

whereas in July, under the short hours system, they earned \$2.88 per day. In other words, they did considerably more work in short hours than they used to do in long hours.

The following states in the United States have enacted legislation for the restriction of hours in some form: Arizona, Arkansas, Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Porto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Nevada, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, Michigan, New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming.

Something has been done in this country in respect of shorter hours of labour. This government has established, not only in principle but in practice, a shorter work day in the National Printing Bureau. By an order in council of April 8, 1896, an eight-hour day was established, to take effect on May 1 of the same year.

Now, we might deal to some extent with the question of how this principle came into operation in a country which is often set as an example. The country I have reference to is Australia. Let us see how it was introduced in Victoria. During the gold fever of 1856 a large number of people immigrated to Australia, and from their experience in the mother country they were bound to have legislation passed in that respect, which they did, but not without a large amount of opposition; and the reasons then given were in exactly the same form as they are to-day, although no solid reasons were advanced to prevent it. I will acknowledge that for four years speeches were made and conferences given to if possible educate the masses, not the workers, as they were already in possession of the knowledge of the necessity of such a law. But the other classes of the community, who were looking at such a law as a socialistic measure, and even the promoters, were uneasy as to the result. But after it came in force, in 1885, in Melbourne, its inauguration was celebrated by a large parade, after which a large banquet was given at which Sir Henry Locke, then governor, was invited to speak. He recalled the great act in favour of humanity, saying that the eight-hour day had done more good and had such a good moral effect on the citizens that in the near future Australia would be set as an example in its labour conditions.

We know that the same government legislated in the same direction in 1890, 1896,

1897 and 1898, extending the law over more industries.

Let us look at the result of the reduction in some of Victoria's trades. The iron trades employed in the Australian Steam Ship Company's works, got a restriction of eight hours per day in 1858, on condition of accepting a proportional reduction of wages; but after a year's trial the company found that between the better work they obtained during working hours and the saving of gas, oil or other items of expense, they could afford to pay the men the old rate per hour, and did so. It seems an obvious conclusion that when so many establishments have found the way to make short hours pay in the face of the overwhelming competition of their long-hours neighbours, there can be no essential reason why the rest should not make short hours pay likewise.

Short hours are sometimes pronounced to be a fruit of high wages; the working man, it is said has merely got rich enough now to prefer an hour's ease to an hour's pay. The successful workman of modern times has shortened his day of labour for the same reason, exactly as the successful merchant devotes less time to business after he has made his competency, because it is human nature to become less willing to work hard when there is less necessity for doing so. But it is also true that in some large industries in some of the large cities, in our country, they are now endeavouring to shorten the hours of labour and are willing to lose the difference in wages, as it has become necessary for those working people to have more rest, as they rightly claim, for to better their physical and moral condition.

Artisans, mill hands and others seem generally to prefer greater ease to greater wealth, thus proving that the painfulness of labour varies so rapidly as easily to over balance the gains of utility.

The same rule seems to hold throughout the mercantile employments. The richer a man becomes the less does he devote himself to business, as it is proved every day by numerous examples. A successful merchant is generally willing to give a considerable share of his profits to a partner or to a staff of managers and clerks rather than bear the constant labour of superintendance himself. There is also a general tendency to reduce the hours of labour in mercantile offices due to increased comfort and opulence.

This may be called theory, and it may be said it is not in accordance with the historical facts, but nevertheless it is proved by the history of ancient and modern times that work-people will prefer more ease to more wealth. But in accordance with the standard of requirements constantly rising, it has been necessary for them to look for