



Fabian Tract No. 112.

LIFE IN THE LAUNDRY.

PUBLISHED AND SOLD BY

THE FABIAN SOCIETY.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

LONDON :

THE FABIAN SOCIETY, 3 CLEMENT'S INN, STRAND, W.C.

JULY 1902.



LIFE IN THE LAUNDRY.

THE laundry industry has during the last few years undergone a remarkable and rapid economic development. Formerly a purely domestic industry, organized upon the economic principle of one woman one wash-tub, it is now a typical, modern, machine "business," characterized by aggregation of workers in one building under one head, subdivision of labor and the use of labor-saving machinery. All over the country, but more particularly in London, there has been a rapid multiplication of large laundry companies and syndicates, "certain of which own as many as a dozen or more fine, well equipped steam-laundries, filled with the latest ingenious inventions in labor-saving machinery, and organized into 'departments,' in which the division of labor is at least as marked a feature as in the majority of non-textile factories. In such cases a single shirt will pass through seven or eight different machines in the process of ironing alone. In place of the elderly married woman or widow 'washer,' we find skilled engineers in charge of a shedful of machinery still called the wash-house, while scores of girls and young women from thirteen upwards 'tend' the various kinds of ironing machines with exactly the same precision and routine as those in any other factory. Even in those departments where machinery is not required, for instance, the sorters with their staff of 'markers,' the dryers who fill and empty with almost automatic regularity the series of drying-closets through which hot air is driven by propulsion fans, the labor is organized and regulated as in an ordinary factory."*

This economic revolution has taken place during the past eight or ten years. According to the Census Report for the County of London, 1901 (Cd. 875-1902), the number of men and lads engaged in laundry and washing service was 3,175, of whom 1,309 worked at home; the number of women and girls was 47,362, of whom 10,408 worked at home; of the males 723 and 16,223 of the females were under 20 years of age. The steam laundries on the register in the London district for 1901 were 216, and the hand laundries 578.

Insanitary Conditions.

This rapid development of laundry work from a hand to a machine industry has been accompanied by many of the evils which have attended the same process in other trades. Some of the most important are those which are inseparable from the use of premises unsuited to the uses of the industry. The enterprising laundry proprietor, alive to the profit-making possibilities of machinery, is not disposed to wait until he possesses suitable premises before beginning

* Annual Report of H.M. Chief Inspector of Factories, 1900, p. 382.

Laundry workers.

business as the proprietor of a steam laundry, and so long as sanitary conditions are a minor consideration an ordinary dwelling-house can be made to serve his purpose. Side by side with the large laundry factories described above, where the structural conditions are as regards sanitation on the whole fairly satisfactory, there is a very much larger class of laundries consisting of ordinary dwelling-houses more or less badly adapted for the purpose.

"It is no uncommon thing to find a row of houses in separate occupation, the back yards of each of which is roofed in and packed with laundry machinery, all driven by an engine installed at one end of the row."*

"The rapid growth of the small laundry factory is a striking feature. It seems to be due partly to the increased cheapness of certain parts of machinery, and largely to the fact that the wage bill is thereby so much lessened."

"It is simply amazing to see the lightheartedness with which an engine, gas or steam, is introduced into what one might call the domestic circle, for in noting unguarded machinery in the house-factory laundry I have always in my mind not only the workers, but the children of the occupier, whom I have so often found watching in a fascinated way the movements of the machines."†

"The prime mover for gas or steam engine is found in a badly lighted basement and in charge of a man who knows little or nothing of the dangers or management of machinery; the fencing of the fly-wheel is in many cases inadequate, a wash-tub often serving the purpose; other dangerous parts are equally disregarded, and it is difficult to persuade the owner that accidents may occur even with a low power."‡

All occupations have their special conditions prejudicial to the health of the workers employed therein, and it is one of the tasks of factory legislation to remove as far as possible the evil effects of such conditions.

The chief unhealthy conditions of the laundry industry are:—

1. Wetness of the washing room floors.
2. The presence of steam in the washing room, and also, though to a lesser extent, in the ironing room.
3. Heated and vitiated atmosphere of the ironing room. To counteract these conditions it is essential
 - (a) That the floor of the washing room should consist of a properly laid impermeable material, provided with adequate means of drainage; and
 - (b) that the washing and ironing room should be properly ventilated.

These, however, are precisely the features that are most conspicuous by their absence from many of the converted back yards and sculleries in which the clothes of most of us are washed, where the laundress works with her head bathed in steam and her feet in water.

"The badly arranged floors in even large wash-houses are a constant source of discomfort and probably ill-health to the workers. The Act requires that they should be 'drained in such a manner as to allow the water to run off freely,' but makes no provision that it should be drained off on the spot where it is discharged."

"It is not all uncommon, therefore, to find that the yellow and foul water from the row of tanks or washing machines at one end of the wash-house flows all across the floor and over the feet of the workers before eventually reaching the drain. In one

* Annual Report H. M. Chief Inspector of Factories, 1900, p. 380.

† Annual Report of the Principal Lady Inspector of Factories, 1901, p. 178.

‡ Annual Report H. M. Chief Inspector of Factories, 1900, p. 380.

laundry where a cataract of dirty water was discharged over the feet in this manner every twelve or eighteen minutes from certain patent washing machines, the occupier triumphantly pointed out that it 'flowed quite freely' to the drain on the other side of the shed."*

But bad as the conditions in the smaller laundry factories often are, the state of things is much worse in those factories which have not developed beyond the "workshop" stage. This will appear from the following quotation from the Annual Report of H. M. Principal Lady Inspector of Factories for 1899 (p. 257):—

THE WASH-HOUSE.—"Very often on entering the wash-house the whole place is so pervaded with steam that I cannot see the workers. A great deal of this steam comes from the coppers, of which there are generally two or three. The provision of hoods would to a great extent remedy matters, but in the greater number of cases these are conspicuous by their absence."

THE IRONING ROOM.—"As the provision in force in factory laundries, viz., that all stoves for heating irons shall be sufficiently separated from the ironing room, does not apply to the workshop laundry, it is only where the temperature is unreasonably high that any steps can be taken to remedy the matter. The heat of the ironing room is largely owing to the fact that very few laundries possess drying rooms. Thus, except in summer, most of the drying is done overhead in the ironing room. This leads to inadequate ventilation, for most laundry proprietors consider shut windows an indispensable condition of drying indoors.

"What with the unscreened stove, the damp clothes overhead, the tightly closed windows streaming with moisture, caused by want of ventilation, the room crowded with the legal quantity of women, perspiring, sneezing, and coughing, a small ironing laundry room is not in working hours a very attractive place. But at dinner time it is less attractive still. The uninitiated would naturally imagine that during the women's absence for meals the windows and doors would be thrown up and the rooms thoroughly aired. Experience unfortunately proves that this is seldom the case. Frequent dinner-time inspections have taught me what to expect. At dinner-time the ironing room becomes a furnace. The stove is heated to the greatest extent, and the windows and doors are particularly tightly closed, and drying proceeds under conditions alleged to be advantageous from the laundress's point of view, but frequently not so."

The small hand laundries, especially those in the Soho district of London, receive special attention in the Annual Report of the Principal Lady Inspector of Factories for 1900 (p. 385):—

"The owners of many of these laundries are of French or Italian origin. They invest their small capital in the rent of a house or part of one, sub-let the upper rooms, and devote the lower to their trade. They appear to start with the impression that any house is good enough for a laundry, given a fair supply of water, and show no consideration whatever for the health of their workers or the number of hours they are employed. The front room on the ground floor, originally intended for a shop, forms in most cases the principal ironing room. . . . The wash-house is placed in the basement room, more often like a cellar than a room. In one, the worst of any, it was not more than six feet in height, and ventilated only by the door leading up to the house. The place was black with accumulated dirt. The floor was covered with water. A gas-jet in one corner gave the only light. A copper in another corner poured out steam for which there was no means of escape, and which was so thick as to hide the two workers almost completely from view. The temperature was so high that the perspiration streamed off their faces. This was, of course, an exceptional case, but one having many points in common with others which have hitherto escaped the attention of the proper authorities. Laundries of the kind described above may be exempted from inspection if it can be proved that not more than two persons besides members of the same family are employed."

* Annual Report H. M. Chief Inspector of Factories, 1900, p. 385. Section 8 of the 1901 Factory Act will probably be found useful in preventing the existence of the state of things described above.

The special importance of good sanitary conditions in laundries is at once apparent when it is borne in mind that, as the law affords very imperfect protection to the laundry woman in the matter of hours of labor, the laundry is occupied for long periods. The Factory Act of 1901 left this subject untouched, and the following provisions of the 1895 Act form the sole protective enactments against excessive hours of labor :—

“(1) In every laundry carried on by way of trade, or for the purposes of gain, the following provisions shall apply :—

“(a) The period of employment, exclusive of meal hours and absence from work, shall not exceed for women fourteen, for young persons twelve hours, and for children ten hours in any consecutive twenty-four hours ; nor a total for women and young persons of sixty hours, and for children of thirty hours in any one week, in addition to such overtime as may be allowed in the case of women.

“(b) A woman, young person or child must not be employed continuously for more than five hours without an interval of at least half an hour for a meal.

“(c) Women, young persons and children employed in the laundry shall have allowed to them the same holidays as are allowed to women, young persons and children employed in a factory or workshop under this Act.

“(e) The notice to be affixed in the laundry shall specify the period of employment and the times for meals, but the period and times so specified may be varied before the beginning of employment on any day.

“(2) Women employed in laundries may work overtime, subject to the following conditions, namely :—

“(a) A woman must not work more than fourteen hours in any day ; and

“(b) The overtime worked must not exceed two hours in any day ; and

“(c) Overtime must not be worked on more than three days in any week, or more than thirty days in any year ; and

“(d) The requirements of section 50 of this Act with respect to notices must be observed.” [That is to say, the employer must give seven days' notice of his intention to work overtime to the Inspector and to the employees.]

Compare these provisions with those which obtain in the case of Factories and Workshops. There the work begins and ends at a definite stated time ; definite and simultaneous times for meals are prescribed ; overtime is prohibited altogether for young persons (*i.e.*, persons under eighteen),* and is only allowed for women under ex-

* By section 51 of the 1901 Act overtime is allowed for young persons and children in exceptional industries, *e.g.*, bleaching and dyeing works. But not more than thirty minutes overtime can be worked per day, and the total number of hours worked must not be “above the number otherwise allowed under this Act.”

ceptional conditions ; night work is prohibited for young persons,* and Sunday work prohibited altogether. In factories, moreover, no child or young person can be employed without a medical certificate of fitness for employment. In laundries no medical certificate is required, Sunday work is not prohibited at all, and, although young persons are not allowed to work "overtime" as that term is technically defined in the Act, yet under the present law a girl of 13 or 14 may (allowing two hours for meals guarded by illusory provisions which it is impossible to enforce) be kept at work in the laundry from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. on three days and from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. on two days every week in the year, and still have four more hours' work for Saturday. And so far from night work being prohibited, the normal period of twelve hours work per day which the law allows for a girl of 14 may be arranged for any part of the twenty-four, and the girl may actually be kept at work all night.

It may be thought that the humane instincts of employers would forbid the employment of young girls at night ; but the following quotation shows that this is far from being the case :—

"Accustomed to the conditions of life and work among ordinary factory workers, nothing is so striking to the Inspector as the spectacle of numbers of young girls from 14 years old and upwards all legally employed at 10 or 11 o'clock at night in the ordinary factory labor of tending machinery. Passing at night from one factory laundry to another, and finding the young calender-feeders employed in their mechanical task of "feeding" the large steam-heated, power-driven, ironing rollers with the damp linen to be ironed (a cloud of steam rising as each "piece" is passed through), it is impossible not to speculate on the effect of the work and the hours on these young girls. One can only feel surprise that accidents are not more numerous when one realizes that the slightest carelessness or inattention may result in the fingers or hand being drawn between the hot cylinders, and when one considers how easily such inattention may arise in the case of over-tired young workers. In few, if any other industry, are the daily working-hours so long.

"Working and standing in the steaming hot atmosphere of a calender-room, from 8 a.m. till 9 or 10 p.m. all the week, with the exception of one day, is an arduous strain on the young constitution."†

The irregularity of the periods of employment makes the detection of illegal hours exceedingly difficult. In a factory or workshop the work begins and ends at a stated time, and the working-day must be within the round of the clock. If the work begins at 6 a.m. it must end at 6 p.m. ; if it begins at 7 a.m. it must end at 7 p.m. The period of employment, *i.e.*, whether the hours are to be from 6 to 6 or from 7 to 7, etc., must be fixed beforehand, and when once fixed cannot be altered without written notice to the Factory Inspector, and to the workers, and even then not oftener, unless in exceptional circumstances, than once in three months. In laundries the round of the clock rule does not apply. Provided the hours are specified in a notice exhibited in the laundry before the day's work begins, the period of employment may vary from day to day, and may vary for each individual worker. Under these conditions it is

* In certain exceptional industries, *e.g.*, blast furnaces, a limited amount of night work is allowed for *male* young persons.

† Annual Report H. M. Chief Inspector of Factories, 1900, p. 383.

obvious that the legal maximum number of hours must often be exceeded, and the fact escape detection. It is, indeed, difficult for the laundry-keepers to understand the law which they must observe. As Miss Paterson says: "It is easy for even a person of limited experience to understand such an instruction as that from Monday to Friday no one will be employed before 8 a.m. or after 8 p.m., and that the limitations on Saturday are 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., but the laundry regulations with rigidity here and laxity there are *not* understood."* The freedom given to spread the number of working-hours over the whole day is without parallel in our factory legislation. "Under the present law, allowing two hours for meals, women can be kept continuously at work from 8 a.m. until 12 (16 hours) on two days in every week throughout the year; on two other days in the week from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. (12 hours), and on Mondays and Saturdays (the usual short days) from 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. (10 hours), and from 8 a.m. until noon (4 hours) respectively. And this without overtime." ("Law and the Laundry," *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1897.)

In the matter of long hours it is questionable whether such special and imperfect legislation has not made the lot of the laundress worse instead of better. Formerly, it was the custom of the trade to regard work after 8 p.m. as overtime. Now, overtime is only reckoned after the maximum of sixty hours per week has been worked. Counting overtime, it is possible to arrange the hours of labor in a laundry during any ten weeks in the year, so as to make this table legal:—

Monday	from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Tuesday	" 8 " 8 "
Wednesday	" 8 " 12 midnight.
Thursday	" 8 " 12 "
Friday	" 8 " 12 "
Saturday	" 8 " 12 noon.

Nearly the whole of the work of a laundry is done standing, and the long hours spent in this position, often in surroundings the reverse of sanitary, amidst a heated and damp atmosphere, render the laundress especially liable to pulmonary complaints, varicose veins and ulcerated legs. Uterine displacement, a terrible affection, which embitters the lives of far more women than is generally known, is particularly prevalent amongst laundresses. Miss Deane, one of H.M. Inspectors of Factories, from whose valuable report on laundries, published in the annual report of the Principal Lady Inspector of Factories for 1900 (p. 384), much of the information contained in this Tract is taken, investigated the effects of the present conditions of labor on the health of the laundry women. She examined the records of the number, ages, diseases, and occupations of the patients at the Isleworth and Wandsworth and Clapham Infirmaries, and extracted the following table, which speaks for itself.

* Report, etc., 1901, p. 178.

TABLE A.
ISLEWORTH INFIRMARY (INCLUDES ACTON, CHISWICK, BRETFORD).

	Number	Suffering from ulcers of legs	Proportion	Phthisis	Proportion
1898					
Laundresses	58	9	1 in 6	6	1 in 10
Women other than laundresses	179	7	1 in 25	7	1 in 25
1899					
Laundresses	79	13	1 in 6	9	1 in 9
Women other than laundresses	218	7	1 in 31	11	1 in 20

TABLE B.
WANDSWORTH AND CLAPHAM INFIRMARY (INCLUDING BATTERSEA).

	Number	Suffering from ulcers of legs	Proportion	Rheumatism	Proportion	Bronchitis	Proportion	Phthisis	Proportion
1899									
Laundresses	247	36	1 in 6	16	1 in 16	45	1 in 5	21	1 in 11
Women other than laundresses	1,171	50	1 in 23	49	1 in 22	129	1 in 9	63	1 in 19
1900									
Laundresses	199	27	1 in 7	12	1 in 16	21	1 in 9	18	1 in 11
Women other than laundresses	1,127	41	1 in 27	69	1 in 16	133	1 in 9	59	1 in 19

Miss Vines, another of the Factory Inspectors, points out :—" A danger to the health of the women employed in wash-houses appears to me to be the close proximity in which new laundries are built. It not infrequently occurs that the windows of one wash-house are only a few feet away from those of the other next door, the natural result of such an arrangement being that when steam is forced through the outlets of one wash-house, it often merely passes in at the windows of the adjacent laundry. . . . Another danger, only likely to arise when a laundry business is carried on in a dwelling-house, is the admitted presence of disease."*

* Report of H.M. Chief Inspector of Factories, 1901, p. 178.

Exempted Laundries.

The provisions of the Factory Act with respect to laundries, inadequate as they are, have only a limited application. Two important classes of laundries are exempt altogether from the operation of the Act by the following clause :—

“Nothing in this Act shall apply to any laundry in which the only persons employed are—

- “(a) Inmates of any prison, reformatory or industrial school, or other institution for the time being subject to an inspection under any Act other than the Factory Act ; or
- “(b) Inmates of an institution conducted in good faith for religious or charitable purposes ; or
- “(c) Members of the same family dwelling there, or in which not more than two persons dwelling elsewhere are employed.”

Institution Laundries.

The Factory Bill of 1895 contained provisions for the regulation of these establishments. Speaking on the second reading of the Bill, Mr. Asquith said: “We cannot concede that they (the institutions) are entitled without inspection to have machinery which is dangerous in its character or operation, or to employ persons for a larger number of hours than the Factory Act allows.” The proposed regulations, however, met with the keenest opposition from the Irish members on whose vote Mr. Asquith was dependent, and had to be dropped. In the Government Bill of 1901 another attempt was made to bring a modified form of inspection to bear on the institution laundries, but the same opposition was renewed and with the same success.

It is difficult to see by what arguments the exemption of the institution laundries can be justified. Many of these laundries are practically business establishments competing freely in the open market, and though it has been urged in Parliament and elsewhere that they do not work for profit, it cannot be denied that many of them make large sums of money, as is shown by the following figures taken from the Annual Charities' Register for 1901 :—

Name of House.	Income from Laundry.	Income from other sources.
	£	£
Magdalen Home, Edgbaston	631	237
Home of Good Shepherd, Malvern	703	287
Asylum for Penitent Females, Dublin	1,046	225
Edgar Home, Belfast	1,132	144
Edinboro' Industrial Home for Fallen Women	1,649	158
Magdalen Asylum, Edinburgh	5,847	493

It is impossible to deny that establishments such as these are serious competitors in the laundry industry ; and there is justice in the demand of the laundry proprietor that charitable and religious institutions should obey the law which he has to obey, that they

should, so to speak, "play the game." It is, of course, most important that the charitable work of rescue should not be subject to interference, and that the discipline of the establishments should be maintained, but it is hard to see why this should be incompatible with an occasional visit of a woman inspector to the laundry for the purpose of satisfying herself that the conditions are sanitary, the machinery properly fenced, and the hours of work not excessive. Nor can it be said that the conditions of work in these laundries are of such a nature as to render inspection unnecessary as well as undesirable.

"That there is need for inspection, in some cases, I have no doubt. Great complaint was made to me of a religious community, where workers were kept for 19 hours at work at times, but, of course, I had no power of entry, and could do nothing in the matter. The competition of such places, where even the laundry hours are exceeded, is a source of complaint to the law-abiding proprietors of laundries." (Annual Report of Chief Inspector of Factories, 1898.) "Again, I must record that the exemption of the present domestic laundries and charitable institutions causes great dissatisfaction to the other laundry proprietors. They complain bitterly of the competition of places which are allowed to work 'all hours of the night,' and I must say I think they are fully justified in their complaint." (Annual Report of Chief Inspectors of Factories, 1900, p. 387.)

In addition to these statements of the Government officials, we have the testimony of the Rev. Arthur Brinckman, who was Assistant Chaplain at St. Andrew's Home, Edinburgh, Chaplain at St. Agnes Hospital for the Fallen, and Chairman of the Church Mission to the Fallen. He says that in some of the homes of his acquaintance the hours of work are

"irregular and long, especially in the laundry. I have known girls far advanced in consumption in the laundry working long after they ought to have been elsewhere, or in hospital. Self-supporting homes need extra inspection, the temptation being to overwork the girls."

"After more than 30 years' close connection with hospitals, sisterhoods, homes and refuges, I feel the need of inspection most strongly. . . . One objection that has been raised against inspection is that the girls would be unsettled for a day or two. It is made in all seriousness, but I think it is not worth considering."

At a meeting of managers of charitable institutions of a religious character, held at Westminster in 1902, State inspection of such laundries was generally approved, but they asked that men inspectors only should be employed. This suggestion must be negatived. Lady inspectors who have gained experience in inspecting commercial laundries are required.

Much may be learnt in this connection from the example of France, where inspection of religious houses has been enforced by the Government since 1892. The following are some of the evils which were reported by the inspector when the work was begun :—

"Children from seven to eight years old were kept at work from 5 a.m. to 5 p.m. Children over twelve years old worked till their task was finished. No instruction was given to the children, and owing to the division of labor, which kept them employed in some such detail as the sewing of a button-hole, they were unable to become proficient even in the trade which they practised. Women frequently left the convents between the ages of twenty and thirty without being able to read or write, and incapable of earning their livelihood." (Report of Industrial Law Committee on Laundries.)

The need of inspection in France is proved by the fact that in 1899 there were 4,429 infractions of the law, 924 of which related to the duration of work. There has, however, been a great improvement since the introduction of Government supervision.

Exempted Smaller Laundries.*

"Why may clothes be washed under dirty conditions next door, where only two women are employed, while I, who employ three, must set my house in order and conform to regular hours?" and "Why may a man work his own children harder than other folks?" These are questions frequently put to the Factory Inspector, and are difficult to answer. The unhealthy state of certain of these small laundries has been described above, and the evils of insanitary conditions and excessive hours of labor are as great, if not greater, in these places as in any other class of laundries. The Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on the employment of school children contains the following instructive passage: "Some of the very worst cases of overworking little girls of which we have heard occurred in the small laundries, which are exempt from the provisions of the Factory Acts." The exemption has led to an evasion of the law which bears unjustly not only on competitors but on ratepayers. It has become a common practice to keep only two workers on the premises, and to send the others with the "washing" into a public wash-house, thus competing at the expense of the ratepayers, and to the exclusion of those for whom the wash-house was intended, with those employers who are obliged to conform to the provisions of the Factory Acts.

How to Improve our Laundries.

We have seen that the chief evils connected with the present state of the laundry industry are—(1) Insanitary conditions; (2) Excessive and irregular hours of labor; (3) Exemption of institution laundries, and laundries in which not more than two persons dwelling elsewhere are employed.

The insanitary conditions are, as a rule, dependent on the use of premises which were never intended for laundries. In the comparatively few cases where the laundry was built for laundry work the conditions are usually good; but where, as is generally the case, the laundry is a hastily converted dwelling-house or part of a house, the conditions are, as has been shown, often very bad. To remedy these conditions a more energetic administration of the present law is required, as well as fresh legislation to deal with special points.

The duty of enforcing sanitation rests upon the Factory Inspector if steam or other power be used in the laundry; otherwise it rests upon the local sanitary authority. The Inspector, however, may act in default of the sanitary authority should the latter neglect its duty. The staff of Factory Inspectors is, as is generally admitted, ridiculously inadequate†, and, without a material increase in the staff, improve-

* Laundries in which not more than two persons dwelling elsewhere are employed.

† The total number of Factory Inspectors, including assistants, is 141. Only seven of these are women.

ments in the power-laundries will be but slowly secured. Women inspectors are particularly wanted for this work. The sanitary authorities in many districts have unfortunately not evinced any remarkable degree of zeal in carrying out their duties under the Factory Acts; but lately, and more particularly since the passing of the 1901 Act, greater activity has been displayed, and several authorities have appointed special workshop inspectors, male and female.

But though much more could be done under the existing law than actually is done, further legislative powers are required. At present, the occupiers of a laundry where power is used can be compelled to provide a fan or "other means of a proper construction" for regulating the temperature in every ironing room, and for carrying away steam in every wash-house in the laundry. He must sufficiently separate all stoves for heating irons from any ironing room, and must not use gas-irons that emit any noxious fumes. These provisions should be extended to hand-laundries. The bad effects of noxious fumes, a steam-laden atmosphere and an excessively high temperature do not depend upon the use of mechanical power, and there is no good reason why provisions for preventing these conditions should be confined to places where power is used. The 1895 Act has a special provision for floor-drainage in power-laundries; but section 8 of the 1901 Act,* which applies to laundries, will probably be found more effective. It is more than doubtful, however, whether there is any statutory power at the present time to deal adequately with that fertile source of ill-health, the wet floor, that is so constant a feature in many, probably most, wash-houses. It is not sufficient to provide stands. When they are not fastened to the floor they are a source of danger, especially when machinery is near. The workers are liable to trip over them or catch their feet in broken pieces. Even when they are firmly fixed they are usually very slippery and offer a horrible nest for all the foul stuff which dirty water in a laundry collects. The Act should order that the floor should be constructed of proper material, that the fall and the means of drainage should be efficient, and, most important of all, that provision should be made for draining off the water at the spot where it is discharged (see page 3). The practice of drying clothes by hanging them out over cords suspended from the ceiling of the drying-room is unhealthy and should be prohibited. Better provision should be made for cleanliness in hand-laundries. In power-laundries all walls and ceilings must be limewashed once at least every fourteen months, or, if painted, they must be washed down with soap and water. This provision should apply also to hand-laundries. Further, it is essential that the workers should not be allowed to eat their meals in laundries. The surroundings are worse than in many factories, and separate rooms for the consumption of meals should be provided.

* This section provides that: "In every factory or workshop, or part thereof, in which any process is carried on which renders the floor liable to be wet to such an extent that the wet is capable of being removed by drainage, adequate means shall be provided for draining off the wet."

Long Hours.

The simplest and most satisfactory method of obviating the long and irregular periods of employment is to extend the definition of "factory" and "workshop" to include laundries. At present a laundry is a "factory" or a "workshop" (the distinction depending on the use of mechanical power) in so far as regards "sanitary provisions, safety, accident, the affixing of notices and abstracts, and the matters to be specified in such notices (so far as they apply to laundries), notice of occupation of a factory or workshop, powers of inspectors, fines, and legal proceedings for any failure to comply with the provisions of this section* and education of children." In all matters relating to hours of work, however, laundries are not factories or workshops, but are regulated by the special provisions quoted on page 5. The distinction is purely artificial and should be removed. Practically, laundries are as much factories or workshops as dye-works, and all that is wanted is to make them such technically by Act of Parliament. This course would at once bring into force the following provisions:—

1. Prohibition of Sunday work.
2. Prohibition of night-work and overtime for young persons.
3. No child or young person would be employed without a medical certificate of fitness.
4. Definite times for meals would be specified.
5. Provision for a Saturday half-holiday.
6. Period of employment would be arranged on the round of the clock rule. This provision would make it an offence for the laundry to be kept at work after a certain fixed hour, and the working of illegal hours would be easy of detection, instead of, as at present, extremely difficult.

Another evil connected with the laundry trade is the excessive hours that collecting and delivering boys and girls are employed. It is quite a common thing for these boys and girls to be employed for ninety hours per week. The Factory Act provisions for non-textile factories would not, even if extended to laundries, afford any relief for this excessive employment. The hours under these provisions are limited only for those employed "in" a factory, and it would probably be held that such young persons are excluded. What is wanted is a clause defining these young persons and definitely including them in a limitation of hours.

Lastly, the provisions of the Factory Act should be made applicable to all laundries carried on for purposes of gain. In the case of the institution laundries this should be done with all due regard to their special conditions. For instance, inspections should only be made by women inspectors. But no laundry should remain exempt from the legislative regulations which experience has shown to be necessary to protect the health and well-being of the laundry workers.

Several unsuccessful attempts have been made to secure these provisions for laundries. Trade opposition has been too strong for the

* Sect. 103 of the 1901 Act; the section dealing with laundries.

Factory Act reformers. It has been urged that owing to the special conditions of the industry, it would be impossible for employers to work regular hours throughout the week. The "washing" does not arrive at the laundry, as a rule, till Monday afternoon, and must be returned on Friday. Hence the necessity of working young girls till 10, 11, or even 12 at night. This argument exalts a domestic custom to the dignity of a law of nature. There is nothing inherent in the constitution of the universe which demands that dirty linen should be collected on Monday, washed on Tuesday, dried on Wednesday, ironed on Thursday, and sent home clean on Friday. There is no reason in the nature of things why families with a normal supply of linen should not have their "washing" called for on a certain day of the week, and returned on the same day in the following week. Most of the large steam laundries in London adopt this rule, and there is no doubt that its general adoption would be welcomed by a considerable section of the trade. As a leading laundry proprietor has expressed it: "Why should the trade be disorganized for the sake of the one-shirt brigade?" As to the "uncertain" nature of the work, it must be remembered that the laundry industry has now reached in many places a high degree of organization.

"With the advent of machinery and subdivision of labor, the whole character of the industry has changed, the 'uncertainty' so much dwelt on as a peculiarity of laundry work practically disappears. The 'capacity' of each machine, and of the whole plant, is known to a fraction; the amount of work that can be dealt with per hour can be accurately calculated, often more so than in many other factories. . . . This change in the economic conditions of the industry is of great importance from the point of view of legislative regulation. It is impossible not to be struck by the contrast afforded by the spectacle of the steam laundry full of labor-saving machinery engaged mainly on contract work, with every modern device for regulating and organizing the 'output,' the capacity of each machine and department of which is perfectly gauged, and that of the dressmaker or milliner employing only hand labor, often very highly skilled, dependent on mere passing whim or fancy of a fleeting season, struggling with 'uncertainties' and 'rushes' and other difficulties as great as any with which the laundry has to cope, and yet successfully complying with regulations which the factory (for such it practically is) could often more easily conform to."*

It is refreshing to note that the bogey of foreign competition, which has hitherto loomed large over all projects of factory reform, cannot be raised in this connection. However anxious the housewife may be to see her laundry basket brought home on Friday evening, she is not likely to send her dirty linen across the Channel to be washed. It is said, indeed, that the gilded youth of London can only be satisfied with a Paris-dressed shirt, and that his Parisian comrade repays the compliment, but this international reciprocity is a trivial matter.

It has been objected that increased regulation would drive the trade from the smaller laundries into the large factory laundry. A more correct statement is that it would tend to transfer the trade from the less capable to the more capable employers, and it has yet to be shown that this is a process to be regretted. Even the imperfect legislation of the past has had this effect. The Chairman of the

* Annual Report of H. M. Chief Inspector of Factories, 1900, p. 382.

Eastbourne Sanitary Steam Laundry Company told his shareholders on 25th January, 1897, that "the new Factory Act prevented the hands working so long as they used to do, and the directors had been obliged to provide machinery to enable them to do the work in less time."* It is only the stupidity of many laundry proprietors which prevents them from perceiving how beneficent is the compulsion of the law, even from the purely business standpoint. To quote Miss Paterson once more, "The maximum of inconvenience and confusion seems to be reached in many of these cottage homes, in which the structure also involves methods of working so extravagant that the unnecessary expense could only be disregarded in a business so profitable as laundry work. The little dark, narrow entrance passage blocked continually by baskets and heaps of soiled linen, the dark kitchen wash-house crowded with machinery, with proper lighting, ventilation and means of removing steam almost impossible to secure, the condition of flooring required by the Act, only obtained by constant mending, all these tend to delay work and workers and so increase the cost of the business."† In fact, the sympathy of the public for the poor widow has been exploited for the benefit of proprietors who do not even know their own business, and the British housewife's laundry bill is run up to maintain a cruel and wasteful system. It is time that an end were put to such a state of things in the name alike of humanity and of business common-sense.

* Quoted from "Industrial Democracy," by S. and B. Webb, p. 727.

† Report of Principal Lady Inspector of Factories, 1901, p. 178.

AUTHORITIES.

Annual Reports of H. M. Chief Inspector of Factories, 1895-1901. "Law and the Laundry," *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1897. Report of Industrial Law Committee on Laundries. "What can be done by Legislation to Improve the Conditions of Laundries?" *Women's Industrial News*, December, 1900. *Dangerous Trades*, edited by T. Oliver; Murray, 1902. 25s. Trade journals. *Laundry Record*, etc.

ment of its Rules and the following publications can be obtained from the Secretary, at the Fabian Office, 3 Clement's Inn, London, W.C.

FABIANISM AND THE EMPIRE: A Manifesto.

Edited by BERNARD SHAW. 1s. post free.

FABIAN ESSAYS IN SOCIALISM. (35th Thousand.)

Paper cover, 1/-; plain cloth, 2/-, post free from the Secretary.

FABIAN TRACTS and LEAFLETS.

Tracts, each 16 to 52 pp., price 1d., or 9d. per doz., unless otherwise stated.

Leaflets, 4 pp. each, price 1d. for six copies, 1s. per 100, or 8/6 per 1000.

The Set of 85, 3s.; post free 3/5. Bound in Buckram, 4/6; post free for 5s.

Boxes for set, 1s., post free 1s. 3d.

I.—On General Socialism in its various aspects.

TRACTS.—107. Socialism for Millionaires. By BERNARD SHAW. 79. A

Word of Remembrance and Caution to the Rich. By JOHN WOOLMAN.

78. Socialism and the Teaching of Christ. By Dr. JOHN CLIFFORD.

87. The same in Welsh. 42. Christian Socialism. By Rev. S. D. HEADLAM.

75. Labor in the Longest Reign. By SIDNEY WEBB. 72. The Moral

Aspects of Socialism. By SIDNEY BALL. 69. Difficulties of Individualism.

By SIDNEY WEBB. 51. Socialism: True and False. By S. WEBB. 45. The

Impossibilities of Anarchism. By BERNARD SHAW (price 2d.). 15. English

Progress towards Social Democracy. By S. WEBB. 7. Capital and Land.

5. Facts for Socialists (8th edn. revised 1899.) LEAFLETS.—13. What Social-

ism Is. 1. Why are the Many Poor? 38. The same in Welsh.

II.—On Application of Socialism to Particular Problems.

TRACTS.—112. Life in the Laundry. 110. Problems of Indian Poverty.

By S. S. THORBURN. 106. The Education Muddle and the Way Out.

98. State Railways for Ireland. 88. The Growth of Monopoly in English

Industry. By H. W. MACROSTY. 86. Municipal Drink Traffic. 85. Liquor

Licensing at Home and Abroad. By E. R. PEASE. 84. Economics of Direct

Employment. 83. State Arbitration and the Living Wage. 80. Shop-

life and its Reform. 74. The State and its Functions in New Zealand.

73. Case for State Pensions in Old Age. By G. TURNER. 67. Women and

the Factory Acts. By Mrs. WEBB. 50. Sweating: its Cause and Remedy.

48. Eight Hours by Law. 23. Case for an Eight Hours Bill. 47. The

Unemployed. By J. BURNS, M.P. LEAFLETS.—89. Old Age Pensions at

Work. 19. What the Farm Laborer Wants. 104. How Trade Unions

benefit Workmen.

III.—On Local Government Powers: How to use them.

TRACTS.—111. Reform of Reformatories and Industrial Schools. By H. T.

HOLMES. 109. Cottage Plans and Common Sense. By RAYMOND UNWIN.

105. Five Years' Fruits of the Parish Councils Act. 103. Overcrowd-

ing in London and its Remedy. By W. C. STEADMAN, L.C.C. 101. The

House Famine and How to Relieve it. 52 pp. 76. Houses for the

People. 100. Metropolitan Borough Councils: their powers and duties.

99. Local Government in Ireland. 82. Workmen's Compensation Act:

what it means and how to make use of it. 77. Municipalization of Tram-

ways. 62. Parish and District Councils. 61. The London County Council.

55. The Workers' School Board Program. 54. The Humanizing of the

Poor Law. By J. F. OAKESHOTT. LEAFLETS.—81. Municipal Water. 68.

The Tenant's Sanitary Catechism. 71. Same for London. 63. Parish

Council Cottages and how to get them. 58. Allotments and how to get

them. FABIAN MUNICIPAL PROGRAM, FIRST SERIES. London's

Heritage in the City Guilds. Municipalization of the Gas Supply.

Municipal Tramways. The Scandal of London's Markets. A Labor

Policy for Public Authorities. SECOND SERIES (Nos. 90 to 97). Muni-

cipalization of the Milk Supply. Municipal Pawnshops. Municipal

Slaughterhouses. Women as Councillors. Municipal Bakeries. Muni-

cipal Hospitals. Municipal Fire Insurance. Municipal Steamboats.

Each Series in a red cover for 1d. (9d. per doz.); separate leaflets, 1/- per 100.

IV.—On Books.

29. What to Read on social and economic subjects. 4th edition, enlarged and re-arranged. 6d. net.

V.—On General Politics and Fabian Policy.

108. Twentieth Century Politics. By SIDNEY WEBB. 70. Report on Fabian

Policy. 41. The Fabian Society: its Early History. By BERNARD SHAW.

VI.—Question Leaflets, containing Questions for Candidates for the

following bodies:—20, Poor Law Guardians. 24, Parliament. 25, School

Boards. 26, London County Council. 27, Town Councils. 28, County

Councils, Rural. 56, Parish Councils. 57, Rural District Councils. 59,

Urban District Councils. 102, Metropolitan Borough Councils.

BOOK BOXES lent to Societies, Clubs, Trade Unions, for 6s. a year, or 2/6 a quarter

Published by C. Standish, 7 Finchbury St., London, E.C., and published by the Fabian Society