

The _____
Salvation Army

1909

A
Calumny Exposed

A REPLY
to the unfounded
— Charges of —

SWEATING

Brought against the
Hanbury Street Labour Home



LONDON:
INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
101 QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.

1909

THE MAIN QUESTION AT ISSUE

LETTER BY THE GENERAL

FOR some months an agitation has been conducted by a Trade Union and persons with political and personal aims to promote against the Hanbury Street branch of The Army's Social operations. The agitators aver that the work carried on there is detrimental to others in the same trade, namely, carpenters and joiners. They allege that we undersell manufacturers and 'sweat' or underpay the men employed by us. These are the main charges. There are other charges, which we deal with at length in the following pages.

When the attack was first made we denied that, in competition with others, we quoted prices for goods manufactured by us that proved we were underselling. We still deny the charge. The onus of proof has all along been on our opponents,

THE SALVATION ARMY PRINTING WORKS
ST. ALBANS

therefore, and they have failed, though they have made, we believe, wide investigations in the market—to cite a single instance of underselling. They cannot do so—for the good reason that we do not undersell.

There, accordingly, remains but one serious charge to deal with, namely, what is called 'sweating'.

Now that raises a rather important economic question, as well as moral and philanthropic considerations, which, we think, are all satisfactorily answered by The General, in the following letter, which he addressed to the Chairman of a Deputation from the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress, which waited upon him some time ago:—

'INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,

'LONDON, E.C.

'July 22, 1908.

'DEAR SIR,

'I regret that the demands upon my time, and much absence from London, have prevented my sooner replying to your letter of May 13th last, with reference to the

alleged sweating at one of the Workshops connected with our Social Work.

'In harmony with my promise to the Deputation which was good enough to call upon me on the matter, I have had full and careful inquiries made, and I am satisfied that there is no ground for the complaints made against this effort, which is one carried on solely for helping men who, when they come under our care, are outside the opportunities of ordinary labour. I think the enclosed memorandum, by my Officer who is responsible for that branch of work, deals very fairly with the facts.

'If your Committee still think that efforts of this kind should be discontinued, then I must ask, as I did when I had the pleasure of meeting your Deputation, What is to be done, for example, with the seventy men now working in the Hanbury Street Factory?

'Shall we send them to the trade unions? I venture to think that such a course would be obviously useless. The majority, if not

all of them, have forfeited their tickets and are without tools. The trade union officials could not be expected to look at them.

'Would you have me send them adrift rather than endure the criticism and vilification of those who are prejudiced against our work? I could, undoubtedly, do so. But should I do so? To whom can they turn if they find themselves again in the streets, where already so many vigorous, decent fellows are to be found in search of work? What chance would they stand in their present condition were they brought into competition with other workers for such work as is available?

'Supposing that I should say to them to-morrow: "Your old friends tell me that I ought to give you all the standard rate of wages, whether you earn those wages or not, and as this would require the expenditure of a fortune, and would involve me in paying what some of you do not and probably never will earn, I regret that I shall be compelled to dismiss you", what would

follow? I do not think it is difficult to predict. A proportion of the seventy would, I fear, at once augment the army of spongers and tramps; others would, in all probability, drift into crime; and some, despairing of help, would make their bed in the waters of the Thames.

'Such an alternative as this, as I said to your Deputation, I cannot face. I propose to go on helping these poor fellows so far as I possibly can, and to place them in suitable situations as soon as they are fit to take them, whenever a chance occurs, either in this country or some other.

'And, notwithstanding the many unkind and foolish things that have been said about us in this connexion, I believe that every humane person will agree with me in thinking that I am doing right.

'I am, yours faithfully,

'WILLIAM BOOTH.

'W. C. STEADMAN, Esq., M.P.'

But let us look at the question closer than it was necessary for The General to do in the above. Here is a case typical of one section of the men whom we take in—a man who, through no fault of his own, had reached a state of distress. He had been out of work for seven months, during which time his wife had gone to live with a sister. He had sold up his home to buy bread, pawned part of his tools for the same reason, and had acquired habits that aggravated his circumstances. Besides, he was not what could by any means be called a first-rate workman—which to some extent may have accounted for his non-employment for so long a period. Then, he was getting on in years.

When he stood before our man at Hanbury Street he was without food, and his clothing was sparse and seedy. He was distinctly off colour. Now, it seems to us that as he stands there this man requires, in his own interests and in the interests of Society, four things :

WORK,	MORAL IMPROVEMENT, and
HEALTH,	HOPE.

In plain language, to be taken in hand and put right. And that is what Hanbury Street attempts to do, and does to a very

large extent with the hundreds that enter and pass through it.

But if we understand the position of the party opposed to us, they maintain that, no matter what the man is or is not, or how weak or incompetent he may be, if he is set to work to do carpentry or joinery, he ought to be paid the standard or Union rate of wages! That is to say, if his labour is only worth 15s. a week, we must pay him 38s. 6d. It is truly a great idea! How many employers of labour, we wonder, carry it out?

Now we think ours is a more excellent way, as The General tersely points out in his letter to the Trade Union Congress. For if we do not take the man in, what happens? The man must live. If he lives by sponging, Society pays and pays twice, for every dole it gives him only makes him eager for another. If he lives by going the round of the Casual Wards, the rate-payer must support him. If he tries the Workhouse, again the poor, burdened ratepayer has to provide his breakfast, dinner, tea, supper and bed, with nurses, doctors, attendants, and a few luxuries thrown in. If he resorts to crime, then the condition of the man imposes a heavier charge still upon Society. Whereas, by

taking him in, as we do, we turn him at once into an earner—a producer as well as a consumer.

We admit that if we kept him there till he became efficient in head and heart, and we continued to use his labour to undersell others for any serious length of time, we should be guilty of frustrating our own aims. But one of the conditions attached to Hanbury Street is that nothing produced by this man shall be put on the market at a price below the market rate. We thus guard against that mischief. And, further, in order that we may not raise this agency up to the usual standard of a carpenter's shop filled with expert hands, this man and those like him are sent out at the end of a given period, or as soon as we or they can find situations, so as to make room for others in need of temporary aid and moral repair.

This goes on year after year. And we can find no more effective, non-pauperizing method for extricating this class of worker from starvation.

CHAPTER I

THE HANBURY STREET ELEVATOR

THE Hanbury Street Elevator of the City Colony is an innocent branch, and one of the least important links of the Social Scheme of The Salvation Army.

It was practically started simultaneously with the first stage of General Booth's Darkest England Scheme, eighteen years ago.

It consists of moderate-sized premises, fitted up as a modern carpenter's and joiner's shop, with working accommodation for eighty men.

The object is to provide temporary work for a section of the stranded unemployed, and in a way that prevents the pauperization of recipients of its benefits.

The men at work first seek our aid through Labour Bureaux, Shelters, Metropoles, and similar arrangements which The Army has established for keeping in touch with the submerged classes of the City.

We call the place an Elevator—because it elevates the men who enter it.

We also compare it to a hospital, because it relieves distressed poverty-stricken and morally damaged men.

The qualification for admission is destitution.

The type of men may be classified as broken-down carpenters and joiners—broken through old age, some form of physical infirmity, periods of unemployment, domestic sorrow, accident, sickness, misfortune, and, we regret to add, bad conduct—principally drunkenness, gambling, and other vices.

We take them in.

We put them to work at various branches of ordinary carpentry and joinery.

We adopted this branch of labour simply because a proportion of the men who knock at our gates belong, or had at one time belonged, to these industries.

We have other agencies for other classes.

We treat each man on his merits.

Though the men do not like it, and we say as little about it as possible (we believe in helping the most debased to develop what is left of self-respect), we treat them as patients. Each man is registered, welcomed, studied, and encouraged to hope and work for a favourable turn in the wheel of his fortune.

We bring to bear upon each man, according

to the character and ability of the Officers in command, the influences of brotherly interest, self-advancement, kindness, discipline, and religion—the goal being, *not* what we can get out of the man, but how we can make or re-make the man.

We succeed with many; we fail with others.

The inmates—or Colonists, as we prefer to style them—are made to feel from the moment they cross the threshold of Hanbury Street that their elevation is largely in their own hands.

If they will work, conform to discipline, abide by regulations, they will get on.

We impress upon them that the sooner they are out in the world again, rehabilitated in mind, heart, and body, the better we will be pleased.

We dispel from the minds of the Colonists the notion that this Agency is a mere charity.

It is nothing of the kind.

It is what it professes to be—an Elevator and an Industrial Hospital.

We say to a man, 'Here you are. Here's a chance for you. While here you need not dread hunger, starvation, the casual ward, or work-house; and the sooner we can find work for you outside, or in the country, or in another land, the better will it be for yourself, or others in the streets ready to take your place.'

He commences work.

The Officer in charge soon discovers his capacity.

At the end of a week he is given, in addition to his board and lodgings, a grant of money, whether he has earned it or not. It is, of course, a small grant; but it is the promise of a bigger.

If the man gets on, his grant will gradually increase till it may reach 7s. 6d., and even above.

In course of time, by this grant—which, remember, is not expended in drink or gambling—the man will be able to redeem tools, if pawned, procure some decent clothing, and still have a little sum to his credit, which will be handed to him on leaving.

All the time the man feels and knows that he is working out his own industrial restoration.

Generally speaking, we assist the Colonists in many ways, such as—

1. In providing tools, and selling new clothes at cost price, thus avoiding the pauperizing effects of a dole system.
2. In effecting reconciliations between Colonists and their relations and friends.
3. In teaching some to be better, and some even to be skilful workmen.
4. In curing a number of indolent habits, which largely account for their fall. If by insisting that a man with the capacity to labour

shall labour, we sweat him, then we glory in the impeachment.

5. In finding permanent employment outside, or in another country, for a proportion of the Colonists.
6. In bringing many to a state of reason and Salvation.

The Bill of Health of the Colonists is excellent; not six times is the doctor called in in twelve months.

Disorder is unknown, because our discipline is as firm as our consideration and care for the men are consistent.

Of the total number of men now employed, over forty have been with us less than twelve months, which means that some have only been with us a few weeks.

And yet this is the Institution that is labelled a sweating shop and 'a gigantic and a damnable fraud'!!

We do not say that it is perfect.

We have always maintained that this and kindred agencies are rough-and-ready methods for grappling with an intricate problem. But there is a virtue in their being rough and ready. There is too much kid-glove gentility about many modern systems of relief.

The Institution does not pay, of course, and we

question if it ever will be made to pay. That is not, however, the chief consideration. If we can maintain the present standard of work for these poor and unfortunate fellows we shall be satisfied.

Very much more could be said of the advantages of the Hanbury Street Labour Home, and the lessons which it conveys to the statesman and the social reformer; but enough has been stated to make it plain, we hope, that it is a God-send to the men who make it 'a way out' of their difficulties, and a boon to the community.

CHAPTER II

WHY THE AGITATION ?

NOTWITHSTANDING the above plain and unvarnished statement of facts illustrative of its beneficent and practical character, there has been a violent and virulent agitation against it.

At first, we Salvationists could not understand why.

We had lived in the fond dream that anything that turned a non-producer into a producer was an economic gain to the State, especially if accompanied by individual reformation.

We had also thought that the position of The Salvation Army toward Labour questions was well-defined and acceptable to everybody, because we could not, and do not now see, how it can be otherwise.

We have no political bias.

We have no hard-and-fast plans for elevating the people.

We are simply workers in the cause of humanity, believing that God has called us to the

work, and has put His blessed seal of approval upon our ministry.

We have no quarrel with Trade Unionism as such. We are one of the biggest employers of Trade Unionists in the religious world. In a great undertaking such as ours, we must necessarily have many departments that are run on purely commercial lines, though we observe that this is also objected to—on what principle we cannot quite understand.

Take, for instance, our Joinery and General Works Department, which employs carpenters. *That* pays its hands according to the Trade Union rate. The same applies to our Printing, Publishing, Book-binding, Instrument-making and other Departments that we need not name here.

The vital difference between these branches and the Hanbury Street, is that the former have no connexion with our Social Work. The employés are not submerged, whereas the men employed in Hanbury Street are largely of the class already enumerated.

Then, we have no quarrel with Socialism—that is, it is not our place to express an opinion for or against it, as such, though we are bound to observe that the utterances of many of its supporters raise some very serious moral, to say nothing of religious, questions.

We attack no one.

We abominate public controversy, and only resort to it when we are compelled to do so in the interests of the people whom we may designate—not egotistically, we hope—our clients.

'When reviled, He reviled not again.' Christ is the model we strive to follow in all questions of public policy.

Hence our silence—a silence which has been construed into cowardice, and made the occasion for a host of cruel and a few amusing innuendoes.

'There must be some truth in it!' has been the subtle and insinuating phrase applied to The Army's so-called 'failure to reply to the charges!'

But why the agitation? That is the question asked.

Well, it is with a measure of reluctance, but from a deep-seated conviction, we reply, that we do not believe the agitation against our Hanbury Street Labour Home is sincere, or actuated by a desire to better the circumstances of the class of men whom we have just tried to describe.

We maintain that the agitation is mainly, if not entirely, political—not philanthropic.

As was stated in 'The War Cry' of September 12, 1908:—

'Under the pretence of denouncing imaginary evils, a band of revolutionists have for weeks

been beating up a pow-wow against our little Labour Home in Hanbury Street, and last Sunday it came off in Trafalgar Square. Our readers will be able to realize for themselves the character of the assembly by a simple reference to a few facts.

'There was not one word of practical hope held out for the class of men whom we befriend and redeem—not a word! Out-and-out red revolution was preached from the plinth of the great obelisk. It was clear, almost from the start, that the agitators had not come so much to denounce sweating, as to advocate their main cause—Social Revolution; and it is only fair to state that they had the courage to say so, not once, but a hundred times, in the course of the afternoon.

'Royalty was mocked. His Majesty King Edward was vilified. The Glasgow men who insulted Prince Arthur were applauded as benefactors of the race, and wished success in "*whatever they did*". The police regulations for the Square were denounced; the Bible was ridiculed and execrated; God was blasphemed. Our Social Officers were politely informed that they are "deceivers", "liars", "scoundrels", and "robbers", while the particular Institution under condemnation was described as a "gigantic and d—e fraud".

'The General was abused; neither his age nor his personal appearance were spared, and voices in the crowd cried, "Boil him!" and "Boil him in dynamite!"

'One lady, possessing some oratorical power, raved at England, calling it the land, above all others, of cant and hypocrisy; and yet her perora-

tion was a vulgar and hissing demand that her audience "ought", to quote her exact language, "to laugh at The Salvation Army, and hoot them out of existence", and the red flag of revolution waved, and Anarchists and Socialists cheered.

'Not an argument worth the weight of a pin's head was employed. Figures, and prices of goods manufactured at Hanbury Street, were deliberately faked; and for two hours abuse without argument, defamation without facts, and appeals founded on revolutionary doctrines, swayed part of the crowd, who, after all, are not altogether responsible for being misled, for they do not see that the chief end of the agitation is to exploit the condition of the Social miserables for the purpose of preaching the gospel of social and economic destruction.'

This same violent spirit was exhibited by a section of members at the Trade Union Congress at Nottingham, when a resolution on the question was discussed.

In what is unanimously described by the Press as a fiercely denunciatory speech, the delegate who moved the resolution called upon the Congress to 'emphatically brand The Salvation Army as sweaters, aggravated by disguise under the cloak of philanthropic and rescue work'!

The General was personally denounced and held up to ridicule. 'Will delegates', another member of the Congress asked, 'tolerate a man like General Booth, cadging food and money and clothes, and then paying the men 2d. an hour for

their labour? And he has the impudence to say that this is a method of saving the soul!

The *raison d'être* for the agitation is, we think, transparent. Imagining that the trumped-up charges of 'sweating' would make a rattling, up-to-date stick with which to thump the revolutionary drum, it is being employed, and will, no doubt, be still further employed, for that purpose.

This simple but lamentable fact will, we are certain, explain much that was, to a few of our friends, somewhat mystifying. It will, we believe, be no longer necessary to inquire, 'What is the bottom of these persistent attacks upon The Salvation Army?' The fact just stated supplies the answer. The agitation is political and personal.

As to the methods of the most active critics, they may be summarized as follows:—

Repudiation of point-blank denials to specific charges.

Covert insinuation.

Skilful perversion of fact.

Misrepresentation mixed with falsehood.

Statements prejudiced by, and emanating from, former beneficiaries of our Social Work.

CHAPTER III

THE CHARGES REFUTED

As Commissioner Sturgess, the head of the Men's City Colony, pointed out last year, in addition to underselling, 'It is said that there is, or has been, a system of "sweating" at one of our Men's Social Labour Factories; that there men work scandalous hours, are subjected to bad feeding, and are given wages much lower than the Union rate of pay'.

Well, let us look at these charges one by one:—

I. We are charged with underselling.

They say that we take advantage of the destitute and semi-destitute Colonists to undersell other manufacturers by offering goods at prices below the trade rate. In other words, that we exploit this cheap labour.

To which we reply that—

1. *It is not true* that the labour is 'cheap'. The labour is dear. The loss on the working

of the Labour Home is due to the class of labour employed, and the labour alone. If the labour were up to the Trade Union standard, there would be no need for Hanbury Street. We should shut it up.

2. *It is not true that we undersell manufacturers.* We have challenged our traducers to produce an instance. They have not done so, for the good reason that they cannot do so. We do not undersell.
3. As to our prices, we have again and again demonstrated, by actual figures, that we do not undersell.

Certain figures have been published against this contention with a show of effect. But we take leave to repeat that these same figures are totally misleading.

Take, as an example, the price paid for a certain number of seats for a public hall, which are given as follows:—

‘Salvation Army price, 30s. the lot; builder’s estimate, £5 5s. for the labour.’ But the figure so hastily put down for The Salvation Army price is, I again state, an imaginary one. The figure represents the price paid merely for the putting

together of the various pieces of wood after they have been prepared.

‘The charge for the seats would be about £14, of which we should pay for labour alone between £5 and £6! But up to the present our opponents have failed to show grace enough to withdraw their animadversions.’

Commissioner Sturgess points out:—

‘When the Trade Union first took up the agitation, they did it upon the list of prices which our Officer at Hanbury Street issued six years ago, as follows: 1½-in. sashes and frames, 5½d. per ft. super; 1¾-in. sashes and frames, 6d. per ft. super; 2-in. sashes and frames, 6½d. per ft. super.’

The Manchester correspondent of ‘The Timber News’, commenting on this subject, wrote: ‘We are in a position to quote from a dozen makers within a dozen miles of Manchester, who employ Union labour, and who are prepared to beat these prices considerably.’ And yet we undersell!

‘5½d., 6d., and 6½d. are not, however, present-day quotations at Hanbury Street, nor has it supplied goods at these figures for some years, having advanced our prices, and this notwithstanding the fact that certain wholesale joiners in and around London are still quoting the figures to which the Trade Union takes exception.’

A reply of a kind was made to the above; but

the authority just quoted—'The Timber News'—again commented as follows:—

'The joiners' society object to $5\frac{1}{2}d.$ being the rate at which The Salvation Army are prepared to supply $1\frac{1}{2}$ -in. sashes and frames. They regard this price as too little. However, we have before us, at the moment of writing, a quotation from one of the leading joinery firms within the Manchester radius, and who employ Union labour, and pay the Union rate of wages, $8d.$ per hour, and who quote for 2-in. sashes and frames (not $1\frac{1}{2}$ -in.), made from red deals, with double sunk sills, at $5d.$ per super ft., and we believe that other firms, who also employ Union labour, are prepared to beat even this price, and deliver as well on to the job.

'Even if the rate of wage is $10\frac{1}{2}d.$ per hour in London, as opposed to, say, $8d.$ here, this cannot possibly make a difference of more than $\frac{1}{2}d.$ per ft. Where, then, does the undercutting by The Salvation Army come in?

'Is Mr. Stennett prepared to say that Union men in London do not work as hard as do the men here, or that the joinery shops there are not so well equipped with machinery as is the case here? There must be some other reason to account for the difference, because the discrepancy in the rate of wages is not enough.

'The Army are also charged with undercutting in regard to prices of doors. But this we are not prepared to enter into, insomuch as in their original statement the joiners' society quote only the prices for labour, and do not tell at what price the doors are supplied.

'We know this, however, that four panel doors, double moulded, 6 ft. 6 in. by 2 ft. 2 in. by $1\frac{1}{2}$ in., are made here of good quality timber, and supplied at $8s.$ The same door in 2 in. can be supplied at $12s.$, and front doors, 6 ft. 8 in. by 2 ft. 2 in. by 2 in., with bolection mould on one side, and flush moulded on the other, are sold at $14s.$ each.

A public exhibition is persistently made of what are technically called 'tabs'—but which are simply workmen's statements—in order to demonstrate that we must necessarily undersell, because of the price paid to the worker. Now, this is very plausibly put; but what do these 'tabs' actually represent? We reply they do not represent the *whole* of the labour on a particular job. They only represented a *section* of that labour, and for this reason, that we used the 'tabs' not merely to estimate the labour, but to bring the amount of work done weekly or fortnightly before the individual worker, and let him know just where he was, with the object of creating in him an incentive to do better.

An ounce of fact, they say, is worth a ton of theory. And the following incident will, we fancy, illustrate how our critics have been misled by statements which they may have accepted as bona fide from men who have passed through this or some other Elevator of our Social Work. Here

is the incident, as related by Commissioner Sturgess:—

In answer to the joint-charge of sweating the individual workman, and in reply to the oft-repeated assertion that the tabs or work-slips show that we do not pay our men the full amount that they earn—according to the value of their labour—it was only the day after the Trafalgar Square Demonstration that a Scotchman, with a newspaper in his hand, and evidently labouring under the excitement of his national beverage, wanted to prove that he was paid only one shilling for making sashes and frames!

Said the Manager: 'Did you do the cutting off?'

The Scot winced.

'Answer the question, my friend—yes, or no?'

With a shrug of the shoulders, and the suggestion of a squint of his eye, he replied, slowly, 'No'!

'Did you do the planing?'

Again, slowly, 'No'.

'Did you do the moulding?'

'No.'

'Did you do the morticing?'

'No.'

'Did you do the tenoning?'

'Yes, I did. Well,' pausing, 'I did it when I was waiting to save time.'

'You did not, my friend,' corrected the Manager. 'You might have done it as an exception, but you did not do it as a rule.' And so, forsooth, the poor fellow wanted to say that he was paid 1s. for making sashes and frames, whereas he simply put the sashes and frames together; and he was paid, of course, for *that* part of the job.

Incidentally, this man was with us for six weeks. He left Hanbury Street three months ago. I picked him up myself, destitute. He had walked the streets for two nights, had pawned his clothes and tools, and was stranded in London, and on Monday—the day after the Trafalgar Square fiasco—he told me that he had been working at his trade up till last Friday, and was in possession of £7!

But our critics, snapping at any weapon they can devise, practically charge us with paying only 1s. for ALL the divisions of labour essential to the manufacture of these articles.

Then, it is said that we pay less than the builder's price for the making of stairs, doors, etc.—and here we would point out that our critics confuse the issue by putting our prices, which are those of the manufacturing joiner, as against the builder's wholesale and retail figures. But the fact is, that the 'cutting off', 'nosing', 'planing',

and 'housing', with stairs, as well as 'moulding', 'morticing', and 'tenoning' in other cases, are all done by others, or by machines, so that the prices complained of are, as already stated, for the mere putting together, after the several parts have been prepared—just as we have shown in Commissioner Sturgess's incident.

Our position in regard to the general question is very clearly put by one of the most consistent supporters of the Trade Union Movement, namely, 'Lloyd's Weekly News', which has a circulation of 1,250,000 copies, mainly among the working classes. It is an authority on the matter, and this is how it argued the main points in its issue of September 13, 1908:—

'A charge has been levelled against The Salvation Army by the Trade Union Congress, and by individual representatives of labour organizations, that while striving to help the almost helpless, the organization is executing work for a certain price, that would, in the ordinary course, be carried out by traders of the purely commercial type, on strictly business lines, and be paid for at the Trade Union rate of wages. And that thereby The Salvation Army, while helping the derelicts, is endangering the prosperity and safety of those who have not yet become "submerged".'

'But there are circumstances to which the Trade Unionists do not appear to give sufficient atten-

tion. In the first place, the men who apply to The Army, or similar organizations, for help, are obviously in the very last stage of despair and penury. They must work to live. They will not steal, they refuse the scant hospitality of the casual ward, and the often semi-luxury of the able-bodied indoor pauper, and the chances are that irresistible economic pressure will force them into competition for what work there is going at any wage they can obtain. If they cannot secure the Trade Union rate they will accept what they can get. And it makes very little difference to them whether they are fed by the individual employer or by The Salvation Army. But it makes a great deal of difference to those who are in work, and to those who labour unceasingly to keep wages at a reasonable subsistence standard. *If the despairing unemployed are in the open market competing, the unscrupulous employer can organize their labour, prey upon their urgent need, and use them as a means of undercutting his competitors. There can only be one result from that: wages must fall all round.**

'But The Salvation Army takes up the destitute and, from the Trade Union point of view, dangerous men, and in a very large number of cases sends them abroad to colonies, where their labour is well paid, where they can lose even the memory of the bad times, and where

* But this is what we have not done or do. We do not use them as a means of undercutting competitors. As a matter of fact, the labour is too dear—cheap as it is! Then, we do not quote prices below the trade rate.

they will not compete on unfair terms with other workers. Again, those who go to The Army are chiefly men of poor physique and indifferent industrial training. They are the men whose need is a constant menace to the employed, for reasons already stated. They have to live—we have not yet arrived at the ideal of some, when a lethal chamber shall reward the chronic idler and the dangerously diseased,—and it is better that they should live by useful labour than that they should “sponge” on those in work, live upon the earnings of industrious relatives, go into the workhouse to be irretrievably lost, or into the jails and hospitals, where they are an expense to the community.’

Then, we are the perpetrators of another offence. It is asserted that we send out men to do jobs for private tradespeople, and it is stated that we must make no less than £850 profit per annum! How silly such a statement looks in the face of the fact that the total value of work done outside under this head altogether for twelve months only comes to £218 4s. 8d.!

In reference to the work done on a suburban estate, it is alleged that we fit up houses, and so displace the ordinary carpenters and joiners.

We have certainly made cupboards, dressers, sashes and frames, door frames and stairs. But the fixing of these articles *is done in the house by the builder's workmen*—not by ours—with the

exception of the stairs. This particular builder, however, *will* have the stairs fixed by the makers. Unless we did so we should lose all his other work, and that risk we are not so foolish as to run. Seeing, then, that with this exception all the work is done by the builder's own men on the job, may we not reasonably ask for a little consideration, *when we send a couple of men once a month to put in the stairs only?*

Take another view from a newspaper that is supposed to stand strongly for the much-maligned capital interest. We refer to ‘The Daily Graphic’ :—

‘The Salvation Army has had its full share of adverse criticism from time to time; but we scarcely imagine that the more sensible of its opponents will consider the present “sweating” agitation a good enough stick to beat it with. If yesterday's demonstration in Trafalgar Square could produce no better arguments than comparisons between the rates of pay in The Army's workshops and those laid down by the Trades Unions, then the demonstration was not worth the holding. As will be seen in the extracts from The Salvation Army's reply, which we print on another page, The Army does not profess to pay wages.

‘To begin with, it does not employ wage-earning men. The workers in its “Labour Factories” are either men who, through their own faults, have “dropped out”, or men

whom a combination of adverse circumstances has "crushed out". The great majority of them not only have no skilled training, but do not know how to work. It is mere rubbish to contend that these poor people must receive wages that shall bear comparison with those paid to skilled, able-bodied artisans. What "wages" are paid in the workhouse for casual labour? To be consistent, the United Workers' Anti-Sweating Committee must surely turn their forces against this quarter.

'We have ourselves been constrained on occasion to criticize some of the methods of The Salvation Army; but to agitate against the particular features of that Organization which merely feeds and houses those genuinely in need, and to a greater or less extent inspires them with hope and the tonic effect of regular work, appears to us not only ungrateful but stupid.

'The charge of "underselling" seems to be sufficiently refuted by the statement that the Labour Homes do not obtain one-third of the work for which they tender in other departments of The Salvation Army.'

If further proof were needed of the baseness of the reiterated charge that we undersell, it would be found in the purely business relationships of the Hanbury Street Works to The Salvation Army as such.

The Salvation Army has always a good deal of building going on, in the way of new Halls and houses, or in making improvements in old Halls and other premises.

Tenders for each job are invited in the open market, and various builders compete in the ordinary way, and a Property Council, composed of experienced men, decides all these matters.

The Manager of Hanbury Street takes his chance with the others when tendering. No favour is shown to him whatever. His tender is considered on its merits, and accepted or rejected by the Council, whose first consideration is the interest of the department affected.

Not one in ten of these jobs falls to the lot of Staff-Captain Smith, for the reason that his prices are too high!

Quite recently his tender for improvements to the Blackfriars Shelter was £468 below the highest, and £575 above the least of the other tenders, of which in all there were eleven. And yet we undersell! And this job is under the control of Commissioner Sturgess, the head of the Men's City Colony, and who is also responsible for Hanbury Street Factory.

If these facts were looked at by our critics without too much colour blindness, they would see that it would be to the advantage of all concerned to promote the industries of The Salvation Army.

So much, then, for the charge of underselling.

II. It is next alleged, and in furious language, that we sweat the men who work in our Hanbury Street Labour Home.

To which we reply by asking, What is sweating?

1. If by sweating is meant the exploitation of the men's condition to fatten The Army's exchequer, we answer that it is an abominable lie, and those who say so know that it is.

Our published Statement of Accounts shows that the agency is philanthropic, because it is run at a loss. We could run it at a profit to-morrow if we dismissed the present batch of men and put in first-class skilled workers. But it was not started, and is not carried on, for the efficient: it was started, and is carried on, for the non-efficient.

We run our St. Albans Printing Works, which is a Trade Union shop, at a profit, because the workers are up to the Trade Union standard in stamina and ability.

2. Again, if by sweating it is implied that we do not give the men a just return for their labour, we deny the charge.

We do give them a just return, judged by the object and character of the agency. We certainly do not profess—it would be a folly—to pay wages in the ordinary sense of the term.

The system of remuneration is graduated to the circumstances we have explained, and to the ability of the worker.

Trade Union principles—which we admit have done much to raise both the standard of the work and the worker, and with which we have no quarrel—do not apply here at all.

A shop is not run on the same principle as a hospital. Here we have an industrial hospital. We could, naturally, do more for the men if we had the money. For example, the question of tools has been raised, and raised in a way which leaves the impression that we do next to nothing for men to redeem or renew their tools.

A little thought would have convinced these objectors that it would be detrimental to the very object we are striving to attain, if we advertised on the house-tops *all* that we do for the men. We should require a gold mine if it were given out that The Salvation Army provides tools when a man leaves its care. The 'rice Christians' of India would not be in it.

We take the liberty of informing the so-called friends of the working man that we know our business. By which we mean that, in a matter of this kind, we know whom to assist, and how to assist them; and the friends who have been

disgusted by this unwarranted attack upon an interesting branch of our Social Work, might help us by donating a few pounds to enable us to do more for the men than we can with our present limited resources.

3. If by sweating it is suggested that Hanbury Street is run in the personal interests of any Officer of The Salvation Army, it is a libel upon and an insult to the fair name of the Officer.

4. And, finally, if by sweating it is suggested that The Salvation Army 'makes a fine thing' out of Hanbury Street, we ardently wish the time may not be so far distant as we imagine when The Army will benefit, financially, by this branch of its Social operations.

But what does the phrase, 'making a fine thing out of it,' mean? The people who indulge in this sort of language conveniently forget that any money made out of one Social department goes to help another Social department, and not, as one of the most unscrupulous men that ever dipped his pen in ink to blacken The Salvation Army insinuates, to bolster up the spiritual wing of the Movement.

Both wings—that is, the Social and the Spiritual—are established under separate Deed Polls, and have their separate management,

accounts, books, balance sheets, Officers, and newspapers.

The sweating lie is, it strikes us, founded on a deliberate misrepresentation of the main principle on which this particular Social department is managed.

III. We are also charged with supplying the men with rotten food.

The answer to this vilest of all charges is supplied in the following letter by a comrade, who, till a short time ago, was in charge of the feeding arrangements of the Hanbury Street men—a letter, by the way, which also throws an interesting sidelight on the methods of some, at least, of our traducers:—

DEAR SIR,—Mr. Manson's attack on the Hanbury Street Factory and The Salvation Army calls for a reply from me.

I am the Officer to whom he refers as having been recently in charge of the department for feeding the men.

The inference is that I left The Army because of dissatisfaction with the arrangements.

My reason for leaving was nothing of the kind.

I consider the feeding of the men, while I was in charge of it, was wholesome in quality and abundant in quantity.

There is nothing to complain of, and no complaint was made.

I wish you to know that I am still a Salvationist, and am very grateful to The Army for giving me a new start in life—which, by the way, was done by the very means which Mr. Manson and others evidently take such a pleasure in condemning.

I am not the only one.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) JOHN E. ROWLANES.

I ought to add that I have been approached by interested parties opposed to The Salvation Army, and deliberately promised help, and, in one instance, a £10 note was mentioned as a sum that would be handy in business, if I would disclose anything detrimental to The Army.

But I had nothing to disclose.

(Signed) J. E. R.

To the Editor of 'The Westminster Gazette'.

It is impossible to conceive how this particular scandal got currency, inasmuch as the purchase of food is in the hands of an expert, who visits the markets three times a week.

A perusal of the weekly bill of fare, however, will make it abundantly evident that the man who is suffering from weakness caused by starvation, at the end of three weeks in the Workshop, or Elevator as it is called by us, must either be an epicure come to the wrong place by mistake or—something else!

Sunday

BREAKFAST.—Fish, three slices of bread and butter or margarine, one pint of tea.

DINNER.—Three ounces of prime roast meat, greens, potatoes, bread, boiled pudding or stewed fruit, pint of tea.

TEA.—Two slices of bread and butter or margarine, two slices of cake, pint of tea.

Monday

BREAKFAST.—Two ounces of corned beef, three slices of bread and butter or margarine (seven ounces), pint of tea.

DINNER.—Meat-pie or stew, beans, potatoes, bread, rice pudding and stewed plums, pint of tea.

TEA.—Two ounces of flank, or rice and jam, three slices of bread and butter or margarine, pint of tea.

Tuesday

BREAKFAST.—Two ounces of cold bacon, three slices of bread and butter or margarine (seven ounces), pint of tea.

DINNER.—Three ounces of prime roast meat, blue peas, potatoes, bread, jam tart, pint of tea.

TEA.—Two ounces of bacon, three slices of bread and butter or margarine, pint of tea.

Wednesday

BREAKFAST.—Fish, three slices of bread and butter or margarine (seven ounces), pint of tea.

DINNER.—Stew or meat-pie, carrots, or beans, or peas, bread, bread pudding, pint of tea.

TEA.—One saveloy or two ounces of sausage, two slices of bread and butter or margarine, one slice of cake, pint of tea.

Thursday

BREAKFAST.—Two ounces of corned beef, three slices of bread and butter or margarine, pint of tea.

DINNER.—Three ounces of prime cold meat, pickles, potatoes, bread, rice pudding and stewed plums, pint of tea.

TEA.—Three ounces of flank, or rice and jam, three slices of bread and butter or margarine, pint of tea.

Friday

BREAKFAST.—One egg, or fish, or two ounces of sausage, three slices of bread and butter or margarine (seven ounces), pint of tea.

DINNER.—Pie, or stew, beans, potatoes, bread, boiled pudding, pint of tea.

TEA.—Fish, egg, or sausage, three slices of bread and butter or margarine, pint of tea.

Saturday

BREAKFAST.—Two ounces of corned beef, three slices of bread and butter or margarine (seven ounces), pint of tea.

DINNER.—Meat pudding, beans, potatoes, bread, rice and jam, pint of tea.

TEA.—Two ounces of flank, two slices of bread and butter or margarine, one slice of cake, pint of tea.

SUPPER consists of one slice of bread, jam, marmalade, cake, butter or margarine, half pint of tea.

IV. We are also charged with compelling the men to work 'scandalous hours'.

Here, again, we repudiate the slander. The hours at Hanbury Street are fifty-three per week. Is that a 'scandalous' number?

Overtime is seldom resorted to, and, in common with all employers of labour—whether of one kind or another—we are against it as far as it is practicable.

Many other charges, 'too numerous to mention,' as the auctioneer would comprehensively put it, are hurled at Hanbury Street, because we do not accede to the Quixotic demands of one or two persons who have some material advantage to gain by continuing the attack.

CHAPTER IV

THEORY AND FACT

BUT while others theorize upon the causes of and cures for unemployment, we shall stick to the much more humane and practical business of helping the unemployed and the unemployable to help themselves. While others propagate their campaign of destruction, we continue to use the old saw of Salvation—the salvation of the body as well as the soul—and the amelioration of misery by the restoration to hope, industry, and moral health of the miserable.

Others may close their gates against the derelict; ours are open to him. Others preach the survival of the fit; we preach the salvation of the unfit. Our methods may be characterized as obsolete. We know of none better, and will apply them till we discover or invent some more appropriate. We are charged with usurping the functions of the State. When the State will assume the responsibility, and the need no longer exists for extending a helping hand to the man who lies

wounded by the wayside, we shall retire from the field. But not till then. Meanwhile, we will continue to play the part of the Good Samaritan. We are called friends of the Capitalists, as if that were a mortal sin. We throw back the taunt by proclaiming ourselves to be the friends of Christ, and, therefore, the particular friends of the black sheep, as well as mothers and fathers to the sooty lambs of Society.

Will you help us to shelter, feed, cleanse, and restore them?

PRESS COMMENTS

'THE TIMES'

Commenting in a leading article upon a proposal discussed at the Trade Union Congress that the Government should make grants to out-of-work funds of Trade Unions, 'The Times' says:—

'Poor General Booth was denounced as a cadger in the mean and bitter attack made on The Salvation Army, but the proposed subsidy from public money is, of course, not cadging! It is, as another member pointed out, demanded "as a right". Suppose The Salvation Army, instead of asking for voluntary support, which people are free to give or refuse, were to demand a subsidy from the Government "as a right" on the ground of its services in providing relief, what then?

'The Army at least takes all comers, whereas the Trade Unions help only their own members'.

'MANCHESTER GUARDIAN'

If they (the trade unions) could show that The Army gave its 'Elevator' patients low wages, not because their labour was nearly worthless, but because an attempt was being made to undercut prices by undercutting wages, then public opinion ought to join them in condemning The Army. But this is precisely what they have not yet, to our knowledge, succeeded in showing.

'DUNDEE EVENING TELEGRAPH'

General Booth and his fellow-workers will not suffer. Utterances of this wild sort can only react on those who make them, and most likely those in the gathering who laughed at the remark that The Army was 'dealing with the wreckage stranded on the shores of our sociology' will

PRESS COMMENTS

47

find enough in labour problems to reduce them to seriousness. General Booth has, of course, an effective reply to his critics—he can stop the work at Hanbury Street and let the workers go to swell the ranks of the unemployed. He is not, however, likely to do that.

'DUNDEE COURIER'

As is pointed out in a spirited defence already issued in pamphlet form, in reply to such attacks, by The Salvation Army Officers responsible for the management of the Home in question—a statement which puts a very different complexion upon the situation from that so strongly insisted upon yesterday—such an Institution is a sort of 'industrial hospital', in which the conditions are very different from those normally existing.

LONDON 'EVENING STANDARD'

The Salvation Army, so far as we have grasped its intentions, does not pretend to give the entire loaf. What it does attempt—what it does succeed in doing—is to lend a helping hand to the sorely distressed. Is it to be blamed by sticklers for fair wages if, when it has helped a man from the slough of despond, it discovers that it cannot set him on a horse? So long as it enables him to walk—to tide over a perilous part of his journey through life—it will perform a service for which the individual and the community cannot be too grateful. To talk of sweating is mere foolishness. One might as well complain that the Poor Law does not supply the recipients of relief with sufficient money to start banking accounts. The Trade Union Congress has not learnt that beggars cannot be choosers. In its enthusiasm for generous standards it would kill charity before it has dispensed with the need for charity.

'THE CHRISTIAN WORLD'

The Army has no views on the advantages or otherwise of State Socialism. All they know is that the men are there and need help, and they try to give it. They argue, with great force, that it is impossible to run a Home like that at Hanbury Street on Trade Union lines. They do not pretend to pay the derelict class of labour which they get there the trade union rate of wages. The charges have been made

before and answered before, but as one Socialist put it at the demonstration last Sunday, they object equally to work-houses, prisons, reformatories, and rescue homes of the Hanbury Street type, holding that they are all props of the capitalistic system. It is just as well to know what the real grievance is.

NEWCASTLE 'DAILY CHRONICLE'

The chief Officers of The Salvation Army assert that they have a complete answer to their critics, but even if all that has been said in criticism of the methods of The Army in this matter were proved to the full, we do not believe that it would alienate public sympathy from General Booth and his helpers. And, at any rate, however undesirable a thing cheap labour may be, there is not likely to be any general demand that the rescued shall be paid trade union rate of wages.

'THE STANDARD'

The offence of The Salvation Army is that they find work of a sort for a number of industrial derelicts and pay them such wages as their funds permit. For this high crime and misdemeanour the officials have been denounced as cadgers for charity and sweaters of labour. But it is not easy to see what reply the trade unionist scolders will make to The General's temperate and closely reasoned letter. When his critics have framed a plausible reply they may fairly invite him to discontinue his efforts to relieve distress in his own way. It is not necessary to approve his theological teachings, or even to accept his social theories in order to see that the argument, so far, is all on the side of The Salvation Army. For the destitute and wretched and partially unemployable it is not too much to say that The General in a few years has done more than trade unionism in half a century of organized energy.

'DAILY CHRONICLE'

If you have ever seen The Salvation Army Elevator at Hanbury Street you will have no sympathy with the complaints at under-payment. The carpenters—for example—who work there are the men who have gone under, and could not, in their present condition, command the trade union rate of wages. The Salvation Army, knowing that

a man out of work drops day by day in efficiency, says, 'Come along, we'll save you at least from that deterioration—but we can't afford more than the bare subsistence'.

'PALL MALL GAZETTE'

Entitling its notelet, 'The General's Back to the Wall', this journal says:—

The attitude of the Congress is more than inconsistent: it is stupid. If the trade unions were able to grasp the position in its true proportion, they would see that The Salvation Army was capable of being made a valuable ally. But they are not, so they waste their breath in condemning The Army for coming to the assistance of the men they cannot or will not help themselves, and they go on their selfish way, shedding more social jetsam as they go, and caring nothing as to what becomes of it. The case is put in a nutshell by General Booth in his letter to Mr. Steadman. He says, in effect: 'I am told I ought to give the standard rate of wages whether it is earned or not; but this requires the expenditure of a fortune and would involve me in paying what some do not and probably never will earn. Am I, then, to dismiss these men, and let them drift into crime and suicide?' Such an alternative the spirited head of The Army declines to face, and every one with the least spark of generosity in him will applaud The General for doing so, however Trade Union Congresses may bleat and bawl.

'NOTTS DAILY EXPRESS'

The Salvation Army admittedly does very good work among the very poor and helpless section of the community. The fact that the Institution pays no profit is significant. A friendly conference between trade union officials and General Booth and his friends would be all to the good; it would serve to remove any misapprehensions that exist and make the whole position clear to the public.

'DUNDEE ADVERTISER'

The attack made on General Booth and The Salvation Army at the Trades Congress was extravagant and unjust. . . . If The Salvation Army are not allowed to go on on the lines which they are at present following, the works

would have to be closed, and the men thrown on the streets whence they were picked up. Is this an alternative to be lightly faced?

'LLOYD'S WEEKLY NEWS'

There are circumstances to which the Trade Unionists do not appear to give sufficient attention. In the first place, the men who apply to The Army, or similar organizations for help, are obviously in the very last stage of despair and penury. If the despairing unemployed are in the open market competing, the unscrupulous employer can organize their labour, prey upon their urgent need, and use them as a means for undercutting his competitors. There can only be one result from that: wages must fall all round.

'BRISTOL TIMES AND MIRROR'

If the trade unions themselves did anything for the human failures and outcasts whom The Salvation Army makes its care, language of this kind might have some excuse. As it is, the only effect will be to disgust those who realize how earnestly The Salvation Army and other promoters of working Homes and Colonies for the destitute unemployed are coping with tasks which have become a social necessity.

'THE STAR'

General Booth has given Mr. Bowerman an assurance that, although the Elevator is used as a Shelter for the homeless and the foodless, the applicants are refused admission unless they agree to certain conditions of labour. We are sure that the Trade Unionists and The Salvation Army can arrive at some method which will satisfy the aims of philanthropy on the one hand and the principles of Trade Unionism on the other.

If Christ were at Hanbury Street

(Reprinted from 'The Daily Chronicle')

What would Christ do—what would He likely say—to the men who, in their hunger and distress, knock at the gates of our Hanbury Street Labour Home from time to time?

He was a carpenter. He must have been familiar with the ups and downs of the trade, and with the economic changes and the poor harvests that brought in their train alternate periods of industrial depression and prosperity. Trade has always fluctuated. Human nature was neither better nor worse in His day than it is in ours. There were, no doubt, broken-down, aged carpenters in His time, as well as a proportion who, through their own misconduct and neglect, were brought to poverty and the verge of despair.

Stranded Humanity

What did He say, I wonder, to the man who may have called at the home of His earthly parents and asked for the privilege of doing a little work to tide over his misfortunes or the effects of his folly? Revelation is wisely silent about what He did and what He did not do in the pre-Jordan days of His benevolent ministry; but, perhaps, we shall be satisfied in attempting to answer the question if we let one or two of the men who are at present recipients

of the benefits of this Labour Home for stranded humanity just speak for themselves :—

'I am a member of the Church of England, and here are the records, with satisfactory testimonials of my past. I am in the way, sir. This right hand of mine is not so steady as it once was, and my eyesight is getting dim—and you know, sir, that a man at the bench needs a steady wrist and a clear eye. I am reduced to this twopence. If I could get enough to keep myself decent, I've a plan, sir, by which I think I can finish up my little life like a Christian. I served my country on board a warship for twelve and a half years, and I have a fair chance of obtaining a small pension. Two of my boys will give me a shilling or two a week, and once this old-age pension scheme is running, I'll get enough to settle down without the dread of finishing in a workhouse, and being put underground in a pauper's box. All I ask for, sir, is a chance. I'll soon be seventy, and at my age, and with this 'ere hand, it's no good tramping from shop to shop in the hope of getting a permanent job. A chance is all I ask for!'

Now, what would Christ do if He were in Staff-Captain Smith's position at Hanbury Street? He certainly would not slam the gate in the poor man's face because the applicant was a faithful son of the Anglican Church—for His children are to be found in all folds. He would not cast the old man aside because of his age and frailty. These facts would rather excite His compassion. He would not, I think, send the old man to the Relieving Officer, with a line to admit him to the Union. That would break the old man's heart.

Would He reason with him on the laws of supply and demand, and the gospel of the fit and the unfit? Fine theories, like fine words, butter no parsnips. His Gospel

was bread for the hungry and water for the thirsty, even if they were His enemies. Neither would Christ, I fancy, have appealed to the rich for funds to keep the old man in idleness for the remainder of his days.

The Only Sin

No: I'm not far wrong in supposing that if Christ were at Hanbury Street He would give the man with only twopence the chance he begged for, and at once appoint him to a place at the old bench, with the assurance that there would be enough to eat and drink, and something over to maintain his self-respect, as well as an opportunity to worship God according to the forms and ceremonies most acceptable to his own judgment. At any rate, that is the only sin that Staff-Captain Smith is guilty of committing in this instance!

And when, in the Providence of God, the old man obtains his pension, and settles down to meditate upon the sinking sun, I don't believe that the men, callous as they are, who charge us with sweating, will find it in their hearts to condemn. They certainly will acknowledge that society was benefited by the act.

But what would Christ do with this young man? Let him also speak for himself :—

'Will you give me a job? Why? Well, a big sorrow led me on to the wrong track. I'd rather not go into it now. But you can investigate it after. It was a home-sorrow. I tried to be a good husband and father; but there, now, I must not go into details. I took to drink, and then I took to the road. I've been wandering about the country for months and months. And I am sick at heart. I know I've done wrong. But I was attracted by the singing of a mission in a country lane, and I followed

it, and that night, in a Hall, I made a resolve that I would let God have His own way with me. Yes; I've a few tools, and I am willing to work. I'm perhaps not so quick at work as I was; but try me! I want to get straight, and with a little time and quiet—away from the temptations of the outside—I may yet be able to hold my head up.'

Needed Repairing

What would Christ say to such an appeal? Send the prodigal to the nearest joiner's shop, with the request to give him a chance at the standard rate of wages? He might. I can't say. But I know the master joiners in London have no use for tramp-carpenters. On his own showing, the man needed more than work, and he would probably find it here. He needed repairing, his heart recharging with hope and faith and fortitude.

Whatever differences of opinion there may be as to Salvation Army methods of religion, I don't think the most inveterate sceptic would object to our taking such a man in hand and making an attempt to assist him in the manner suggested. And if such a man, with a hidden sorrow, needs help, then Hanbury Street is, I think, the place for him. Anyway, our Officer in charge committed the sin of taking him by the hand, and has now the satisfaction of seeing the experiment justified in a rehabilitated man—physically, morally, and spiritually.

Then there is 'Sunshine', as he is called. Baldheaded, spectacled, toothless, he does not lack either the fame of hearty content or hope in a better time coming. How did he come to plead for admission?

'For nearly twenty years I worked for one firm as a first-class cabinet-maker. My line was fancy-work—not like the rough stuff Hanbury Street turns out. Thinking to better myself, I entered partnership with a friend. It

turned out a bad egg, and I came out of it with all my savings gone and £100 to the bad. So I had to go back to the firm, dead-beat. They were kind enough to take me on again, and for four years all went well. Then, one day, the head of the firm died and the sons took charge, turned the business into a limited, began to discharge the over-forty hands, and by and by my turn came. I had to pack up my tool-chest and walk out. That was the blackest day in my life, sir—the blackest. Well, the rest is soon told. I failed here, I failed there, and I failed yonder, until I came to my last tanner. Just then I came across The Salvation Army and here I am, thank God! What prospects, do you ask? That depends. I think I'm giving satisfaction, and I am perfectly happy. The company here suits me. I've got plenty to eat, and it's all right, too—though at times it's a trifle monotonous, like the Englishman's ham and eggs for breakfast. But I've enough for the moment to get a pair of new boots and a decent coat, and a newspaper at night, and a magazine occasionally. And then I've got the grace of God in my heart; and something will yet turn up, I feel sure, to get me on to my feet again. This is just the place for the likes of me.'

As the Good Samaritan

Would He, who sought out the halt and maimed that He might heal them, and whose ministry was distinguished by a supreme pity for the sick and weak, the erring and the demon-possessed—whose Gospel, in short, was magnified in making fit the unfit—have turned a deaf ear to this unfortunate man, broke in the war for bread? I can't imagine it possible. The Army took him into its Home, and acted towards him as did the Good Samaritan.

But that is 2,000 years ago, and, therefore, must be a heinous offence against the tenets of the modern political economist, and, I suppose, a sure sign of silly sentimentality!

