectors, and only because they dared to ask to be worked less than 16 hours per day the year round, and to be treated more like men than brutes.

Hence, the spirit of the down-trodden and neglected English 'busmen is roused to a recognition of their power, with hope of a brighter future by the establishment of a Co-operative Society in which all shall be equal, with equal voice, power, and responsibility, and we trust with a lasting benefit to all.

English workers, who claim to be the foremost in the world in enterprise and skill, should, at least, carry forward this scheme successfully and satisfactorily to themselves and the general public, which to be absurdly successful must of necessity be supported by them and our fellow-workers conjointly, which we trust we may be able to obtain.

We propose to commence a service of omnibuses as early as possible, by issuing shares of 1l. each, terms of which we now place before you.

The shares will bear no interest, but will be repaid as soon as possible from the profits of the business, and the liabilities of the members will be limited to the value of their shares.

All members must have one or more shares, but no individual member shall hold more than 200 shares, and no society shall hold more than 500 shares.

With the abolition of high paid directors, watchers and inspectors, the expenses will be less, and profits larger.

All profits will be used, firstly, for enlarging the business, and secondly, to benefit the labour cause generally, as the managing committee may decide.

We intend to pay trade union rates of wages, have no overtime, and establish an eight or nine hours' day, with two sets of men.

Members of the Society when they become too old to follow their calling as 'busmen, will be duly provided for from a fund set aside out of the profits of the Society.

A committee of management, to conduct all the business of the Society will be appointed hereafter by the members.

THE WORKERS' CO-OPERATIVE OMNIBUS SOCIETY, LIMITED.

FUNDAMENTAL RULES.

I. No interest or profit shall be paid, or any other payment (exclusive of wages) shall be made to the members beyond the original paid-up value of their shares.

II. Each individual member shall have one vote, no matter how many shares he or she holds. The shares shall not be transferable, but shall be, as far as individuals are concerned, withdrawable until each individual member holds one share only.

III. As soon as the Society is fairly established, no worker in the service of the Association shall be employed more than 48 hours per week; and all payments to workers shall at once be the trades union rate of wages.

IV. In the event of the dissolution of the Association, no member shall receive more than the sum he or she has actually paid in effecting the purchase of shares, and as far as not already repaid in whatever form. Any surplus which remains after payment of all claims on the Association shall be given to some body or association to be used for the collective benefit of producing classes at large as the members may decide.

V. The above rules and this rule shall be considered as fundamental rules, and cannot be altered or repealed except by an unanimous vote of the members present at a duly convened special general meeting of the Association.

We especially ask the executives of the separate trades and labour organisations to support us by taking up shares to establish the same.

We feel confidently assured that it only requires careful consideration to induce all omnibus men to give this scheme their unanimous support, and, assisted by the organised workers and general public, their future is in their own hands.

Successful it must and will be, which means labour and pleasure by shorter hours, higher wages, and the profits for those who earn them by their labour, bringing brighter and more cheerful homes for the wives, mothers, and children: more pleasure, leisure, and recreation for the present and future generations of omnibus workers.

Finally, give your approval and support by at once applying for shares, and inducing others to follow your example.

Relying with confidence on 'busmen, workers, and friends of labour.

We are, yours in the cause of Labour,

The Provisional Committee.

J. ATKINSON (Tram Coachman), Workers' Co-operative (Productive) Society.

J. BARKER, 'Bus Coachman.

F. BOWEN, 'Bus Conductor.

H. BOWBICK, General Secretary, Amalgamated Omnibus and Tram Workers' Union.

HERBERT BURROWS, Workers' Co-operative (Productive) Society.

FERDINAND GILLES, Workers' Co-operative (Productive) Society.

H. LAMB, 'Bus Conductor.

ALBERT W. MACDONALD, London Society of Compositors.

J. NIGHTINGALE, 'Bus Coachman.

GEO. POOK ('Bus Conductor), Workers' Co-operative (Productive) Society.

GEO. POWELL, 'Bus Conductor.

GEO. TAYLOR, 'Bus Coachman.

JOHN BEASLEY, General Secretary, Metropolitan Cab Drivers' Union (Treasurer).

FRED HAMMILL, Organising President of the Amalgamated Omnibus and Tram Workers' Union (Secretary).

And Others.

The offices of the Workers' Co-operative Omnibus Society, Limited, are at 30, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to which address all communications for the secretary, Fred Hammill, should be sent.

All moneys to the treasurer; cheques, Post Office orders and postal orders to be made payable and sent to John Beasley (Treasurer) at the above office.

THE WORKERS' CO-OPERATIVE OMNIBUS SOCIETY, LIMITED.

APPLICATION BY AN INDIVIDUAL.

To the Secretary of the Workers' Co-operative Omnibus Society, Limited.

SIR,

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that I agree with the principles of the Workers' Co-operative Omnibus Society as set forth in its prospectus and fundamental rules, and will do nothing inconsistent therewith, especially as regards the nonpayment of interest or profit, and will neither claim nor accept for myself individually anything beyond the re-imbursment of the sums I shall have paid for the purchase of shares, under these conditions I hereby apply for [] shares in above-named association, and enclose [] for £. s. d. being the amount required for the above shares, the [] being made payable to John Beasley, 30, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

Signature []
Date [] Occupation []
Address []

N.B.—One share can be paid as follows: 5s. on application, and to be fully paid up by February 25th, 1892.

THE WORKERS' CO-OPERATIVE OMNIBUS SOCIETY, LIMITED.

APPLICATION BY AN ORGANISATION.

To the Secretary of the Workers' Co-operative Omnibus Society, Limited.

SIR,

We the undersigned secretary, and two of the committee of management of the [] herein-after called the applicant, in virtue of a resolution thereof dated the [] day of [] hereby declare that the applicant agrees with the principles of the Workers' Co-operative Omnibus Society, as set forth in its prospectus and fundamental rules, and will do nothing inconsistent therewith, especially as regards the nonpayment of interest or profit, and will neither claim nor accept for ourselves or the Society we represent anything beyond the re-imbursment of the sums we shall have paid for the purchase of shares; under these conditions we hereby apply for [] shares in the above-named Association, and enclose [] for £. s. d. being the amount required for the above shares, the [] being made payable to John Beasley, 30, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

Signatures []
Date and address []

APPENDIX CXV.

"IMPROVED CABS CLUB."

"IMPROVED CABS CLUB."

Formed 6th March 1882.

Chairman: W. PARKHURST, Esq. Vice-Chairman: CAPTAIN THOMPSON.

Secretary: MR. E. B. ANDREWS.

3, Edwardes Square, Kensington, London, W.

RULES.

1. That this Association be called the "Improved Cabs Club," and the object of it be for the mutual protection of cab proprietors and drivers.
2. The officers of this Club, all of whom must be members, shall be as follows:—A chairman and vice-chairman; also a secretary, who need not be a member.
3. That a monthly meeting be held the first Tuesday in each month, which shall commence at 5 p.m., and all reports be sent into the secretary by 6 p.m.
4. That all officers shall be elected for six months only, and at the expiration of such period shall be eligible for re-election; and that an election or re-election of officers shall take place at every half-yearly general meeting, and that such half-yearly meetings shall be those held in January and July.
5. Not more than one member of a firm or company shall be eligible for election on the staff of management mentioned in Rule 2.
6. Any proprietor wishing to become a member must be proposed and seconded by two members, and if carried by the majority of votes will be admitted as a member, and become eligible to all the benefits, after paying three months' subscription as an entrance fee, providing he is working a minimum of six numbers.
7. When any person is admitted a member he shall, at the time of admittance, give to the secretary, in writing, the numbers of his Government plates to be entered in a book kept for that purpose.
8. Any member who may have neglected to pay his subscription for four successive weeks after same shall have become due shall be informed thereof by letter, to be written by the secretary, stating the amount due, and if not paid on the following meeting night he will be suspended from all benefits arising from the Club, but may renew his membership any time within three calendar months from the time of payment of his last subscription, on paying all the arrears of subscription, and on payment he shall be entitled to all the benefits of the Club, but shall not be entitled to any benefits of the Club during the time his subscriptions were in arrear; and if such arrears are not paid within the three calendar months, as before stated, such defaulter shall cease to be a member of this Club.
9. If any member shall neglect to attend the monthly meeting for two successive months he shall be liable to pay to fine of 10s. 6d.
10. No money shall be voted away for any purpose whatsoever, whether charitable or otherwise, without a special meeting being called by writing to the members.
11. Any member knowingly employing a driver who is on the tinue as a defaulter shall be subject to a penalty of a day's hire for the time being, to be paid to the member who had previously employed him.
12. Every member must get each of his drivers hereafter engaged to sign an agreement for hire, which agreement shall be drawn up and settled by a meeting at an early date.
13. The minimum price per day to be charged by members to drivers shall be as follows:—From January 1st to March 14th, exclusive, or boat race day, 15s.; from March 14th or boat race day, as the case may be, till April 1st, exclusive, 16s.; from April 1st to April 14th, exclusive, 17s.; from April 14th till Monday of Derby week, 18s.; from Monday of Derby week till August 1st, exclusive, 19s.; from August 1st to August 24th, exclusive, 18s.; from August 14th to August 21st, exclusive, 17s.; from August 21st to August 28th, exclusive, 16s.; from August 28th to September 4th, exclusive, 15s.; from September 4th to Cattle Show day 14s.; and from Cattle Show day till the end of the year, 15s.
14. Any member who may happen to be at a race meeting near London is requested to note the numbers, and let the owners know if he sees any cabs of a fellow member there.
15. All members shall have a rule in their yards forbidding the use of public troughs for their horses, and shall dismiss any driver who shall have been proved to have committed this offence.
16. All business to be agreed on by voting; the majority of votes to be binding.
17. One representative only of each firm or company to be entitled to vote at a meeting; the number of his votes to be equivalent to the working number of cabs for which his firm or company pays subscription.
18. That all subscriptions and fines be paid to the secretary, to be entered by him in a book or books kept for that purpose.
19. Working expenses of the Club to be paid out of the funds of same. No moneys to be paid without a cheque, drawn by the secretary and signed by the chairman or vice-chairman.
20. That the duties of the secretary be to attend every meeting-night at 5 p.m. (or provide a substitute), committee meetings and special meetings; to keep the books and take the minutes of such meetings at the time correctly; and should he neglect to attend, or in any other way neglect the duties of his office, he shall be subject to a fine of 2s. 6d.
21. No rule or rules to be altered or amended without the sanction of the majority of members at a general or special meeting held for the purpose. Each member is expected to conform to these rules and regulations, and to use his best endeavours to uphold the same.

Challenger, H.M.S. A Report on the Scientific Results of the voyage of, during the years 1873-1876, under the command of Captain George S. Nares, R.N., F.R.S., and Captain Frank Turler Thomson, R.N. Prepared under the superintendence of the late Sir C. Wyville Thomson, Knt., F.R.S.; and now of John Murray, Ph.D., V.P.R.S.E.

This Report is now nearly complete, 39 volumes having already been issued.

The most recent issues are as follows:—

PHYSICS AND CHEMISTRY. Vol. 2. Parts IV., V., VI., and VII. 614 pp. 3 plates. 64 maps. Price 52s. 6d.
ZOOLOGY. Vol. 32. Price 25s. —Comprising Part LXXX., Antipatharia, Price 14s.; Part LXXXI., Supplementary Report on the Alcyonaria, Price 4s. 6d.; and Part LXXXII., Keratosa, Price 6s. 6d. 426 pp. 29 plates. "DEEP SEA DEPOSITS," 446 pp. 29 plates. 65 maps. Price 42s.

Record Office Publications:—

PRIVY COUNCIL OF ENGLAND. ACTS OF THE. New series. Edited by J. R. Dasent, M.A. Vol. 4. A.D. 1552-1554. 528 pp. Cloth. Price 10s.

I. CALENDARS OF STATE PAPERS.—Imperial 8vo. Cloth. Price 15s. per vol. :—

DOMESTIC SERIES. Committee for Compounding. Part IV. July 1650 to December 1653. Edited by Mary Ann Everett Green.

COLONIAL SERIES. Vol. 8. East Indies, 1630-1634. Edited by W. Noel Sainsbury, Esq.

FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC. HENRY VIII. Vol. 13. Part I. Edited by James Gairdner, Esq.

CLOSE ROLLS. EDWARD II. A.D. 1307-1313.

ANCIENT PETITIONS OF THE CHANCERY AND OF THE EXCHEQUER. Index of.

Price 9s. 6d.

II. CHRONICLES OF ENGLAND.—Royal 8vo. Half bound. Price 10s. per vol. :—

CHRONICLES AND ANCIENT HISTORIES OF GREAT BRITAIN, by John de Waurin. Translated by Edward L. C. P. Hardy, F.S.A. Vol. III. A.D. 1422-1431. 316 pp.

YEAR BOOKS OF THE REIGN OF EDWARD III. Year 15. Edited by Luke Owen Pike, M.A. 584 pp.

SCOTCH :—

GREAT SEAL OF SCOTLAND. Register of the. Edited by J. M. Thomson. Vol. VII. A.D. 1609-1620. Imp. 8vo. 1,132 pp. Cloth. Price 15s.

THE HAMILTON PAPERS. Letters and Papers illustrating the Political Relations of England and Scotland in the XVth Century. Edited by Joseph Bain. Vol. II. A.D. 1543-1590. 904 pp. Price 15s.

Europe by Treaty. The map of. By Sir Edward Hertelet, C.B. Vol. IV. Nos. 452-625. 1875-1891.

Price 14. 11s. 6d.

Military:—

ALLOWANCES OF THE ARMY. Regulations for. 1892. Price 1s. 6d.

AMMUNITION. Treatise on. 5th edition. Price 6s.

CAVALRY DRILL, 1891. Vol. I. (Provisional), and Vol. II. Price 1s. each.

FORTIFICATION AND MILITARY ENGINEERING. Text Book of. Part I. Price 5s.

INFANTRY DRILL. 1892. Price 1s.

MESSING OF THE SOLDIER. Memoranda on. Price 1d.

QUEEN'S REGULATIONS AND ORDERS FOR THE ARMY. 1892. Price 2s.

RANGE FINDER, DEPRESSION. For elevated batteries. 1892. Price 6d.

VALPARAISO. The capture of, in 1891. Reports on. Price 1s.

Naval:—

GYMNASTIC EXERCISES FOR THE USE OF HER MAJESTY'S FLEET. Handbook of. Price 1s.

SEAMANSHIP. MANUAL OF. For Boys' Training Ships of the Royal Navy. 1891. Price 1s. 6d.

Public Health (London) Act, 1891. Model Bye-laws under. As to:—Nuisances Prevention, Cleansing of Cisterns, and Care of Water-closets. Price 1d. each.

Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 to 1890 :—

PROVISIONAL ORDER under. Forms I., II., and III. Fcap. Stitched. Price 4d. each.

REGULATIONS FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY and of the Electric Lines and Works of the Postmaster-General, and of other Electric Lines and Works prescribed by the Board of Trade under the provisions of the Electric Lighting Act, 1889. Fcap. 4 pp. Price 1d.

RULES WITH RESPECT TO APPLICATIONS FOR LICENSES AND PROVISIONAL ORDERS, &c., August, 1890. Price 1d.

Railway and Canal Traffic Act. Canal Rates Inquiry. Daily Proceedings. Price 2s. per day.

Labour Commission. The Evidence taken by the Commission is published day by day. Price 2d. each day.

Geological:—

MALLENSTANG. The Geology of the country around. With parts of Wensleydale, Swaledale, and Arkendale (Explanation of Qr.-sht. 97, N.W. New Series, Sht. 40.) 8vo. 224 pp. 12 illustrations. Wrapper. Price 2s. 6d.

FLOORENE DEPOSITS OF BRITAIN. The Vertebrata of. By E. T. Newton, F.G.S., F.Z.S. Price 4s.

Agriculture. Board of:—

DIAMOND BACK MOTH (CATERPILLAR). Special Report of the Intelligence Department on the attack of the. Price 3d.

DAIRY FARMING IN DENMARK, SWEDEN, AND GERMANY. Report on. Price 6d.

Publications issued by the Emigrants' Information Office, 31, Broadway, Westminster, S.W., viz. :—

Colonies, Handbooks for. 8vo. Wrapper.

No. 1. Canada. 2. New South Wales. 3. Victoria. 4. South Australia. 5. Queensland. 6. Western

Australia. 7. Tasmania. 8. New Zealand. 9. Cape Colony. 10. Natal. Price 1d. each.

No. 11. Professional Handbook dealing with Professions in the Colonies. 12. Emigration Statutes and

General Handbook. Price 3d. each.

No. 13. (via., Nos. 1 to 12 in cloth). Price 2s.

Summary of Consular Reports. America, North and South. December 1891. Price 2s.

Board of Trade Journal, of Tariff and Trade Notices and Miscellaneous Commercial Information. Published

on the 15th of each Month. Price 6d.

Kew: Royal Botanic Gardens. Bulletins of Miscellaneous Information. Volume for 1891. 8vo. Boards.

Price 3s., and Monthly parts, 1892, price 2d.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LABOUR.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

WITH

APPENDICES,

TAKEN BEFORE

GROUP "B."

TRANSPORT AND AGRICULTURE

(The term "Transport" including Railways,
Shipping, Canals, Docks, and Tramways),

OF THE

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LABOUR

(Volume II.)

TRANSPORT BY WATER (DOCKS, WHARVES, SHIPPING AND
CANALS), AND TRANSPORT BY LAND (TRAMWAYS,
OMNIBUSES, AND CABS).

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.
June 1892.



LONDON:

PRINTED FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE,
PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE, EAST HARDING STREET, FLEET STREET, E.C., and
32, ABINGDON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.; or

JOHN MENZIES & Co., 12, HANOVER STREET, EDINBURGH, and
90, WEST NILE STREET, GLASGOW; or

HODGES, FIGGIS, & Co., LIMITED, 104, GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

1892.