

standpoint of her health, but to the girl who had to make her own way in the world, to pay her own expenses, and who wished to live on a certain scale, then it was insufficient and did not attract, and those people did not come into the service except perhaps in very limited quantities.

Q. Then the woman who is depending for her livelihood on what she could earn in the employment of the Bell Telephone Company could not make a sufficient amount to really properly pay her living expenses in the city of Toronto?

A. Not of the class that we wanted. Of course you understand you can get down down, but I say of the class we wanted and of the age that we wanted, the low salary was insufficient and the short hours did not appeal because it did not enable her to live.

Q. Did you have in your employment any number of girls depending entirely on what they are getting from the Bell Telephone Company?

A. Undoubtedly.

Q. Would that be a large number?

A. It would be a very large percentage; not the largest percentage, but a very substantial percentage which is dependent.

Q. Would that be 50 per cent?

A. I wouldn't like to say; if I were to make an estimate I would be more inclined to put it perhaps at 30 to 40 per cent.

Q. That 30 to 40 per cent were not receiving a sufficient amount?

A. Unless they were members of the old staff, in which case they would be getting the old salaries because they were never reduced, or unless they were filling a superior position I was speaking of before, but as I said before that class turned away and would not enter the service, and yet that is the very class we want in the service because experience shows that they make the best operators.

Q. Any self-respecting woman wanting employment would naturally turn away from employment that would not give her a livelihood?

A. Most decidedly, unless we could promise her sufficient overtime to enable her to make it in that way, and when she was told we could not do that, and wouldn't do it, then of course there was no alternative but to go away.

Mr. Maw, referring to the inability to obtain suitable applicants gave the following evidence:—

Q. Was it in consequence of the smallness of the salary offered?

A. Almost without a doubt.

Q. That was the real reason after all for the change in the number of hours and in salaries, because you could not get the applicants?

A. That was one of the reasons.

Q. The main reason.

A. The principal reason, but the service given was entirely unsatisfactory to the public.

Q. When you found you were going to have to pay more wages to get applicants, was it at that time you considered an increase in hours? Was that the motive that prompted you increasing the hours?

A. That coupled with the working of the operators and the service.

Q. What do you mean by the working of the operators?

A. The service given, general statements of people who say: "I ask for Central, and I got that promptly," or "I may get my number and I just hear a buzz; if I get them, well and good; if I don't I may stand and shake, and so forth."

**Nature and Extent of Wages Change under New Schedule.**

Notwithstanding the low rates of wages paid to operators prior to the change, the operators without exception stated it was the question of hours, and not of wages which occasioned hostility to the new schedule, and was responsible for the strike. Both the management and the operators admitted that under the old scale it would

have been impossible for a self-supporting woman to maintain herself, the cost of living being what it was in Toronto. In view of this, the *bona fides* of the operators in making a protest against any change which meant increased remuneration can hardly be questioned. What the change really amounted to a brief explanation will show.

The rate of wages for local operators under the 5-hour schedule and the 8-hour schedule were respectively as follows:—

Local Operators.	5-hour Schedule.	8-hour Schedule.
	Per month.	Per month.
1 to 6 months.....	\$18 00	\$20 00
6 to 12 ".....	20 00	22 50
12 to 18 ".....	20 00	25 00
18 to 24 ".....	22 50	25 00
24 to 30 ".....	22 50	27 50
30 to 36 ".....	25 00	27 50
Thereafter.....	25 00	30 00

Long distance \$2.50 per month additional.

Under the five-hour schedule there were no reliefs, but there was a system of overtime which made it possible for operators to supplement their regular earnings by working additional hours. At the rate of 26 working days in the month, and working 52 hours overtime, each month, an operator might supplement her regular wages to the extent of \$7.20 during the first 6 months of her employment, to the extent of \$8, between the 6th to the 8th month, to the extent of \$9 between the 18th to the 30th month, and to the extent of \$10 thereafter. Under the eight-hour schedule it was proposed that overtime should be done away with completely. In its stead was to be substituted an increased number of hours of regular work per day, with an increase in the monthly wage. The number of hours increase in regular work under the new schedule as understood by the operators at the outset amounted to 78 per month, though under the schedule as modified before the commission the actual increase in working hours per month came to 52 in the case of those working the regular hours; where operators were working on reliefs, as was the practice with beginners for the 6 months, the increase would be less, being an increase of 6 hours only. In the cases, though, where operators worked as reliefs, their day was more broken, the working time being at less regular periods, and the intervals between, more frequent or longer.

The amount of increase in wages, as will be seen by a comparison of the two schedules was:

	5-Hour Schedule.	8-Hour Schedule.	Increase per month.
		\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1 to 6 months.....	\$18.00 per month.....	20 00	2 00
6 " 12 ".....	20.00 ".....	22 50	2 50
12 " 18 ".....	20.00 ".....	25 00	5 00
18 " 24 ".....	22.50 ".....	25 00	2 50
24 " 30 ".....	22.50 ".....	27 50	5 00
30 " 36 ".....	25.00 ".....	27 50	2 50
36 and thereafter.....	25.00 ".....	30 00	5 00