

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—At the present rate per hour? A.—That would hardly be analogous—at twenty cents per hour for five hours, it would not pay; but the wages would go up correspondingly.

Q.—How do you compare your statement when you refer to the higher purchasing power of wages in England when you advocate shorter hours and increased pay. A.—We had shorter hours in the old country, in Manchester, than we have here or will have for some years to come; we worked forty-seven and a half hours several months in the winter and in the summer I think fifty-two hours. That was the Manchester rule. We had the rule pasted up in the shop. I had a book of rules when I belonged to the general union; I gave it to Thos. Moore and have never got it returned. If I had, I could have produced the evidence from the book. I think we worked fifty-two hours in summer and forty-seven and a half during the months in winter; the wages were eight and a half pence per hour and the purchasing power of money is greater in England. How that is I cannot explain, but I know it is a fact.

Q.—Suppose you had a contract for building a mechanic's house could you build that house as cheaply if you worked five hours a day and received forty cents an hour as you could if you worked ten hours a day and received thirty cents per hour. Would it not be better for the owner and yourself and the community at large to work eight hours and get twenty-five cents an hour or would it on the other hand be better for you to work ten hours and receive twenty-five cents an hour? A.—No, I cannot answer that question, but I would not want to go down to five hours. I think that is begging the question. I think eight hours was my remark, but to go to five hours would be going to an extreme point.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—You were in England when the nine-hour movement was established? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did wages fall or rise? A.—They came up.

Q.—You were here when the nine hours was established? A.—Yes.

Q.—Then the tendency of shorter hours is to increase the wages? A.—When I came here in 1879 I worked for John Hamblin, at one dollar and thirty cents a day for ten hours work. I was just fresh out from England; I was a younger man by seven or eight years than I am now, and I suppose I was a better man then than I am now.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—Would the shortening of hours give young men more spare time to run out to saloons and spend money than when you were employed? A.—Some had a habit of going to saloons, but I did not go there. I may be what you may call a peculiar person, in other words a crank. But I desire to respect and honor the Sabbath and consequently I want Saturday afternoon to prepare the wood and do the chores round the house to be ready for Sabbath. All men do not do that, but I may be allowed that privilege. That is why I want Saturday afternoon; it is that this work may not encroach on the Sabbath.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—You have stated that a man can run a machine capable of doing the work of sixty men? A.—I suppose so. I take it for granted that a mortising machine run by steam power would do the work of fifty or a hundred men; and therefore of necessity it must dispense with the labor of that number of men.

Q.—I was under the impression that machinery increased the labor demand? A.—It may in some kinds of business; but it has a tendency in my view of the subject to decrease labor. That is from what I have seen.

Q.—You do not think more men are required from hands being required to run the engine, attend to the boiler and machinery? A.—I have looked at all those points