

Q. The reference in our resolution before this committee is to the effect that the principle of the minimum wage as it applied to female labour should be extended to male labour. You have male labour in connection with your factory too?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you think it would be a reasonable thing to set a minimum for the male as well as the female? That is what we are getting at in this committee.—A. Well, I hardly agree with that, because as I say, being head of a department, and having no trouble at all, I see no necessity for it. It appears to me personally that it is not giving the good man a chance. For instance, if I were bound to give everybody on a certain job, tending nappers, for instance, a certain amount, I would have to discharge some of them. You see, I have two machine jobs, and I have three machine jobs which pay more, and if a man eventually does not become competent, when tried on the three machines, if he cannot run that work, I would say "You cannot do that; you will have to take that much less money and run two machines."

Q. Did you ever discharge any girls for not being competent?—A. No, I have not.

Q. What I am getting at is simply this, that apparently the minimum wage for girls is working out satisfactorily; how could there be any more trouble with a minimum wage for the male employees?—A. I do not say that there would be any more trouble; I do not see why there should. It would depend, from the manufacturing end of it, what the minimum wage was.

Q. We had some evidence with regard to that the other day, from the standpoint of the social workers. What do you think a man ought to receive in your town in order to keep a family in decency? Have you any idea of the wages?

The CHAIRMAN: How many in the family?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We were going the other day with a small family, three children.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, a family of five, including the father and mother.

Mr. WHITE (Mount Royal): Young children; not children old enough to become self-supporting.

The WITNESS: I have young married men of that description working for me, and I have no trouble with them at all. They seem to be living; some of them own motor boats, and they go down the river fishing on week ends and holidays, and all I have to pay them is \$15 a week.

By the Chairman:

Q. \$60 a month?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. You pay them \$15 a week and you pay all unmarried girls \$10?—A. Yes.

Q. Would you say that the expenses of a man and his wife and three children would not be greater than one-half as much as a girl's?—A. Of course, but I am speaking about dissatisfaction, and what is apparently necessary. I understood that is the way I was to answer that.

Q. How could a man and his wife and three children live on \$15 a week if it takes \$10 to keep a girl?

The CHAIRMAN: I don't see how a family of five could begin to exist on \$60 a month.

Mr. BELL (St. John): It does not necessarily mean that because a girl gets \$10 a week that she can save very much money.