

facturer were responsible for those girls' wages he would be apt to look more strictly after the parties he let it out to.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—The conduct of one or two rascals like those we have had examples of throws disgrace upon a lot of men who are trying to do right.

Mr. LOVE.—Yes. And a security would have the tendency of keeping that class of men out. As far as my experience goes, the general body of contractors in Toronto are a respectable class of men.

The COMMISSIONER.—I have been given to understand that the carpenters have something to say to night.

Mr. JOHN KANE.—(Who was introduced as representing the carpenters' union.) So far as the carpentering trade is concerned there is a tendency on the part of contractors in the city of Toronto to adopt the sweating system. The carpenter employed by a sub-contractor has no possibility to make a living wage. A party last summer wanted some sheeting done. He paid by the piece. The man who worked on it the first day made 36 cents; he quit the job; the next man made 24 cents for the day and he threw it up. The work was finished on piece work by different men trying to earn a day's wages on it. There is a great deal of piece work in the trade. A contractor building a house gives the carpentering to a sub-contractor, who has it done by piecework. Men have been known to make only \$4 to \$5 per week—work hard as they will—under such circumstances when they should have earned \$5 a day. The thing is growing and cannot be put a stop to too quick. I am glad a commission has been appointed on the matter. It is an evil that should be put a stop to. We are not able to do it ourselves. We cannot cope with the manufacturers in this line.

The COMMISSIONER.—Public opinion seems to almost force the Government to get their own work done by contract.

Mr. KANE.—Even the carpentering in our Parliament Buildings was done by contract, and even the planing of the floors was done in that way. The men had to work like slaves to make a living. You will always find it that way until a radical change is made.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Would it not be possible to prevent articles intended for wear being made in private houses?

The COMMISSIONER.—I have not lost sight of that phase by any means. There is a law now before the courts of the United States by which it is proposed to provide that the wholesaler must have a license for each man he gives out clothing to. But I don't think that it will ever become a law, although it has received the endorsement of a good many labour bodies, and that of the Convention of Factory Inspectors recently held.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—The intention of the license was as a safeguard in regard to sanitary conditions. By being obliged to license each person who took out work for him the wholesaler would have to get their address and inquire into the condition of their establishments. If one or two of those places were not well kept it would militate against him, and his trade would fall off because of the reports of the Government inspectors. It would attain to a great improvement in sanitary matters.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—A woman might take work to her private house—and it might be a clean one—but that is what is killing our trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—We have not got power to interfere with the rights of private individuals.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE (to Gurofsky).—Have you considered in this connection the result to honest widows who have children and who could not leave those children to go and work in places away from their homes, and who by force of circumstances are compelled to earn their own living? Your system would not be right for her.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I should think the law should be framed for the greatest good of the greatest number.

The COMMISSIONER.—Would it be a great good to deprive an honest woman of a day's work?

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—I sincerely hope that there will never be a law passed that will have such an effect. But I hope that there will be a law to prevent her employing other people to work for her in her house.