

Senate fill sixty-six closely printed columns of the «Congressional Globe,» and those in the House seventy-eight columns. If that be «secrecy» and «stealth,» what would constitute publicity?

There is abundant testimony also that the meaning of the bill was at no time concealed, or sought to be concealed. Mr. John J. Knox, who was then deputy-comptroller of the currency, prepared the bill and accompanied it with a communication, which stated distinctly three times that its provisions discontinued the coinage of the silver dollar piece. He had previously submitted the bill to boards of trade, chambers of commerce, professors in colleges, mint officials, and other experts, and persons best competent to pass judgment upon it, and the replies of these authorities were included in the communication to Congress. Mr. Knox said subsequently, in regard to the charge of «stealth,» that it «has no foundation in fact,» that «it is not probable that any act passed by any Congress ever received more care in its preparation, or was ever submitted to the criticism of a greater number of practical and scientific experts.» Ex-Senator Edmunds, who was a member of the Senate during the three years in question, said many years later, when asked if it was generally understood at the time that the bill put the country upon the single gold standard:

Certainly. All the nations with which we did business—or the most of them—were going to the gold standard alone; and the tendency of all trade pointed to that as the inevitable basis of values.

But the strongest evidence against the stealth charge is to be found in the speeches made in both Houses while the bill was under consideration. In January, 1872, the bill was before the House, and was debated for nearly two whole days. Congressman Kelley, of Pennsylvania, made a long speech in explanation of its provisions, giving a detailed account of the authorities to whom it had been submitted for opinion, saying that its only object was to provide for the «integrity of the coinage,» and adding:

I would like to follow the example of England and make a wide difference between our gold and silver coins, and make the gold dollar uniform with the French system of weights, taking the grain as the unit.

Congressman Hooper, of Massachusetts, when the bill was again before the House in February, 1872, explained the coinage and other sections of the bill in a speech which fills ten columns of the «Globe,» and in the course of which he said of the silver dollar which the bill discontinued:

The silver dollar of 412½ grains, by reason of its bullion or intrinsic value being greater than its nominal value, long since ceased to be a coin of circulation, and is melted by manufacturers of silverware.

Congressman Potter, of New York, who opposed the bill, said:

This bill provides for the making of changes in the legal tender coin of the country, and for substituting as legal tender coin of only one metal, instead, as heretofore, of two.

Mr. Potter opposed the bill, not because he objected to its effect, but because, as the country had not at that time resumed specie payment, it was premature legislation. In replying to him, Mr. Kelley spoke of the bill in terms which leave no doubt that its meaning was per-

fectly well known by those who were considering it. Speaking of the «impossibility of retaining the double standard,» he said:

The values of gold and silver continually fluctuate. You cannot determine this year what will be the relative value of gold and silver next year. Hence all experience has shown that you must have one standard coin which shall be a legal tender for all others, and then you may promote your domestic convenience by having a subsidiary coinage of silver which shall circulate as legal tender for a limited amount, and be redeemable at its face value by the government.

The bill passed the House in May, 1872, and was sent back to the Senate, which had passed it in 1871, with certain amendments. It came up again for final passage, or concurrence in the amendments, in the Senate in January, 1873, and was passed without a division. In his speech explaining its provisions, Senator Sherman said:

The bill proposes a silver coinage exactly the same as the French and what are called the associated nations of Europe, who have adopted the international standard of silver coinage; that is, the dollar (two half dollars) provided for in this bill is the precise equivalent of a 5-franc piece.

The final debate in the Senate on the bill filled nineteen columns of the «Globe.»

At the time the law was passed, the silver dollar was an obsolete coin. Senator Edmunds said, in a published interview from which we have quoted above:

For many years silver, save as a subsidiary currency, had been practically unknown, when the act of 1873 was passed. After 1845, or thereabouts, the silver dollar disappeared, and was an unknown quantity.

The reason was that it was worth three or four cents more than the gold dollar, and hence refused to circulate. Instead of being demonetized by the act of 1873, it had demonetized itself about 1845, or a quarter of a century earlier. Instead of the passage of that act taking half of our currency out of circulation, it actually increased the volume of it very largely. The total silver coinage for the first five years after the passage of the act was over \$31,751,000 against \$7,600,000 for the previous ten years. In 1873 began the enormous increase in the product of silver, which has been going on ever since. In 1870 this product was \$51,575,000. It increased gradually till in 1873 it reached \$81,800,000, a gain of 60 per cent. within three years. It fluctuated a little during the next few years, but at no time fell below \$81,000,000, and in 1881 it reached \$102,000,000. From that time it advanced several millions every year till in 1893 it exceeded \$209,000,000, a gain of 145 per cent. within twenty years.

It is very clear from these facts and figures that it was not the passage of the act of 1873 which either demonetized silver or reduced it one half in value. In both cases, the moving forces have been the eternal laws of nature, and if any «crime» has been committed against silver, nature is the culprit.

The Wage-earner's Interest in Improved Housing.

ONE day a wandering cynic chanced to visit a humble tenement lodging, and found the bath-tub full of coal. He did not stop to inquire what he himself would do if

he lived in quarters so restricted that there was no other means of storage, but straightway formed the opinion that improving the homes of working people was a fruitless task because of their misuse of such improvements.

Though the tale may represent reality in isolated instances, as a generalization it is absolutely untrue. Even the dullest and lowest intelligence will, in time, respond to an ameliorated environment.

This is not a mere thesis. There is plenty of evidence to sustain it. Lord Shaftsbury, who practically interested himself for more than sixty years in improving the homes of the masses, said time and again that many of the people who were in a filthy and deplorable condition had been made so by their surroundings, and that where their homes had been improved, they had been rescued from such conditions. Human nature is imitative; the force of good example is catching. Lack of opportunity to lead a more civilized existence, not the inclination to remain as they are, largely explains the situation of the poorer elements amongst city dwellers. Sir Sydney Waterlow cites the punctuality with which the rents are paid to his corporation as evidence that people having good rooms are anxious to keep them. He believes that there is a growing desire for comfortable homes.

Perhaps the most eloquent testimony to the desire of wage-earners for a decent living environment is the prosperity attending model housing enterprises wherever they have been established. An exhaustive study made by Prof. E. R. L. Gould, covering all model enterprises in existence in the larger cities of Europe and the United States, shows that eighty-eight per cent. of them are earning dividends equal to or in excess of normal commercial rates. Upwards of 160,000 people find shelter in the improved tenements of London. The owners reap solid financial returns.

Prof. Gould's experience, based on more than three years' study and investigation of this matter, has established the firm conviction that wage-earners feel a positive interest in improved housing, and will cheerfully take advantage of it whenever it is provided.

What are the wage-earner's special interests in improved housing? In the first place, this class is vitally interested in the conservation of health. Good health means earning power, and as working-men lead more or less of a hand-to-mouth existence, any loss of earning power is a serious matter. Lord Beaconsfield aptly voiced this truth in an address delivered at the opening of some new blocks of improved tenements in London. He said «the health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and their power depends.» Few realize the loss of productive energy through sickness brought about by bad living environments. Sir James Paget, the distinguished English physician, estimates that the whole population of England between fifteen and sixty-five years old works in each year twenty millions of weeks less than they might if it were not for sickness. He puts down the loss inflicted on wage-earners at nearly fifteen millions of dollars annually. He refers simply to a purely preventable loss. Some years ago, the London health authorities instituted inquiries in certain low neighborhoods to estimate the value of labor lost in a year, not by sick-

ness, but from sheer exhaustion induced by unfavorable surroundings. It was found that, upon the lowest average, every worker lost about twenty days in the year from this cause. One might go on multiplying such instances, but it is not necessary to enforce the argument by cumulative citation.

Wage-earners are vitally interested in the passage and enforcement of wise sanitary laws. Bad sanitation entails proportionally worse economic consequences to them than to the more highly favored. They are also more often the victims of sickness and epidemics, fostered by insanitary neighborhoods. The working-man has a positive interest in using whatever political power he possesses to secure legal remedies against uninhabitable houses through expropriation laws such as those current in England, and the measure recently put into operation by the Board of Health of New York City under the Tenement House law of 1895. Who, if not wage-earners, are interested in the obliteration of rookeries where the death rate equals seventy-three in a thousand? Whatever promotes better living conditions, no matter whether it comes from legal enactment or private effort, will find support from wage-earners who appreciate their true interests.

Important as are the physical and economic aspects of this question, they are not the sole, perhaps they are not even the chief, considerations. Ethical issues have greater ultimate significance. Many of our moral and social ills are more nearly connected with bad housing than appears upon the surface. Take for example drunkenness. How absurd to suppose that immoderate liquor-drinking can be suppressed so long as people are left to live in houses where lack of elementary sanitation saps vitality, while noisomeness and unattractiveness impel a search for outside relief. It is entirely unjust to suppose that only a low impulse to debauch or a reckless disregard of family duties leads wage-earners to contract the «saloon habit.» The utter dullness, the lack of individuality in tenement-house existence, often lie back of the fatal temptation.

Promiscuity in human bee-hives, rendering independence and isolation impossible to the family, is a serious drawback. What may we legitimately expect from such conditions? Not only can there be no development of domestic life, which in the words of Cardinal Manning «creates a nation,» but every member from earliest childhood is a prey to those forces which drag down,—a stranger to those which uplift. Unwholesome sights and sounds fix themselves in the memories of children ere infancy is really past. The exuberance of youth, finding no possibility of expression inside the home, is poisoned by the philosophy of the streets. Boys, while yet of tender age, are introduced to viciousness and petty crime. Young girls from their earliest teens engage in a struggle for moral preservation. Mothers, instead of finding wifehood and motherhood the sweetest of all human relations, are oppressed to hopelessness, soured into ill-feeling or brutalized into a state of callous indifference. There is everywhere a distinct lowering, if not an entire loss, of moral tone.

With prospects of this sort, varying of course in degree according to circumstances, can one say that wage-earners, even of the lowest class, regard the out-

come with equanimity? Are these fathers and mothers so entirely different from the heads of more fortunately circumstanced homes?

It is a most gratifying fact that along with the destruction of the worst tenements in New York by the opening of the new small parks, and by the condemnation proceedings above referred to, an extensive movement has been started looking to the building of model tenements. Under the new tenement-house laws every new tenement must be better built than formerly,—with more light and air and safety from fire,—but the building on the voluntary principle (and not as in England by the local government) of additional model tene-

ments will help to make a new and better city; better, we believe, both in health, morals, and the enjoyment of life. The principal agency now at work in this direction is the City and Suburban Homes Company, of which Prof. Gould, of Johns Hopkins, is the President, and Mr. A. W. Milbury the Secretary, Mr. R. Fulton Cutting being the Chairman of the Board of Builders. This Company proposes to accomplish its philanthropy in a business-like way, which is, we believe, the best way for the permanent success—the permanent good influence—of the enterprise. The example will surely be followed not only in New York, but in other crowded cities of America.



OPEN LETTERS

Training Schools for Domestic Servants.

IT is too late in the day to discuss the need of better domestic service in the United States. It is the one crying evil that besets society, and makes life a series of makeshifts from the effects of which even the rich are not exempt, while at some time or other, and in most families continually, every man, woman and child suffers more or less. Some day the American people will realize what an intimate bearing this question has upon the national character as well as upon domestic happiness. Systematic study of the subject will follow, and some of the vast energy that now goes into remedial charities will be directed to the solution of this fundamental problem. For the present there seems to be only one remedy for the general situation, the Training School for Domestic Servants. It is the purpose of this article to make suggestions as to its range and character.

Such a school should be well organized and equipped for the thorough training of servants in all branches of household work. In the first place it should have facilities for teaching pupils how to bathe properly, to care for their own bodies and for their own clothes. It should have different departments of training, one for laundresses, another for chambermaids, another for waitresses, another for cooks, and another for general housework servants, the last, of course, requiring a special condensed course. On entrance, young women or girls should be classified as far as possible, according to their general intelligence and ability as well as the employment for which they wish to be fitted. The first work given should be the washing of the kitchen-ware, the sweeping of the kitchen, and the scrubbing of the floor and tables—in short, every pupil should be taught the work of a kitchen-maid. After that, even though she intends to fit herself for a special department, she should be taught to sweep and dust carpeted rooms, and next to do plain washing and ironing, these being among the things which every domestic should know how to do well.

An ordinary dwelling-house might be utilized for the school. The basement, which should be well lighted, could be fitted up as a laundry, capable of accommodating a large number of women, to be classified as they advance in skill in the department. There must be a head laundress to look after those under her, and inspectors to decide when a woman is capable of promotion. In a city of 5000 inhabitants, such a laundry might easily be made self-supporting.

The first floor of the Training School could be devoted to the cooking department. It should have several kitchens where the women in different stages of advancement could work, under an expert leader. The different departments in cookery could be made self-supporting by having lunch-counters where men could go in with their dinner pails and have served to them from the kitchens of the less skilled pupils hot soup, tea, coffee, and other plain food, while a restaurant of a better class might be sustained from the work of those who were more thoroughly trained. Another source of income might be secured by filling orders for special dishes, or for whole meals. Setting a table, waiting, washing fine china and glass, and polishing silver, could be taught in connection with the restaurant.

The upper floors should consist of a parlor, and various apartments, where servants could be trained in cleaning, dusting, window-washing, care of lamps, and all kinds of second work. From this department servants could be sent out by the hour or day to sweep, dust, or act as housemaids.

With the training given in this way a thoroughly competent laundress, if she were a fairly industrious and intelligent worker, should be graduated in perhaps six months. After the first month she might be paid a small sum for her services. The cooks might also begin to have small wages after the first month. At least two years would probably be required for a cook to be thoroughly trained in every branch of her work, from caring for her range to doing fine cookery. Those who show special capacity should be trained to take the whole responsibility of planning and cooking elabo-