

Q.—Also a benefit from the Amalgamated Society? A.—Only for those who are members of the Amalgamated Society.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Then the only remedy is to pay you weekly or fortnightly instead of monthly? A.—That would be a great advantage.

Q.—The other matter is regulated by supply and demand? A.—Yes, our rates of wages.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Would you consider it advisable to reduce the hours of labor, at the same time of course lessening the pay? A.—I would go in for short hours all the time. I believe shortening the hours of labor increases the pay.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Would you go for shorter hours and less pay? A.—Yes.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—You would be prepared to do that from the start? A.—Yes, for a time it would be a loss to the men, but extra men would be required and there would be more work to do for each. Instead of nine men being required in a certain shop ten would be needed, and employment would thus be given to an additional man. The law of demand would bring up the wages and the men would get more money.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Some witnesses have said that mechanics can do as much in nine hours as in ten; what is your opinion? A.—I don't think so.

Q.—You do not believe that a man can do as much in nine hours as in ten? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you not perform as much work in nine hours with the aid of machinery as you formerly did in ten? A.—A great deal more.

Q.—Should not the men have benefited from the machinery as well as the employers? A.—They should. Machinery has however been more serviceable to the employers than to the men.

Q.—Suppose a man was receiving twenty-five per cent more wages with machinery than he was when there was no machinery would it cost more to produce an article? A.—It would not.

Q.—So if your hours were shortened and the wages increased it would not make any difference in the cost of production? A.—Not if the men got as much for their contracts.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Do you know anything about the Factory Act in force in Ontario? A.—I have read it.

Q.—Do you think is it a good Act? A.—I do not think it goes far enough.

Q.—Please state why? A.—It is about eighteen months since I read it and I cannot enter into details. I have seen the Factory Act of the Old Country, and there were provisions which I thought might have been introduced into the Act here, such as those respecting the employment of women and children. I am not certain, but I think it is not as stringent here as at home.

Q.—Does the Factory Act of the Old Country say anything as to how long a child shall attend school until he has attained a certain age? A.—I do not know anything about the New Factory Act. The one in existence when I lived there provided that no child should go to work under thirteen years—that was to work full hours. There were children employed, half-timers, in factories. Those half-timers worked five hours and the employer was compelled to send them to school for education the other half of the day. Boys under eighteen were not allowed to work any longer than the legalized hours.