

The creation of the Bureau of Labor Statistics

Jonathan Grossman; Judson MacLaury

Monthly Labor Review (pre-1986); Feb 1975; 98, 000002; ABI/INFORM Global

pg. 25

The first national labor statistics agency
began life 90 years ago,
following two decades of campaigning
by U.S. trade unions

JONATHAN GROSSMAN AND JUDSON MACLAURY

The creation of the Bureau of Labor Statistics

THE UNITED STATES Bureau of Labor Statistics began operations 90 years ago, following a 20-year legislative battle by the American labor movement. Although several State labor agencies preceded it, the Bureau was the first national agency of its kind in the world. Not until 1891, 6 years after the American bureau was founded, did France organize the first European labor agency, Office du Travail, followed by England in 1893, Spain in 1894, Belgium in 1896, Austria in 1898, and Germany, Italy, and Sweden in 1902.¹ The European countries had been ahead of America both in the collection of statistics and in enacting social legislation, but the United States was clearly the leader in creating labor bureaus.

Altruism and fear

The two-decade crusade for a national labor statistics bureau took place in an American climate of altruism which sought to "put the Christian religion into social science."² In the decades after the Civil War, the United States was transformed into an industrial society. The economy grew spectacularly, but the workers who helped build this industrial empire often labored under harsh and hazardous conditions, lived in firetrap tenements, suffered unemployment, and, even when working, received near-starvation wages.

Many Americans tried to deal with the labor question in a way which was both businesslike and ethical. Thus in 1885, the commissioners of State

bureaus of labor statistics, in a joint report, concerned themselves with "experiments of the age seeking to harmonize the interests of labor and capital." Carroll D. Wright, long-time head of the Massachusetts bureau and the first commissioner of the U.S. Bureau of Labor, observed that "the altruistic spirit of the age undertakes to ascertain what the social classes owe to each other . . . [but] altruism . . . must be guided by facts, and the facts can be gained only by the most faithful application of the statistical method."³

Mixed with the "altruistic spirit of the age" was a fear of social unrest. For example, Rev. R. Heber Newton, a proponent of the social gospel, feared "the shadow of the old world proletariat . . . stealing upon our shores" and saw a need to study the forces producing "such alarming change in our American society."⁴ Americans also were frightened by strikes. The violent railroad strikes of 1877 bordered on social revolution. Though strikes have roots in earlier American history, not until the last quarter of the 19th century did they become a major weapon in the hands of labor to redress real or fancied wrongs. The 762 strikes reported in the United States in 1880 exceeded the total recorded for all previous years.⁵ Many Americans, frightened by social unrest and the growing power of labor, demanded that the Federal Government investigate the conditions of working people with the aim of answering the labor question.

Unsuccessful early bills

Altruism and fear were the guiding stars of the drive for a labor statistics bureau, but the political power of the growing labor movement was the wind in its sails. During the Civil War decade, unions fought for both national and State labor bureaus. In 1864, Representative Gottlieb Orth of Indiana introduced a bill to create a Federal labor depart-

Jonathan Grossman, a labor historian, is a social science adviser in the U.S. Department of Labor and professor of labor history at the University of Maryland. Judson MacLaury is a historical researcher in the department. This article is one of a series of historical articles marking the Nation's bicentennial. The events leading up to the appointment of the first Commissioner of Labor will be discussed in a forthcoming issue of the *Review*.

ment. The bill failed, but it was probably the first time Congress considered establishing a department of labor.⁶ Under the leadership of William Sylvius, the National Labor Union in 1868 urged that the national census include labor statistics and called for a Federal bureau of labor with "its sole object the care and protection of labor."⁷ In 1871, Congress considered two bills to create a labor bureau but neither was acted upon. That same year, Representative George F. Hoar of Massachusetts introduced a bill to appoint a 2-year commission to study wages, hours, and the division of returns between capital and labor. The bill was debated in the House as a concession to labor. It passed the House but the Senate tabled it without debate.⁸ The death of Sylvius, the decline of the National Labor Union, depression, and the near disintegration of the labor movement killed for nearly a decade the campaign for a national bureau of labor.

Labor politics proved more successful on a State than on a national level. Massachusetts workers, long before the Civil War, had exerted pressure for a shorter workday. In 1865, the legislature appointed a commission which the following year recommended "the annual collection of reliable statistics in regard to the condition, prospects, and wants of the industrial classes." The legislature ignored the recommendation. But in 1869, after initially rejecting another proposal to establish a bureau of statistics of labor, the legislature finally yielded to the powerful labor interests which were then winning victories at the polls. On June 23, 1869, the governor of Massachusetts signed a bill establishing the first bureau of labor statistics in the world, the true ancestor of all government bureaus of labor.⁹ Other States followed Massachusetts, almost always at the instigation of organized labor or in response to labor political movements. The Knights of Labor, the dominant labor organization of the period, also took up the cause of labor statistics. By 1884, 15 States had established such bureaus.¹⁰

Labor's success in winning State bureaus acted as a spur for revived Federal action. In 1879 the Massachusetts legislature sent a resolution to Congress urging a National Bureau of Labor which would "harmonize and unify existing divergencies between capital and labor."¹¹ Shortly thereafter Representative Thompson Murch of Maine introduced a labor bureau bill in the House and George Hoar, by this time a Senator from Massachusetts, revived his old proposal for a labor commission.

Neither bill passed, nor were additional proposals by other Congressmen in 1880 and 1882 acted upon.¹²

The Senate labor investigation

In response to increasing concern with labor, the Senate resolved on August 7, 1882, that its Committee on Education and Labor investigate the "relations between labor and capital, the wages and hours of labor, the conditions of the laboring classes, . . . the division of capital and labor, . . . strikes, and . . . the causes thereof."¹³ The Committee was to recommend legislation based on its findings. It held hearings in 1883 in several major cities and heard testimony from a variety of witnesses, including corporation executives, labor leaders, reformers, clergy, and ordinary workers. Their testimony presents a vivid picture of living and working conditions, as well as comments on unions and labor strife.

These hearings gave a dual thrust to the drive for a national labor bureau. First, since the Senate committee was investigating such subjects as working conditions, labor unrest, and labor organizations, it functioned as a temporary labor bureau, and so planted the seed of a labor agency in the Federal Government. The second thrust came from the testimony itself. Witness after witness recommended establishment of a permanent Federal bureau to investigate labor matters. The form that it should take and the reasons for creating it varied, but no witness questioned that there should be one.

Unions strongly supported the creation of a bureau of labor, and an impressive array of labor figures testified at the hearings. Among them were Peter McGuire, the founder of the Carpenters' Union; Adolf Strasser, president of the Cigar Makers Union; Louis Post,¹⁴ a journalist and member of the powerful Central Labor Union of New York City; John Jarrett,¹⁵ president of the Amalgamated Iron and Steel Workers' Union (who almost became the first U.S. Commissioner of Labor); and John Swinton, a leading labor journalist and publisher of *John Swinton's Paper*.

Peter McGuire testified that workers generally wanted a permanent bureau of labor statistics. He pointed out that the Federal Government was already collecting some labor statistics, but the work was scattered in different agencies. If it was consolidated under one bureau, this agency could then publish reports on current conditions and would be a "guide and a warning as to the storms that are continually

coming upon us from the business and financial world." John Jarrett felt the prime purpose of the bureau should be to obtain from detailed annual financial reports exact information on the wages paid and the profits of industry. Other labor spokesmen suggested that a bureau of labor statistics could provide accurate data to facilitate fair settlements of labor disputes and educate workers concerning labor laws so they would demand better enforcement.

The bureau also received support from management. Charles Lenz, the editor of *Capital and Labor*, an industry organ, said that a bureau of labor statistics would provide facts concerning workers' grievances on which to base intelligent action. A plant manager from Pittsburgh also considered the bureau a very desirable idea, as long as it would benefit the working class as a whole and not advance the interests of particular groups.

One Elisha Winter, an employee of the Delaware and Hudson Canal Co., called for a bureau of immigration and labor statistics which would give immigrants honest information on jobs and the availability of land. This bureau would thus help them escape the crowded cities and their evil influences.

Carroll D. Wright, then commissioner of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, which he had developed into an agency widely respected for objectivity, stated that a Federal bureau of labor statistics "should be constituted entirely on a scientific basis; should not be run on theories at all, but absolutely as a statistical bureau." He wanted the appointment of officials in the bureau to be free of political influence. Wright thought the bureau should "establish an agency in every State," but he did not specify whether these would be State-run bureaus or divisions of the Federal bureau. Aware of the problem of fitting the bureau into the existing bureaucracy, Wright proposed lodging it in the Department of the Interior rather than making it a separate agency.

When the hearings were over, the Senate committee was praised for conducting its investigation on labor and capital in an even-handed, objective manner. The generally conservative Senators on the committee were fair, patient, and probing in their examination of witnesses, many of whom were craft workers and laborers.¹⁶ These hearings established a precedent for objectivity in labor investigations by the Federal Government.

Opinions differed on the success or failure of the Senate's investigations on labor and capital. The

Washington Post, under the caption "Much Ado About Nothing," editorialized that the committee had wasted time and effort. Others felt that hearings were successful, and there is little doubt that they were an important step in the creation of a Federal bureau of labor.¹⁷

Support by labor organizations

The strong support and growing power of organized labor and the labor press were crucial to the success of the drive for a Federal labor bureau. The industrial congresses of labor unions in the 1870's demanded "from the several States and from the national government the establishment of bureaus of labor statistics."¹⁸

Though these national labor congresses collapsed during the depression of the 1870's, their place was taken by the Knights of Labor. In 1878 at Reading, Pa., during their first general assembly, the Knights called for labor bureaus because they felt that action on behalf of workers had to be based on knowledge of their true condition. The Knights of Labor flourished, growing from less than 10,000 members in 1878 to more than 700,000 in 1884. While they advocated many labor programs, they fought with growing effectiveness for a national bureau of labor statistics.¹⁹

The fledgling Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions, the predecessor of the American Federation of Labor, also favored creation of a bureau of labor statistics. The Declaration of Principles adopted at the organization's founding in 1881 stated, "we recognize the wholesome effects of a Bureau of Labor Statistics as created in several States, and we urge upon our friends in Congress passage of an act establishing a National Bureau of Labor Statistics."²⁰

Labor papers also urged creation of a Federal agency to collect labor statistics. In 1883 *John Swinton's Paper* ran a front page article proposing various humanitarian and social welfare measures, among them creation of a National Board of Industry to collect information on such subjects as the 8-hour day and woman and child labor. The *National Labor Tribune* called for a Bureau of Statistics to study both labor and industry.²¹ When there was a coal mine disaster in West Virginia in 1884, the *Tribune* claimed it could have been prevented had there been a Federal bureau of labor. The *Tribune* wanted a truly effective bureau, unlike some in Congress who,

it said, wanted "a mere gathering of figures by a few clerks. . . . Good heavens! that the lives of the wealth producers of the country should be held so cheap."²²

The Blair bill

The trickle of labor bills which started in 1879 had swelled into a stream by late 1883 and early 1884. The time was ripe for Federal action on a bureau of labor statistics. In the Senate Henry Blair of New Hampshire took the lead. Blair was chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and had led its investigation on labor and capital. He had a "rags to riches" career and, though generally conservative, had championed a variety of causes often associated with social justice. Blair introduced his bill for a bureau of labor statistics on December 4, 1883. Labor approved. The Carpenters' Union called it an important bill and urged its members to put pressure on their Congressmen to pass it.²³

The Blair bill found a powerful supporter in Senator Hoar, who over a decade earlier had called for a national labor commission. Hoar wanted the proposed bureau to study workers' living conditions and wages. If wages got too low, he said, "I despair of the maintenance of the Republic for many generations." But in spite of his advocacy of high wages he felt the bureau should be a noncrusading, objective agency.

Senator Joseph Hawley of Connecticut objected to the bill on the grounds that the creation of a special bureau of labor statistics would lead to other specialized statistical bureaus. It would be better, he argued, to consolidate all statistical functions under the Treasury Department's Bureau of Statistics. Senator Blair countered that the field of labor statistics was so broad that, if anything, studies in other areas should be done by the labor statistics bureau.

The Blair bill drew opposition from Senator William B. Allison of Iowa; who pointed out that the budgets for other statistical agencies had mushroomed. He felt that the new bureau's budget, though small, was "but the entering wedge of an enormous expenditure." Senator Charles H. Van Wyck of Nebraska saw no practical good in a bureau of labor statistics. Whenever there was a national problem, he said, "the universal panacea is a commission or else a distinct bureau."

Although there seemed to be some sentiment in its favor, the Blair bill was tabled and thus effectively killed. Perhaps Senator Blair allowed the bill

to die in the hope that a similar bill already introduced in the House of Representatives would have a better chance of enactment.

The Hopkins bill

In any case, the mourning period was brief. Even before the Blair bill was debated in the Senate, several Congressmen introduced proposals calling for labor bureaus. On December 10, 1883, Congressman Albert Willis of Kentucky submitted a bill to create a bureau of statistics of labor and industry. The following day Congressman James H. Hopkins of Pennsylvania introduced a similar bill. Representatives John Lamb of Indiana, John J. O'Neill of Missouri, Martin Foran of Ohio, and William McKinley, a future President of the United States who was also from Ohio, introduced bills for labor bureaus. Foran's bill seemed especially promising. Foran had been a founder and president of the Coopers' International Union, was a prominent sponsor of a pioneer labor statistics bureau in Ohio, and had a good deal of influence with the labor movement.²⁴ John Swinton, who had at first supported the Blair bill, switched his allegiance to Foran's proposal to create a department of industry which would include a bureau of labor statistics.²⁵

The House Committee on Labor studied the bills and reported favorably on James Hopkins' bill.²⁶ Hopkins, though a vice-president of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, was friendly toward labor and was chairman of the House Labor Committee. The *National Labor Tribune*, published in Pittsburgh, was enthusiastic about the Hopkins bill which, it proclaimed, "reaches out as far as the most exuberant fancy of the most probe-to-the-bottom mind could wish."²⁷

In the House debate on the bill, Hopkins pointed to precedents in scientific and investigative agencies and projects sponsored by the Federal Government. He mentioned the Lewis and Clark expeditions, the National Botanical Gardens, and specialized statistical bureaus studying commerce, education, and agriculture. "A great deal of public attention . . . has been given to the American hog and the American steer," lamented Hopkins. "I submit it is time to give more attention to the American man." He argued that the proposed bureau would increase the prosperity and happiness of the workers and would help perfect "the stability, the beauty, and the symmetry of the Republic."

Representative John J. O'Neill, a Missouri businessman, called the bill "one great step in the elevation of the wealth-producers." O'Neill thought the department could provide useful information for legislation on, for example, the tariff question, which was a burning issue at the time. There was a pathetic shortage of reliable statistics and the proposed appropriation of \$25,000 for 1 year seemed to O'Neill insignificant compared with the millions paid out by the Government. Yet in opposition to this paltry sum "gentlemen rise on this floor to perfect terror." O'Neill felt that even with this small an outlay the department would be of greater service "than all the fine-spun theories or dogmatic utterances based upon unreliable facts."

Representative Foran, who rallied behind the Hopkins bill after his own proposal was dropped, expanded this view of the value of labor statistics. He argued that one cause of the enactment of bad laws was ignorance of social facts and sociological principles so that the laws were not based on the true nature of society. He felt that too often laws were enacted only in reaction to crises rather than preventing crises in the first place. A statistical department would gather data to help further the development of scientific principles on which proper laws could be based.

Representative Frank Walford of Kentucky expressed reservations about the bill. He was in favor of a department of labor statistics if it would tell American workers where the best wages were being paid. But he feared that the department might be misused to enable employers to find out where wages were low in foreign countries so they could import the cheapest foreign labor to compete with American workers.

H. Casey Young of Tennessee also favored the general idea of the bill, but he opposed unnecessary enlargement of the Federal establishment and felt that six departments were enough. Since a sub-cabinet level Agriculture Department served the two-thirds of the labor force which worked on farms, Young wanted the labor statistics function undertaken by that department rather than a new one. Considering the antagonism between agriculture and industry over the tariff question, Young wanted to "strengthen and improve that natural unity which should exist between the workshop and the field." By a vote of 97 to 68 the House voted down an amendment to turn labor statistics over to the Department of Agriculture.

Much of the opposition to the bill came from Southerners such as James Blount of Georgia. He said he would not trust data collected by a department of labor statistics because he thought such agencies existed only to serve political purposes. Blount strongly objected to the Government's inquiring about religion, sanitary conditions, education, and so on, because "if we have the right to be making investigations, . . . we have the right to legislate those subjects" which he felt properly belonged to the States. To appease the workers Blount supported creation of the department, but only if it were severely restricted in its activities. Hopkins expressed surprise "that the ghost of 'States rights' would be invoked in opposition to this bill" and pointed out that there were already several other Federal statistical bureaus.

After the debate proper, the House considered a number of amendments. The name was changed from "department" to "bureau." Hopkins had wanted it called a department to insure that it would be independent of other bureaus, but he yielded to those who objected to giving the agency so high a status. Inquiries into workers' religious lives were eliminated from the bill. Civil service reform was a major issue at that time, and an unsuccessful amendment was offered to have the Commissioner of Labor's term continue indefinitely, limited only by good behavior.

Some labor leaders were pessimistic about the fate of this bill and other labor legislation in Congress. Swinton took a particularly sour view and criticized the "clowns and cranks of Congress . . . [who were] set up like chicken cocks against each other" and killed time that should have been devoted to other labor matters.²⁸ In fact, the debates were completed in a single day and the bill passed easily.

The Senate debate

The bill then went on to the Senate. Senator Blair, whose own bill had died 2 months earlier, brought in the Hopkins bill on May 14, 1884. He failed in his effort to get the bill passed without amendments to avoid sending it back to the House and to a conference committee.

Newspapers reporting the Senate debate took particular note of the speech by John J. Ingalls of Kansas, who had a reputation for vitriolic denunciation. He claimed he identified with the workers and denounced the "transparent demagogues who are attempting for sinister and selfish purposes to array

one class of people of this country against another . . . [and the] visionaries who are asking that all the evils of human society shall be cured by legislation." Ingalls ridiculed the clause in the bill giving the Commissioner of Labor authority "to do what? 'to issue circulars.' Most lame and impotent conclusion. . . . Who ever heard before that it is necessary to pass an act of Congress to enable a man to issue circulars?" A few moments later he criticized the "gigantic . . . and absolutely unprecedented power" given the Commissioner. At the end of his speech he said that with certain changes he would support the bill. Senator Blair thought it was best to ignore the "trivial sarcasm" of Ingalls but the labor press roasted him. Swinton wrote that "Roaring Ingalls . . . [was] very funny over the proposed bill." The *National Labor Tribune* said that while he "may not be an ass habitually . . . he was an exaggerated specimen of the animal on that occasion."²⁹

Labor continued to lobby for the bill. A "Memorial of the Federation of Labor Unions and Knights of Labor of the District of Columbia" was presented to Congress, urging passage of the Hopkins bill and other prolabor laws in order to prevent "anarchical scenes and revolutionary violence." Henry Blair read to the Senate a telegram sent him by Terence Powderly, General Master Workman of the Knights of Labor, which said, "Three thousand assemblies of Knights of Labor request of Senate to concur in action of House on bureau of labor statistics bill."

The Senate passed the bill in a modified form. The most important change was Rhode Island Senator Nelson Aldrich's amendment placing the bureau under the Interior Department, which Carroll Wright had recommended the previous year at the Senate hearings. The House refused to concur in the Senate's amendments but the Senate insisted and ordered a committee of conference over the disagreeing votes of the two houses. The Senate won its point and the Bureau of Labor went to the Department of the Interior.

The bill then passed both houses overwhelmingly and on June 27, 1884, President Chester A. Arthur signed the bill into law. John Swinton gave much credit for passage of the bill to Senator Blair, who "pushed it with great persistency and strength of purpose."³⁰ This bureau was the direct ancestor of the present Bureau of Labor Statistics and the seed

out of which the Department of Labor has grown.

Social justice and labor politics

The idea of a bureau of labor statistics grew out of labor's aspirations for social progress. Labor leaders as well as social scientists of the post-Civil War period were imbued with the altruistic spirit of the age. They believed in the essential goodness of man and had faith that knowledge was the basic remedy of the evils of society. If legislators knew the truth, they would pass good laws.

Legislators also accepted the goals of social justice, but nothing sharpened their altruism as much as an impending close election and labor's growing political strength. In the 1880 Presidential election in which more than 9 million votes were cast, James A. Garfield won by a hairline popular majority of seven thousand votes. The Presidential election of 1884 was also expected to be touch and go. Both major political parties were looking for labor votes. The Republican Party adopted in its 1884 platform a plank endorsing a bureau of labor. The Democratic platform, written after the bill had been passed, endorsed legislation which "will tend to enlighten the people as to the true relations of labor and capital."³¹

Much of the criticism of the bill was that it did not do enough for labor. John Swinton, for example, termed the entire session of Congress in which the bill was passed "full of big schemes, ending in small beer."³² Similarly, Senator Van Wyck felt that the Bureau of Labor was a gesture to appease labor while delaying more important legislation such as prohibiting the importation of contract labor.

In this preelection, prolabor atmosphere, the Hopkins bill was passed initially in the Senate by 55 to 2, and in the House by 182 to 19. Of the 19 dissenting votes in the House, 16 were from the South where organized labor was weak. The *Washington Post* lamented that labor had the "power to defeat or elect the candidates of either of the two parties," and that Senators and Representatives voted for bills advocated by labor spokesmen "for no better reason than because they dared not risk offending them."³³

A national Bureau of Labor was the offspring of the political power of organized labor and the altruistic spirit of the age. The idea that accurate

statistics would serve the cause of social justice was embodied in the declaration of purpose of the act, which provided that the Bureau of Labor

shall collect information upon the subject of labor, its relations to capital, the hours of labor, and the earnings of laboring men and women, and means of promoting their material, intellectual, and moral prosperity. □

—FOOTNOTES—

¹ George W. W. Hanger, "Bureaus of Statistics of Labor in Foreign Countries," *Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor*, 54 (September 1904), p. 1023.

² Carroll D. Wright, "The Working of the United States Bureau of Labor," *Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor*, 54 (September 1904), p. 977.

³ Wright, "Working of the Bureau of Labor," p. 978; *Sixteenth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor* (Boston, 1885), p. 3. The 1885 joint report on the company town of Pullman, Ill., was signed by Carroll Wright and 12 other heads of bureaus from the States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, Mississippi, Illinois, Indiana, New York, California, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Maryland.

⁴ *Report of the Committee of the Senate upon the Relations between Labor and Capital* (U.S. Senate, 47th Cong., 1st sess., 1883), Vol. II, pp. 535–36, 541.

⁵ George W. W. Hanger, "Strikes and Lockouts in the United States," *Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor*, 54 (September 1904), p. 1097.

⁶ *Organization and Law of the Department of Commerce and Labor* (U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor, 1904), p. 13.

⁷ James Sylvis, ed., *The Life, Speeches, Labors, and Essays of William H. Sylvis* (Philadelphia, Claxton, Remsen, and Haffelfinger, 1872), p. 74. According to his brother James, William Sylvis proposed a national labor bureau at the meeting of the National Labor Union in Chicago in 1867.

⁸ *Congressional Globe*, 42d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 102–05, 258, 3868.

⁹ George W. W. Hanger, "Bureaus of Statistics of Labor in the United States," *Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor*, 54 (September 1904), pp. 991–99.

¹⁰ Terence V. Powderly, *Thirty Years of Labor* (Philadelphia, 1890), pp. 158–62.

¹¹ *Congressional Record*, 9, Apr. 23, 1879, p. 716.

¹² *Organization and Law*, pp. 14–15.

¹³ *Report on Labor and Capital*, Vol. I, p. 1. This report sets forth the testimony given at the hearings.

¹⁴ Many years later Louis Post was appointed Assistant Secretary of Labor under William B. Wilson.

¹⁵ See the article on the selection of the first Commissioner of Labor in a forthcoming issue.

¹⁶ John Garraty, ed., *Labor and Capital in the Gilded Age* (Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1968), p. xii.

¹⁷ *Washington Post*, Nov. 21, 1883; Garraty, *Labor and Capital*, p. xii.

¹⁸ *Annual Report of the Department of Labor*, 1920, p. 15.

¹⁹ John R. Commons and others, *History of Labor in the United States* (New York, Macmillan, 1918), Vol. II, pp. 335, 339, 381; John Lombardi, *Labor's Voice in the Cabinet* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1942), pp. 29, 31.

²⁰ *Proceedings of the American Federation of Labor*, 1881 (Bloomington, Ill., Pantagraph, 1905), p. 4.

²¹ *John Swinton's Paper*, Oct. 14, 1883; *National Labor Tribune*, Feb. 2, 1884.

²² *National Labor Tribune*, Mar. 22, 1884.

²³ Daniel W. Crofts, "The Blair Bill and the Elections Bill," Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1968), pp. 75–78; *The Carpenter*, Feb. 1884. The Senate debates on the Blair bill are in the *Congressional Record*, 15, Mar. 7, 1884, pp. 1675–77 and Mar. 10, 1884, pp. 1746–51.

²⁴ Hanger, "Bureaus in the United States," p. 998.

²⁵ *John Swinton's Paper*, Dec. 12, 1883 and Jan. 13, 1884; *Congressional Record*, 15, Dec. 11, 1883; *Iron Molders' Journal*, Nov. 1882.

²⁶ The House debates on the Hopkins bill are in the *Congressional Record*, 15, Apr. 19, 1884, pp. 3139–61; the Senate debates in 15, May 14, 1884, pp. 4147–57, May 19, 1884, pp. 4281–86, May 22, 1884, pp. 4385–98, and May 23, 1884, pp. 4427–30; and the subsequent course of the bill in 15, June 4, 1884, p. 4811, June 9, pp. 4898, 4934, June 24, pp. 5516, 5534, June 25, pp. 5579, 5605, and June 28, p. 5755.

²⁷ *National Labor Tribune*, Jan. 5 and Jan. 12, 1884.

²⁸ *John Swinton's Paper*, Apr. 20 and Apr. 27, 1884.

²⁹ *John Swinton's Paper*, June 8, 1884; *National Labor Tribune*, May 31, 1884.

³⁰ *John Swinton's Paper*, June 1, 1884.

³¹ Lombardi, *Labor's Voice*, p. 31.

³² *John Swinton's Paper*, July 13, 1884.

³³ *Washington Post*, May 28, 1884.