

REPORT

ON THE

CHICAGO STRIKE

OF

JUNE-JULY, 1894,

BY THE

UNITED STATES STRIKE COMMISSION,

APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT JULY 26, 1894, UNDER THE
PROVISIONS OF SECTION 6 OF CHAPTER 1063 OF
THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES
PASSED OCTOBER 1, 1888,

WITH

APPENDICES CONTAINING TESTIMONY, PROCEEDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.



WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
1895.

eigners, and recruits from the criminal classes. Few strikers were recognized or arrested in these mobs, which were without leadership, and seemed simply bent upon plunder and destruction. They gathered wherever opportunity offered for their dastardly work, and, as a rule, broke and melted away when force faced them. In the view that this railroad strike was wrong; that such mobs are well known to be incidental to strikes, and are thereby given an excuse and incentive to gather and to commit crime, the responsibility rests largely with the American Railway Union; otherwise that association, its leaders, and a very large majority of the railroad men on strike are not shown to have had any connection therewith. Labor advocates contend that strikes are the last resort; that they are the industrial war measures of labor to assert and obtain the rights which humanity, morality, and changed conditions demand; that labor can not otherwise arouse interest in its demands, and that, hence, labor is no more responsible for the public disorders and calamities that attend strikes than are the employers who provoke them. Many impartial observers are reaching the view that much of the real responsibility for these disorders rests with the people themselves and with the Government for not adequately controlling monopolies and corporations, and for failing to reasonably protect the rights of labor and redress its wrongs. None assert that laws can completely remedy contentions as to wages, etc., but many do insist that something substantial can be accomplished in this direction if attempted honestly, reasonably, and in good faith.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

The commission has tried to find the drift of public opinion as to strikes, boycotts, and labor disputes upon railroads, and to find their remedy. The invitation freely extended in this direction has brought before the commission many expressions of views, orally and by written communications. A condensation of these latter is presented with this report. In reaching its conclusions the commission has endeavored, after careful consideration, to give due weight to the many suggestions and arguments presented. It is encouraging to find general concurrence, even among labor leaders, in condemning strikes, boycotts, and lockouts as barbarisms unfit for the intelligence of this age, and as, economically considered, very injurious and destructive forces. Whether won or lost is broadly immaterial. They are war—internecine war—and call for progress to a higher plane of education and intelligence in adjusting the relations of capital and labor. These barbarisms waste the products of both capital and labor, defy law and order, disturb society, intimidate capital, convert industrial paths where there ought to be plenty into highways of poverty and crime, bear as their fruit the arrogant flush of victory and the humiliating sting of defeat, and lead to preparations for greater and more destructive conflicts. Since nations have grown to the wisdom of avoiding disputes by conciliation, and even of settling

them by arbitration, why should capital and labor in their dependence upon each other persist in cutting each other's throats as a settlement of differences? Official reports show that much progress has been made in the more sane direction of conciliation and arbitration even in America. Abroad they are in advance of us in this policy. Were our population as dense and opportunities as limited as abroad, present industrial conditions would keep us much more disturbed than we now are by contests between capital and labor.

In England, prior to 1824, it was conspiracy and felony for labor to unite for purposes now regarded there by all classes as desirable for the safety of the Government, of capital, and for the protection of the rights of labor. All industrial labor is there, as a rule, covered by unions trained to greater conservatism through many disastrous conflicts under harsh conditions and surroundings. Capital abroad prefers to deal with these unions rather than with individuals or mobs, and from their joint efforts in good faith at conciliation and arbitration much good and many peaceful days have resulted. In fifteen of our States arbitration in various forms is now provided by law; the United States and eleven States have sanctioned labor organizations by statute. Some of our courts, however, are still poring over the law reports of antiquity in order to construe conspiracy out of labor unions. We also have employers who obstruct progress by perverting and misapplying the law of supply and demand, and who, while insisting upon individualism for workmen, demand that they shall be let alone to combine as they please and that society and all its forces shall protect them in their resulting contentions.

The general sentiment of employers, shared in by some of the most prominent railroad representatives we have heard, is now favorable to organization among employees. (a) It results in a clearer presentation and calmer discussion of differences, instils mutual respect and forbearance, brings out the essentials, and eliminates misunderstandings and immaterial matters. To an ordinary observer, argument to sustain the justice and necessity of labor unions and unity of action by laborers is superfluous.

The rapid concentration of power and wealth, under stimulating legislative conditions, in persons, corporations, and monopolies has greatly changed the business and industrial situation. Our railroads were chartered upon the theory that their competition would amply protect shippers as to rates, etc., and employees as to wages and other conditions. Combination has largely destroyed this theory, and has seriously disturbed the natural working of the laws of supply and demand, which, in theory, are based upon competition for labor between those who "demand" it as well as among those who supply it. The interstate commerce act and railroad-commission legislation in over thirty States are simply efforts of the people to free themselves from the results of

^a See testimony of Albert W. Sullivan, questions 42 to 52 inclusive.

this destruction of competition by combination. Labor is likewise affected by this progressive combination. While competition among railroad employers of labor is gradually disappearing, competition among those who supply labor goes on with increasing severity. For instance, as we have shown, there is no longer any competitive demand among the 24 railroads at Chicago for switchmen. They have ceased competing with each other; they are no longer 24 separate and competing employers; they are virtually one. To be sure, this combination has not covered the whole field of labor supply as yet, but it is constantly advancing in that direction. Competition for switchmen's labor still continues with outside employers, among whom, again, we find a like tendency to eliminate competitive demand for labor by similar combination. In view of this progressive perversion of the laws of supply and demand by capital and changed conditions, no man can well deny the right nor dispute the wisdom of unity for legislative and protective purposes among those who supply labor.

However men may differ about the propriety and legality of labor unions, we must all recognize the fact that we have them with us to stay and to grow more numerous and powerful. Is it not wise to fully recognize them by law; to admit their necessity as labor guides and protectors, to conserve their usefulness, increase their responsibility, and to prevent their follies and aggressions by conferring upon them the privileges enjoyed by corporations, with like proper restrictions and regulations? The growth of corporate power and wealth has been the marvel of the past fifty years. Corporations have undoubtedly benefited the country and brought its resources to our doors. It will not be surprising if the marvel of the next fifty years be the advancement of labor to a position of like power and responsibility. We have heretofore encouraged the one and comparatively neglected the other. Does not wisdom demand that each be encouraged to prosper legitimately and to grow into harmonious relations of equal standing and responsibility before the law? This involves nothing hostile to the true interests and rights of either.

A broad range of remedies is presented to the commission as to the best means of adjusting these controversies, such as Government control or ownership of railroads; compulsory arbitration; licensing of employees; the single-tax theory; restriction of immigration and exclusion of pauper labor; protection of American industries; monetary legislation; suppression of trusts and combinations; written contracts requiring due notice of discharge by employers and of leaving service by employees; United States labor commission to investigate and fix hours of labor, rates of wages, etc.; a fixed labor unit; authority to courts to settle these questions; insurance departments and pensioning of employees; fixing hours of labor and minimum rates of wages by statute; change in law of liability of master to servant; and various suggestions for relief, outside of any legislative action, through educa-

tional methods tending to the inculcation of mutual forbearance and just consideration of each other's rights in the premises.

The commission deems recommendations of specific remedies premature. Such a problem, for instance, as universal Government ownership of railroads is too vast, many-sided, and far away, if attempted, to be considered as an immediate, practical remedy. It belongs to the socialistic group of public questions where Government ownership is advocated of monopolies, such as telegraphs, telephones, express companies, and municipal ownership of waterworks, gas and electric lighting, and street railways. These questions are pressing more urgently as time goes on. They need to be well studied and considered in every aspect by all citizens. Should continued combinations and consolidations result in half a dozen or less ownerships of our railroads within a few years, as is by no means unlikely, the question of Government ownership will be forced to the front, and we need to be ready to dispose of it intelligently. As combination goes on there will certainly at least have to be greater Government regulation and control of quasi-public corporations than we have now.

Whenever a nation or a state finds itself in such relation to a railroad that its investments therein must be either lost or protected by ownership, would it not be wise that the road be taken and the experiment be tried as an object lesson in Government ownership? The Massachusetts Railroad Commission, which is noted for its eminent services as a conservative pioneer in the direction of Government control of railroads through the force of public opinion, for several years urged that the experiment of State ownership be tried with the Fitchburg system, because of the large State investment in the Hoosac Tunnel. We need to fear everything revolutionary and wrong, but we need fear nothing that any nation can successfully attempt in directions made necessary by changed economic or industrial conditions. Other nations under their conditions own and operate telegraphs and railroads with varying results. Whether it is practicable for this nation to do so successfully when it becomes necessary to save an investment or when the people determine it shall be done, is an open and serious question which can not be answered fully except by actual experiment.

We ought now to inaugurate a permanent system of investigation into the relations between railroads and employees in order to prepare to deal with them intelligently, and that we may conservatively adopt such remedies as are sustained by public opinion for defects or wrongs that may from time to time appear. In the long contest between shippers and railroads penal and specific legislation proved inadequate. The lessons of this period of legislation need to be well remembered by labor. Hasty, revengeful, and retaliatory legislation injures every interest, benefits nobody, and can not long be enforced.

The question of the right of Congress to legislate in regard to the

conditions of employment and service upon railroads engaged in interstate commerce is a most important one, and the right seems by analogy to exist. Similar power as to rates, discriminations, poolings, etc., has been exercised in the act to regulate commerce, and has been sustained by the courts. The position of railroads as quasi-public corporations subjects them and their employees to this power, and imposes its exercise upon Congress as a duty, whenever necessary for the protection of the people. The question of what shall be done is therefore one of expediency and not of power. When railroads acted as judge and jury in passing upon the complaints of shippers, the people demanded and Congress granted a Government tribunal where shippers and railroads could meet on equal terms and have the law adjust their differences. In view of the Chicago strike and its suggested dangers, the people have the same right to provide a Government commission to investigate and report upon differences between railroads and their employees, to the end that interstate commerce and public order may be less disturbed by strikes and boycotts. Public opinion, enlightened by the hearings before such a commission, will do much toward settling many difficulties without strikes, and in strikes will intelligently sustain the side of right and justice and often compel reasonable adjustments. Experience, however, has taught that public opinion is not alone powerful enough to control railroads. Hence power to review and enforce the just and lawful decisions of the commission against railroads ought to be vested in the United States courts. There can be no valid objection to this when we bear in mind that we are now dealing simply with quasi-public corporations and not with either individuals or private corporations. What is safe and proper as to the former might be unsafe and unjust for the latter. That which is done under the act to regulate commerce as to rates can safely and ought properly to be done as to railroad wages, etc., by a commission and the courts.

Some stability and time for conciliation and amicable adjustment of disputes can also be secured by providing that labor unions shall not strike pending hearings which they seek; and that railroads shall not discharge men except for cause during hearings, and for a reasonable time thereafter. A provision may well be added requiring employees during the same period to give thirty days' notice of quitting and forbidding their unions from ordering or advising otherwise.

Many assert with force that no law can be justly devised to compel employers and employees to accept the decisions of tribunals in wage disputes. It is insisted that while the employer can readily be made to pay under an arbitration decision more than is or than he thinks is right, the employee can not practically be made to work. He can quit, or at least force his discharge, when the decision gives him less than he demands. Hence nothing reciprocal can be devised, and without that element it is urged that nothing just can be enacted of a compulsory nature. This may be true in general industries, but it has less

weight as between railroads and their labor. Railroads have not the inherent rights of employers engaged in private business; they are creatures of the state, whose rights are conferred upon them for public purposes, and, hence, the right and duty of Government to compel them to do in every respect what public interest demands are clear and free from embarrassment. It is certainly for the public interest that railroads shall not abandon transportation because of labor disputes, and, therefore, it is the duty of the Government to have them accept the decision of its tribunals, even though complete reciprocal obligations can not be imposed upon labor. The absence of such reciprocal obligations would rarely affect railroads unjustly, if we regard the question in a practical light.

Railroad employment is attractive and is sought for. There has never been a time in the history of railroads when men did not stand ready to fill a labor vacancy at the wages fixed by the roads. The number is constantly increasing. If railroads can thus always get the men that they need at what they offer, is there any doubt that the supply will be ample at any rates fixed by a commission and the courts? A provision as to notice of quitting, after a decision, would be ample to enable railroads to fill vacancies caused in their labor departments by dissatisfaction with decisions. To go further, under present conditions, at least, in coercing employees to obey tribunals in selling their labor would be a dangerous encroachment upon the inherent, inalienable right to work or quit, as they please.

When railroad employees secure greater certainty of their positions and of the right to promotion, compensation for injury, etc., it will be time enough to consider such strict regulation for them as we can now justly apply to railroads, whose rights are protected by laws and guarded by all the advantages of greater resources and more concentrated control.

In solving these questions, corporations seldom aid the efforts of the people or their legislators. Fear of change and the threatened loss of some power invariably make them obstructionists. They do not desire to be dealt with by any legislation; they simply want to be let alone, confident in their ability to protect themselves. Whatever is right to be done by statutes must be done by the people for their own protection, and to meet the just demand that railroad labor shall have public and impartial hearing of all grievances.

The commission does not pretend to present a specific solution of these questions. Its effort is simply to present the facts; to point out that the relations of capital and labor are so disturbed as to urgently demand the attention of all thinking and patriotic citizens; to suggest a line of search for practical remedial legislation which may be followed with safety, and, finally, to urge and invite labor and railroads to hearty cooperation with the Government and the people in efforts to substitute law and reason in labor disputes for the dangers, sufferings,

uncertainties, and wide-spread calamities incident to strikes, boycotts, and lockouts.

To secure prompt and efficient data for the formation of correct public sentiment in accordance with this line of thought, the commission contends that law should make it obligatory upon some public tribunal promptly to intervene by means of investigation and conciliation, and to report whenever a difficulty of the character of that occurring during the past season at Chicago arises. This intervention should be provided for, first, when the tribunal is called upon to interfere by both of the parties involved; second, when called upon by either of the parties, and, third, when in its own judgment it sees fit to intervene. The proper tribunal should have the right, in other words, to set itself in motion, and rapidly, too, whenever in its judgment the public is sustaining serious inconvenience. If the public can only be educated out of the belief that force is and must always remain the basis of the settlement of every industrial controversy, the problem becomes simplified. A tribunal, however, should not intervene in mere quarrels between employer and employed, unless the public peace or convenience is involved; but where it is a clear case of public obstruction, whether caused by individuals or by a corporation, a tribunal should not wait until called on by outside agencies to act. All parties concerned should be notified that the tribunal proposes, upon a certain day—and the earlier the day the better—to be at a given place, there to look into the cause of the trouble, to adjust the difficulties by conciliation, if possible, and, in the event of failure, to fix the responsibility for the same. Proceeding in this way the report of such a commission would cause public opinion promptly to settle the question, or, at least, to fix the responsibility where it belonged, and to render successful opposition to the conclusions reached an improbability. To carry out this idea involves no complicated legislation.

As authorized by statute, the commission has decided upon certain recommendations and certain suggestions, growing out of its study of the Chicago strike and boycott. These recommendations and suggestions are upon three lines: First, for Congressional action; second, for State action; and third, for the action of corporations and labor organizations. It readily sees the impropriety to a certain extent of making any recommendation for State action, yet feels it a duty, as a result of its investigations, to make such suggestions as will enable citizens interested in State legislation to benefit by its experience, and also to make such suggestions to corporations and labor organizations as shall tend to harmonize some of the existing difficulties. The commission therefore recommends:

I.

(1) That there be a permanent United States strike commission of three members, with duties and powers of investigation and recommendation as to disputes between railroads and their employees

similar to those vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission as to rates, etc.

a. That, as in the interstate commerce act, power be given to the United States courts to compel railroads to obey the decisions of the commission, after summary hearing unattended by technicalities, and that no delays in obeying the decisions of the commission be allowed pending appeals.

b. That, whenever the parties to a controversy in a matter within the jurisdiction of the commission are one or more railroads upon one side and one or more national trade unions, incorporated under chapter 567 of the United States Statutes of 1885-86, or under State statutes, upon the other, each side shall have the right to select a representative, who shall be appointed by the President to serve as a temporary member of the commission in hearing, adjusting, and determining that particular controversy.

(This provision would make it for the interest of labor organizations to incorporate under the law and to make the commission a practical board of conciliation. It would also tend to create confidence in the commission, and to give to that body in every hearing the benefit of practical knowledge of the situation upon both sides.)

c. That, during the pendency of a proceeding before the commission inaugurated by national trade unions, or by an incorporation of employees, it shall not be lawful for the railroads to discharge employees belonging thereto except for inefficiency, violation of law, or neglect of duty; nor for such unions or incorporation during such pendency to order, unite in, aid, or abet strikes or boycotts against the railroads complained of; nor, for a period of six months after a decision, for such railroads to discharge any such employees in whose places others shall be employed, except for the causes aforesaid; nor for any such employees, during a like period, to quit the service without giving thirty days' written notice of intention to do so, nor for any such union or incorporation to order, counsel, or advise otherwise.

(2) That chapter 567 of the United States Statutes of 1885-86 be amended so as to require national trade unions to provide in their articles of incorporation, and in their constitutions, rules, and by-laws that a member shall cease to be such and forfeit all rights and privileges conferred on him by law as such by participating in or by instigating force or violence against persons or property during strikes or boycotts, or by seeking to prevent others from working through violence, threats, or intimidations; also, that members shall be no more personally liable for corporate acts than are stockholders in corporations.

(3) The commission does not feel warranted, with the study it has been able to give to the subject, to recommend positively the establishment of a license system by which all the higher employees or others of railroads engaged in interstate commerce should be licensed after due and proper examination, but it would recommend, and most urgently,

that this subject be carefully and fully considered by the proper committee of Congress. Many railroad employees and some railroad officials examined and many others who have filed their suggestions in writing with the commission are in favor of some such system. It involves too many complications, however, for the commission to decide upon the exact plan, if any, which should be adopted.

II.

(1) The commission would suggest the consideration by the States of the adoption of some system of conciliation and arbitration like that, for instance, in use in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. That system might be reenforced by additional provisions giving the board of arbitration more power to investigate all strikes, whether requested so to do or not, and the question might be considered as to giving labor organizations a standing before the law, as heretofore suggested for national trade unions.

(2) Contracts requiring men to agree not to join labor organizations or to leave them, as conditions of employment, should be made illegal, as is already done in some of our States.

III.

(1) The commission urges employers to recognize labor organizations; that such organizations be dealt with through representatives, with special reference to conciliation and arbitration when difficulties are threatened or arise. It is satisfied that employers should come in closer touch with labor and should recognize that, while the interests of labor and capital are not identical, they are reciprocal.

(2) The commission is satisfied that if employers everywhere will endeavor to act in concert with labor; that if when wages can be raised under economic conditions they be raised voluntarily, and that if when there are reductions reasons be given for the reduction, much friction can be avoided. It is also satisfied that if employers will consider employees as thoroughly essential to industrial success as capital, and thus take labor into consultation at proper times, much of the severity of strikes can be tempered and their number reduced.

regarding the matter which you desire in any way to criticise or answer?—Ans. Well, there are some—not facts, but misstatements that have been made here—

290 (Commissioner KERNAN). Well, anything of that kind.—Ans. We have no hesitancy in stating to you about what was done anywhere and everywhere and we have always been that way. A good deal has been said about this meeting at Blue Island.

291 (Commissioner KERNAN). Where you made a speech and it is alleged that you made several statements. You may testify in reference to that whatever you desire.—Ans. It is true that Mr. Debs, Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Lovejoy, and myself went to Blue Island and were met by a delegation of railroad men after we got there and went to a hall to address a meeting of the railroad men. This hall was full of men except a very small space right in the center of the room, quite a good many were sitting on the floor even, but the doors were wide open and everybody and anybody was welcome to come in. I want to say at the outset, with as much respect for a decent use of the English language as any man in America, I want to explain something about the brogue or parlance that practical railroad men have. Every railroad man in the United States, or on this continent, for that matter—for I have been in Canada and Mexico as well, and I have not found any exception to the general rule—all men who have served, oh, any time at all in the railroad business—practically, I mean, at any practical railroad work as brakemen, as firemen, as conductors, as engineers, or in the train service generally, in a practical way, they get in the habit of using certain phrases, and there is not a great deal meant, strictly speaking, by a great many of the terms that they use. I will say to you that “son of a bitch” among railroad men is a very common expression, and if there are any old-time railroad men in the house every one of them will verify what I say right now. I would not be afraid to give a bond of \$10,000 that every old railroad man will verify what I say right now about that, and it is even such a common expression (of course they don’t expect the world to know it is, because it is only among themselves that they use those terms) that when they meet their best friends sometimes they say, “Hello, you old son of a bitch.” It is a common thing, and they get so in the habit of using the term that it seems they sometimes use it on occasions where they lack for words to supply the deficiency.

I made a speech at Blue Island and spoke about Mr. Pullman. It was about that time that the newspapers had said quite a good deal about his refusing to assist his aged sister—I think it was an aged sister—that he had only given her \$100, and that through an earnest appeal of some business man in Chicago who knew her condition; and that he afterwards refused to assist her in any way, and that she was in abject poverty; and in talking to the railroad men about Mr. Pullman, for I wanted them to know all about Mr. Pullman and about the treatment of the Pullman employees, the reduction of their wages, etc., and of the treatment that was accorded to Miss Jennie Curtis in forcing her to pay the rent that was due to the Pullman company from her father at the time her father died. After narrating all this I said, “The old son of a bitch ought to be hung.” See? I knew who I was talking to. I was talking to railroad men, and I know how to talk to railroad men to get them to understand me. Now, as far as that coupling-pin business is concerned, I am surprised at the testimony that has been given here by railroad men who boast of their intelligence, and nearly all of them boast of what they know. I spoke just as plainly as a man could possibly speak. However, in regard to the hanging of Mr.

Pullman, I did not say I wanted to be a party to the hanging or anything of that kind; and I did not use the term, "son of a bitch," in any sense of degradation to Mr. Pullman's folks nor himself, but merely to emphatically express the principle that I wished them to understand I was trying to apply to that occasion; I was trying to do everything I could to array them against the Pullman company. That is exactly what I was trying to do.

And as to this coupling-pin matter, I will explain that to you, for I am on record all over this country, from here to the Pacific Coast, in town after town where we stopped, and on the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe, the Union Pacific, and all down the coast on the Southern Pacific, even down to San Diego, we made speeches against this wave of religious persecution that has been sweeping over this country for the past few years. I would invariably say this—and I said this at Blue Island, and it was no different from what I said at every place, and I can produce a thousand witnesses—yes, more, if necessary—but I have no hesitation in saying I can bring a thousand here to testify to this effect from various points where we made these speeches. I would start out, after telling them what we could do by organizing all upon one common plane, where the jealousies and all the differences that exist now between the old organizations would be eliminated, for we would all be in one organization; and we have stated from time to time, and, in fact, it was the purpose of the American Railway Union to do away entirely with strikes, for we said, "When we are organized so our force will be recognized, we will never have to use the only weapons that labor has got, the strike and boycott," and exactly upon the same principle that I stated here when I gave my former testimony—I believe I did, anyhow—I stated that this was a striking Government, did I not?

I stated that this was a striking Government, or said it certainly must be, from the armies and navies and forts and arsenals and human-killing machinery that it keeps on hand and maintains. And then in speaking of the Government I used that to illustrate what I meant by the recognition of the force of labor when it was in one solid phalanx. I said this Government will never strike. Why? Should injustice be perpetrated upon a citizen of this country by any foreign power, when a representative of this country goes forward to seek redress for that injury or injustice it will never be necessary for us to strike to protect that citizen, but we will always be met by a spirit of conciliation and arbitration, and it will never be necessary for this Government to strike and use its weapons, because its force is recognized. And upon that same principle I said that the force of labor would never have to strike when it had the good sense to get solidly in line, when its force would be recognized. And we would start out to refute the saying that capital defeats labor. We have always said and always will say that capital never has defeated labor nor can not defeat labor. Labor defeats itself through its tragic deeds. That is what we have said everywhere.

Now, in connection with this other matter. I started out by saying, "I am a Protestant. I want you to understand exactly how I stand," I told the audience; "but you men ought to have more sense than to have allowed emissaries of these corporations to have wormed themselves into your midst, some of them even joining your lodges," and I have even dubbed them "the sleuths of hell." I have even said that, and have explained how these sleuths would get on one side of a lodge room—that is, they would join a lodge of one of the brotherhoods and they would get on one side and secretly tell the members on one side,

"You have got to organize to protect yourselves against the encroachments of the fellows on the other side. These Protestants are going to do you up if you don't organize; they already now have a movement on foot to have every one of you discharged, and if you want to hold your own against them, organize, but don't let me be known in it. I am your friend." And this very same sleuth would go to the other side and would tell the very same thing to the Protestants about what the Catholics were doing: "Organize. If you don't the Catholics will do you up." And that very principle that was used throughout this country put the lodge fires out of scores of lodges of every brotherhood, and there is not a grand officer in these brotherhoods today but knows it, but they have not the nerve to come out and fight squarely against anything of that kind. And then I said, "I am a Protestant, and I am in favor of America, with all her free institutions, and, like Archbishop Ireland, I would be the first man, if our free institutions were attacked, to enlist for their defense;" and I might quote what Archbishop Ireland said in that connection.

I wanted to be neutralized between the Catholics and the Protestants. I wanted to appeal to their good sense. I would then tell them that when it came to a matter of religion, however, that it was not my business to inquire into any man's religious belief; that it was enough for me to know that I could worship my God according to the dictates of my own conscience, according to the rights that the Constitution of this country grants to all its citizens. And I said it was a mortal sin for a man to persecute another because of his religious belief, and that a man that persecuted another because of his religious belief ought to be persecuted and would, in time be persecuted, and I believe it. Then I explained further, in connection with this—preached them a little sermon as it were, and conscientiously, too, notwithstanding the language I sometimes use. It may puzzle some of you when I tell you that I profess to be a Christian man; but I do. I said that if where fault is found as between people of different religious belief it could not at all be consistent on the part of anyone to find that fault or even criticise it, unless the criticism was between consistent Christians to begin with, but I even questioned the propriety of that. I said, "If John Brown had to share the voyage through the valley of death with me, he then might, with some right, comment or criticise my action in regard to religious matters." But I always stated about in this way: "That I had to pass through that voyage by myself, alone, and that at the great bar of God, on the judgment day, I would have to stand and give an account for the deeds done in my body, and that John Brown could not answer one question for George Howard." That is what I stated. And I stated that there at that meeting at Blue Island in the substance I am giving you. I covered this ground, however.

Then, after explaining all this, I said, "Look out; these corporations have used this matter of religious persecution to divide you, and they have been successful in it. Now we are getting you together again; but look out, for they will hatch up something else; what it may be I know not, but as soon as I can get onto it I will tell you what it is. Look out, though, for they will never be idle. I tell you," I said, "as a representative of a corporation for nearly eighteen years, that their only hope to conquer you is to divide you, and there is not a general manager in this country that will deny that. I have talked it over with some of them. They have laughed about it. 'If you get the boys together you know what we have got, but if we divide you we will whip you.' 'Yes; we concede that; but you can't whip us if we

stand together.' They know it as well as we do. Now, no matter what they do towards dividing you, if they ever send one of these 'sleuths'—and perhaps I said 'of hell;' sometimes I used that expression—if they ever send one of these sleuths of hell among you again and you find him injecting his poisonous venom in between you to divide you on a matter of religion, or anything else that will prove detrimental to your interests as laboring men, I hope somebody in this city, or in this place, will have the nerve to take a coupling pin and tap that sleuth on the head and put him to sleep forever." That is exactly what I said, and I have said over a thousand times.

So far as urging or offering violence to people that ever attempted to take the places of our men, we invariably said, and nobody can truthfully say otherwise—and I can produce thousands of witnesses to testify, for they are all over the country, and we addressed thousands and thousands of men—we have said, "When we are together it will not be necessary for us to strike, and we never will strike unless the railroad companies force us to strike, and in that event we will only ask you to go home and put on your good clothes and stay away from the railroad company's property and let them get men to operate their lines if they can; we will have no objection, but we know they can't do it." And I say it now. They can't do it. The general managers were whipped the fifth day after this strike was on; they were whipped and they know they were whipped, and they laid down, and they said, "Now we will let the whole business go to hell," that is what they said, "until this great populace will arise and realize the necessity of the use of these roads, and when they get ready to operate the railroads and will quell this mob, why, we will then operate them." But, mind, the soldiers had not come, and there had not been any rioting done up to that time.

Now, I would like to have the General Managers Association, or some one connected with it, answer these questions to this commission. They are as follows:

"Did your company have a contract with the Government to transport the mails?"

292 (Commissioner KERNAN). If there were any questions to be asked, why were they not handed in at the proper time to the commission?—Ans. I did not know of the notice until today. There will be a general manager here, probably. The other questions I wanted to ask are as follows:

"Was the contract dependent upon your ability to transport Pullman cars?"

"Did your contract with the Pullman company provide that you should not carry the mails unless you took Pullman cars upon the same train?"

"Did the strikers at any time interfere to prevent you carrying the mails if Pullman cars were not attached to the trains?"

"Could you not, at all times, have transported the mails without interruption if you had not insisted upon attaching Pullman cars to the same train?"

"Was your contract with the Government to transport the mails any less binding upon you than your contract with the Pullman company, or was one contract in any sense made dependent upon the other?"

Now, there was one question that Mr. Pullman was not asked the other day when he was on the stand—I don't believe he was, and I want to mention this before the commission. It was currently announced in all of the papers, or nearly all of them, that in Mr. Pull-

man's making an explanation of the situation to Grover Cleveland, the President of the United States, he stated that the railroad companies, or their representatives, meaning the managers, I presume, had told him that if he yielded to the demands that were being made upon him to arbitrate these troubles with his men that they would refuse—in fact, it said they would boycott the Pullman cars. Now, that was stated publicly, and it was stated that he said so to Grover Cleveland, and I would like for this commission before it finishes its work, after they get to Washington, if not here—it can be done by letter—I would like them to bring that out in order to know if Mr. Pullman said that. We want to show, and we will show before we get through with this—if not here, at our trial—that the railroad managers did conspire and did not want any settlement, but they made up their minds that they would never have a better opportunity to crush the American Railway Union than they had now, and they have known for the last five years that the balance of the organizations amounted to nothing.

293 (Commissioner KERNAN). We asked the questions, I think, of both Mr. Pullman and Mr. Wickes as to what conferences they had had with the general managers and what was said at them, and as to whether there was any agreement or arrangement between them, or if they tried to influence them, or if they followed their advice or sought their advice, or if the general managers advised, or any of them, against arbitration. Those questions I know were asked of Mr. Wickes, and I think of Mr. Pullman also.—Ans. Well, I was not here and merely just thought of it. I believe I did mention it before, but I could not be here. I would like to go upon record in this way for the benefit of the community at large. I would like to ask the question, if railroad men were engaged in the riots, etc., why did not or why do not the railroad companies manifest the same disposition that we have manifested and are manifesting all the time to apprehend these rioters or these incendiaries? For we have been instrumental in having arrested all that have been arrested thus far; we have been instrumental ourselves in having all apprehended that have been apprehended.

294 (Commissioner KERNAN). One moment there. Those who have been arrested have been arrested either by police officers or by United States marshals, have they not?—Ans. Yes, sir.

295 (Commissioner KERNAN). Is it your understanding that the arrests have been made at the instigation or suggestion of the American Railway Union?—Ans. Yes, sir, through the officers; the testimony was furnished by the American Railway Union to these officers, and we will make this interesting before we get through.

296 (Commissioner KERNAN). Would that fact appear if we should go to the police headquarters or to the courts where these men were charged with these offenses?—Ans. Mr. Hopkins will tell you so personally when he comes on the stand, and I understand he is to be here today or his inspector, Shea; and I would like for Mr. Hopkins or his inspector, or chief detective—I would like for him to say whether any general manager has ever been to him.

297 (Commissioner KERNAN). We have had marshals on the stand who made arrests.—Ans. I understand that.

298 (Commissioner KERNAN). And we have had railroad men here who have been arrested. Now, as to them, I don't remember of any evidence that tends to show that they were arrested at the instigation of the order.—Ans. I won't say as to these frivolous arrests, but I mean arrests where we have got evidence against them and have got them held, and they are being held. There have been lots of men arrested

on trumped-up charges who have been discharged again—hundreds of them.

299 (Commissioner KERNAN). I would regard of some importance here any evidence showing that your organization or its officers charged men with these offenses that were committed and caused their arrest.—Ans. As I told this commission a week ago, I want John P. Hopkins, the mayor of the city, put upon the stand.

300 (Commissioner KERNAN). You understand that we have invited him?—Ans. Yes, sir; that is the reason I asked that he be put upon the stand a week ago.

301 (Commissioner KERNAN). We invited him among all the others to appear here when we first came here.—Ans. Now, if it was necessary, and I asked the chairman of the commission if it was necessary that we should furnish any more witnesses to demonstrate that there is a blacklist on the part of these corporations, and I was told no, that perhaps it would not be necessary, I want to say right now, that I can furnish hundreds of witnesses from different parts of this country right here in Chicago to prove that there is a blacklist and that they use it all the time, and furthermore, that J. A. Fillmore, the general superintendent of the Southern Pacific, does not deny it today, but boasts of it, if the reports are true not only from men on his line but from his public official utterances.

302 (Commissioner KERNAN). As to a "blacklist," may there not be simply a difference between you and the railroad companies in the use of terms?—Ans. Well, a boycott and a blacklist are the same thing.

303 (Commissioner KERNAN). What I mean is, if a man applying for railroad employment is always asked to furnish his references or clearance papers from other roads and then it is the practice for the company to apply to the road which he gives as a reference as to the man's character and ability and as to the cause of his discharge, and in answer to that inquiry the information is given that, if he quit as a striker that may or may not be given, but it generally is stated. Now, there has evidence to that effect been given here. Is that what you mean when you say there is a blacklist, or is it something different?—Ans. Here is what I mean. In fact, the laws of this land say it is wrong and common sense and justice say it is wrong to try to kill a man because he has made one mistake. As I said before—

304 (Commissioner KERNAN). The question is whether what I have said amounts to what you call a blacklist—that is, one road stating to another, upon inquiry that a man was discharged for such and such a cause, as for striking or for incompetency or for whatever it might be?—Ans. That would be all right if they would be open about it; if they would give a man a letter saying, "You were discharged for such and such a thing," we would say all right to that; that is fair and honorable; but they get secret information in which the names of these men are placed in a book and are kept on file by these various railroad companies throughout this country to prevent men who have made a mistake, we will say—that is, engaging in a strike or something that they honestly engaged in to better their conditions.

305 (Commissioner KERNAN). The evidence, so far as the railroad people are concerned, upon that point is, that the names of all men discharged are kept by the railroad companies somewhere for the purpose of keeping the records complete, and that that is furnished to the different division superintendents of the road so that they may not employ men who have been discharged upon other divisions. Now, that seems to be the evidence of the railroad managers as to that

question—or some of them admit that to be true.—Ans. I admit that, for I have kept them in my own office—

306 (Commissioner KERNAN). But they do take the position that they do not voluntarily send that list of names to other railroads; that they do not exchange lists of that kind with each other, but that they only give that kind of information to each other when it is sought, after a man makes an application for work. Now, if there is anything more in the black list I want to know it.—Ans. J. A. Fillmore, general superintendent of the Southern Pacific Railroad, said in the public press only yesterday that these men shall not be employed any more on his railroad and that he will follow them throughout the United States, and through the world, that they shall not be employed on any railroad in Canada. And right here on the Illinois Central and Rock Island you will find it; you will find that they have a blacklist, and I can produce thousands of witnesses to show they have—that is, we can not produce their books, you will have to do that, but they do exchange these and blacklist people as between each other. If they don't, how do you reconcile the testimony that has been given here by certain people to their statements when they told you that they have gone from here to Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Altoona, and elsewhere and found themselves on record when they got there, when they were never known in that part of the country before?

307 (Commissioner KERNAN). I do not remember of evidence of that kind. Evidence has been given of application made to work and references given and then afterwards the parties informed that their services were not wanted, and in some cases where men had got positions and handed in their references and then were discharged. Now, that might be consistent with this system of inquiry and would rather militate against your suggestion that the names are exchanged, because if that was so no man could get a position at all, but some of these men got positions.—Ans. But none of these fellows who were blacklisted got positions, and they won't unless the railroads are forced to the wall and compelled to employ some of the old men, and they will have to reemploy some of these men. But here is the advantage that could be taken if they would do their business open and above board—for instance, here is a letter headed "Chicago and Erie Railroad Company, office of superintendent Western Division, 621 Western Union Building, Chicago." It reads as follows:

AUGUST 22, 1894.

To whom it may concern:

The bearer, Mr. Frank Wells, entered service of this company as switchman at Chicago, and was in continuous service, with good record, up to June 29, 1894, when he went out on strike with other switchmen, and was not again permitted to enter the service.

Yours truly,

GEO. A. COE, *Superintendent.*

It says they would not let him enter the service of that company; but that man's name is on record with all the other railroads in Chicago. We could beat this if it was not for this undercut, the man might change his name. They have not been keeping this general black list until the last twelve years. We used to beat this; the man could change his name and go off and get a job somewhere else. I have had that done many a time to help these men out, and it was a common occurrence, and has been testified to here, although I don't know that it was testified to by more than one party, but a man from Pullman told you about it. They could beat it in that way by changing their names. We deplore anything of that kind, for we don't like to see a man sail under

a false name, but when that is the only thing he can do to obtain support for himself and family we say it is justifiable.

308 (Commissioner KERNAN). These questions that you have handed me to be answered—Ans. They can be asked from Washington by letter.

309 (Commissioner KERNAN). It seems to me they have been substantially covered, or can be covered without calling anybody. This first question that you ask here, "Did your company have a contract with the Government to transport the mails?" Of course, every company that transports mails has a contract with the Government, that will be conceded. The second question is, "Was the contract dependent upon your ability to transport Pullman cars?" Of course they would say "No" to that. The third question is, "Did your contract with the Pullman company provide that you should not carry the mails unless you took Pullman cars upon the same train?" They would say "No" to that; and, besides, we are to have a copy of the Pullman contract with the roads.—Ans. All of them?

310 (Commissioner KERNAN). Not all of them, but a sample of the kind of contract that they made is to be furnished to us. They said they were all substantially the same. The next question is, "Did the strikers at any time interfere to prevent your carrying the mails if Pullman cars were not attached to the train?" I have understood that the strikers at no time took the position that they would not operate the trains if they would take all the Pullman cars off, and I assume that to be so.—Ans. That is right.

311 (Commissioner KERNAN). There is nothing to the contrary, I think, here. Your next question is, "Could you not at all times have transported the mails without interruption, if you had not insisted upon attaching Pullman cars to the same train?" That follows from the preceding question and from the fact that the strike was against Pullman cars attached to trains. I assume, of course, that they could have transported the mails if they had removed all of the Pullman cars. I think the evidence that we have got covers those questions.—Ans. I knew on the Great Northern Railroad Charles Nielson, who is now Second Assistant Postmaster-General, when he was assistant superintendent. I had known him quite a while when he was on the Cincinnati, Hamilton and Dayton road, and we talked personally about the matter, and I got evidence to show that they were running empty mail cars out on the road filled with United States deputy marshals, with no mails in at all, the United States marshals guarding empty mail cars. I went and told Mr. Nielson, "I have testimony to show that your United States marshals have been used by the Great Northern company to protect mail cars with no mail in them." He said, "I know that is a fact, for I ordered the man down to take all of the Government property out of the cars."

312 (Commissioner KERNAN). Your last question is, "Was your contract with the Government to transport the mails any less binding upon you than your contract with the Pullman company, or was one contract in any sense made dependent upon the other?" I do not think we should assume that the Government contract as to the mails was any less binding than any other contract that the road had.—Ans. The Government contract would certainly take precedence over anything.

313 (Commissioner KERNAN). I don't think we need to ask that question.—Ans. We know what they have to answer before you ask the questions; if the ground has been covered, it is superfluous to ask them.

314 (Commissioner KERNAN). We would assume that a contract to carry the mails is as binding as any contract a man can make.—Ans. The most binding. But we can't straighten these matters out without agitation.

August 30, 1894, George W. Howard, recalled, on behalf of employees, testified as follows:

315 (Commissioner KERNAN). Are these telegrams described in this information in the United States circuit court against Mr. Debs, yourself, et al., substantially correct?—Ans. I know nothing about a telegram, not one; I didn't send any and know nothing about them.

316 (Commissioner KERNAN). You are one of the parties defendant in that case?—Ans. Yes, sir.

317 (Commissioner KERNAN). I didn't know but what the information was served upon you and you had ascertained whether they were substantially correct.—Ans. I would not deny they are not correct, because there is nothing in them we care about. I think I read them over once, but the truth about the matter is that I have not paid enough attention to that suit to know.

318 (Commissioner KERNAN). I understand they were not denied by you in your answer. Some one has said to me that these telegrams were paid for by the American Railway Union, although it was further said that many of them were not sent by Mr. Debs himself, but were sent from headquarters by parties about there. Do you know how that is?—Ans. Yes, sir.

319 (Commissioner KERNAN). Is that substantially so?—Ans. Yes, sir.

320 (Commissioner KERNAN). You don't think we would be doing an injustice to the American Railway Union if we were to assume these telegrams in this bill were sent either by Mr. Debs, so far as he has testified here about it, or were sent from the headquarters of the American Railway Union during that time, do you?—Ans. I would like to look over them.

321 (Commissioner KERNAN). We can send to the telegraph office and get them, but that would take time and we would like to have them.—Ans. Mr. Debs' name is signed to all of them and I hate to testify to anything his name is signed to when I know nothing about it. I did not see one of those messages before they were sent. I didn't see any messages before they were sent before the strike at all.

322 (Commissioner KERNAN). We would not assume anything more than is stated in the answer of Mr. Debs, or one of the directors, perhaps it is Mr. Keliher's answer, to the effect that while Mr. Debs did not personally send them or know of them, that they were sent from the headquarters of the American Railway Union by parties there and were paid for by the union. If we could assume that to be true without doing injustice to the American Railway Union it would save us sending to the telegraph company.—Ans. I think we denied in toto all the charges made against us in that bill and made affidavit to that effect, and so far as I am concerned I know nothing about those telegrams. I read them over just once. I think the Government in its complaint against us claims to have gotten those telegrams or some telegrams from the Western Union company, and I said the other day on the stand and I say now that we have no objection to the Western Union company delivering any and all telegrams that were sent to us; we would just as soon they would do it openly as under cover, but as to those telegrams in that bill I would not want to say anything about

them because they have a direct bearing upon our case in court which is to be tried shortly. If I recollect right we deny in toto all the charges in that bill.

323 (Commissioner KERNAN). I assumed it was conceded in the answer of some of the defendants that these telegrams were sent from the headquarters of the American Railway Union and paid for by the union?—Ans. No, sir; that was never testified to by anybody that knew anything about it, certainly not by any of the defendants in the case.

324 (Commissioner KERNAN). I know you said in your former testimony you were willing the Western Union should produce anything that was sent?—Ans. Yes, sir; we have found telegrams and Mr. Debs has just unearthed a great many more that were sent by parties that we did not know anything about. We have some special detectives now at work trying to find out who sent some of the telegrams that were sent.

325 (Commissioner KERNAN). I suppose the custom in and about your headquarters during the strike was such that a number of persons there could have sent telegrams in this way?—Ans. I don't think there was any number of persons. The persons were very few that had authority to send telegrams, perhaps not to exceed one or two around headquarters.

326 (Commissioner KERNAN). Is there anybody here who can say as to whether these telegrams were sent from headquarters or not?—Ans. No, sir; but I will do this: I will go and see our attorney, Mr. Irwin, who has jurisdiction of all papers except what was turned over to the commission, and tell him to let us know what he don't want to use in our case and you are welcome to all of the balance of them and to all the rest after our case is decided. Our case comes up September 5. We will give you a copy of anything and everything.

327 (Commissioner KERNAN). I don't know but what we could save time by taking this list in this bill.—Ans. You realize my position; I know nothing about them and we deny the whole thing I believe; I know so far as I am concerned I do; I know I didn't send them and I know Mr. Debs did not.

328 (Commissioner KERNAN). Well, you see your attorney about it and if he thinks proper to make that admission, so we may be saved the trouble of going to the telegraph office about it, do so.—Ans. We have some telegrams that our attorneys have got, and as soon as we get through with them we will have no hesitancy in giving you the whole business.

EXHIBIT 1.—CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN RAILWAY UNION.

PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSES.

It is a self-evident truth that "in union there is strength," and, conversely, without union weakness prevails; therefore the central benefit to be derived from organization is strength—power to accomplish that which defies individual effort.

The American Railway Union includes all railway employees, *born of white parents*, organized within one great brotherhood. There is one supreme law for the order, one roof to shelter all, and all united when unity of action is required. The reforms sought to be inaugurated and the benefits to be derived therefrom, briefly stated, are as follows:

First. The protection of members in all matters relating to wages and their rights as employees is the principal purpose of the organization. Railway employees are entitled to a voice in fixing wages and in determining conditions of employment. Fair wages and proper treatment must be the return for efficient service faithfully performed. Such a policy insures harmonious relations and satisfactory results. The order, while pledged to conservative methods, will protect the humblest of its members in every right he can justly claim; but while the rights of members will be sacredly guarded, no intemperate demand or unreasonable propositions will be entertained. Corporations will not be permitted to treat the organization better

than the organization will treat them. A high sense of honor must be the animating spirit, and even-handed justice the end sought to be obtained. Thoroughly organized in every department, with a due regard for the right wherever found, it is confidently believed that all differences may be satisfactorily adjusted, that harmonious relations may be established and maintained; that the service may be incalculably improved, and that the necessity for strike and lockout, boycott and blacklist, alike disastrous to employer and employee, and a perpetual menace to the welfare of the public, will forever disappear.

Second. In every department of labor the question of economy is forced to the front by the logic of necessity; the importance of organization is conceded, but if it costs more than a workingman is able to pay, the benefits to accrue, however great, are barred; therefore, to bring the expenses of the organization within the reach of all is the one thing required, a primary question which must be settled before those who stand most in need can participate in the benefits to be derived; hence to reduce the cost to the lowest practical point is a demand strictly in accord with the fundamental principles of economy, and any movement which makes it possible for all to participate in the benefit ought to meet with popular favor.

Third. The organization will have a number of departments, each of which will be designed to promote the welfare of the membership in a practical way and by practical methods. The best thought of workingmen has long sought to solve a problem of making labor organizations protective, not only against sickness, disability, and death, but against the ills consequent upon idleness and those that follow in its train; hence there will be established an employment department, in which it is proposed to register the name of every member out of employment. The department will also be fully informed where work may be obtained. It is doubtful if a more important feature could be suggested. It evidences fraternal regard without a fee, benevolence without alloy.

Fourth. In the establishment of the department of education, a number of important features are contemplated, as, for instance, lectures upon subjects relating to economics, such as wages, expenses, the relations of employer and employee, strikes, their moral and financial aspect, etc. In this connection a daily paper will be established whose mission it will be to advocate measures and policies in which labor has vital interest, and also the publication of a standard monthly magazine, which will occupy a still broader field in the discussion of questions which engage the attention of the best writers and thinkers of the times.

Fifth. There will be a department designed to promote legislation in the interest of labor, that is to say, the enactment of laws by legislature and by Congress having in view well-defined obligations of employers and employees, such as safety appliances for trains; apprentices in all departments not to be encouraged, and the influence of the unions used to suppress them; work for the inauguration of the eight-hour day and the regulation and payment of wages, the rights of employees to be heard in courts when they have claims to be adjudicated. The enactment of employer's liability law and the restriction of Sunday work.

Sixth. In the department of insurance sound business principles will be introduced, something that has not hitherto engaged the serious attention its importance merits. At present insurance entails grievous burdens without corresponding benefits. To lessen the cost, while maintaining every security and every benefit, will be the problem the department will solve. It is the purpose to have a life as well as a disability department, both to be optional with the membership. With this declaration of its purposes, and with boundless faith in its conquering mission, the American Railway Union consecrates itself to the great cause of industrial emancipation. It comes with a message of greeting and good cheer to all organizations and all men who stand pledged to the sacred work of lightening the burden and lifting up the bowed form of labor. It hails with a glow of satisfaction the signs of the times, indicating with an unerring certainty the coming of a new and better era, when heart, brain, and conscience in holy alliance shall be the controlling power in human affairs. In this spirit it enters upon its chosen field, and will labor with all the zeal, devotion, and ability at its command to attain the cherished object of its high ambition.

CONSTITUTION OF GENERAL UNION.

SECTION 1. This organization shall be known as the American Railway Union, and its headquarters shall be located at Chicago, Ill.

SEC. 2. The American Railway Union shall be composed of a general union consisting of a board of directors of nine members, and the duly accredited representatives; also of the local unions instituted under the jurisdiction of the order.

SEC. 3. The board of directors shall be elected quadrennially, and shall have general supervision of the organization; they shall hold stated meetings on the second Tuesday in the months of June, September, December, and March, and such special meetings as may be required for the transaction of business. The board shall, at

4 (Commissioner KERNAN). On what do you base the loss of wages?—
 Ans. We estimate that the earnings of July would at least equal what they were in June so far as the freight earnings are concerned. With the matter of passenger earnings, we found the loss in June, 1894, from June, 1892, was 13.92 per cent; we deduct that same percentage from the passenger earnings for July, 1892, and call the remainder the probable earnings what they would have been in July, with no interruption of our business.

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR G. WELLS.

August 29, 1894, Arthur G. Wells, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name and business.—Ans. My name is Arthur G. Wells; I am assistant to the first vice-president of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad Company.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You were asked to furnish a statement relative to the losses on your road. Have you the statement asked for by the commission?—Ans. Yes, sir; it is in the form of a letter.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Will you kindly give us the figures?—
 Ans. The loss of property on the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe aggregated: Cars, to the value of \$2,373.09; buildings and other property, \$2,663.84. As to the loss of business, we are not able to give information that would be reliable; we estimate that it will run pretty close to half a million dollars. The loss of wages to employees by reason of the suspension of traffic, as nearly as we can figure it, aggregated \$111,217.36. I believe those are all the figures that the commission called for.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Is that statement in a form that you can file it with the commission?—Ans. I can put it in form and send it over and will do so (a).

5 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). The strike has been declared off on the Santa Fe, has it?—Ans. Not formally; no, sir.

6 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Is the road operating now as it did before the strike?—Ans. Yes, sir; without interruption to traffic.

7 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Do you personally know anything with reference to violence on the road and destruction of property?—
 Ans. No, sir; not from personal observation, only from reports.

EXHIBIT 12.

ATCHISON, TOPEKA AND SANTA FE RAILROAD SYSTEM,
 Chicago, August 30, 1894.

Hon. CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
 Chairman United States Labor Commission, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: As directed by you this morning, and agreeable to promise, I beg leave to submit the following statistics:

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad lost by acts of strikers and their sympathizers during the American Railway Union troubles the following property:

Cars to the value of.....	\$2,373.09
Buildings and other property	2,663.84

Total	5,036.93
-------------	----------

As nearly as we can arrive at it the loss in wages to employees during the same period aggregated	111,217.36
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

The loss of traffic by reason of the strike is hard to arrive at, but we think it will closely approximate.....	500,000.00
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

Respectfully submitted.

A. G. WELLS,
 Assistant to First Vice-President.

TESTIMONY OF E. ST. JOHN.

CHICAGO, August 29, 1894.

HON. CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Chairman Labor Commission, city.

DEAR SIR: By careful examination of our records, we find that the total number of men affected by the strike upon our line was 6,998.

Wages lost to employees	\$115,602.93
Damage to property	13,144.94
Loss in business (estimated)	459,293.38
Cost for protection (estimated).....	35,000.00

(We have already paid on above item, by voucher, and it is not all in,
 \$29,601.27.)

Total loss to the company and its employees.....	623,041.25
Deduct loss to the men in wages	115,602.93

Total loss to the company direct	507,438.32
----------------------------------------	------------

Probably this amount will be increased rather than diminished when the actual facts are obtained.

Very respectfully,

E. ST. JOHN, *General Manager.*

STATE OF ILLINOIS, *Cook County, ss:*

E. St. John, being first duly sworn, on his oath says, that he is general manager of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, and affiant further says that the above and foregoing statement by him subscribed is true, according to his best knowledge, information, and belief.

E. ST. JOHN, *General Manager.*

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of August, A. D. 1894.

H. S. WALDRON, *Notary Public.*

(See also testimony of A. W. Sullivan, *ante*, as to the losses, etc., on the Illinois Central Railroad.)

The above testimony is all that was given before the commission at its hearing. From written statements from the railroad officials, some verified and some unverified, forwarded the commission since the hearing at Chicago, and from data furnished by companies to the Department of Labor, the commission was enabled to make up the statement published on page XVIII of the report proper, which is believed to be as nearly accurate as could be made in a matter necessarily based, to a considerable degree, on estimates.

TESTIMONY ON THE PART OF THE STRIKING EMPLOYEES AT THE TOWN OF PULLMAN.

TESTIMONY OF THOMAS W. HEATHCOATE.

August 16, 1894, Thomas W. Heathcoate, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name, age, residence, and occupation.—Ans. My name is Thomas W. Heathcoate; am 58 years of age; am a car builder, and reside at Pullman, Ill.; have been a car builder thirty years; I was employed at the Pullman shops until the recent strike; have been at Pullman as a car builder five years; am a member of the American Railway Union and have been since April, 1894; am president of local union, No. 208, at Pullman; the membership of that local union is 656; there are nineteen local unions of the

American Railway Union at Pullman, and their membership varies from 200 to 650 members; I could not state the number of members in each local union exactly; these local unions at Pullman are all affiliated with the American Railway Union.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). It has been stated here that the recent strike at Pullman by the employees of the Pullman Palace Car Company was declared by the local unions there belonging to the American Railway Union; is that correct?—Ans. Yes, sir.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State what you know of the causes which led to that strike by the local unions at Pullman, the conditions which surrounded it, and any facts connected with it that came within your knowledge. State it in narrative form in your own way, as briefly as possible.—Ans. In May, 1893, we were getting good wages and had quite a good deal of work on hand in the Pullman shops; along about September, 1893, our wages began to be reduced because work was slack, that is, on their own work, and they kept reducing our pay each month on almost every contract we took from the company; they kept reducing the price of piecework until it was almost impossible for us to live; in January, 1894, the men wanted to strike, but we were not organized at that time; there was no organization in the shops, except the painters, and in order to succeed in securing a higher rate of pay it became necessary for us to organize in some way; we could not see any more feasible plan than to organize in the American Railway Union, for the reason, we believed, that union was stronger than any other organization in the country.

Along about the latter part of March or 1st of April, 1894, we began to organize, and in order to do so we had to go to Grand Crossing, as the Pullman company would not tolerate any union in their shops. If a man belonged to a union, if the company knew it, he was discharged; we had to go down to Grand Crossing for the purpose of organizing the first local union; then we held meetings over in Kensington. At about the first meeting that was held I think about 200 signed their names as members of the American Railway Union. The conditions became worse; in April there was another cut, which made it impossible for us to maintain our families and pay our rent; we had to do something; times were hard and men could not get money enough to move away from Pullman; we did not know really what to do. I used my utmost endeavors to keep the men from striking. I knew the condition of the times, but it was utterly impossible for me to control those who wanted to strike; we then held meetings until we had about 35 per cent of the men organized; and on the 10th of May, after this committee had been down to see the Pullman officials, after they had used every effort with the Pullman company to make some concessions towards the raising of wages or reduction of them, the mediation board, which was a committee composed of three members from each local union, then organized, met in Turner Hall, and were in session all night discussing what to do, and that night a strike was ordered by the local union, that is, three members from each local.

The strike occurred on May 11, 1894, and we then met in Turner Hall and appointed what is called a central strike committee for the purpose of conducting the strike. We then appointed committees to watch the Pullman property, so as to protect it. We had about 300 men stationed at different points for that purpose, thinking perhaps hoodlums would come from Chicago and other places and try to destroy the shops. We kept them there night and day, changing the men, until the United States Government sent troops there. There were about 4,500 men

there that had nothing to do, and we took that precaution in order to save the Pullman property, and only withdrew our watchmen after the United States militia came.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Did any violence or destruction of property take place at Pullman?—Ans. No, sir.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You spoke of the United States militia; you mean the State militia, do you not?—Ans. I mean the United States troops.

6 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Were United States troops at Pullman?—Ans. Yes, sir.

7 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What wages were you receiving at time of and prior to the strike?—Ans. Now, I was foreman of a gang, or what they call a gang boss, and I have my time book with me [witness referring to book]. In June, 1893, my pay for two weeks' work was \$43.55 at piecework; in July, 1893, my pay for two weeks' work was \$34.65. The reason of that difference was in the difference in the cars. On some cars we got a little better price than on others, it being finer, nicer work, and an expert mechanic can make better wages on fine work than common work.

8 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You worked on palace cars?—Ans. Yes, sir.

9 (Commissioner KERNAN). If you had kept on at the same kind of work you were on in June would not your earnings have been the same?—Ans. If I had had that class of work right along and the price for it my wages would have been the same.

10 (Commissioner KERNAN). Was there any change in the scale of wages in those two months?—Ans. Not on the same kind of work. For the last two weeks of July, 1893, my pay was \$30.20. I lost some time during that two weeks; I did not work two or three days. In the first two weeks in August there was a reduction in the pay of 20 per cent, that is, the same class of piecework was cut down and a 25 per cent reduction made on the piecework. The day rate remained the same in August. We were rated at so much a day, but we had to do piecework, and a great many of us never got any day work. It was only the friends of the foreman that got the day work. The last two weeks of August, 1893, my pay was \$37.25; I worked some overtime. In the first two weeks of September my pay was \$32.70, and for the last two weeks of September, \$12.25. We were laid off from the 22d to the last of September, that is, the foreman laid all the gang off, so I only earned \$12.25 that two weeks. During the month of October we had no work at all. The first two weeks in November I received \$8.05; the second two weeks \$20.10. There was another cut; there were two cuts came in the first two weeks.

11 (Commissioner KERNAN). Can you give us here what you would have earned for the same amount of work in June, 1893?—Ans. I could not tell exactly without figuring it, but instead of earning \$20 I would have earned about \$38.

12 (Commissioner KERNAN). And while you were earning the \$8 what would you have earned?—Ans. I should have earned then about \$14.

13 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). While you were earning the \$8 during the two weeks you speak of you were not working all the time?—Ans. No; but for the same amount of time I did work I would have earned \$14 in June, 1893. In December, 1893, I worked full time and made \$22.70. There was another cut—

14 (Commissioner KERNAN). How much would you have earned for that time, say, in June, 1893?—Ans. I would have earned \$48. This more than cut the wages in two; it took a little more than half the price

off what it had been in June, 1893. During the last two weeks of December, 1893, I worked every day except seven hours and earned \$21.15; in January, 1894, I worked full time with the exception of five hours and earned \$20.85.

15 (Commissioner KERNAN). What would you have earned for the same time in June, 1893?—Ans. Forty-eight dollars. The last two weeks in January, 1894, I worked full time and made \$27.55; the first two weeks in February I made \$22.10, and the last two weeks \$14.75. In March, 1894, the first two weeks I made \$24.75, and the next two weeks \$26.50.

16 (Commissioner KERNAN). What would you have earned for the same work in June, 1893?—Ans. About \$43. We were making in June, 1893, from 28½ to 32½ cents per hour on piecework, and now we are making 19 cents an hour, and 18, 15, and 14 cents.

17 (Commissioner KERNAN). What do you mean by now?—Ans. In the months of March, April, and May, 1894. The first two weeks in April I lost two days and made \$16.25; the second two weeks, working full time, I made \$20.95. I worked up to April 4, and we appointed a committee to go and see Mr. Wickes. On the 5th that committee returned to Pullman. We waited two days to have an answer from Mr. Wickes in regard to what should be done, and on the 9th we returned again to Mr. Wickes.

18 (Commissioner KERNAN). You have not given us what you said to Mr. Wickes?—Ans. In the first place we went to Mr. Middleton, the manager of the shops, and asked that something be done with reference to the piecework, that the price be raised, that we could not possibly live at the prices we were getting. He said he could not do anything, that he had no authority, that the general manager had utterly refused to do anything with regard to raising prices so we could make more per day. We then appointed a committee of three from each department to go down and see Mr. Wickes, so each department would be represented. We went down and saw him, stated our case to him, and he said he could not do anything, that the company could not pay any more wages, that they were losing money. I asked Mr. Wickes why it was that railroad companies were paying \$2.50 per day for the same work the Pullman company were only paying \$1.90 for. He said he was not aware of anything of that kind. I had gotten that information from the master car builder of the Great Western road and the Northern Pacific. I wrote to him to find out what price they were paying per day and found out that they were paying \$2.50 per day for the same kind of work that was being done in the Pullman shops for \$1.90 per day, only ours was piecework and theirs was day work.

In order to show you the difference in making \$1.90 at piecework and \$1.90 at day work, a man has to do about four times as much work at piecework as he has to do at day work, because the prices are cut down so low it is almost impossible for a man, unless he is an expert, to make \$1.90 per day at the work. For instance, take the desk behind which you sit. I take the making of that desk today for \$20; I go to work on it and, being an expert, make \$4 per day at it; then the foreman says to me "the next time I will not give you but \$18 for making it." Well, I take another desk at that and by hard work still make \$4 per day at it. The next time he cuts the price down to \$16. I still by using more effort, working hard, make \$4 per day at it. He then cuts the price down to \$12 and I can only make \$3 per day at it. Being an expert mechanic, I will not make any more, don't want to. He then gives the desk to some other man who is not as expert in doing the

work, and that man can not make \$1.25 per day at it. That is the reason a man has to work so much harder in order to make \$1.90 than the man who works in a railroad shop at \$2.50 or \$2.75. He has to do four times the amount of work.

19 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Would the same proportions you have given with reference to your own loss of earnings hold good for the general employees at Pullman during the time you were working there?—Ans. I think so. There are some men in Pullman that earn good wages, but on the average all the employees of the Pullman shops were in about the same condition.

20 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Between June, 1893, and the time of the strike at Pullman, which was May 11, 1894, was the company building new palace cars?—Ans. Yes, sir; they were building compartment cars of their own, and they were building some refrigerator cars for the Lake Shore, some for the Long Island road, and they had a few cars for some other line. I am not familiar with the names of the lines.

21 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Does the Pullman company manufacture palace cars for roads over which they do not operate the cars themselves?—Ans. If you term palace cars common day coaches, they do.

22 (Commissioner WRIGHT). I mean those palace cars in which seats are sold at an extra price?—Ans. That would be a chair car; I don't think they do.

23 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do they manufacture sleepers for the Wagner company?—Ans. No, sir; not since I have been there.

24 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you live at Pullman now, and occupy one of the Pullman houses?—Ans. Yes, sir.

25 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What rent do you pay?—Ans. \$17.71 per month when I have the money to pay.

26 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What is the size of the house?—Ans. Five rooms, a cellar, and a back yard.

27 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What would you have to pay in this city for the same accommodations, or say in Kensington or Hyde Park?—Ans. There are seven and eight room cottages, separate and alone, that are renting there today for \$7, \$8, and \$9 per month.

28 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What was the price last year for such accommodations as you have at Pullman?—Ans. The same as it is now.

29 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Has there been any change in the rental since you have been working there?—Ans. No, sir.

30 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Does the rent you pay include any privileges, such as water, gas, or anything?—Ans. It includes the water; it is \$17 for rent and 71 cents per month for water.

31 (Commissioner WRIGHT). And your gas you pay for as you use it?—Ans. I can not afford to use gas.

32 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What is the price of gas at Pullman?—Ans. I think \$2.50 per thousand; I am not positive.

33 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What does the company pay for water?—Ans. I don't know, but I understand Mr. Pullman makes \$33,000 per year over and above what it costs him from his tenants; I have been so informed.

34 (Commissioner WRIGHT). By persons in a position to know?—Ans. It did not come to me through any officer of the company, but from parties who had heard some of the officers say so; I only know that from hearsay.

35 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you made application for reinstatement at Pullman?—Ans. No, sir; I have been told that I am black-

listed; they have a blacklist there and I have one of them in my pocket, similar to the one sent out to different railroad companies.

36 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Will you produce it, and submit it as part of your testimony?—Ans. Yes, sir; the blacklist that was made out in December is as follows:

PULLMAN, ILL., December 23, 1893.

To all foremen:

In connection with the recent trouble we have had with steam fitters, both in the construction and repair departments, I give below the names of the men who have left our employ, and I hereby instruct that none of these men be employed in these works.

CONSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT.

No. 1703. Joseph Cohan.
1705. Frank McKevilt.
1706. William O'Meara.
1707. James H. Matthews.
1711. Edward Sweeney.
1715. John Guthardt.
1721. Martin Tracey.
1720. Tice Mastebrook.
1722. Charles G. Duffy.
1740. Frank Vincent.
1743. Michael McNulty.
1753. William H. Danaher.

No. 1764. Edward M. Barrett.
4500. Jacob Stockman.
4516. Robert Goebbels.
4563. James A. Brown.
4564. Louis Moss.
4565. Thomas Hamilton.
Daniel J. McCarthy (a).
John A. Smith (a).
Frank Pohl (a).
Ambrose J. Hough (a).
George Elwell (a).

REPAIR DEPARTMENT.

No. 6976. Frank Engel, steam fitter.
6977. B. Jones, steam fitter.
6978. Thomas Johnston, steam fitter.
6980. Wm. J. Connell, steam fitter.
6982. Angust Berghofer, helper.
6983. Chas. R. McGinnis, steam fitter.
6985. C. Patton, steam fitter.
6985. P. McCaffrey, steam fitter.
6988. Martin Craig, steam fitter.

No. 6990. J. C. Warburton, steam fitter.
6995. B. O. Gara, steam fitter.
7002. Josh. Jones, helper.
7007. William Mack, helper.
7015. Mike Carroll, helper.
7016. Frank Oberreich, helper.
7035. Dave Burrows, helper.
7024. M. Cunningham, helper.
7025. James Payne, helper.

H. MIDDLETON, *Manager*.

37 (Commissioner KERNAN). Where did you get this list?—Ans. It was given to me after the strike. Of course I do not want to name the man, but it came from the company's office, and it was presented to me by one of the friends of one of the clerks.

38 (Commissioner KERNAN). Have you any objection to stating who the clerk was?—Ans. I do not want to, for he would lose his position.

39 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you suffered from this blacklisting method at Pullman?—Ans. I have not yet myself, but I am convinced that I shall never be able to get a job in the railway service again.

40 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you known of employees there who have suffered by blacklisting?—Ans. One man went down to the Rock Island shops and made application to Mr. Childs for a job. He told me yesterday that Mr. Childs took out a list, or asked his clerk for the names of the men that had worked in the Pullman shops, and his name was in the list, and he was told he could not have a job.

41 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Who is that man?—Ans. A man in Pullman. I can bring him down here if necessary.

42 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). This list you present is dated December 23, 1893, what trouble does that refer to?—Ans. That was at the time of the steam fitters' strike in Pullman, in December, 1893.

^a These men were hired, but would not go to work when they found the other men had quit.

43 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Was there ever a strike before that time?—Ans. Yes, sir; there have been several strikes in different departments; in 1886 the body builders struck; you see, an inside finisher can do body work, and a body builder can do inside finishing, so they would use one department to whip another until the organization of the American Railway Union; then when one went out all went out.

44 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Up to the time of the trouble in May had the relations of the employees to the company been a kindly one or an inimical one?—Ans. The employees were very favorably disposed toward Mr. Pullman until the actions of the last management seemed to estrange the men from the Pullman management—that is, from Mr. Pullman; I believe the employees were very favorably impressed with Mr. Pullman previous to Harvey Middleton's taking hold of the shops about one and a half or two years ago.

45 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You say labor organizations were not allowed at Pullman and you had to go elsewhere to organize?—Ans. Yes, sir.

46 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Were there any orders from the company to that effect?—Ans. Not any orders that were posted.

47 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What measures were taken to prevent the employees organizing?—Ans. In order to explain that to you I will state that the inside finishers and body builders went out on a strike since I went there—or rather it was not a strike—it was during Mr. Sessions' administration, and they organized over in Roseland, at least a portion of them organized, and as soon as the company found out this organization was in existence some of the leaders were dropped, and they have not been able to get work there to this day. It is very easy for the company to drop men and not let the cause of it be known, but when a man comes up to them for an explanation they give him no excuse whatever, only that his services are not needed. Why should they drop some of the best mechanics they have, at times when they want first-class mechanics, that are leaders in an organization like that? There must be some reason, and that is why we judge no union will be tolerated there.

48 (Commissioner WRIGHT). But there was no open order against it?—Ans. Not at that time, but now when a man goes to the company for a job they ask him, "Are you a member of the American Railway Union?" "Yes, sir." "Have you got a card?" "Yes, sir." "Give us that card." The card is handed to them and then the applicant signs a paper that he will have nothing to do with the American Railway Union or any other order for five years if he wants a place in the Pullman shops.

49 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Returning to the matter of building cars, the Pullman company takes contracts to build any kind of cars, does it not, from any railroad that wants them built?—Ans. Yes, sir.

50 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Going back to your efforts to settle the difficulties at Pullman, did you serve on any of the committees of the American Railway Union other than for your local union?—Ans. I was chairman of the committee that went down to see Mr. Wickes. I was spokesman there on both occasions, but never was on any committee that went from the American Railway Union to see Mr. Wickes. I have only acted in the capacity of chairman of the local committee that went to see Mr. Wickes, and as chairman of the strike committee.

51 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Were you a member of the convention which was held June 12?—Ans. No, sir.

52 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You have stated, I think, that your efforts were to prevent a strike?—Ans. Yes, sir.

53 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What were the results of the two interviews with Mr. Wickes of which you have spoken?—Ans. We asked Mr. Wickes if he could in any possible way adjust our wages so we could support our families and pay our rents. We wanted either the wages of 1893, or a reduction of the rent and a raise in our pay sufficient to pay rent and support our families. He said the talk about cutting down the rent was utterly impossible, as they were only making 3½ per cent on their money invested. In regard to raising the wages he said they were losing money. You must understand that nine-tenths of the work done in the Pullman shops is Pullman work; the cars are owned by Pullman, and operated by the company.

54 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Leased to railways you mean?—Ans. Sleeping cars, day coaches, dining cars, all cars operated by the Pullman company. I should judge, up to the time of the strike, that nine-tenths of the work done was done on Pullman work alone.

55 (Commissioner WRIGHT). That is repairs, etc.?—Ans. Yes; repairs and new work. Now, the question was, why they could not pay the same rate of wages as were paid in other railway shops. They were getting work done in other railway shops at the rate of \$2.75 per day, that is, for the repairs on the cars that the Pullman company had to do that was done in other shops, they were paying for at the rate of \$2.50 and \$2.75 per day, while we, at the Pullman shops, had to do the same kind of work at piecework for \$1.90 per day, while if we could have gotten the same price for our work the Pullman company paid in other railroad shops we could have made \$3 per day easy. I also desire to say there is a great deal lost by mismanagement in the Pullman shops. The manager of the Pullman shops is no car builder, and in order to be manager of car works of such magnitude as the Pullman company has the manager must be a practical car builder. Now, Mr. Middleton is a machinist or locomotive engineer and does not understand car building. I don't know much about Mr. Perant, the general foreman, but he is not an expert mechanic, or is not experienced in the business; and some of the other foremen are not experienced, and consequently there is a great deal of work gotten out and spoiled by the foreman, the management, etc.

Now, the cars have to be built at a certain price and, therefore, on account of the material that is spoiled the men have to suffer for the mistakes of the general manager and foreman. When Mr. Sessions was there there was nothing of that kind going on at all. We had good wages under him, but as soon as Mr. Middleton took charge he put inexperienced men in almost every department, men who were his friends, and, of course, as the cars had to be built for so much the men had to do so much more work in order to pay for the destruction of the material. To illustrate: There was one coach of which the sash was made of mahogany, and because the sash did not happen to be all of one color, instead of picking out the color for one side of the car, and putting all the same color on one side and then take the other side of the car and put all the same color on that side, the general foreman ordered the men to break up those sash and smash them all to pieces.

56 (Commissioner KERNAN). Was there any reduction in the pay of the men who made them?—Ans. That had to be paid for by the men who made them in a reduction on the next lot of cars.

57 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Was the reduction in pay applicable to all departments of car building, as well as in your own line?—Ans.

I think the freight-car department suffered worse than the others. I know it did, the freight cars and sleepers. There is a gentleman here who will testify before the commission, named Coombs, who knows all about the cuts that were made in the freight department. There is also a gentleman here from the paint department, Mr. Theodore Rhodie. There are a great many departments in the Pullman shops, and in order to get at the real facts in the matter a man from each department should be called on to testify before you.

58 (Commissioner KERNAN). Do not they understand that the commission is ready to hear all testimony offered?—Ans. Yes; but some of them have not got money enough to come here from Pullman.

59 (Commissioner WRIGHT). If rents had been reduced to any reasonable extent, along with the reduction of wages, would the employees at Pullman have been satisfied?—Ans. Yes, sir; if they had reduced the rents in proportion to the reduction of wages.

60 (Commissioner KERNAN). Were employees permitted to buy land within the corporation of Pullman and build their own houses?—Ans. No, sir.

61 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You asked the Pullman company to submit certain questions to arbitration?—Ans. Yes, sir.

62 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State specifically just what points you desired to have arbitrated.—Ans. We wanted to lay our grievances in regard to our wages and the rents before a board of arbitration, and whatever decision that board arrived at we were satisfied to submit to. If they had said the rents were right as they were, and we were getting wages enough for the class of work we were doing, the employees of the Pullman Palace Car Company would have submitted to that decision.

63 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How did you propose to have that board constituted?—Ans. We wanted to select one man, allow the Pullman company to select another, and let those two select a third.

64 (Commissioner WRIGHT). And you promised the company to abide by the result?—Ans. Yes, sir. Now, I want to be understood in this matter; other committees went there for the purpose of asking the Pullman company to arbitrate, and Pullman said they had nothing to arbitrate. Mr. Pullman claimed he was losing money, and then two days afterward declared a dividend of \$600,000, and that made the men much more determined to strike. It appeared to the men and it appeared to me—and I claim to have a small amount of intelligence—that if I were losing money I could not possibly declare a dividend of \$600,000.

65 (Commissioner KERNAN). That dividend might have been declared out of accumulated profits rather than from the earnings of the company. Was not that explanation given at any time?—Ans. That dividend might have been declared on money that had been previously accumulated and had nothing whatever to do with the Pullman company, and if Mr. Pullman had explained that the men would not have felt the way they did.

66 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Was that a semiannual or a quarterly dividend?—Ans. Quarterly; there have been two dividends declared since the strike.

67 (Commissioner KERNAN). Was there anything said in the interview you had with Mr. Wickes about permitting you to examine the books of the company in order to see how their business was running?—Ans. Yes, sir; they gave us the privilege of examining the books, but we were pretty well posted in regard to the management of the books.

We know the parties up in the shop who keep the books, are pretty well acquainted with them, and so far as getting at the real facts on the company's books I don't think it is possible to do so. There was no possible means of getting at their losses or gains from the books.

68 (Commissioner KERNAN). You did not accept that offer because the men had no confidence in the accuracy of the books?—Ans. Yes, sir.

69 (Commissioner KERNAN). The men believed the books were prepared for the occasion?—Ans. Yes, sir.

70 (Commissioner KERNAN). Did you have any facts to justify that belief, or was it mere suspicion?—Ans. I believe that one time previous to this that occurred, and there is but one expert in Chicago that can go through Pullman's books; I believe he is in the court-house building somewhere, but I don't know his name.

71 (Commissioner KERNAN). Did you agree to have an expert make an examination?—Ans. Our financial condition was such it would have been impossible for us to have paid an expert.

72 (Commissioner KERNAN). The question did not come up as to how you were to make an examination, whether personally or through an expert?—Ans. No, sir.

73 (Commissioner KERNAN). You never got to that point?—Ans. No, sir. When we left the Pullman service we owed George M. Pullman \$70,000 rent, and our pay was such we could not pay our rent and have sufficient to eat. I have known men to drop down by the side of a car when they were working for want of food; and the way I had to work myself, in order to make the amount of money I did, I would frequently have to sit down at 10 o'clock in order to rest until I got strength enough to go on again, and there were hundreds of men in that condition at the Pullman shops when we quit.

74 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). You mean you had to work so hard at piecework in order to make what you did?—Ans. Yes, sir.

75 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Do I understand you to say that all the operatives who live in Pullman and are housekeepers live in houses owned by the Pullman company?—Ans. Whenever a man is employed in the Pullman shops he is supposed to live in a Pullman house until the Pullman houses are filled; that has been the case previous to this strike; when a man came to the shops he must live in a Pullman house. He could not live in Roseland unless he owned his own property; he must live in Pullman. I have known men who owned property in Roseland who had to leave their property not rented and come down to Pullman and hire houses in order to fill up the Pullman houses.

76 (Commissioner KERNAN). How was that rule made and enforced?—Ans. Suppose you made application to a foreman for a job; if the houses in Pullman were not filled he would give you a job, provided you moved into Pullman; that was made a condition of the job. I have seen men that lived out of Pullman get jobs when men were out of employment in Pullman, but that was through the favoritism of the foremen.

77 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Do you mean to say that a man having a job in Pullman and who was living in one of the Pullman houses, if he saw fit to move to Roseland and rent there, that would be sufficient cause for losing his job?—Ans. Yes, sir.

78 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). You say you pay \$17 per month rent and 71 cents for water?—Ans. Yes, sir.

79 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Are you acquainted with the cost of building such houses as you occupy?—Ans. Yes, sir.

80 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). About what would it cost to construct such a house as you live in?—Ans. I would like to have the job of constructing the same class of houses for \$600 each.

81 (Commissioner KERNAN). How about the street improvements, sidewalks, and things of that sort?—Ans. There are macadamized roads there and wood sidewalks; take the sodding, etc., of course we have to pay for the sodding ourselves out of the rent; then there are men employed on the street picking up paper, keeping things clean, and one thing and another, and that, indirectly, comes out of the men employed in the shops.

82 (Commissioner KERNAN). They pay it in their rent?—Ans. Yes, sir.

83 (Commissioner KERNAN). You spoke a while ago about owing \$70,000 back rent; during how long a period has that accumulated?—Ans. The accumulation of the back rent commenced about the 1st of November. I do not think there was a man in the Pullman shops that owed any rent up to November 1, 1893.

84 (Commissioner KERNAN). Do you know what, if any, attempts have been made to collect those rents during the last three or four months?—Ans. They have been around twice after the rent within the last three months; there have not been any attempts at eviction as yet; when we used to get our pay our pay was in two checks, one check for the rent, the other for the amount we had left.

85 (Commissioner KERNAN). How would the check be made out for the rent?—Ans. It would be made out in full for the current rent; that is, two weeks in advance.

86 (Commissioner KERNAN). Was the check payable to your order?—Ans. Yes, and I would have to indorse the rent check.

87 (Commissioner KERNAN). And that check would be good anywhere?—Ans. They have a paymaster and a rent collector that goes with him.

88 (Commissioner KERNAN). Could you get the rent check cashed anywhere in town?—Ans. Not without I was to keep it and not sign it. If I was in such a condition that I could not pay my rent, or any part of it, of course the law of the State is that I must be paid in full; of course they could not compel me to pay the rent, but if I had only \$9 coming to me, or any other amount, the rent would be taken out of my pay; that is, the rent check would be left at the bank and I would have to leave my work in the shop, go over to the bank and have an argument there for a few minutes to get the gentleman to let me have money to live on, and sometimes I would get it and sometimes not. I have seen men with families of eight or nine children to support crying there because they only got 3 or 4 cents after paying their rent; I have seen them stand by the window and cry for money enough to enable them to keep their families; I have been insulted at that window time and time again by the clerks when I tried to get money enough to support my family, even after working every day and overtime. They would want to know why I could not pay my rent up when the average per capita was only 8 cents over the rent, and a man would have to keep a family for two weeks on it. If there is any woman can keep a family on 8 cents apiece, clothe themselves, and appear decent on the streets I would like to see it done.

89 (Commissioner KERNAN). Are the schools free?—Ans. Yes.

90 (Commissioner KERNAN). Are the schoolbooks furnished?—Ans. No, sir; they are paid for by the parents.

91 (Commissioner KERNAN). How about your coal, flour, and things of that kind? Who furnishes those things at Pullman?—Ans. A man named Davis keeps a coal and wood yard in Pullman, and then there are other stores in Kensington.

92 (Commissioner KERNAN). The Pullman company has nothing to do with the matter of furnishing supplies?—Ans. No, sir. Well, the company sells to a party that delivers wood from the shops—that is, waste stuff from the saws—hard wood and all kinds of waste wood.

93 (Commissioner KERNAN). That is the only place the company at all interferes in the matter of regulating the purchase of supplies?—Ans. Yes; and they don't interfere in that.

94 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Is there a savings bank at Pullman?—Ans. Yes, sir.

95 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What is the name of the treasurer?—Ans. Bryant.

96 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Are lots in Pullman bought and sold, so that you can give an approximate estimate of the value of a lot there?—Ans. No, sir; there are none sold there.

97 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Do you know how many acres of land belong to the Pullman company?—Ans. No, not exactly; but there must be 220 or 230 acres there.

98 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Have you any familiarity with the value of suburban lots in any of the other towns adjacent to Chicago that would enable you to say what would be the fair market value for the house and lot you occupy, and for which you pay \$17 per month rent?—Ans. I know a house and lot that has been built about two years. I believe the party paid \$2,500 for it, and it has two tenements and is separate from any other buildings. It has a nice front yard, with as much room in it as is in my house, and much more beautifully located. That can be rented for \$12 per month.

99 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Where is that house located?—Ans. On One hundred and eleventh street. I think the number is No. 2524.

100 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Do you think the cash value of that house and lot is as much as the cash value of the house and lot you live in, or more?—Ans. I would build the one I live in for much less than I would build the other one.

101 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Taking the lot in connection with it, I mean?—Ans. Yes; it is in a more desirable location than the house I live in. It is on a boulevard, on One hundred and eleventh street, and the house I live in in Pullman is on a back street.

102 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). So you think the fair cash value of that house is as much as that of the house and lot you live in?—Ans. It is more. I would not give over \$1,000 for the house and lot I am living in.

103 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). You stated that Mr. Wickes said to you "the company was only realizing 3½ per cent out of the rent."—Ans. Yes; on the investment in Pullman; that is what Mr. Wickes and Mr. Pullman himself said; either 3½ or 2½ per cent, I could not say which.

104 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Three and one-half per cent on the value of the house and lot you live in would make the house worth about \$6,000 if you pay \$17 per month rent?—Ans. Yes, sir.

105 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). But he spoke on the whole investment?—Ans. Yes, sir; the whole investment; well, I don't know;

the houses are operated by the Pullman Land Company and the shops by the Pullman Palace Car Company; so he could not have meant all of it.

106 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Then you think the reference was to the investment of the Pullman Land Company alone?—Ans. Yes, and they have nothing invested there except in the houses and lots. There are some wooden houses there which rent for \$8 per month that I should judge could be built for \$90 or \$100 at the outside; they are 7-foot ceilings; they really ought not to rent for over \$5 a month, and that would be a large price.

107 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). You have spoken of some of the workmen there receiving only 8 cents and different amounts less than \$1 after deducting their rents, as I understand you?—Ans. Yes, sir.

108 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Did not that occur on account of their not putting in full time, or, in other words, was there any rate of wages so low that a party working, putting in full time, would have only such an insignificant amount of money left after deducting his rent?—Ans. In order to answer that question I will state: During the time of the construction of the Alley L cars I made 15 cents per hour on an elevated car, and a gang right by me made 4 cents and 5 cents per hour, which would be 50 cents a day, and they were doing the same kind of work I was, inside finishing, on those Alley L cars.

109 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). What made the difference?—Ans. The inexperience of the men.

110 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). You are what is regarded as an experienced workman?—Ans. I believe so; yes.

111 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). And those other men after paying their rent would have but a small amount left?—Ans. I don't think they would have had a cent left if they paid their rent. I had two of those cars; I made 16 cents per hour on one car and 15 cents per hour on the other, and I never worked so hard in my life.

112 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). You say others working right by you only made 4 and 5 cents?—Ans. Yes, sir. There was one car—I have not the number of the car—but a party that worked in the car with me knows that to be a fact, that in order to get the car out the company put in two extra men into the car, when there ought not to have been but two men in it, and paid the two extra men they put in out of the money that was coming to the parties having the contract for the car, at the rate of 15 or 18 cents per hour, in order to complete the job, and that is the way they do in a great many instances.

113 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). That is, where they require extra help to finish a certain job, they take the pay of that extra help from the regular employees building the car?—Ans. Suppose I took a job today and don't have it done on time, or at the time they want it; say that I have six days' work to do in that car and they want it done in one day; of course, it will require five more men to do that work. Now, whether I want it done or not, they go to work, regardless of my objections, and put in five extra men, no matter whether they can do as much work in a day as I can or not, and pay them the same wages I get myself, and take it out of my contract. That is the system employed in the Pullman works all the time and there is no redress.

114 (Commissioner KERNAN). Do not they give you a certain time to do the work in, and is it not your own fault, to a certain extent, in not getting the work done on time?—Ans. No, sir; it is misjudgment on the part of the management; they agree, when I take such a job, that in case of anything of that kind happening, they will allow you one-half

for overtime and pay half the help themselves, and let you pay one-half out of the contract.

115 (Commissioner KERNAN). How much of a lot has the house you live in at Pullman?—Ans. Just enough to hang up clothes in the rear. The lot is about 20 feet by 60.

116 (Commissioner KERNAN). And the house occupies about half the lot?—Ans. No, not quite. I think the house is about 20 by 35; something like that.

117 (Commissioner KERNAN). Not much room for a garden?—Ans. No; there is no garden lot.

118 (Commissioner KERNAN). What advantages do you have by living in Pullman in the way of a library or other advantages?—Ans. You have to pay for books from the library, but I never went near the Pullman library.

119 (Commissioner KERNAN). Why don't you do it?—Ans. I don't like to go. I have reading matter enough myself, and I never felt like going to the library.

120 (Commissioner KERNAN). Because it cost too much?—Ans. Yes, sir.

121 (Commissioner KERNAN). What does it cost you to have library privileges?—Ans. Three dollars per year, or something like that.

122 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Are you able to state about what the average wages of the average workingman were at Pullman during the months of January, February, and March, 1894, leaving out the rent entirely? About what were the average wages per day of a mechanic ordinarily skilled?—Ans. I don't believe they would average over \$1.50 per day.

123 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). How about the laborers?—Ans. One dollar and thirty cents per day. The laborers sometimes drew more than the mechanics.

124 (Commissioner KERNAN). Taking the whole number of employees at Pullman, how many of them are mechanics and how many laborers?—Ans. I should judge about 800 of them are laborers and the balance would be mechanics.

125 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you any other suggestions you would like to make to the commission relative to your relation to the Pullman company, or to the strike, or as to the relation of other employees?—Ans. In regard to this blacklisting, I don't think any corporation should be allowed, or any class or set of men, to blacklist an employee. I don't think it is just. I think it is doing the laboring class, or, in fact, any American citizen, an injustice.

126 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Is blacklisting confined solely to the employers; are they the only people who practice the system of blacklisting?—Ans. I never knew of anything of that kind in connection with railways until I came to Pullman. I have been in charge of railway shops as general foreman and as master mechanic, and I would not allow anything of that kind. I resigned my position once on a road on account of the blacklisting system.

127 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do unions ever blacklist nonunion men?—Ans. The American Railway Union does not. I don't know anything about other unions, for I never belonged to one.

128 (Commissioner WRIGHT). If you could have your way, how would you prevent strikes, provided, of course, you are opposed to them, as you say you are?—Ans. There are a great many ways, but there is one system I would like to see adopted, and that is to have the railways in the hands of the Government, and everything else. I

would like to see the banks controlled by the Government—money and everything connected with it controlled by the Government. I believe that would do away with all strikes, for I never heard of a strike in a post-office system or in the navy-yard; never heard of anything of that kind.

129 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Would that prevent strikes in other industries?—Ans. I think it would.

130 (Commissioner WRIGHT). If you could not carry that out, is there any other way which would prevent strikes?—Ans. If matters were placed before a board of arbitration that was just to both parties I believe that would prevent strikes.

131 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How far would you go in arbitration? Would you have a board of arbitration authorized to compel the attendance of both parties and then have power to enforce its decree like the judgment of a court?—Ans. I would go so far as to compel the attendance of both parties, but so far as compelling them to agree. I would not do that, because I don't think that would be right. I believe that reasonable men, men who have a heart in them, any manhood about them, when they know my family is starving to death and I am compelled to use every effort and energy I have, and knowing my qualifications as a mechanic can not sustain life, then I think if they are not in a condition to arbitrate or concede to my demands to some extent I think after that board of arbitration had decided, I would beg my way from door to door rather than to strike.

132 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). But you would go far enough to compel them to submit the grievances to arbitration?—Ans. Yes, sir.

133 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are there any other suggestions that you would like to make?—Ans. I don't think of any just now.

Commissioner WRIGHT. If there are any representatives of the Pullman Palace Car Company present who would like to cross-examine Mr. Heathcoate they can do so now.

(No response.)

August 16, 1894, Thomas W. Heathcoate, recalled, testified as follows:

134 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you know how many liquor saloons there are in Kensington and vicinity?—Ans. There must be somewhere in the neighborhood of one hundred, and one in Pullman at the Hotel Florence.

135 (Commissioner WRIGHT). When on the stand before you were asked as to the relations existing between the Pullman company and its employees. I will ask you further, do those relations affect your standing in any way in the community, with reference to your rights as citizens, as voters or members of society, outside of your membership in the American Railway Union?—Ans. Yes, sir; politically, that is, it has previous to this strike; I myself was never approached upon the question as to who I should vote for, but there have been men who have been ordered, when making an effort to secure a nomination, to leave the service of the company.

136 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you state that of your own knowledge?—Ans. Yes, sir.

137 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Is the prohibition or temperance question, in relation to whether saloons shall or shall not be licensed at Pullman, regulated by vote?—Ans. I don't know that there has been any vote in regard to the liquor question there since I have been in Pullman. I think it is a conceded fact that Chicago is a liquor town, not

a prohibition town, and I don't think it could be made so, but there are sections of Chicago I believe that are in favor of prohibition. With reference to Pullman it is prohibition, with the exception of the Hotel Florence. There is a saloon there, or a place where you can get a drink. That is the only place at Pullman, unless you have a prescription from a physician for liquor. The management get their drinks at the hotel, but the men have to go to Kensington and Roseland.

138 (Commissioner WRIGHT). To what extent do they go to Kensington for that purpose?—Ans. There are quite a number of Germans there who indulge in drinking beer, more or less.

139 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Has there been much of that since the strike began?—Ans. No, sir; I have advocated in all my speeches to the strikers not to carry any pails of beer over to Pullman.

140 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Your union advocates that?—Ans. Yes, sir.

141 (Commissioner KERNAN). Have they observed the rules of temperance during the trouble down there?—Ans. Yes, sir; there has been a less number of arrests and fewer calls for the patrol in Pullman than ever before.

142 (Commissioner KERNAN). The number of saloons there seems to be regulated by public sentiment, does it not?—Ans. I don't know as to that, but I don't think public sentiment would favor so many saloons as there are at Kensington and Roseland.

143 (Commissioner KERNAN). I am speaking of Pullman?—Ans. Oh, no; George M. Pullman regulates that himself.

144 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Does public sentiment support Mr. Pullman in that matter?—Ans. There has never been any vote in Pullman in regard to that.

145 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You say you advocated the strikers avoiding the liquor saloons in Kensington; is it true that the saloons of Kensington have not received support to any extent from the striking employees at Pullman?—Ans. That is true.

August 18, 1894, Thomas W. Heathcoate, recalled, testified as follows:

146 (Commissioner WRIGHT). I understand that you desire to make some further statements in addition to what you testified to the other day?—Ans. I desire to state in regard to the books the Pullman company propose to allow us to examine. We were allowed to examine the books, say, today and tomorrow morning we were not allowed to examine them; it was simply a statement made by one of the clerks.

147 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You stated in your testimony the other day that the day after the conference at Pullman, when it was decided not to strike, that three members of your committee were discharged?—Ans. Yes, sir.

148 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Of how many did that committee of which these three men were members consist?—Ans. I think it was 46.

149 (Commissioner KERNAN). Were these men peremptorily discharged?—Ans. Yes, sir.

150 (Commissioner KERNAN). Was any reason given?—Ans. No, sir.

151 (Commissioner KERNAN). The rest of the 46 were not discharged?—Ans. No, sir. Mr. Wickes said that if we would return to work they would consider our grievances, make an examination of them, and we went back to the shop with the promise that none of the men on this committee or any of the girls should be discharged or in any way interfered with, but the next morning Mr. Hasty and two

others were discharged. We tried to find out the reason of their discharge, and the reason they gave was that the work these men were engaged on was so far ahead that they would have to lay them off on that account.

152 (Commissioner KERNAN). Who gave that reason?—Ans. The foreman of the department to which Mr. Hasty belonged, and under the order of the superintendent of the iron machine shops the work was taken out of the hands of Mr. Hasty and the foreman completed the work, working all day on that piece of work. Mr. Hasty asked the reason of his discharge and he was told he was discharged, or laid off, and laid off in cases of that kind was virtually discharged.

153 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you know any reason why the balance of the 46 members of the committee were retained?—Ans. No, sir.

154 (Commissioner WRIGHT). When were the local unions of the American Railway Union organized at Pullman?—Ans. In the latter part of March and through the month of April.

155 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What led to that organization?—Ans. The different cuts made in the shops were so severe that we had no other way by which we could get the company to talk with us except through organization. If they knew we were thoroughly organized with that purpose we might make a settlement with them better on that account than though we were not organized; all other attempts had been made, and we could get no redress.

156 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Did the organization of the local unions spring from your own action at Pullman?—Ans. Yes, sir.

157 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How many men or people went out on the strike of May 11, 1894, at Pullman?—Ans. There were about 4,000.

158 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What proportion of that 4,000 occupied houses at Pullman?—Ans. About 2,500 or 3,000, I should judge. There was quite a number lived outside in Chicago, Burnside, Auburn Park, Roseland, Kensington, and Riverdale.

159 (Commissioner WRIGHT). I think you said in your former testimony that the aggregate membership of the American Railway Union at Pullman was something like 4,000?—Ans. Yes, sir.

160 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Each one of that 4,000 had a card from the union?—Ans. Yes.

161 (Commissioner WRIGHT). At what expense?—Ans. One dollar.

162 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You therefore raised \$4,000 to join the American Railway Union?—Ans. Yes, sir; but that card was good for a year's membership.

163 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you any other information you wish to give the commission?—Ans. There is one more matter I would like to state. One of the foremen—he has a very violent temper—had a piece of work being done which he had to wait for some little time on account of the workman not being able to do it in a certain length of time, and he struck him in the face, making his nose bleed. The matter was reported to the management, but they took no action whatever in regard to it. The man was going to sue the foreman, but he was told by the foreman of the department to which he belonged that if he did he would be discharged. The foreman's name was George Trumbley. I don't know the name of the man who was struck, but can get his name when I return to Pullman.

August 21, 1894, Thomas W. Heathcoate, recalled, testified as follows:

164 (Commissioner WRIGHT). In your former testimony you stated that the grievance committee of the Pullman employees held a meeting on the night of May 10?—Ans. Yes, sir.

165 (Commissioner WRIGHT). And that, acting under the advice of the officers of the American Railway Union, they decided not to strike. Is that the way you wish to be understood?—Ans. No, sir; it was a grievance committee of the different locals at Pullman, consisting of 46 members, and they took three or four votes. We were up all night until 5 o'clock in the morning and decided to strike against the advice of the American Railway Union. The reduction of wages was such that it was utterly impossible to sustain ourselves and families, and we had no other alternative. We had done all we possibly could with the Pullman company to have our rents cut down or give us more pay, and failed. We were not earning enough to live on and we had no other alternative than to strike. That was the conclusion we came to and we voted that night to strike. There were three votes taken, and the first time all but three voted to strike, and we struck on the 11th of May. We heard in the forenoon that the Pullman company intended to lock us out at noon on the 11th. They had a man watching the action of this committee; he either climbed in the windows or got a bench outside, put it up to the window, and looked through to see what the committee was doing, and we finally changed our quarters and went into another place—Turner Hall—and this man went and reported this matter to the Pullman company.

166 (Commissioner WRIGHT). The conclusion to strike was reached on the night of the 10th?—Ans. Yes, but there was no time set for the strike; this subsequent information we received precipitated the strike, together with the discharge of the three men I have before testified about.

167 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Would the strike have taken place when it did if it had not been for these two occurrences you have just related?—Ans. It was decided by the committee to refer the matter back to the locals and have them take another vote upon the question of striking, but the locals had given this grievance committee the power to order a strike, and I thought, being chairman of that committee, it would be best to refer the matter back again. I did not want any strike. I used every influence in my power to keep them from striking.

168 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You have already testified to that?—Ans. Well, the conditions of the men were such that it was utterly impossible for them to be kept back; I could not control them, nor could the officers of the American Railway Union.

TESTIMONY OF JENNIE CURTIS.

August 16, 1894, Jennie Curtis, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name, residence, and occupation.—Ans. Jennie Curtis; reside at Pullman; have been a seamstress for the Pullman company in the repair shops sewing room; worked for them five years.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you a member of any labor organization?—Ans. Yes, sir; I am a member of the American Railway Union.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long have you been a member of that union?—Ans. Since about the 8th day of last May.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you hold any position in the union?—Ans. I am president of the girls' union, local, No, 269, at Pullman.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Did you have anything to do with the strike at Pullman, which occurred on the 11th of May, 1894?—Ans. No, sir.

6 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Had you anything to do with any of the efforts to avoid the strike, or to settle the difficulties?—Ans. I had not, further than being on a committee which called to see Mr. Pullman and Mr. Wickes, the general manager of the company, to ask for more wages, asking to arbitrate, and such as that.

7 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Were you on those committees, or some of them?—Ans. Yes, sir; I was.

8 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State briefly what you did as a member serving upon those committees.—Ans. I was on a committee that went from Pullman to speak for the girls in May before the strike, to ask for more wages.

9 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Whom did you see?—Ans. We saw Mr. Wickes the first time, and the second time we saw Mr. Brown, Mr. Perant, and Mr. Wickes, and all the head managers of the company were there; also Mr. Pullman.

10 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State what took place at the first interview.—Ans. We went there and asked, as the men did, for more wages; we were cut lower than any of the men's departments throughout the works; in 1893 we were able to make 22 cents per hour, or \$2.25 per day, in my department, and on the day of the strike we could only earn, on an average, working as hard as we possibly could, from 70 to 80 cents a day.

11 (Commissioner KERNAN). Can you give us how the wages changed from month to month?—Ans. Whenever the men were cut in their wages the girls also received a cut. We were cut twice inside of a week in November, 1893, and in January our wages were cut again; that was the last cut we received, and we worked as hard as we possibly could and doing all we could, too. The most experienced of us could only make 80 cents per day, and a great many of the girls could only average 40 to 50 cents per day.

12 (Commissioner KERNAN). How many girls in the Pullman works at Pullman belong to your union?—Ans. About 125.

13 (Commissioner KERNAN). How much were these girls that finally got but 40 to 50 cents per day earning in May, 1893, for the same kind of work?—Ans. They could average at that time not less than \$1.50 per day.

14 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you pay rent in Pullman?—Ans. No, sir; not now.

15 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You pay board?—Ans. Yes, sir. My father worked for the Pullman company for thirteen years. He died last September, and I paid the rent to the Pullman company up to the time he died; I was boarding at the time of my father's death. He being laid off and sick for three months, owed the Pullman company \$60 at the time of his death for back rent, and the company made me, out of my small earnings, pay that rent due from my father.

16 (Commissioner KERNAN). How did they make you do it?—Ans. The contract was that I should pay \$3 on the back rent every pay day; out of my small earnings I could not give them \$3 every pay day, and when I did not do so I was insulted and almost put out of the bank by the clerk for not being able to pay it to them. My wages were cut so low that I could not pay my board and give them \$3 on the back rent, but if I had \$2 or so over my board I would leave it at the bank on the rent. On the day of the strike I still owed them \$15, which I am afraid they never will give me a chance to pay back.

17 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Your union, consisting of girls employed in the Pullman shops, struck at the same time the other employees did?—Ans. Yes, sir.

18 (Commissioner WRIGHT). And are still out?—Ans. Some of them, and some of them have gone back.

19 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Take up that interview again and give us a little more fully what occurred, as you remember it, between your committee and the managers of the Pullman company.—Ans. We stated our grievances to Mr. Wickes and told him we wanted our wages raised; he said it was impossible to raise them, as the company was losing money on its contracts and it could not possibly raise our wages a cent. We then asked if they did not think they could lower rents a little. He said, "No; it was utterly impossible to lower the rents one penny, as they were only receiving about 3 per cent on their investment now, and were losing money on contracts just to enable their men to have work." Mr. Wickes then appointed another interview with us the following Wednesday, and we went down again and saw Mr. Pullman; he said he could not raise our wages nor lower the rents.

20 (Commissioner KEERNAN). Was anything said on either of those occasions about arbitration?—Ans. I don't remember on those occasions. I went with another committee from the convention of the American Railway Union and saw Mr. Wickes and asked if the Pullman company would not arbitrate. He said they had nothing to arbitrate.

21 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What did you expect the board of arbitration to decide upon in case it had been agreed between you that a board should be chosen?—Ans. I expected them in justice to decide that we receive more wages.

22 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). I didn't understand what work you were engaged in at Pullman?—Ans. We made all the carpets, and all the silk, satin, plush, and velvet drapings for the dining cars, made all the linen for the sleepers, berth curtains and vestibule curtains, and we sewed the tapestry for the covering of the seats; we bound the blankets, made the mattresses for the bunks, and all such work as that.

23 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Does it require expert labor to do that work?—Ans. It does for the drapery part for the Pullman cars, because they are very elegant sometimes.

24 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You say you were told the company was losing money on its contracts?—Ans. Yes, sir.

25 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Were the girls working at Pullman doing contract work or Pullman work?—Ans. I don't know.

26 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You were working on the cars which the Pullman company operated?—Ans. Yes, sir.

27 (Commissioner WRIGHT). And not on cars they were building for outside parties?—Ans. Well, I really could not say as to that.

28 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you any other information you would like to furnish us?—Ans. No, sir; I have not.

Commissioner WRIGHT. Is there any one present who desires to cross-examine Miss Curtis?

(No response. Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF THEODORE RHODIE.

August 16, 1894, Theodore Rhodie, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name, age, residence, and

occupation.—Ans. Theodore Rhodie; 39; live at No. 367 Stephenson street, Pullman, Ill.; am a painter.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you been employed at Pullman in the works there?—Ans. Yes, sir.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long have you been employed there?—Ans. About twelve years.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). As a painter?—Ans. Yes, sir.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you a member of the American Railway Union?—Ans. Yes, sir.

6 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long have you been a member of that order?—Ans. Since April last, the 19th day of April, I think.

7 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you one of the strikers at Pullman?—Ans. Yes, sir.

8 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State what led you to strike, the cause, etc., in your own way?—Ans. About four years ago I had a job and there was another class of work they wanted me to do that nobody else could make a day's wages out of on piecework, and they wanted me to work in partnership with two or three or four other men, as many as might be necessary, to carry on that class of work, and whatever we made we were to divide equally, and I was to kind of oversee the work, that it was done properly and got out at the right time. I told them I would take the job under consideration and would see if I could get along with it, but if I could not make wages at it I would want my old place back. After they got me at it once I told them several times I did not like the job and would like to have my old place back, but I could not get it back; I was told I had to stay there or else get out. We get so after working a number of years at a certain class of work that we can make from \$2.65 to \$2.80 per day, working 10½ hours per day; for work that I got \$9 per hundred last fall I only got \$4.25 at the time we struck. They kept cutting me down from last fall on the same kind of work and on the same amount of work we could not make \$1.25 per day out of it; I told the foreman it was impossible to make anything at it, and he said if I didn't like it I could quit. There was also many other things which led us to strike—the abuse, and I owe them for rent and I could not pay it, and I was in debt to my grocery-man, to my butcher, and so on all along the line, and it was impossible for any of us to make a living.

9 (Commissioner KERNAN). When you used the word abuse, what did you mean?—Ans. From the abuse the foreman gave us. They would talk to the men as though they were dogs. For instance, one time the foreman came up to me—he was looking after some sash—and he said he understood there should no more sash come up. I told him if that was the case he should give the men in the cabinet shop an order not to send any up; that I had nothing to do with it; that I could not interfere with another man's business; that I was only to attend to my own department. He said, "Why don't you fix it?" I said, "I can not fix it." He said, "Why can't you paint it up?" I said, "I could not do it and make a good job out of it." Then he said, "You had better ask somebody that can." I said, "Well, I will ask you. I have worked at this business now for twelve years, and I try to do the best I can, and will leave it to my foreman here whether I am doing my work as good as it can be done, or if they have anybody else here that can do it any better." He said, "If you can not do any better work than that you will have to quit," and said he was going to get somebody from St. Louis. Finally he got a man from St. Louis and put him at it, but after it was done and went in the cars it was brought back, and I had to fix it up. The man from St. Louis did not do it as

good as I did. I had to fix it over, and when I asked for pay for doing it the answer was, "Oh, we have a contract. You understood we were to see that the work was done right, and because you did not do it right was the reason you had to do it over again."

10 (Commissioner KERNAN). Didn't you get any pay for the time you spent fixing it over?—Ans. No, sir; these men experiment a good deal at our expense. For instance, they will buy new material without knowing anything about how it is going to work up, and if the work turns out bad the workmen have to turn right around and fix it up so as to make it go out, and if they ask for extra pay they will not give it; lots of times they get English varnish in there which can not be used in the shops only when the atmosphere strikes it just right; if the air is a little damp, the varnish goes back on us, and of course it then causes a great deal of unnecessary work which should not be done. We have to do the job over again, sometimes two or three times, and get nothing for it. If you ask the management to pay you for the time, they say no, they can not do that; but they can ask you to do the work for nothing, and if you don't like to do it you can quit.

11 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you live in one of the Pullman houses?—Ans. Yes, sir.

12 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What rent do you pay?—Ans. Fifteen dollars rent and 71 cents for water.

13 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How many rooms and what other accommodations do you have?—Ans. I have five rooms, part of a cellar, and part of a back yard.

14 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How does the price you pay compare with the rent of similar houses with similar accommodations in adjoining localities?—Ans. You could get the same accommodations, I believe, at from \$7 to \$8 per month.

15 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How large a lot of land belongs to your house?—Ans. I should say the frontage of those houses is from 16 to 20 feet.

16 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How deep?—Ans. Thirty to 35 feet; that is, the house; the lot is deeper; I could not say just how deep.

17 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Were you a member of any of the committees which attempted to secure a settlement of the difficulties at Pullman?—Ans. Yes, sir.

18 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State what your experience was with reference to those efforts?—Ans. We sent a committee up to the management and they said they could do nothing for us.

19 (Commissioner KERNAN). Were you on any of them?—Ans. No, sir.

20 (Commissioner WRIGHT). I thought you said you were on a committee—we only want what you know of your own knowledge.—Ans. Well, I had nothing whatever to do with that part of it; I only know we sent committees there and they brought back reports.

21 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). About how much did you earn in the month of April, 1894?—Ans. I could hardly tell that, but I know I did not have much left after my rent was taken out.

22 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). About how much did you have after paying your rent?—Ans. From \$12 to \$15 every two weeks.

23 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Are you a man of family?—Ans. Yes, sir.

24 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long since you have paid any rent?—Ans. I believe I owed \$2 or \$3 for back rent before we went on the strike and I have not paid any since that.

25 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Has there been any effort to collect any

rent out of the tenants?—Ans. There was day before yesterday, I believe.

26 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What form did that effort take?—Ans. I was not home, but they asked my wife if I was going to pay any rent; my wife told them that I would pay rent as soon as I could get work and earn enough to pay it; that I had no work and had no money, but would pay the rent as soon as I could get money enough to pay it.

27 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). The Pullman shops are running now, are they not?—Ans. Yes, sir.

28 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Do you know what wages they are paying?—Ans. Only from hearsay; I hear they are paying some men from \$2.50 to \$3 per day, and others from \$3 to \$5.

29 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Have you made application for work since the strike?—Ans. No, sir.

30 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Is there any reason why you have not made application?—Ans. There is one reason, and that is, I do not like to walk up there and hand up my membership in the American Railway Union; because when a man asks me to give up my principles, my right as an American citizen, he might just as well ask me for my life.

31 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Would you be expected to sever your connection with the union if you went to work at Pullman now?—Ans. Yes, sir.

32 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you know that to be a condition of reentering the works?—Ans. Yes; I know that to be a fact. I know some men who went there, and after they had taken their card away from them and sent them to the foreman, the foreman said that he had nothing for them to do and did not want them, and did not give them their cards back again.

Commissioner WRIGHT. The witness, Rhodie, is subject to cross-examination if anybody wishes to cross-examine him.

(No response. Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF R. W. COOMBS.

August 16, 1894, R. W. Coombs, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name, residence, and occupation.—Ans. R. W. Coombs; No. 526 Stephenson street, Pullman, Ill.; car carpenter by trade.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long have you been employed as a car carpenter?—Ans. I have followed the business for near twenty years; at Pullman for the past ten years.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What class of cars do you work on?—Ans. In the freight department on refrigerator cars, gondola cars, and cabooses.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you a member of the American Railway Union?—Ans. Yes.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long have you been a member?—Ans. Since last February.

6 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State what wages you received as a car builder a year ago, and what wages you received in April last.—Ans. A year ago I made about \$2.25 per day at piecework; I received 17½ cents per hour; last April I was not working as a car carpenter; I was

inspecting for the company; but in March, 1894, my wages as a car carpenter was about 68 cents per day at piecework.

7 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Was that reduction gradual or sudden?—Ans. The cut commenced in November, 1893; prior to that the car carpenters received on the average from \$2.10 to \$2.25 per day at piecework; in November, 1893, was the first reduction we had and the cut came all of a sudden. I have here what I copied myself out of a ledger of the Pullman company that was gotten up by the general time-keeper of the freight department.

8 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Does that give the earnings from November last down to the time of the strike?—Ans. I will give it to you. We built cars there in lot numbers. Lot No. 1515—that was a Santa Fe stock car; that was built in 1888. Now, in November, 1893, we built the same kind of a car with the latest improvements upon it; in 1888 a car carpenter received \$13 for his work on such a car; a truck builder received 90 cents, and a truck laborer 31 cents; hanging the brakes, \$1.20; delivering, forging, and casting, \$1.05; delivering lumber to the car, 88 cents; framing the car, 40 cents. Now, I will give the prices for the same kind of a car with the latest improvements, in November, 1893, which was the first cut we had that we felt; the car carpenter received \$7 for his work—that is a reduction of \$6 right on the jump; the truck builder received 60 cents; the truck laborer, 9 cents; hanging the brakes, 64 cents; delivering, forging, and casting of car, 35 cents; delivering lumber to the car, 21 cents; framing the car, 12 cents; making a total of \$9.01.

9 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Has there been a reduction since November last?—Ans. Yes, sir.

10 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What would the expense of building that car have been in April last at the prices then paid?—Ans. We finished those cars about the 7th day of September, 1893.

11 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Give the reduction after that, if any, in the same class of work.—Ans. We have not been building a class of cars of that kind in 1894 yet.

12 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What would the price have been had you built any?—Ans. If we had built any more of them in 1894 I don't think we would have got anything for it; I don't know but what we would have to have paid the company for the privilege of building them.

13 (Commissioner KERNAN). After November, 1893, during the time you continued to work until the strike, what further reduction, if any, was made?—Ans. Well, I will say this: The car we struck on was what is called a Wickes patent refrigerator car; those are the cars the freight-shop men refused to work on; I don't know whether it was a strike or not, but the boys refused to work; at the time the boys quit there their wages averaged them about 81 cents per day. The very best car builders, men who had had experience of from twelve to fourteen years, could not make over 81 cents per day.

14 (Commissioner KERNAN). In May, 1893, what would they have been paid for that same class of work?—Ans. Prior to November, 1893, they would have been paid at the rate of about \$2.10 per day.

15 (Commissioner KERNAN). In November, what would they be paid for that work?—Ans. Just about what I have stated.

16 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you rent a house in Pullman?—Ans. Yes, sir.

17 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What do you pay for it, and how many rooms are there?—Ans. I have been paying \$15.71 per month.

18 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long have you been occupying that house and paying that rent?—Ans. For the past four years.

19 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Has the rent been the same all the time?—Ans. Yes, sir; \$15 for rent and 71 cents for water.

20 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). How much did you have left last February from your earnings after you had paid your rent?—Ans. Just about \$3.50 in the month of February after I had paid my rent.

21 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). What is the size of your family?—Ans. A wife and two children.

22 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How many rooms in your house?—Ans. Five.

23 (Commissioner KERNAN). Is it a separate house by itself?—Ans. No; it is what is called a flat. There is a family that lives right over me who pay the same amount of rent.

24 (Commissioner KERNAN). What yard room is connected with it?—Ans. There is a back yard about 25 by 40 feet, and the family above and my family use the same yard. There is no front yard whatever.

25 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What would the same accommodations cost you of like size in some place other than Pullman?—Ans. I could go over to Roseland and rent a house with from five to seven rooms, with a nice yard to it, both front and back yard, with the same water we pay Pullman for, at from \$9 to \$12 per month.

26 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you any views relative to the prevention of strikes?—Ans. Yes, sir; I have.

27 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Please state them.—Ans. If the men at Pullman had had proper treatment there would never have been a strike. If our general superintendent in the freight department had listened to what a great many of us asked him to do, and had done it, there would have been no strike. I lay that strike altogether down there on a man named John Pearson, assistant superintendent of the freight department; he was the cause of the whole strike and nothing else, on account of his treatment of the men; his language and abuse to them drove them to what they did. I have heard him use very abusive language to his men, and during the last two months before the strike, while I was inspector for the company, I was told that if a man did not do what I told him to do to take a club and knock his damned head off.

28 (Commissioner WRIGHT). By whom were you told that?—Ans. I was told that by John Pearson, assistant superintendent.

29 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you an applicant for work now at Pullman?—Ans. Yes, sir.

30 (Commissioner WRIGHT). On what conditions can you return to work there?—Ans. Under no conditions can I work there again. Harvey Middleton says I took a very prominent part in the strike. I asked Mr. Wickes one day if any of us had committed any great depredations sufficient to bar us from working for the Pullman company. Mr. Wickes said, "Not that I know of; you have all conducted yourselves like gentlemen; you have not destroyed a flower in our flower beds or broken a window pane." I asked him why we should be debarred from working there again. He said he didn't know as anything, but Mr. Middleton insisted I should never work there again. The day I took my tool chest out of the shop I had hardly got it out before he told me, "Now get away from here, and we don't want you here any more."

31 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you in arrears for rent?—Ans. Yes, sir; I think I owe those people about \$117 for house rent.

32 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have they taken any steps to collect it?—Ans. They have been at my house two or three times in the past

two weeks after rent, but they have taken no legal steps that I know of.

33 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). If I understand you correctly, you think there would have been no strike at Pullman on account of the inadequacy of the wages if it had not been for the conduct of this man Pearson?—Ans. I don't believe that there would. I believe he was the cause of all of it.

Commissioner WRIGHT. Does anyone wish to cross-examine Mr. Coombs?

(No response. Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF MERRITT BROWN.

August 17, 1894, Merritt Brown, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name, age, and occupation.—Ans. Merritt Brown; 28; car builder; reside at Pullman.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you employed by the Pullman company?—Ans. I have been, but I am not at present in their employ.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). When did you first enter their employ?—Ans. Five years ago last January, but I have not worked there steady; I worked there off and on until May 11, 1894.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Did you join the strike at that time?—Ans. Yes.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you a member of the American Railway Union?—Ans. Yes.

6 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you made any attempts to return to the employ of the company?—Ans. No, sir; I have not, for the reason that I have been led to understand I am a blacklisted man and can never work for the Pullman company again.

7 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How did you get that understanding?—Ans. From a gentleman that was on our committee. I never went to see whether it was a fact or not, but I have been blacklisted there before.

8 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State the circumstances on which you were blacklisted prior to this strike.—Ans. Three years ago last January we had a strike in the Pullman freight-car shops. At that time some 150 men went on a strike. The shop was very busy and they gave us nine days to reenter the employ of the company, or we could never work for them again. We voted not to go to work as a body, and went away, scattered over the country, and finally I came back to Chicago in the fall. Work was short in the city here, and being out of work two years ago in April I went to the Pullman company for employment. Upon going there the foreman and superintendent at that time gave me to understand—of course the superintendent did not say so in so many words, neither did the foreman—that I would have to change my name if I wanted to reenter the employ of the Pullman company. I changed my name, and worked for them for two years after that under an assumed name, and I know of several other instances where men have had to assume another name to get work from the Pullman company in the freight-car shops.

9 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What were your wages there a year ago?—Ans. A year ago our wages were from \$2 and \$2.25 to \$2.50 for the best men; the poorer men, some of them, would not make but \$2 per day on the freight cars. Prior to May, 1893, they made \$2.75 and \$3; but when the house rents, water, and gas bills were taken out the

men had very little left. We worked pretty steady up until September, 1893, and from September to December I had about twelve or fourteen days' work, making something like \$18. In December we worked two weeks. I have not got my exact wages with me, but from that time until the 1st of May, 1894, I have my wages in a book.

10 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Give your wages, month by month, as they were paid to you, from December, 1893, up to the time of the strike.—Ans. January 8 I drew \$11.25 for two weeks' work, paying \$3.65 out of that for house rent. January 23 I drew \$6.38 for two week's work; no house rent was paid out of that. February 8 I drew \$21.75, paying \$8.60 for rent out of it.

11 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Each of these amounts are for two weeks' work?—Ans. Yes, sir. February 23 I drew \$19.85, paying for rent \$8. March 8 I drew \$13.96, paying \$7.60 for rent. March 23 I drew \$15.72, paying \$8 for rent. April 8 I drew \$17.50, paying \$7.60 for rent. April 23 we were laid off two weeks and had no pay. May 8 I drew \$13.99, paying \$7.60 for rent. At the time I left the company's employ I was employed as an inspector, and had been about three weeks. In the main office they knew nothing about my working there under an assumed name, but in the freight-car department they knew it, and as I took quite a prominent part there last January and February, trying to get the freight shop organized, I do not see why it was, unless it was to get me out of the way, they made me an inspector, unless it was that I had some influence with the men and they thought if they gave me that position there would be no strike. The company makes an appropriation for every lot of cars and that appropriation has to cover all expenses, and I know of one instance where there was an immense lot of lumber gotten out for the cars that was never used. It was such poor material that it could not be used. Railroad inspectors would not receive it, and when any of that lumber was put in the cars the men had to take it out at their own expense; whereas if they had not had to take it out they would have made fair wages. The company never allows the men for any poor material they put in the cars. All that freight work is on the piecework system, the company allowing a gang of four men so much for a car.

12 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You say the plan is to make an appropriation for which a certain number of cars must be built?—Ans. Yes, sir.

13 (Commissioner WRIGHT). And if there are any mistakes in construction, or anything that would make an excess of that appropriation, the men have to bear the burden?—Ans. Not exactly in that way. The freight-car department is allowed that much from the general office, and if that appropriation runs out they must make it up on another lot of cars on a different contract. I mean where the cost of construction exceeds the appropriation on one lot of cars the men, as a general thing, are cut down and work for a less amount of money on another lot of cars. That has been going on for six years that I know of. When I was inspector I had to look over every car and see it was all right before it went away, and our general foreman, who took the place of the general superintendent just before we went out on a strike, came to me one day when we were just finishing up a lot of cars and said, "All the work you do on these cars from this day will have to go in on the next lot, as the appropriation for these cars has been exhausted."

14 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Your statement is that when the management furnished poor lumber that was worked into the cars and then had to be taken out that the men got nothing for the extra expense of taking it out?—Ans. Yes, here lately. When I first went

there we were always paid by the hour—17½ cents per hour for each man—but in the last year very little of that was done; the four men in the gang that had built the car had to take the material out, and it was seldom they were allowed anything for it.

15 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you occupy a house owned by the company?—Ans. Yes, sir.

16 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How much rent do you pay?—Ans. \$14.60; \$14 for rent and 60 cents for water.

17 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How many rooms have you?—Ans. Four rooms, part of the cellar and back yard.

18 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you know how that price for your tenement compares with the price of like tenements in adjoining towns?—Ans. Yes, sir; in Roseland I could have got a five-room frame cottage—a nice cottage—for \$6 per month, and in the city here in different places where I have lived I have never paid over \$10 or \$12 per month for a house with better accommodations than the Pullman houses.

19 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Is your house in Pullman in a block or is it a separate house?—Ans. It is in a block, and as a general thing they take up about 18 feet front; they don't take up a full lot.

20 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long have you been a member of the American Railway Union?—Ans. Since February.

21 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you an officer of that body?—Ans. No.

22 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Did you take any official part in the recent boycott?—Ans. No more than any other member of the union would.

23 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You were not a member of any of the committees?—Ans. No, sir; the only thing our local unions in Pullman took part in they quit work, and if any strangers came to town we would talk to them and try to get them not to work for the Pullman company.

24 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Was there any intimidation on the part of the old employees against the new ones?—Ans. Not that I know of.

25 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Would the local unions at Pullman tolerate that action?—Ans. No, sir; they have condemned it right along.

26 (Commissioner WRIGHT). And don't undertake to prevent non-union men from working?—Ans. Not to my knowledge; there has not been a man prevented from going to work at Pullman any more than a man would go and talk to him; I never knew of a man's being intimidated.

There is one thing in the Pullman shops that I don't think has been spoken of, and that is, a man that works in those shops has to take a check out in the morning when he goes to work, and if he finishes his work at 10 o'clock he has to stay until noon just the same; if he don't have a good excuse to get out of the shop he can not get a permit to go home, and it is the same way in the afternoon; I have been there from 2 o'clock to 6 o'clock doing nothing, but was not allowed to go home, unless I could slip out and get back some way, and put the check in; when they lay out piecework in the freight shop they take two or three of the most experienced gangs and put them on the work, and sometimes take some of them and figure from the work of the best men in the shop, and at the time we quit there there were men I actually know could not make a dollar a day, no matter how hard they worked, while there were some who could make more; and the assistant foreman, Mr. Pearson, came around and told the boss he would see that the men did not make but \$1.60 a day at piecework; that if they made any more

they would not be allowed to turn it in, and I have had him figure up what he made in the shop and let all that exceeded \$1.60 per day run over until the next pay day; they would not allow them to make more than that at piecework.

27 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What was the nature of the relations between the employees at Pullman and the company?—Ans. So far as I know in the freight shops there has never been any love lost between them; they have never been satisfied in the freight shops, because they have always been cut down on nearly every contract that came into the shop for pretty nearly six years.

28 (Commissioner WRIGHT). The price of piecework has been gradually reduced, has it?—Ans. It has for the last five years right straight along on freight-car work in the Pullman shops, and not only there but in most of the shops in the country; I have been around considerably, and the Pullman shops are the worst shops in the country for piecework on freight work; they pay less wages and make a man work harder there than any other place in the country.

29 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you worked in the Pullman shops at any other point?—Ans. No, sir; I have not; freight-car work is my business, and they have only one freight-car shop in the country that I know of, and that is at Pullman.

30 (Commissioner KERNAN). You spoke about the men making \$1.60 per day on piecework, was that about the time of the strike?—Ans. Yes; and for some time before.

31 (Commissioner KERNAN). What did the men get for the same amount of work prior to May, 1893?—Ans. We built some cars in February and March—Wickes patent cars, similar to the Merchants Despatch cars—that we got \$36 for in the spring of 1890 and only got \$19.50 for them at that time, making a cut of \$16.50 on a car.

32 (Commissioner KERNAN). When was that cut made?—Ans. In February, 1894.

33 (Commissioner KERNAN). I want to know what a man would earn per day on that class of work in May, 1893?—Ans. We would make \$3 per day straight along when we had steady work, but a car at the present time is much harder to build than it was then; that is, cars similar to what is now called the Wickes patent; in May, 1893, four men could build a car in less than three days; now they can not build it under three days; that is, expert workmen.

TESTIMONY OF REV. WILLIAM H. CARWARDINE.

August 17, 1894, Rev. William H. Carwardine, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name, profession, and residence.—Ans. William H. Carwardine; am a clergyman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Pullman, Ill.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long have you been at Pullman?—Ans. It will be two years the 1st of October.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you been interested in the recent labor difficulties at Pullman?—Ans. Yes, sir.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you investigated the conditions of the employees there, their wages and their general environments?—Ans. Yes, sir; I have.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you kept yourself informed as to the facts of the boycott or strike, from day to day?—Ans. Yes, sir; I have followed it very closely indeed.

6 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State what you know of your own knowledge relative to the causes of the strike there, and the conditions which led to it, and which concerned the strike after it did occur. State it in your own way as briefly as possible.—Ans. Last year we had a very prosperous year at Pullman and the men were apparently doing very nicely; along toward September, perhaps a little before that, it got very dull and we entered into a very dull season. During the winter I realized that there was a great deal of dissatisfaction among the employees; I heard it said on every hand occasionally, "The men are organized; there will be trouble in the shops in the spring;" I heard that a good deal, and I also realized there was a great deal of distress by reason of the hard times, and here and there cases of destitution were shown. Toward the spring I realized that the dissatisfaction was about to break out, and as it has been repeated here—it is simply the old story—they waited on Mr. Middleton, who did not accede to their desires; they then took the matter to Mr. Pullman and Mr. Wickes, talked the matter over with them and did not get any redress there.

At that time Mr. Pullman agreed to look into the matter, and I think said he would give them an answer on the following Wednesday, which he did. Well, we all were of the opinion that night—I know the most of us felt that the strike had practically been averted, and the trouble would not come to pass; we were all in hopes of that; that was our general feeling; we feared a strike. I remember that I, myself, felt very easy that night, thinking that matters were averted and negotiations were going on and perhaps things would be made all right. The next day, to my surprise, and to my great regret, I saw that the word had gone out that the men were going out of the shops. I watched them go out and felt very sorry. We then commenced to discuss the matter, and I began to hear the discussions. I saw the employees were being condemned very much by the press, and a brother clergyman in the town told them he thought they had done a very unwise thing; that he thought they were better off in the shops, etc., and knowing the state of affairs as I had seen it, I felt I must preach upon the subject, as the other pastor had done, and state my views on the question. I did so, and from that on I have taken a great deal of interest in the matter. That brings me up to the question of the strike. What further do you desire me to state; anything in regard to the cause of the strike?

7 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Yes; what you know of the cause of the strike—Ans. I judge from all I have found out in regard to the matter that in the first place the wages were cut very severely; they were cut, it seems to me, from all I have been able to find out, unequally; there was not an equalization of wages throughout the shops. I also realized there was a great deal of dissatisfaction with what is known as the local administration, and also on account of the abuses that were practiced by the foreman and subforeman. I also realized that one cause of the strike was that while they were cutting wages, and unequally cutting them, they did not at the same time make a reduction in the rents, and when the employees made their appeal for an investigation they were very suspicious; they were in a state of suspicion regarding the company. They had come to feel that they could get no justice. There was that feeling on the part of the men, that it was no use, that these things would not be made right, and, I am sorry to say, the feeling was very bitter, and has been very bitter all through. It was through that winter at least, and has been, ever since the strike has been on, very bitter against the local administration.

I feel, personally, that Mr. Pullman is not so much to blame for the present state of affairs, in one sense of the word, or Mr. Wickes either. I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Wickes and also to some degree for Mr. Pullman. I have felt that the great trouble has been, that the difficulty lies, with the local administration. I have felt, however, that Mr. Pullman is to blame for this; he has not kept himself in touch with the laboring men. Of course, as a clergyman, I constantly have compared him with the class of men represented by George W. Childs and such as him—with, for instance, Mr. Armour. I compared Mr. Pullman in his relations to his employees with men of that character with whom I have occasionally come in contact, and I am positive today—I feel free to make the statement—that there never would have been a strike in Pullman if Mr. Pullman had been in closer relations to his men, and if the rents had been reduced at the same time the wages were cut.

8 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How far would you carry that reduction of rents relative to the reduction of wages?—Ans. That, as a business man, I am not prepared to say; but it does seem to me they ought to be reduced from 10 to 20 per cent—perhaps that is too much.

9 (Commissioner WRIGHT). If the works ceased entirely to operate, would you have the rents cease entirely, too?—Ans. Of course if the works ceased at Pullman that would end the whole matter.

10 (Commissioner WRIGHT). It would end the relation of employer and employee?—Ans. Yes, sir; it would to a great extent; but the reason I criticise the Pullman company is this: They started out upon the basis that their system is paternalistic, and according to the literature I can find relative to the company they founded their system upon a desire to improve the workingmen and to solve the industrial situation, for instance, on a basis of a mutual recognition. Now, I contend that a company making as much money as the Pullman company does out of one part of its plant, that when they come to reduce in another part of their plant—having old employees who have been with them so long—it ought not at least to cut them so severely, but share up a little bit with them, from the standpoint that it is a paternalistic system.

11 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you examined in regard to the wages paid at Pullman?—Ans. I think I have. I have talked with the men a good deal personally in regard to the cutting of their wages and have read a good deal about it from all sources; then I have taken, for instance, the cuts as given by the employees in their reports to the American Railway Union. I took that as a basis and I submitted that to one or two gentlemen who had been for many years in the employ of the company. I submitted it particularly to one gentleman who had been in the employ of the company, I think, from ten to eleven years, and who knew about the cuts, and asked him if he thought it was a fair statement to make; and while he did not wish me to use his name, or in any way bring him into public notice, yet he said they were all right.

12 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you those figures in writing?—Ans. I have them in a small pamphlet I have printed on the subject.

13 (Commissioner WRIGHT). The statement in that book relative to wages paid at Pullman, then, was the result of your investigation?—Ans. Yes, sir.

14 (Commissioner WRIGHT). And you believe the statement therein made relative to wages to be true?—Ans. So far as I could get at the truth, I have reason to believe they are true.

15 (Commissioner WRIGHT). So if the commission should refer to your work relative to wages it would have your statement as you

wished to make it?—Ans. It would, with this understanding, that if there are mistakes I am willing to take the blame of them, but wish it understood I have been sincere in seeking to get at the truth, and as near as an outsider can get at it I have endeavored to tell the truth in that pamphlet.

16 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Had you access to any of the pay rolls of the company in preparing that statement?—Ans. No, sir; it is statements of employees who have been in the employ of the company, and whom I believe had grounds to base their opinions upon.

17 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you rent the house in which you live of the Pullman Land Company?—Ans. Yes, sir.

18 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What rent do you pay?—Ans. I pay \$18.50 per month, plus 71 cents for water.

19 (Commissioner WRIGHT). And what accommodations do you have?—Ans. I have a brick cottage with five rooms, a water-closet upstairs, no bathroom, a little back yard, and one faucet in the house.

20 (Commissioner WRIGHT). A detached cottage?—Ans. A cottage that is in the middle of a brick block.

21 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What would the rent be for such accommodation in other places where you have lived?—Ans. My house costs me \$19.21; I can go to Stewart boulevard in Auburn Park, and I can rent an elegant stone flat, one upstairs and one down, with all the modern improvements, with a large bathroom, all finished in hard wood, with one of those nice fireplaces, etc., with all the conveniences of being on a boulevard, for \$20 per month. I am giving \$19.21 for what I have—in addition there are seven rooms in the flat of which I speak.

22 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you a member of the American Railway Union?—Ans. No, sir.

23 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Did you associate with the committees of that union in any efforts to secure a settlement of the difficulties at Pullman?—Ans. Yes, sir.

24 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Were you present at any interviews between such committees and the management?—Ans. Will you allow me to state wherein I endeavored to bring about a settlement at one time?

25 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Take your own method.—Ans. For instance, it will be remembered just about the time the federated labor unions were about going out and the boycott seemed to be just on the wing, and we were all afraid of the federated labor union, two or three editorials were printed in the Chicago Herald, headed each day "A way out of the difficulty"—that was about the substance of the heading—and the editorials said, "Now was the time for the Pullman men to do something for their country, etc." If they would get Mr. Debs and the American Railway Union to declare the strike, or rather the boycott, off and throw the matter back to the Pullman strike, then the sympathy of the public, because of that patriotic action, and because of their interest in the welfare of the public, etc., would revert to the Pullman men. I was very much pleased with that editorial, and a minister named Rev. Brushingham, in Chicago, telegraphed me on the evening of that day and said, "Will you not try to do something on the line of that editorial?"

After my church service was over I went down to the headquarters and asked Mr. Heathcoate if I might meet the central committee in their secret session. He said, "Yes," and I met them at half past 10 that night, which was the first time that I had ever met them in that way.

I read the editorial to them and made an appeal to the men to do all they could to refer the strike back to Pullman, and alleviate the strain that would come by the federated labor union going out. After I had made my appeal to them I left them. The next morning I was told they had sent a committee down to see the American Railway Union and asked if I would go myself to see Mr. Debs. I went down to see Mr. Debs; told him what I had done, and he said to me, "We are about to do that very thing to-night. I meet the federated labor union at 8 o'clock, and we will propose a plan by which if the railroad managers will take back the men without prejudice, excepting those who have indulged in lawlessness, we will declare the boycott off." I then left Mr. Debs, feeling that I had at least done a little something, and you will remember that that night they did that very thing, but the railroad managers refused to have anything to do with it, and that was the end of it. I refer to that to show that I was anxious to use what little influence I had at that time to bring about something of that kind.

26 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you in favor of strikes?—Ans. No, sir. In my sermon delivered within ten days after the strike, which was printed at the time—I believe I sent you a copy of it last night—you will find I said then and there that I deplored the strike, and to my mind it was an unwise thing to strike. I felt that these men had better have remained at work and have had their grievances settled, but I wish to say alongside of that, it is my private opinion, if they had remained in hoping for a settlement on these other lines they never would have got it.

27 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have they yet received the settlement?—Ans. No, sir; I don't think the disposition of the company was to really give them a fair show about it.

28 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Are there tables in the book you speak of having published?—Ans. Yes, sir.

29 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Will you refer to the pages of your book which contain tables of wages?—Ans. Page 81, and I think pages 83 and 84.

30 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you given any attention to the subject of a settlement of strikes and labor difficulties?—Ans. I have thought a great deal about it, but I confess I hardly know what absolute opinion to form. I am very much inclined, however, to the idea of courts of arbitration, but am not settled in my own mind as to whether that would be a wise course. I am also very much inclined to be sympathetic with the idea that has been advanced with reference to putting the railroads into the hands of the Government. I will not say that I have committed myself to that idea, but am inclined to look somewhat towards that as one of the solutions of the difficulty. I realize that there are many things—for instance, it would require something in the line of civil-service reform—it is rather difficult in my mind to get an absolute settlement. I am convinced, however, of this, which of course is Utopian to those who do not look at it from my standpoint, that there never will come a settlement of these difficulties until employers are more just toward their employees than has been illustrated in this affair through which we have just passed. There will have to be more justice, more of the spirit of cooperation, more of the spirit of recognition.

31 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you carry those views far enough to advocate what is known as state socialism as a way out of the present difficulties?—Ans. I am not prepared to take that position,

32 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You have not advocated it as yet?—
 Ans. No, sir; I have not. I do not like to commit myself to the policy as yet, but I confess I am inclined very much toward some of these things.

33 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You have been charged with being both a socialist and an anarchist?—Ans. Yes, sir.

34 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You of course understand the difference in the terms?—Ans. Yes, sir.

35 (Commissioner WRIGHT). And if you are a socialist you can not be an anarchist at the same time?—Ans. Yes, sir.

36 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How much truth is there in that public charge?—Ans. In regard to anarchy?

37 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Yes, sir.—Ans. That charge would be so low that I really don't feel like answering it; to suppose for a moment that I, who am American born, my father a soldier who died for his country—to suppose that I for one moment would be thought an anarchist is to me one of the most contemptible and false charges that could possibly be brought against me. I might be what you would call a Christian socialist, but as to anarchy, I repudiate it entirely.

38 (Commissioner WRIGHT). I thought it fair to allow you to define your position relative to these difficulties, and that is why I asked the question.—Ans. I confess I am surprised at the prejudice which exists on the part of a great many people toward this whole matter. I am told that my book has not been read because people believe I am of that tendency, and I know that my publisher has endeavored to get certain publishing agencies to take my book and sell it and they have said: "It is a good book, what we in the phrase of the business call 'a seller,' but we prefer not to handle it." I simply refer to that as showing the intense prejudice against literature of this kind. But my brethren in the clergy do not all agree with me in the position I occupy, and I wish to say this: I was a clergyman in the town of Pullman and had to do one of two things, I had to keep quiet and say nothing, and at the same time realize that these men were not being rightly treated, or else I had to speak out my convictions, and that is the reason I have been interested as a clergyman in this matter. I will also say there has been a good deal said on the part of the clergy about reaching the masses, getting hold of the workingmen and getting them into our churches, and I have thought if as clergymen, without indorsing all that the workingmen do, we would show our sympathy for them in their desire to better their condition we would probably be able to reach them on other lines if we would help them practically on these lines.

39 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). On page 98 of your pamphlet you say: "There is no question whatever but that better flats and cottages, with pretty gardens and bathrooms, can be hired at the neighboring towns of Roseland and Kensington at fully 20 per cent less;" are you satisfied to allow that statement to go in as the result of your investigation?—Ans. I think that is probably a little too much. I was talking with my publisher here today. I had better err on the other side than to be a little bit under. While I know it to be a fact in Roseland that you can get accommodations for a workingman, satisfactory, comfortable accommodations, for a great deal less than you can in Pullman, yet I realize, on account of the difference in sanitation, etc., perhaps that statement in my book is a little broad, and think perhaps it would be well to make that about 15 per cent instead of 20 per cent.

40 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). If I understand you, in renting the houses there the water is charged to the tenant?—Ans. Yes, sir.

41 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). I also find this statement: "The water tax has always been a burden upon the people. Bought under contract for 4 cents per 1,000 gallons, it was retailed to the tenant for 10 cents per 1,000 gallons," and that "since Mayor Hopkins took office the price for the town of Pullman has been increased." Was that true up to the time of the increase you speak of?—Ans. That is true, so far as I can find out; I have every reason to believe it is true.

42 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Then there was about 6 cents profit made by the Pullman Land Company on every 1,000 gallons taken by the tenants?—Ans. Yes, as nearly as I can find out. It is a statement that has been made very many times, and I do not think it has ever been refuted.

43 (Commissioner KEERNAN). Someone has said to me that while it was true the charge by the city was 4 cents it is now 6 cents.—Ans. I think the charge by the city is higher; at least, I am inclined to believe Mr. Pullman is not making as much on water now as he did before.

44 (Commissioner KEERNAN). Has any change taken place in the water rent of Pullman, owing to the rise in the cost?—Ans. No, sir.

45 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You pay so much per month for water?—Ans. Yes; 71 cents.

46 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Without regard to the quantity you use?—Ans. If you should figure it out; I think it very unjust myself.

47 (Commissioner KEERNAN). Explain how you have the use of water there.—Ans. There is one faucet in my house. That faucet was in the back room of the second floor. There are two rooms below, three above, and the faucet was in the back room. Now, to oblige the tenant that was in there before me, the faucet was taken away from there, and the tenants used that as a sort of a sitting room and had the faucet and sink put down in the basement, and the faucet is there yet instead of being on the main floor, and but one faucet in the house.

48 (Commissioner KEERNAN). You carry water from that to the different parts of the house?—Ans. Yes, sir; wherever I want to use it.

49 (Commissioner KEERNAN). Is there any bathing facilities in the house?—Ans. Not unless you take a tub or something of that kind. There is no bathroom in the house. There is a small water-closet upstairs, which is kept in good condition.

50 (Commissioner KEERNAN). And this charge for water covers the water for that?—Ans. Yes; I presume so.

51 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How did you make your calculations that the Pullman company pays so much per 1,000 gallons for water and sells it for so much per 1,000 gallons when you pay your water rate by the month?—Ans. I don't know how that is arrived at. I simply make that statement as having been a statement that has always been recognized in Pullman and has never been refuted. If the company will show us it is not so I am willing to accept it.

52 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Seventy-one cents per month, estimating it at 10 cents per 1,000 gallons, would make an expenditure of water of 7,000 gallons, for a cottage of five rooms, per month. I suppose you base it on that sum, do you not?—Ans. I presume so.

53 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Is it also said in this pamphlet that you pay \$2.25 per 1,000 feet for gas, while in Chicago it is sold for \$1.25 and \$1. Where is the gas manufactured that is used in Pullman?—Ans. It is manufactured in Pullman by the Pullman company.

54 (Commissioner KERNAN). What are the conditions in Pullman as to the building of churches for the accommodation of the people?—Ans. When Mr. Pullman built the town of Pullman he decided that there should be one church building, and he built that church, a very handsome structure indeed, and they are renting it today at \$100 per month, plus the water, plus the gas, plus the steam; and the parsonage, which is part of the church, rents for \$65 per month; but no minister, so far as I have ever been able to find out, has received salary enough to permit him to live in that parsonage.

55 (Commissioner KERNAN). What is the membership of that church?—Ans. I could not state; I should judge there were from 200 to 250, but I do not think they have that membership now.

56 (Commissioner KERNAN). You speak of heads of families?—Ans. No, sir; I am taking them all through—men, women, and children.

57 (Commissioner KERNAN). How many heads of families are in that congregation?—Ans. I could not say as to that congregation; my church meets in what is called the Casino Building; we pay \$300 per year rent, plus the steam, water, and gas, but we don't use any water, particularly; we have, say, 200 members, or 225.

58 (Commissioner KERNAN). What I want to know more particularly is whether churches can acquire title to property there at all?—Ans. No, sir; they can not, in the town of Pullman proper; but across the tracks, on Pullman's property, but not really recognized as Pullman proper, the Roman Catholic people have got a lease for ninety-nine years and have a very handsome church there, and the Swedish Evangelical Lutherans have got a church, also. Nobody, however, can buy property to build a church. We have made several efforts to get Mr. Pullman to sell us property to build a church, but could not.

59 (Commissioner KERNAN). Are these tenements generally well lighted, ventilated, drained, and kept in repair by the company?—Ans. I should say yes, as a rule; when you get back in the blocks in some of the houses I don't think it is quite as good as it might be; but am willing to say, taking all things into consideration, that it is all right in that line.

60 (Commissioner KERNAN). I see in your book, on page 23, you speak of cabins renting there for \$8 per month, which you say could be built for \$100 apiece?—Ans. Yes, sir.

61 (Commissioner KERNAN). What kind of cabins are those?—Ans. It is a little bit of a wooden shanty with three rooms in it, the main room, say, about 18 by 24, and then take that room and divide it into two rooms and you have the other two. There is no upstairs.

62 (Commissioner KERNAN). Are those shanties lathed and plastered?—Ans. Whether they are ceiled or lathed and plastered I could not say.

63 (Commissioner KERNAN). Have you had that estimate verified by any builder competent to pass an opinion upon it?—Ans. I have had carpenters look at those buildings and say to me that they could be built for from \$50 to \$75 apiece, and I thought it safe to say \$100.

64 (Commissioner KERNAN). They were speaking of the carpenter work alone?—Ans. I suppose so.

65 (Commissioner KERNAN). And you have added to that what you thought the lumber would cost?—Ans. Yes, sir; I thought, taking it under contract as the Pullman company did, and everything, work, etc., \$100 apiece would be fair.

66 (Commissioner KERNAN). What have you to say as to the conduct of the people at Pullman during the strike?—Ans. I think it has been remarkably good.

67 (Commissioner KERNAN). Have you observed among them a disposition to be violent, requiring urgency on the part of yourself and their leaders to repress, or what was the disposition?—Ans. I felt at times there was an element in our midst that required watching and subduing, but I do not think it was very difficult to subdue that element.

68 (Commissioner KERNAN). Did it need any influence outside of yourself and the citizens there?—Ans. I am free to say I believe it was a good thing to have the militia on the scene of action for about three or four days during our severest time, but I believe sincerely after that that there would have been no disturbance if it had been left entirely to the police force.

69 (Commissioner KERNAN). Have you endeavored to verify this statement of yours, in your book here, as to wages and cuts?—Ans. I have, in the way I spoke of, by inquiring of those who seemed to me were in a position to know.

70 (Commissioner KERNAN). On page 83, I find a statement of the wages of 1893, as compared with those of 1894, giving in one column the wages of 1893 and in the adjoining column the wages of 1894. What time in 1893 is referred to—what month?—Ans. I could not say.

71 (Commissioner KERNAN). Was it early in 1893, before the cuts began?—Ans. The cuts commenced along, I think, about November, 1893. We passed through the midst of the World's Fair season—say about May, I think it was—when things reached their climax, and immediately after that times got very dull and the shops gradually laid off hands until about in September there was not more than 900 men on the pay roll, according to Mr. Middleton's statement to me—

72 (Commissioner KERNAN). Is not that table taken from statements made by the strikers' committee?—Ans. Yes, sir; I state that in the book.

73 (Commissioner KERNAN). It was not one you made up, but one you took from that source, which you believed to be substantially correct?—Ans. Yes, sir; you will see on page 82 that I give credit to them.

74 (Commissioner KERNAN). That shows from 30 to 50 per cent reduction?—Ans. Yes, sir.

75 (Commissioner KERNAN). In addition to that, I will ask you if there is anything in your further statement, "Besides the fact that the scale was reduced, wages were further reduced by the piecework price in the same way," etc.?—Ans. When I come to discuss the real question of wages I am not an adept at that, but I am free to say that so far as I can get down to it, the great trouble has arisen from the piecework and not the day work.

76 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Was this statement taken from the committee's statement you published?—Ans. It was published, but it had been published, I think, for two months; had been before the public, I think, about that time—no, not that long; say about six weeks, and I had looked into the matter a great deal. Then I saw a gentleman who seemed to understand the whole matter; he had been in the employ of the company about eleven years, and he told me, "You are very safe in making those statements," and I said, "If you say so, I will let it go," and he went through it carefully and put me on my honor not to give his name.

77 (Commissioner KERNAN). You speak of shop abuses in this book; have you any personal knowledge on that subject?—Ans. As to absolutely coming in contact by hearing it with my own ears, I will say no.

78 (Commissioner KERNAN). Have you seen any differences yourself

or heard any discussions?—Ans. No, sir; that is a statement that came to me and had been discussed pro and con.

79 (Commissioner KERNAN). I see on another page, further on, of your book, you say, speaking of blacklisting, “Fortunately for the strikers, they had a piece of splendid evidence against the company to prove this charge. About December, 1893, there was some trouble among the steam fitters, which resulted in the blacklisting of the following 40 men.” Then you copy the order as sent out by the general manager:

PULLMAN, ILL., December 23, 1893.

To all Foremen:

In connection with the recent trouble we have had with steam fitters, both in the construction and repair department, I give below the names of the men who have left our employ, and I hereby instruct that none of these men be employed in these works.

You then give the names of the men, and the order is signed by the manager. Was that a printed document?—Ans. It was a typewritten document that was in the possession of Mr. Heathcoate, and a gentleman in the employ of the company who had been instrumental in sending out the identical paper told me, personally, it was all right.

80 (Commissioner KERNAN). Do you know whether that document was sent outside of the Pullman foremen—that is, whether it was given out to the public or to anybody except the foremen of the different shops?—Ans. As to positive evidence of that I have none, but it has been told to me very directly that men have not been able to get work in other places.

81 (Commissioner KERNAN). You have heard it said so?—Ans. Yes, sir; and that would be hearsay evidence.

82 (Commissioner KERNAN). Have you followed up the issuance of that circular to ascertain whether it was sent outside of the foremen of the works to other places?—Ans. As I understand you, you want to know if a man that is blacklisted in the Pullman shops is also blacklisted in other shops?

83 (Commissioner KERNAN). Yes.—Ans. I have no positive evidence of that; I have not seen it with my own eyes, but have no doubt it exists.

84 (Commissioner KERNAN). Did you follow it up to ascertain whether that had been done with this circular?—Ans. No, sir; I will add, with reference to this blacklisting; a certain gentleman told me that a committee that went down to see Mr. Wickes between their first and second visits—this man had been sent out to find out the names of these men with a view to blacklisting them.

85 (Commissioner KERNAN). What is the result of your observation as to whether there is any attempt to interfere at Pullman with the free exercise of the political rights of the help?—Ans. I am very strongly of the opinion that that has been done.

There is one case that came within my own knowledge. A man in the employ of the company was asked by his friends to run on a certain ticket for alderman, and the company had another man toward whom they desired to throw their influence. I talked with this man, being well acquainted with him, and I realized that while he was willing to let his name be used upon the ticket for the nomination, yet he was perfectly willing to withdraw in favor of the other candidate. In the meantime I met one of the officials of the company—I don't think it is necessary for me to give the names of these men—and he and I got to talking about it on the train. He said to me, “This man who is permitting his name to be used is doing an unwise thing, a foolish thing,”

and he spoke of it in other ways. I said, "Do you think it would be better for him to withdraw?" and I said, "He really wants to withdraw; he has no desire personally to go on, and I would rather see him out of the fight." He said, "Well, if you will talk with him and see what he says I would be pleased to have you do so." I said, "I certainly will, for I wish he was out of it." So I went over to see this man, and met him about 2 o'clock in the afternoon in the office, and he was very much excited. This official I referred to, instead of waiting for me to have a conversation with him, had gone into the office and asked him if he was going to withdraw, and said to him, "I think you will have to settle this to-night," giving him to understand that the matter had to be settled at once as to his withdrawing, intimating that his running would interfere with the company's man. The man was very angry, and felt, while he was willing to withdraw, and had told another official, Mr. Sessions, he was willing if his friends would permit him to withdraw, yet because this higher official came to him and said, "You have got to do it," he made up his mind he would not be intimidated in that way, and he drew up a statement of the whole matter, took it before a notary public and swore to it; and I read it, looked over it, and talked about it a good deal afterwards. I considered that intimidation.

86 (Commissioner KERNAN). Do you know of any other instance of that kind?—Ans. No; not positively.

87 (Commissioner KERNAN). Did the men attempt to vote or were they permitted to do so without being attended by a foreman or watchers?—Ans. I have heard it said the foreman would go to the men and press them very strongly; give them to understand that they must vote so and so.

88 (Commissioner KERNAN). Is that something you have heard as happening occasionally, or as a system?—Ans. I would not be prepared to say it was systematic; it was not said that "you must vote this ticket, because it is my party or anything of that kind," but that they wanted you to, and it was especially so in regard to local elections.

89 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Is there any other statement you would like to make?—Ans. I have been told, to illustrate the peculiarity of the company, that there are about sixty-four families that ought to be evicted, and their names are on the list for eviction because of non-payment of back rent, and I am told my own name heads the list.

90 (Commissioner WRIGHT). That is simply hearsay?—Ans. No; I have reason to believe it is a fact.

Commissioner WRIGHT. If there is a representative of the Pullman Palace Car Company present who desires to cross-examine the witness he can do so now.

(No response. Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF MARY ALICE WOOD.

August 18, 1894, Mary Alice Wood, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name, residence, and occupation.—Ans. Mary Alice Wood; No. 302 Stephenson street, Pullman, Ill; from December, 1893, to May, 1894, I worked in the electrical department at Pullman.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you a member of the American Railway Union?—Ans. I am.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you one of the strikers at Pullman?—Ans. Yes, sir.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you sought to get back into the

employ of the company?—Ans. No, sir; I have not, because I could not live on the wages I could get there.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What wages did you earn in June, 1893?—Ans. I did not work there in June, 1893.

6 (Commissioner WRIGHT). I mean from the time you commenced to the time you quit?—Ans. My wages were the same, because I only started there about Christmas, 1893; I got \$1 per day and paid the Pullman company \$7.73 for rent.

7 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You have no knowledge of the rate of wages paid prior to the cuts of last fall?—Ans. Yes, sir; I worked in Pullman some two or three years ago, and I know the girls then made \$2 and \$2.25 per day, seldom less than \$1.75 when I left there; prior to May, three years ago, I earned from \$1.75 to \$2.25 per day.

8 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Is there anything further you desire to state?—Ans. Yes, sir; my father, prior to eight years ago, was employed as a watchman at the Fulton street gate in Pullman, and on the 15th of July, 1886, or 1887 I believe it was, there was a man named Pearson attempted to leave the shops with a box of tools without a pass; the company's orders were strict to take a pass from anyone leaving with any article. Father demanded that he give him a pass; he would not do it and struck father in the face with a hatchet or something—I did not see this, but there are witnesses who did see it, one of the witnesses who saw it was William McLean, he is in New Jersey somewhere now, I don't know his address; a doctor in Pullman attended father and he was brought home; Lieutenant Kane arrested the man; he took a change of venue to a South Chicago police court, and he was acquitted, because they said no man had a right to stop him from taking his tools from the shop, either with or without a pass. Inspector Hunt, at that time captain of police, requested mamma to come up to Chicago with witnesses and they would have the man indicted, but when they got here the grand jury had adjourned and when it met again Pearson had left the town, and there was nothing further said about it.

I wanted mamma to bring a case against the Pullman company, but she had no money and they had everything and she did not do it. Father did not die at once, but he did not recover enough so as to get back his position, although he got employment in the paint department after a while. He was not able to work, and it was only through Mr. Canady's kindness that he was able to hold it at all; when he was able to go to the shop it was all right, and when he was not it was all right, and he died the 30th of May following.

9 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What has this matter to do with this strike we are investigating?—Ans. It has nothing to do with the strike, but a great deal to do with the Pullman company. Last year one of my sisters was renting the house where we lived. In December they said she could not have the house any more because she was owing them about a month's rent, so I took the house in my name, as I was working at that time for the company again, and I had \$6 or \$7 per month to pay on rent. In the latter part of April I was laid off for lack of work and they came to the house and wanted to know how I was going to pay the rent. I told them I wish they would tell me; that I could not tell them unless I could secure work, and they discovered at that time that there was \$12.71 I had paid on the January rent that they credited to my sister. I have a receipt showing the rent paid up to the 30th of April, and a notice of eviction, dated May 3, was served on me, and I have a receipt for the rent paid up to April 30.

10 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Will you produce that notice and make it a part of your testimony?—Ans. Yes, sir.

The notice of eviction referred to by the witness was in the words and figures following, to wit:

[Form 2545. 19-3. 1000 B.]

DEMAND FOR POSSESSION.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, *County of Cook, ss.*

To May Wood:

Pullman's Palace Car Company hereby demands immediate possession of the following described premises, to wit: *House No. 302 Stephenson street, lot number thirty (30), in block number twelve (12), in the town of Pullman, in the township of Hyde Park, in the county of Cook, in the State of Illinois, as shown on sketch plat of said town of Pullman, in the office of the agent of Pullman's Palace Car Company, at the town of Pullman, and hereby appoints said agent to receive possession thereof from you.*

This demand is made upon you on account of nonpayment of rent by you, under your lease of said premises, dated *the first day of January, A. D. 1894*, and under clauses Nos. 6, 14, 15, 16 of said lease and its execution and renewal by you prior to this date, reference to which is hereby made and had.

You are hereby notified that by reason of such nonpayment and default we have elected to determine your lease, and you are hereby further notified to quit and deliver up possession of said premises to us within ten days from this date.

Dated at the town of Pullman, Illinois, this *third day of May, 1894.*

PULLMAN'S PALACE CAR COMPANY.

Per W. P. HOORNBECK,

Agent, Second Assistant Auditor, and Acting Agent.

NOTE.—This demand may be made by delivering a copy thereof to the tenant, or by leaving such copy with some person above the age of twelve years residing on or being in charge of the premises; or in case no one is in actual possession of the premises, then by posting the same on the premises. If the demand is made by a person not an officer the return must be sworn to by the person serving the same.

11 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you any further statements to make?—Ans. Yes, sir. When I was served with this notice I went over to the office to find out why a notice of eviction, dated May 3, was served on me, when my rent was paid up to the 30th day of April. Mr. Hoornbeek said he had signed the notice, that it had been sent to him from the company, and he did not know whether it was right or not; I then went to the bank and Mr. Webb hunted up the record and he said I had only paid \$5 on the January rent, leaving a balance of \$12.71; I told him the day I paid it, then he looked again and found it had been paid, but said they had credited it to my sister's account; I asked them to rectify it; that I had been paying my board the same as if I was away from home until December, 1893; Mr. Webb informed me that he applied all money paid in as he saw fit and he did not consider it any of my business; I went back to Mr. Hoornbeek and he said if Mr. Webb had applied it that way that I would have to pay the \$12.71 over again or leave the house; ma went to Mr. Wickes about it and he said he didn't know anything about my father's case, never had heard of father's being hurt at all, but Mr. Pullman knew of it, for we wrote registered letters to Mr. Pullman from which we never had any reply; Mr. Wickes told ma to go home, and we were going to move; I told Mr. Middleton so, and he went to the foreman where I had been employed and asked him to give me work if there was any; they sent for me to go to work; I said I didn't think there was any use in my going to work as long as I had to leave the house; told Mr. Middleton so; he said the notice of eviction was not worth anything at all, that it would not be executed, and then Mr. Hoornbeek found out he could rectify the mistake, although he had told me before he had nothing to do with it, and that if Mr. Webb had applied the \$12 to the back account it would have to stand.

12 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Was the notice of eviction carried

out?—Ans. No, sir; it has not, but I don't know how soon it will be. Mr. Middleton told ma she would not be bothered for the rent at all; that he thought the Pullman company ought to do something for her, and that she would never be troubled for the rent as long as he was here; but they have asked for the rent three times since then. I don't think his word is very good. At the time the strike occurred, when the shops closed, I had \$3.53 coming to me. When I went to draw it they asked me to sign it over for rent, and twice since they have been to the house. Mr. Middleton asked ma to give him back the notice of eviction, but I didn't know what good it would do him and I did not give it back; I thought, possibly, it would not do me any good, but I didn't think it would do him any either, and as it was served on me, I thought I would keep it. I think there is a prospect of my being evicted.

13 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Well, we will not guess at what people may be going to do.—Ans. I know they were at the house after rent last week, and I can not pay it unless I get work.

14 (Commissioner KERNAN). You say you are paying \$17.71 rent?—Ans. Yes, sir.

15 (Commissioner KERNAN). That was for apartments for whom?—Ans. For my mother.

16 (Commissioner KERNAN). Have you any brothers?—Ans. No, sir, not here; I have a brother in the West.

17 (Commissioner KERNAN). Who else is there in the family besides your mother?—Ans. I have a little niece at home, that is all, that rents the bedroom. We have five rooms.

18 (Commissioner KERNAN). Are there any other employees that help to pay the rent of that apartment except yourself?—Ans. No one helps to pay the rent directly, but indirectly there was, because my mother kept boarders.

19 (Commissioner KERNAN).—But nobody else working in the shops contributed toward the rent?—Ans. No, sir.

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR M. WILSON.

August 18, 1894, Arthur M. Wilson, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name, age, residence, and occupation.—Ans. Arthur M. Wilson; 49; Pullman, Ill.; am a wood-worker; work at inside finishing and at trimming in palace cars.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long have you worked at that at Pullman?—Ans. It will be four years the 28th day of next September.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you a member of the American Railway Union?—Ans. I am.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you now employed at Pullman?—Ans. No, sir.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). When did you leave the employ of the Pullman company?—Ans. I was locked out at the time of the strike. I was not a member of the American Railway Union at the time of the strike, but am now.

6 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you made any attempt to get back?—Ans. I have not.

7 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What were your wages a year ago in your line?—Ans. Twenty-three cents an hour.

8 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What were they just before you were locked out?—Ans. There were no wages stated; we were working piecework, and piecework varies a good deal.

9 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State, if you can, your earnings, say, a year ago and up to the time you left the company's employ.—Ans. (Referring to time book.) For the last two weeks in January, 1893—we got our pay every two weeks there—my pay was \$32.78. In February my pay was \$30.94; in April, \$36; in June, \$28.87. In July we were laid off—summer is generally a slack time in the Pullman shops, usually for two or three weeks. In August my pay was \$30.07. In November—that was before the cut—we were put on seven hours a day, which practically amounted to the same thing as a cut. My wages for the first two weeks in November were \$19.32; the last two weeks, \$18.03. The last two weeks of January, 1894, we commenced to work on piecework; my wages were \$18.97. I will say our time was sent in on the 15th of each month and the last of each month, and from the 16th to the last day of January my pay was \$18.97. The first two weeks of February my pay was \$17.45; the last two weeks it was \$16.35. The first two weeks of March, \$17.35; the last two weeks, \$18.75. My pay the first two weeks of April was \$21.23; the last two weeks, \$20.05. That is the difference between the piecework and day work; where my day work amounted to from \$28 to \$30 for two weeks it then amounted to from \$17 to \$20.

10 (Commissioner WRIGHT). That was the result of the reduction in the price per piece?—Ans. Yes, sir.

11 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you reside in one of the Pullman houses?—Ans. Yes, sir.

12 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How many people went on the strike at Pullman?—Ans. I could not answer that, for at the time the strike occurred the shops were closed, and I was not in the shops the day of the strike and could not say how many people walked out. I would like to say that when the strike occurred I was laid off; my gang was laid off and had been for several days.

13 (Commissioner WRIGHT). When you were employed there were you at work on Pullman work or on contract work it had taken for other companies?—Ans. My work was all company work. I was in the repair department, where they do their own work; the construction department is where they build cars for other roads.

14 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What is the proportion of the company's work with reference to the whole work performed at Pullman, if you know?—Ans. I think it would be safe to say that in the last year eight-tenths of all the work done has been Pullman's own work, principally repair work, that is, in the Pullman shops; I am not speaking of the freight shops or the street-car shops.

15 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You know nothing of that?—Ans. No, sir.

16 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Does the reduction of your wages which you have detailed here represent, so far as you know, about the proportionate reduction in the wages of all the employees there?—Ans. I could not say, for I am not posted on what the other men receive; I even do not know the wages other departments were getting.

TESTIMONY OF MYRTLE WEBB.

August 18, 1894, Myrtle Webb, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name, residence, and occupation.—Ans. Myrtle Webb; No. 325 Watt avenue, Pullman, Ill.; was a seamstress in the Pullman shops.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long did you work there as seamstress?—Ans. Two years.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you now employed there?—Ans. No, sir; not since the strike.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What was the class of your work, and how were you paid for it when you did work?—Ans. Linen, drapery, and carpets, both piece and day work.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State how much you earned last year.—Ans. In 1893 I could make on piecework as high as 17½ cents per hour and this year I could only make 6, 8, and sometimes 12 cents per hour.

6 (Commissioner WRIGHT). On the same work you got 17½ cents for before?—Ans. Yes sir.

7 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How old are you?—Ans. Nineteen next October.

8 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Were you paid the same as the older women there?—Ans. No, sir; some of the older ones got 12 and 14 cents and I got only 10 cents, but there were some that were not as old as I that got 12 cents, where I only got 10 cents for the same work I done and same quality of work—girls that worked right along with me all the time. I went in and spoke to our foreman about it and asked if he could not raise my wages; asked him if he did not think I was capable of earning as much as some of the other girls that came there after I did. He said he rated the girls according to their ages; the older girls he gave 14 cents to, the next 12 cents, and, I being one of the younger girls, he rated me at 10 cents. I asked him why it was that certain girls in the room younger than I were getting 12 cents. He said he didn't know about that; that he did not mean to do me an injustice; but he never saw it was righted. I asked this over a month before the strike.

9 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you a member of the American Railway Union?—Ans. I am.

10 (Commissioner WRIGHT). When did you join?—Ans. About a week before the strike.

11 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you rent a house there now?—Ans. I do not.

TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL J. CARROLL.

August 21, 1894, Michael J. Carroll, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name and occupation.—Ans. Michael J. Carroll; am a printer and editor of the Eight-Hour Herald, and have been editor of that paper for a little over two years.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you a member of the Civic Federation?—Ans. I am.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State to the commission what efforts were made by that federation, so far as you know of your own knowledge, relative to the arbitration of the difficulties at Pullman.—Ans. The matter was taken up by the industrial section of the Civic Federation and a committee appointed to try to bring both parties together. The committee failed for the reason the Pullman officials refused to go on with it; their answer was they had nothing to arbitrate.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Did you take part in that interview?—Ans. No, sir.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). So you have no personal knowledge of

any interview between the representatives of your federation and the Pullman officials?—Ans. Only what they reported back.

6 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What did they report back?—Ans. That it was impossible to bring the Pullman people to see any necessity of submitting their case to arbitration in any way.

7 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Was there any reason given for that decision?—Ans. Simply that they had nothing to arbitrate.

8 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are there any facts that you know of your own knowledge relative to the recent troubles that you would like to state to the commission?—Ans. I don't know that there is anything that has not been made public; it has been gone over pretty thoroughly. I know Mr. Debs was very anxious that the matter should be submitted to arbitration. While at the same time he maintained his organization could win in case of a strike, still he was anxious to avoid a strike.

9 (Commissioner WRIGHT). What is your idea of a remedy for these troubles, if you have any?—Ans. That is a pretty broad question. If you could avoid hard times I don't think you would have any strikes, but I think having hard times, and workmen being ground down to a point where they can no longer sustain themselves and families, of course you will have strikes. I think a little humanity on both sides would avoid them. If we could introduce and recognize generally the principle of the living wage it would do a great deal toward preventing strikes. When workmen are ground down to a point where they can no longer sustain themselves and families, of course it has a tendency to make them desperate, destroy their patriotism, and everything else.

10 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you any views as to what legislation can do to prevent and avoid strikes and boycotts?—Ans. If we could introduce the same system in the mechanical and labor branch of industry that we have in the mercantile houses it would go a long way toward avoiding these troubles. As I understand the rule in all reputable mercantile establishments they promote everybody, encourage their employees in every way, increase their pay, and under such circumstances the trades union does not exist in those establishments—there is no need for it. On the other hand, in all mechanical and laboring branches of trade the practice has been whenever the financial result of the business has not been satisfactory, a cut of wages has been made, regardless of whether the men were getting enough to sustain themselves or not; that has been my experience.

Naturally I am inclined to arbitration, for the reason I am a member of a union, and have been for thirty years, that has always advocated arbitration, and practiced it as long ago as twenty years—the typographical union. One of the objects for which that union was organized was to endeavor to replace strikes and their attendant bitterness and financial loss by arbitration. That is one of their fundamental principles which was practiced twenty years ago. In the scale of prices there is an agreement signed here in Chicago by the representatives of the newspapers and this union by which all matter pertaining to the scale or condition of labor are settled by arbitration, and in my experience with arbitration I have found it satisfactory. While the result of any application of the principle may not be entirely satisfactory to both parties, in fact, it seldom is, it is better than a strike, in my opinion. To avoid strikes I think it would be well to encourage, legalize if necessary, and recognize trades unions. Where a union is strong financially and otherwise, it has a tendency to do away with strikes. Their strength is acknowledged and respected. In such case they naturally

look to arbitration or something else before they resort to a trial of strength.

So far as the railroad corporations are concerned, I am inclined to favor Government ownership. I know the public press of this country to a great extent say it is impracticable. I hold here a letter from our New Zealand correspondent received a few days ago, in which he says: "I observe a great controversy going on in your land about Government control of telegraphs. This somewhat surprises the colonists, because there is no private control of the wires here. The telegraphic system belongs to a public system and is supervised by the minister of posts and telegraph." In regard to the railways, I believe the situation out there is about the same. This is practical experience of people who have tried it, and is worth any amount of theory in a matter of this kind. "Our railways are owned and run by the State under control of nonpolitical boards of three. We have a State labor bureau and everything of that kind." He says also in that connection that the purpose of Government control is to do away with strikes.

11 (Commissioner KERNAN). In speaking of those things, such as Government control of telegraph, etc., in New Zealand, they are advocating compulsory arbitration; that would indicate that everything they have tried thus far, such as ownership of telegraph, etc., has not relieved them from the difficulty of strikes?—Ans. Not entirely. Compulsory arbitration appears to be looked on with a good deal of suspicion. I don't see how else it is to be applied satisfactorily. Where one side always stands ready to arbitrate and the other side will not, what is the use of voluntary arbitration?

12 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You would compel the parties to appear and when a decree was rendered enforce it by compulsory methods?—Ans. I do not see any other remedy, though I don't think that would ever be necessary. My experience has been that conciliation, concessions, and arbitration will do away with any trouble. The thing is to bring the contending parties together. That is what we failed to do previous to every big strike that has taken place lately. It is my opinion there would not be any strikes if we could get the parties together.

13 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). Do you not think if we had compulsory arbitration, as we use the term, and compel each party to abide by the decision of that arbitration, so far as possible, that the very fact of there being that kind of legislation would tend to increase voluntary arbitrations or conciliations before grievances went that far?—Ans. I think it would have that tendency. I think if compulsory arbitration prevailed railroad corporations and other industrial corporations would follow some line of settlement of dispute. It would have a tendency to induce and popularize that system.

14 (Commissioner KERNAN). Whose fault has it been, in your experience, that the parties did not get together?—Ans. The party declining arbitration; invariably the employer.

15 (Commissioner KERNAN). Do you go so far as to say that in all your experience the employees have been ready to arbitrate and the employers have not?—Ans. There has been probably isolated cases where the employees would not submit—the demand might have been unreasonable or something of that kind. Human nature, I suppose, is the same on both sides. There might have been cases where the union considered itself a good deal stronger than the other party.

16 (Commissioner KERNAN). If the employees invariably want arbitration, why are they unwilling to attach to it conditions compelling submission?—Ans. I don't know. I can answer for myself, I have no objection to such a condition.

17 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). You think the general rule is the employers are the ones not disposed to arbitrate?—Ans. That has been the rule in all the cases I can call to mind at present. That was the case at Homestead and at Pullman, surely.

18 (Commissioner KERNAN). You have said you thought there would be no trouble if employers would pay living wages. Now, during times of great financial distress, when employers are losing money, how can we answer their position, that the conditions of business do not permit them to pay beyond certain wages regardless of whether they are living wages or not?—Ans. They do it in the mercantile departments of their business while at the same time they are cutting down the wages of their mechanics.

19 (Commissioner KERNAN). That is for the preservation of the business; they continue paying through times of depression rather than lose their experienced help.—Ans. They should give the employees during that time some of the benefits which accrued from the profits they made when times were good.

TESTIMONY OF REV. MORRIS L. WICKMAN.

August 21, 1894, Rev. Morris L. Wickman, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name and profession?—Ans. Morris L. Wickman; minister of the gospel.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Where are you located?—Ans. On the borders of Pullman. It is called the Pullman Swedish Methodist Church.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long have you been pastor of that church?—Ans. Five years.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you familiar with the condition of affairs at Pullman?—Ans. I think so.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State briefly the condition of the Swedish employees there.—Ans. Their condition, I suppose, is somewhat superior to the condition of the others, because our people are naturally industrious, good mechanics, and sober in their habits, so that up until the present year they had nothing to complain of, except petty grievances in the shops; but during this time of general depression their wages have been so reduced that they were unable to meet their expenses, and quite a number of them became very seriously embarrassed, so that last year, beginning with October or November, we were compelled as a church to take measures to relieve their condition. We had quite a number of destitute families to take care of, and that condition was quite prevalent.

6 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Did you have anything to do with the conditions which led up to the strike?—Ans. No, sir.

7 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you familiar with the condition of the people as to their tenements in Pullman and surrounding places?—Ans. Yes, sir; during the time of my pastorage I have made about 1,500 visits, I should judge, to the families in Pullman, and have visited families in Kensington and Roseland also.

8 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State what you found comparatively as to conditions in those three places.—Ans. I find that the people in Pullman are compelled to pay about one-third at least more rent than the people in Kensington and Roseland for like accommodations.

9 (Commissioner KERNAN). Do employees of the Pullman shops live

in Kensington?—Ans. Yes, sir; but when the work begins to be slack in Pullman the outside workmen receive orders to move into Pullman if they wish to retain their positions. I am acquainted with families that were compelled to do so last fall.

10 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Did you see the order from the Pullman company to that effect?—Ans. No, sir; I did not. But they are not written; they are given verbally by the foremen of the different departments. I have a foreman belonging to my church that personally has given those orders by the orders of the company.

11 (Commissioner KERNAN). The orders were to the effect that they must live in Pullman as long as there were accommodations there if they wanted to work?—Ans. That is, when the work begins to get slack; it is not the condition always.

12 (Commissioner KERNAN). When there is plenty of work, then, the Pullman houses are full; and do you mean to be understood that those who live in the adjoining towns are the overflow?—Ans. They are, save only in cases of exceptionally good workmen.

13 (Commissioner WRIGHT). They are allowed to live wherever they desire?—Ans. Yes, sir; I had a case in my own congregation, a man who is an exceptionally good workman, and orders came from the office twice to lay him off, as they term it, but the foreman said he could not possibly do it, because he had work he had to do, and he was retained even during the hard times.

14 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You have observed, of course, the moral bearing of the people of Pullman, Kensington, and Roseland?—Ans. Yes, sir.

15 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How does that of one place compare with that of the other?—Ans. I think so far as the moral conditions go that the people in Roseland are better off than the people in Pullman. The families in Pullman, on account of the high rents, are compelled to keep roomers, and the rooms are so arranged that a roomer can not go to his room without going through the private rooms of the family, which breaks in upon the sanctity of the family, and there have been cases where immorality resulted from that cause.

16 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How is it as to conditions of temperance as between Kensington and Pullman?—Ans. Kensington has the reputation of being a "bum" town, and the saloons are concentrated there.

17 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Is that reputation well earned?—Ans. Yes, sir; but there is a steady stream of people pouring from Pullman into Kensington every night and every Sunday. There are kegs of beer carried over into Pullman, and the beer wagons have free permission to go through the streets of Pullman, and leave beer and liquor with the families and in the boarding houses.

18 (Commissioner WORTHINGTON). What would you say generally as to the habits of the Pullman employees, so far as sobriety is concerned, compared with the habits of employees in similar establishments?—Ans. I think, taken as a whole, it is a very good community, and I think the conduct of the men during the strike would bear me out, until the rioting began on the railroads. We had more quiet, less rioting during that time than at any other time during the history of the town since I have been there. The people were quiet and attended to their own business.

19 (Commissioner KERNAN). How is it as to their providence as a class; I mean as to saving out of their wages, whether they live up to their income as a rule or whether there is a tendency to save among

them?—Ans. Speaking for my own people, there is a saving tendency among them. Quite a number of them have tried to obtain their own homes in Roseland. Of course they are seriously embarrassed now and have been ever since they attempted it, but it shows the tendency that they wish to get their own homes, and they put all their spare earnings into that.

20 (Commissioner KERNAN). How does the Pullman company, if at all, encourage this desire on the part of the men to get their own homes?—Ans. I don't think the Pullman company tries to hinder it, at least I have never found it so; but of course when work begins to get slack these men are the first laid off; that is the only way the Pullman company hinders them, I believe.

21 (Commissioner KERNAN). The men can buy land in the adjoining towns and build homes if they desire?—Ans. Yes; if they have means.

22 (Commissioner KERNAN). Is it your observation that that course places them at a disadvantage as workmen?—Ans. It does place them at a slight disadvantage, because workmen living in Pullman have the first chance.

23 (Commissioner KERNAN). What inducement is there in the town of Pullman to invest savings, except in the savings bank?—Ans. There is a local branch of a building association called the Calumet Building Association, in which some of the men have invested.

24 (Commissioner KERNAN). Have the Pullman company any connection with that association?—Ans. No, sir.

25 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you reside in one of the Pullman houses?—Ans. I do not now; I reside in Roseland.

26 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long since you resided in a Pullman house?—Ans. It is three years now.

27 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Do you know anything of the case of the threatened eviction of Miss Wood?—Ans. No, sir.

28 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You never were evicted?—Ans. No; I always made my payments. I said there were petty grievances in the shop and the men could not obtain justice, and I believe that is one of the causes which led up to the strike. I have a case in my own congregation, if I may be permitted to mention it.

29 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Was it reported to you?—Ans. No, sir; that I know about myself, and even appeared before the Pullman company in reference to it.

30 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Give us the benefit of your own knowledge.—Ans. It was one of my members who was working in the hammer shops. While he was holding a riveting stake, another man doing the riveting, a piece chipped off the riveting stake and struck him in the hand, crushing a bone and severing a tendon. He was taken to the company surgeon and the wound sewed up, the tendon also. He called on the surgeon several times, but I noticed his arm was continually swelling and getting black, and finally his side was getting black. I saw something must be done for him, and I took him to Wesley Hospital, and when they had reduced the swelling so the wound could be opened they probed it with a tube, which immediately turned black, and when the wound became in such condition it could be operated upon some crushed bone was removed that had not been removed in the first place, and they put a drainage tube in the arm, and they were doubtful whether the man's life could be saved, much less his arm; but they did the best they could for him, and after being nine weeks in the hospital he was discharged as cured, but his hand has never since been in the condition it was before; his wrist is stiffer.

I went personally with him to see the Pullman officials to see if anything could be done for him, because the accident was not on account of his fault, and they read a statement to me which read: "While I was riveting loops in the hammer shop, one of the loops flew up and struck me; the accident was unavoidable," and the statement was signed with this man's name. I said to General Manager Brown: "That is a forgery," and he grew very indignant at first, but afterwards found out that the man was not in a condition to hold a pen to paper at the time that it was signed, and it was signed by the physician and foreman of the shop. Mr. Brown said he would personally investigate the case, and the following week the foreman became frightened and asked to have the matter quieted up, but an investigation was made and another statement made out, to which the man signed his name, stating that a piece of a riveting stake chipped off and struck his hand, showing that the first statement was entirely false. I went again to the company and asked if something could not be done for the man, but Mr. Brown said it was an accident that was entirely unavoidable. "It is a very sad case, and personally I feel sympathy for the man, but I am merely an agent of the corporation and am here to guard the interests of that corporation, and nothing can be done for him."

During the time this man was in the hospital he was charged for rent and had to pay the hospital bills, and when he returned to work his wages were reduced on account of not being fully competent to perform the work he did before. This is just one specimen of the grievances the men had to contend with, and I think to a certain extent led up to the strike.

31 (Commissioner WRIGHT). You think there were others of like character?—Ans. Yes, sir; I think so, because the superintendent of the freight-car shops told me he had numbers of cases of that kind, but did not want me to say it because his position was in danger if it should come out, but he has been discharged since and so I do not think I do him any wrong to tell it.

32 (Commissioner KERNAN). There was no charge made by the company for the services of the surgeon, was there?—Ans. No, sir.

33 (Commissioner KERNAN). Does the company keep a physician?—Ans. Yes, sir.

34 (Commissioner KERNAN). To what extent does that physician look after the health of the people?—Ans. Just when an accident happens in the shop. We have need of an emergency hospital in Pullman, and at one time took steps to get one some years ago. A committee was appointed, consisting of a preacher and two doctors, who called to see the Pullman company, stating that they would see that the expenses of the hospital were met and the doctors would furnish their services free, if the company would donate a cottage on Watt avenue, but they refused, without giving any reason, simply stating that the cottages were not built for that purpose; that they were built for residences.

35 (Commissioner KERNAN). Where was the Wesley Hospital you took this man to?—Ans. On the South Side, Thirty-fifth street and Dearborn.

36 (Commissioner KERNAN). Then an employee that is injured so he needs care has to be removed to some hospital in Chicago for treatment?—Ans. Yes, sir.

37 (Commissioner KERNAN). I understand no provision is made for paying the expenses.—Ans. No provision unless it is so clear that the injury was caused by the fault of the company or its agents that the company can not get out of it.

TESTIMONY OF ANDREW W. PEARSON.

August 18, 1894, Andrew W. Pearson, a witness called by the commission, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your residence, business, and place of business.—Ans. I reside in the city of Chicago; am a real estate agent and have been about two and one-half years; my office is on the corner of One hundred and sixteenth street and Michigan avenue; I deal in real estate in Kensington, Roseland, Gano, and some at West Pullman, and also in Riverdale.

2 (Commissioner KERNAN). Are you familiar with the going prices of real estate and the rental value of property in those locations?—Ans. Yes, sir.

3 (Commissioner KERNAN). Have you had charge of the renting of property?—Ans. I have between 90 and 100 dwelling houses, cottages, and flats I am now renting, and have had for something like two years.

4 (Commissioner KERNAN). What class of property is it?—Ans. It is of the cheaper class, for a poor class of people—the middle class, working people, wage workers, who generally work in the shops in that part of the city.

5 (Commissioner KERNAN). Have you had charge of the sale of real estate in that locality, if so, to what extent?—Ans. Yes, sir. In the last two and one-half years the times have been rather slack in that business. but I have been making on the average one or two sales a month.

6 (Commissioner KERNAN). Of what class of property?—Ans. It is of the cheaper class of property; five-room cottages, including the lot, which together with the lot sell for something like \$1,000 to \$1,200; also vacant lots in the subdivision of C. B. Sawyer on Michigan avenue, located between State street, Michigan avenue, South One hundred and sixteenth, and North One hundred and nineteenth streets.

7 (Commissioner KERNAN). Are you familiar with the rental property at Pullman?—Ans. Yes, sir; to some extent.

8 (Commissioner KERNAN). Are you familiar with the condition of the houses there which rent at from \$8 up to \$25 per month?—Ans. Yes, sir.

9 (Commissioner KERNAN). Will you give us from your knowledge and experience a comparison as between the rental in Pullman and the rental in the surrounding towns for similar houses?—Ans. The property I am agent for don't have the sewerage that there is in Pullman, but we have the city water, and the people renting from me have more privileges, better conditions, and more comfort than they have in the Pullman cottages or in the Pullman flats. I lived myself in a Pullman house as a tenant for about seven and one-half years while I was in the employ of the Pullman company, from the 1st of March, 1881, to the 10th of May, 1891; I lived in the Pullman houses during the largest part of that time. March 1, 1881, the Pullman houses were not yet completed, but as soon as I could get a flat I rented one, and I experienced more misery in that flat than in any other place I ever lived. We had city water in the flat I lived in, but there was not force enough to bring the water up to the second floor, and we had the greatest inconvenience and discomfort there. Then we moved out of that flat into a five-room cottage at Pullman and paid \$17 per month rent and 71 cents for water. There I had the same trouble. My family was sick and I was sick eleven weeks with typhoid fever, and my family was sick with a similar disease, and every other disease, and it took all I

had to pay doctor bills and house rent, and could not pay my grocery bills and other bills that I got value received for. I experienced more discomfort in those Pullman houses than in any house that I ever lived in.

10 (Commissioner KERNAN). After you left those houses, state where you lived then and what rent you paid for similar accommodations—
 Ans. Every house in Pullman has a basement, and there is a valve from the sewer, and sewer gas escapes through that valve and ascends through the house, and I think it was that made my family sick nearly the whole time; and then, the water was inferior; we did not get the water we ought to have had. I don't know whether it was the city water or Lake Calumet water, but the water was not pure, and we were paying as much for inferior water as if it had been good water.

11 (Commissioner KERNAN). When you left Pullman where did you go to live?—Ans. I went into my own house, that I built myself, at No. 1107 Michigan avenue, and have been living there ever since.

12 (Commissioner KERNAN). What are the rentals for houses that you have charge of and know about in towns around Pullman, having similar accommodations to the Pullman houses?—Ans. Houses with similar conditions to what I had in Pullman at \$17.71 rent, I am renting for \$10 per month in Kensington, Roseland, and Gano.

13 (Commissioner KERNAN). How far are those houses from the works at Pullman?—Ans. They are in the neighborhood of three-fourths of a mile from the south point of West Pullman.

14 (Commissioner KERNAN). Take property that rents at \$25 per month in Pullman, what does such property rent for in these adjoining towns?—Ans. At something like \$15 per month.

15 (Commissioner KERNAN). Does this difference you have specified in these two instances extend to all the different classes of houses from the \$8 to the \$25 houses?—Ans. I have better classes of houses, of course, which vary in rental according to locality.

16 (Commissioner KERNAN). What I want to know is whether a flat which rents in Pullman for \$10 per month rents for more or less with similar accommodations in these other towns?—Ans. Property that rents for \$10 per month in Pullman will probably rent for something like \$5 outside of Pullman.

17 (Commissioner KERNAN). To what extent outside of Pullman?—Ans. It would be pretty much the rule in all the surrounding territory.

18 (Commissioner KERNAN). How would it be in Chicago in the vicinity of manufacturing establishments—what would be the rent of such houses having accommodations similar to those of houses usually occupied by that class of people?—Ans. I could not say how it would be in Chicago, but I am agent of property at Grand Crossing, brick cottages of five rooms, having the ordinary conveniences and accommodations, including water, which we pay ourselves, and they rent for \$8 per month.

19 (Commissioner KERNAN). Do you keep the property in repair?—Ans. Yes, sir.

20 (Commissioner KERNAN). In your opinion are the rentals at Pullman higher or lower than the rental of houses that have similar accommodations in that vicinity outside of Pullman?—Ans. As nearly as I can estimate the rental of houses in Pullman is on the average one-third higher than it is outside of Pullman.

21 (Commissioner KERNAN). Has there been a decline in the rental of the class of houses you speak of during the last year or two?—Ans. There has.

22 (Commissioner KERNAN). And the rental you have given is the present rental?—Ans. Yes, sir.

23 (Commissioner KERNAN). Take a five-room flat, or cottage either, which rented for \$15 per month two years ago, what would it rent for now?—Ans. We rent such houses for \$12.

24 (Commissioner KERNAN). Does that represent a fair average of the decrease in rent, owing to the present depression?—Ans. Yes, sir.

25 (Commissioner KERNAN). Has there been any change in the rental at Pullman, so far as you know?—Ans. No, sir; not to my knowledge.

26 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you familiar with the method of assessing property for the purpose of taxation at Pullman, Kensington, and these other places?—Ans. I am not very familiar with that part of it.

27 (Commissioner WOORTHINGTON). Is it not true that so far as adornment, ornamentation, etc., beauty of surroundings, are concerned, it is much greater at Pullman than in the other villages?—Ans. The beauty and attractions of the town of Pullman might be far greater, but the people that rent and live there don't have the comforts they have in the surrounding towns; the rooms in the Pullman houses are laid out so badly you can not possibly have any comfort; the rents are so high that the tenants have to rent the best part of the house out to roomers to get enough to pay rent, and thus deprive themselves of the best part of the house.

28 (Commissioner WRIGHT). When did you leave the employ of the Pullman company?—Ans. May 9, 1891.

29 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Did you leave of your own motion?—Ans. No, sir; I had a paralytic stroke and was not able to work; I left the shop and went to the hospital.

30 (Commissioner WRIGHT). There was no trouble connected with your leaving?—Ans. No, sir; I could not find any fault with the shop management or work of that kind.

TESTIMONY ON THE PART OF PULLMAN'S PALACE CAR COMPANY.

TESTIMONY OF FRANK W. T. GLOVER.

August 22, 1894, Frank W. T. Glover, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 (Commissioner WRIGHT). State your name, residence, and occupation.—Ans. Frank W. T. Glover; residence, No. 326 Michigan avenue, but am residing temporarily at 1315 Michigan avenue, Chicago; occupation, real estate.

2 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you ever resided at Pullman?—Ans. No, sir.

3 (Commissioner WRIGHT). How long have you been in the real estate business?—Ans. Seven years.

4 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Are you familiar with real estate at Pullman, Kensington, Roseland and vicinity?—Ans. Not necessarily; only at Kensington.

5 (Commissioner WRIGHT). Have you been asked by the Pullman company to appear here?—Ans. It is a question whether I was asked