

The COMMISSIONER.—When the Factory Act was introduced into the Dominion House, I urged on the Finance Minister those views. He was doubtful where the jurisdiction lay, but I urged that we get a good Factory Act anyway. Is the present Factory Act sufficiently broad in its provisions to ensure effective inspection of shops in which clothing is made? I think from the answers to other questions that we are all agreed that it is not broad enough and that we have not enough inspectors to make it efficient.

Mr. LOVE.—I can agree with that.

The COMMISSIONER.—I think it would be better if we had more inspectors. Do workmen employed in the ordered clothing trade frequently take goods home to be there made up with the assistance of their families?

Mr. SANGSTER.—It is largely done in the custom work at the present time for this reason: there are very few employers who provide back shops or other accommodation for those employed. Where no accommodation is provided, then of course the work is taken to the homes. That is detrimental I believe not only to those but to every one in the clothing trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—In conversation with me recently, a merchant tailor took the ground that while that was true, he did not believe that tailors took advantage of their children or worked longer hours than in a shop.

Mr. STRACHAN.—If a man goes into a shop and takes work home he is told that it must be done at a certain time. He sits at home and works away until he has it finished. If the men would confine their work to ten hours a day and allow nothing to interfere with that arrangement, the surplus labour would come off the market to a great extent. But under the present system the goods are spread all over the city and those who get the chance are glad to work night and day. This reduces the season, for the season does not now last more than three weeks in the summer and the same in the winter. The rest of the time the men are largely idle, reduced to a job a week. The only fault I have with the union is that it does not restrict the hours of labour of its members so as to be an example to all labourers.

The COMMISSIONER.—When the employees take work out do they work later than they would in the shops?

Mr. STRACHAN.—The unions cannot restrict the hours where people work in their own houses.

Mr. SANGSTER.—There was a tailor last July who employed 12 or 14 hands in a back shop. For the privilege of working in that shop the hands paid him fifty to seventy-five cents per week. After a while a certain number of them did not feel inclined to go into the shop because it was not fit to go into it and they would not go into it. Then the tailor because he could not draw the full revenue for rent for the shop closed it and the people took the work to their homes.

The COMMISSIONER.—Are there any persons in the city who have no shops and yet work for manufacturers and distribute to sub contractors?

Mr. LOVE.—I don't think so.

Mr. GUREFSKY.—There is one thing that you have not brought out. It is about the man going in and getting work from the wholesaler—at any price—opening a shop, hiring girls, getting them to work for two weeks, receive his money from the wholesaler, and then skipping out and leaving the girls in the lurch. Our suggestion was that the wholesaler should be responsible that the people who made the work were paid. He (the wholesaler) would then see that he dealt with good contractors.

The COMMISSIONER.—I must say that I don't see the way in which the remedy is to be applied. What in your opinion would be practicable?

Mr. TRIMBLE.—It could be worked if you compelled the wholesalers to make contractors put up security.

Mr. LOVE.—That would be the way.

The COMMISSIONER.—That would be no great hardship to responsible men.

Mr. LOVE.—No. It is a hard thing that girls should be robbed in that way. The wholesale men don't care who gets the work so that it is done cheap. If the manu-