

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for scanning. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of scanning are checked below.

L'Institut a numérisé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de numérisation sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers /
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged /
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated /
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing /
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps /
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations /
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material /
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Only edition available /
Seule édition disponible
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut
causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la
marge intérieure.

- Additional comments /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated /
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached / Pages détachées
- Showthrough / Transparence
- Quality of print varies /
Qualité inégale de l'impression

- Includes supplementary materials /
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire

- Blank leaves added during restorations may
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these
have been omitted from scanning / Il se peut que
certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une
restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,
lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas
été numérisées.

There are some creases in the middle of the pages.

REPORT
OF THE
ROYAL COMMISSION
ON THE
RELATIONS OF CAPITAL AND LABOR
IN CANADA.

EVIDENCE—QUEBEC.

PART I.



OTTAWA :
PRINTED FOR THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY.

1889.

EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE THE

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON THE SUBJECT OF

LABOR IN ITS RELATION TO CAPITAL IN CANADA.

(Translation.)

MONTREAL, 4th February, 1888.

LOUIS LABERGE, Medical Health Officer of the City of Montreal.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You are a health officer, Mr. Laberge? A.—I am Medical Health Officer of the city of Montreal.

Q.—You have, I believe, within the scope of your duties the superintendence, from a sanitary point of view, of all the buildings, factories and even private houses of the city of Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—Generally speaking, in what condition are the dwellings of working people? A.—The dwellings of working people are generally lacking in space. This is the worst feature about them.

Q.—Is there any municipal by-law regulating the number of people that should dwell in each house? A.—We have no specification on cubic measurements.

Q.—Do you know whether there are any such enactments in other countries? A.—I believe there are some in Europe. Some highly advanced cities have these regulations.

Q.—Outside of these drawbacks, what is the condition of the dwelling houses of working people in regard to drains and the outflow of water used for household purposes? A.—So far, we have no by-law relative to plumbing, and, according to the report of my inspectors, a great number of these houses are badly off on the score of plumbing and drainage. There exists such a theory as a house to house inspection but there is no by-law that lays down the quality of drainage or the manner in which it ought to be disposed of. This is precisely what we are making ready for just now.

Q.—When a city inspector comes across a house that is not fit to live in, what measures do you take? A.—If I understand the municipal law aright, we have the right of posting a dwelling and declaring it unfit to live in, but it is a very slow and lengthy proceeding.

Q.—Is this house posting or placarding confined to diseases which may exist in the dwelling, or does it extend to the houses that are really unwholesome from bad drainage or other sanitary causes? A.—No matter what condition, so soon as the building is unfit to live in.

Q.—Although this is not in your line, could you tell us, in that case, what is the workingman's position, and what he can do to have his house set in order? A.—For repairs, our by-laws are adequate. When there is anything wrong in the drains, for instance, notice is given the landlord to make repairs, within eight days, in pursuance of the law, but as to leaving the house, the workingman, like every other citizen, must avail himself of the usual procedure. There is, for instance, this trouble that we have to deal with. When there is a question of separating a private sewer from the public sewer, architects differ in opinion. Up to date, the law has not determined whether they should be separated or not, and it is on this ground that we must reach some definite rule in order to lay down a general law.

Q.—But in the event of your inspector finding a flaw, which comes under the city by-law, is there a penalty against the landlord to force him to put the house in order? A.—Of course.

Q.—What is your view on the most of workmen's dwellings? Are they generally in fitting sanitary condition? A.—If you speak generally, I fancy we can set down the majority of these houses as being in a proper state.

Q.—There is great mortality among children in Montreal, is there not? A.—There is a mortality of sixteen in the thousand, at least for last year, among children under five years.

Q.—And what is the total mortality? A.—The total mortality is seven and twenty in the thousand.

Q.—One of the commissioners is desirous of knowing whether the percentage of deaths among children, as you declare, comprises deaths in the hospitals? A.—Yes; it comprises the deaths of foundlings and those that die in hospital.

Q.—Are you not of opinion that this high death-rate is partly due to the bad hygienic condition of the houses? A.—It is very hard to answer that question—perhaps the hardest of all points to unravel. Experts are making researches into the causes of this mortality, but there is no doubt that the defective state of the dwellings should be reckoned for a percentage. I hold that the poverty of the working classes and their large number of children are perhaps the two leading causes of this death-rate.

Q.—Have you noticed whether the mortality is greater among those who get small wages than among those who are better in respect of fortune? A.—I could not answer that question without consulting special figures on the point.

Q.—Could you supply us with mortuary statistics by wards? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—I believe these are found in the official reports of the city, are they not? A.—Yes; I could give you the statistics by wards.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Are there many water closets in the city? A.—By a relevé made by my inspector last year, we found that there were ten thousand.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—What was the object of the corporation in taking the taxes off the water-closets? A.—The object was to get rid of the privies.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How far, as a rule, from the houses, are these water closets? A.—The law is very defective on this point. The law provides that they should be three feet from the neighbor's house, but it does not provide how far this should be from the owner's house itself, and it happens sometimes that we have a privy close to the tenant's house. That is one of the first defects of the law which we are now correcting.

Q.—Do you not believe that the mortality among children is in great part due to that fact? A.—We have a great deal of mortality from diarrhoea, and it seems, by the report of the physicians, who have studied the question, that mortality from

diarrhoea is principally due to animal matter, but I think it could be one of the principal causes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have you any idea of the number of rooms occupied by each family in the poor wards of the city? A.—There is general accumulation in the apartments of the poorer classes, and not a doubt of it; but I could not say exactly what is the number of apartments so occupied. There is certainly much crowding.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you know of any case in which a whole family occupied one room? A.—Last week I was called to visit a house, where some women were dying; it was a mere shanty wood house, made out of an office to a wood yard, and there were four persons living in it, but it was considered as an exception. I took the trouble of sending them to the hospital, and giving orders to have the inmates removed, because it was not a habitable house. But, as a general rule, occupying only one room is a rare exception.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—I believe that, by the corporation by-law, water is cut off when the rates are not paid? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is this carried out on a large scale? A.—It is carried out on a pretty large scale, but this extreme measure is evaded by authority given the medical officer to remit the water in cases of poverty. I think we have remitted the water in twelve or fifteen hundred cases.

Q.—What might be the sanitary result of this suppression of water? A.—Very disastrous. Water, like food, is quite necessary, and as a hygienic ingredient, as for washing purposes, it is absolutely necessary. Besides, wherever there are privies, water is the sole security to prevent the emanations from the sewers into the houses.

Q.—Is it not a fact that dwellers in a house from which the water has been cut off are in danger of their health through the exhalations? A.—Yes; chiefly where there is a privy, and, till now, we have always taken care to have the water at once returned to those places where there are privies.

Q.—What is the average sanitary condition of the shops and factories of Montreal? A.—We have, these two past months, a couple of inspectors for the inspection of workshops. Before that there was only one, and the inspection of shops was carried on more or less regularly. Answering squarely your question on the condition of workshops, it may be stated that, after the inspection we have made of them, the majority are in a satisfactory state. A few are behind hand, but, as a rule, this is not due to the drainage system, but rather to the management of the privies.

Q.—In general again, what is the hygienic situation of the public schools? A.—We found several schools in a very backward state. But most of them are in good form. At the present time we have one school sadly lacking in its privies. These are immense privies set near the street and near the houses; we find it difficult to get the needed repairs. The community to which it is attached is a very powerful one, and up till now we are at a loss what to do.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—‘Is it a public school or a private school?’ A.—It is a public school.

Q.—Controlled by a public board? A.—No; by a religious body.

Q.—Has the corporation the power to supervise all education? A.—It has got the power; but when we have to sue a community representing a very large body, it is very hard to make it move, and it takes time.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Is it not true that a portion of our population does not much care about contagious diseases? Is not this one of the reasons why our infant mortality is such as we see it? A.—Unfortunately, hygienic training is altogether wanting among our working classes; there is a kind of contempt, due to ignorance of the laws, more than any thing else, and nothing is observed from the aspect of the law. This is naturally one of the chief causes of our mortality. The great remedy would certainly be education.

By Mr. HELBBONNER:—

Q.—As a physician, could you give us your opinion on the age at which children may be admitted to work in the factories? A.—If you ask my personal opinion. I do not think we should allow children to work in the factories before fourteen, in the case of boys, and fifteen, in the case of girls.

Q.—Do you think that the health of a boy of twelve years, or of a girl of fourteen, would be put in danger by working for six weeks of the year, during seventy-two hours a week—that is, over twelve hours a day? A.—Six consecutive weeks?

Q.—Weeks that may be consecutive? A.—There would be a wide difference between consecutive and non-consecutive weeks. But there is no question that, even taking twelve hours' work, for one or two days only, it would be dangerous to the health of the children.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What should be the hours of work for children under fifteen years of age for boys and for girls? A.—Really, the question is very interesting and I should like to have time for reflection before making a reply.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Do you think that children ought to be let work in factories under fourteen years of age? A.—No; not so far as my personal feeling goes. But, you will observe, that I do not mean to stand for an expert in these matters.

Q.—Do you believe that children under fourteen ought to be allowed to work in factories? A.—No; I do not.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—I would like to know your opinion about the work of young girls in retail stores, and if you think their health is endangered by working up to nine and ten o'clock in the evening, as it is done here? A.—I would prefer that you were willing to put those questions in writing to see what the authors say on the subject.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Do you not judge that the wages of children under fourteen are an important consideration in certain families? A.—Several of these queries are out of my line. You are interrogating me on a point of domestic economy. I said that the working class suffered generally from lack of means, and there is no doubt that, in the families of working people, where the average of children is eight, nine or even ten, there is need of the handiwork of children under fourteen years of age.

S. C. STEVENSON, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What position do you occupy? A.—I am secretary of the Arts and Manufacture Association and director of the technical schools under their control.

Q.—Are you able to speak of the common schools, the public schools of Montreal? A.—I am not in a position to speak very much in regard to that.

Q.—I understand you desire to speak more particularly in regard to technical education? A.—Of course, I have a fair knowledge of the work done in the common schools.

Q.—What is the school age in the Province of Quebec under the law? A.—I do not think there is any special age defined, up to which children must remain at school.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—At what time are they received? A.—There are so many different educational institutions in the province and under so many different controls that children are received sometimes at a very early age. Children are received as young as seven years by some of the communities and other establishments.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—At what age are children received in public schools? A.—The age will be about seven years.

Q.—Are you able to state what proportion of children between seven and fourteen years are regularly in attendance upon schools? A.—I am not able to state that.

Q.—Do you know where those statistics are kept in the province of Quebec? A.—I do not think there is any place where such statistics can be obtained.

Q.—You have given a good deal of attention, I believe, to technical education? A.—I have given considerable attention to it.

Q.—Would you rather give us your views in narrative form in your own way, or would you prefer to have questions asked? A.—To-day I shall be happy to answer any questions you put to me, but I would prefer to come before the Commission again, with my views prepared in writing, and lay them before the Commission. I would then be in a better position to give evidence than I am to-day, for I did not expect to be called at so early a session of the Commission.

Q.—What is the nature of the technical education given in the schools under your superintendence? A.—The classes we have are intended chiefly for apprentices and workmen who have left the common schools and gone to work. The education which they received in the schools which they attended is supplemented by the instructions we give them in evening classes, and which relates chiefly to the occupations in which they are engaged, the basis of all of it being drawing. Within the last two or three years we have endeavored to have the instruction applied. We have made a commencement at that. We have for instance classes in carpentering and stair building in Montreal. Workmen who have not had an opportunity of learning stair building come to our classes and they first receive instruction in drawing; then they make drawings, then they construct, in the school, stairs from the drawings they themselves have made. We also have a class for plumbers which was recently opened, and we also have a class for pattern making for boot and shoe manufacture which we have recently opened. We find that a very large number of people have presented themselves to these classes—in fact in every instance more than we were able to accommodate.

Q.—Are those pupils boys or men? A.—They are both, boys and men. The boys and men come to those classes chiefly, I believe, for the reason that they get instruction that they do not get in ordinary day schools. Day schools at present make no profession of instructing in the practical work which men have to perform, and in the workshops the employer does not take the trouble to instruct them. He considers it is his interest to get the most work out of a boy. In cases where boys are employed with journeymen, the journeymen as a rule take very little interest in instructing them. The journeyman considers his function is that of a workman and

not that of an instructor, and consequently those apprentices and workmen come to our classes to gain the knowledge that they cannot obtain either in the day school or the workshop. Statistics in regard to similar schools established in Europe show that very often a boy will acquire as much in three months in such a school in regard to a practical knowledge of a trade as he will obtain during three years in a workshop, where there is no regular system of training, but where he has to pick up what knowledge he can get.

Q.—How long have these schools of yours been in existence? A.—About fourteen years here.

Q.—Are you able to give any idea of the results you have occasionally achieved? A.—We have no statistics of the results. The pupils when they get through with us go to different parts and we are not able to always keep track of them. We try to do so, but many instances come to us where pupils have improved their positions in life, very much indeed, from the knowledge they have obtained from us.

Q.—They are able to take superior positions than would otherwise have been the case? A.—Yes, and receive higher wages.

Q.—What is the length of time during which the pupils attend your classes? A.—On an average I think they attend for about three years, the majority of them attend about that length of time.

Q.—How many hours a day do pupils who attend the classes work at their trade? A.—Most of them about ten hours.

Q.—Are they not so fatigued at the end of the ten hours work that they are unable to give that attention to their studies that you would like them to give? A.—I have not remarked that. I think most of them regard the instruction as a sort of agreeable change from the manual labor in which they have been engaged and do not find it irksome.

Q.—In imparting this instruction do the teachers find that new ideas are put into the minds of the pupils as to the nature of the work, and the requirements of the work? A.—Undoubtedly they do. Very often a pupil picks up an idea in those classes of the work in which he is engaged, that sets him thinking and leads to important results.

Q.—Do you require of pupils entering your classes any previous mathematical knowledge? A.—None whatever.

Q.—Do you impart any? A.—We do in some of our schools: we give instruction in geometry.

Q.—Do you give instruction in textiles? A.—None whatever.

Q.—Do you intend to extend your classes at all? A.—We are prepared to do so as soon as the want makes itself felt for additional classes and when we can be sure we can get efficient instructors, who are very rare indeed in this country in these subjects.

Q.—By whom are those classes maintained? A.—They are maintained by the Government of the Province of Quebec.

Q.—Does the municipality give any assistance? A.—We have no assistance from the municipality of Montreal. In some of the municipalities throughout the province assistance is given; premises are provided and assistance is given for the maintenance of the classes.

Q.—What fees do you receive from the pupils themselves? A.—In nearly every instance the classes are entirely free. In some instances, though, we have made a charge which is entirely nominal, a charge of perhaps \$1.00 for a course of lessons during the year. The desire of the Government is to make the instruction free, but we find in many instances, in fact it is my own opinion, that it is better to make a charge, because as a rule people appreciate more what they pay for than that which is given to them for nothing.

Q.—Is instruction given in French or English? A.—In French and English—both languages.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Then you have French classes and English classes? A.—Our teachers in nearly every case are able to speak both French and English. When such is not the case we have two classes, one in French and the other in English.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you impart any knowledge of algebra or mensuration? A.—Not at all. We do not take up those questions.

Q.—Do you not consider them essential to the education of a mechanic? A.—I can scarcely say that I do consider algebra essential to the education of a mechanic. I think a mechanic who has a good knowledge of the four elementary rules of arithmetic can make his way fairly well.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What is the duration of your evening classes? A.—Two hours, and sometimes two and a-half hours.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you think if the working hours were shortened these classes would be better attended? A.—I do not think it has any effect whatever on the attendance. As you have brought up that question, I may say, that I think in large establishments it might be very desirable indeed, where young operatives are employed, to have classes in those establishments for instruction, because very often those children have very little education and very little inclination to obtain education. I think where a large number of children are employed, or a large number of operatives, there ought to be some provision made for a certain portion of their time being employed in schooling in a certain portion of the workshop.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Have you knowledge of that system having been carried on in Canada or elsewhere? A.—I do not know of it ever having been carried on in Canada. I know that in many portions of Europe such a system is carried out. In England and Scotland, boys and girls who work in establishments a portion of the time are called half-timers; that is, a portion of their time is spent in the workshop, and another portion in the school or in the place where the factory is placed. I know also that in France there are a great many establishments that support schools for the education of the people who work in them.

Q.—Do you know whether that system is satisfactory or not in its results? A.—It has given very excellent results indeed. I can bring before the Commission instances where this system is in existence at the present time, and where very excellent results have been obtained from it.

Q.—You propose to bring those facts before the Commission on some future occasion? A.—Yes.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—How many pupils are there in attendance at these classes? A.—About 500.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you know how the employers look upon these schools? A.—It is very hard to answer that question. If I must give my own experience I find that employers of labor take, as a rule, very little interest in the education of those they employ. If it had been otherwise we would have found active steps taken by the employers to do something in this matter of educating the workmen: I have seen very little of that sort. There is a notable exception to that in the case of the

master plumbers here, who recognise the importance and necessity of having schools in which to instruct plumbers, and who have come forward and aided the establishment of such a class, and not only that, but the master plumbers themselves give the instruction.

Q.—In the other classes, are the teachers practical men or merely theoretical instructors? A.—As nearly as possible, we get practical men; we have a number of practical men, the majority of the teachers are men who have a knowledge of the work the pupils do and know the wants of the pupils.

Q.—Are the pupils in the classes taught more a practical part of the work or do they receive instruction in the theoretical part? A.—They are taught practical work.

Q.—They do not receive instruction in sanitary science? A.—They will do so. Lectures are given, or what are hardly to be called lectures, but short talks by the masters to the pupils assembled, on the various subjects. I have here a circular relating to the plumbing class which shows the nature of the work which is being done in that class.

Q.—You make a restriction? A.—If we did not make that restriction, we would have a great many of those who are receiving instruction and acquiring a knowledge of the trade going around and saying they were plumbers and qualified to do different varieties of work. We want to be sure that they are really employed in the business.

Q.—You do not wish to exclude those who are actually apprentices, even if their employers should not be willing to give them a letter to you? A.—No, it is simply a guarantee that they are employed in such shops.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—You were speaking of the apprentice system in this country: there is no apprentice system, is there? A.—The word is used very frequently.

Q.—There is no such thing? A.—The title is about extinct.

Q.—There are no apprentices in this country, as a rule? A.—There are boys.

Q.—Is it not a rule that in factories and large work shops boys are employed, but there is no such thing as an apprentice, but merely boys brought there to look after the machines or to do certain work?

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—There is no system of indenture? A.—I think there is, but it is perhaps not so prevalent as it was sometime ago. Nevertheless, in most trades in Montreal, there are as yet apprentices to those trades.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—Is it your experience of the country that boys are apprenticed to serve their time? A.—I certainly think that where boys at early age are bound as apprentices to a business, and where they are instructed in that business in a workshop and by means of schools, we can certainly look for better workmen.

Q.—But as to their moral standing? A.—I think Mr. Helbronner referred to the quality of the work.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—When you opened your building classes did you not receive numerous applications, more than you were able to accommodate? A.—Yes.

Q.—When you opened your classes for leather cutters, did you not receive more applications than you could accommodate? A.—Yes.

Q.—In your opinion, are the working classes of Montreal desirous of coming more

extensively into technical education? A.—I think the need of technical education is being felt more and more, and particularly so among our working people.

Q.—Have you received from other trades applications to open technical schools? A.—I have spoken on the subject with different people, but we have received no formal application from other people; probably we will do so.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—When pupils have passed through a course in any one of your classes, do you give them certificates or diplomas showing they have served with you? A.—We have not done so yet, but we hope to do so at an early day. The reason we have not done so yet, is because we have had difficulty in getting efficient teachers. There is no institution in the country at present for the training of teachers in those lines; consequently, our teachers are of unequal capacity, and there are some who are not able to conduct a class that others are, and accordingly the instruction is not on an equal footing in regard to the classes and we consider it better not to give certificates unless the certificates are of some real value.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—When a boy comes to you from the public school, do you find him fairly educated?—A. The boys who come to us do not all come from the public schools; in fact we have pupils who do not know how to read and write, not in the Montreal schools, in some of the other schools—we have had them present themselves.

Q.—Speaking of boys from the public schools, what have you to say in regard to them? A.—Those are fairly educated.

By Mr. CLARKE :—

Q.—In how many trades do you give instruction? A.—We instruct in the boot and shoe pattern cutting, plumbing, carpentering and stair building and in lithography.

By Mr. CORÉ :—

Q.—You teach drawing, mechanical and machinery? A.—We work in plaster also, and in decorative painting—which is another trade; also in modeling—you might also say that is a separate trade, too.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—In mechanical engineering? A.—We give instruction in mechanical drawing.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Do you instruct in the use of machinery? A.—No; not at present.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you give instruction in the various branches of the shoe trade? A.—Not in the various branches, simply in pattern cutting.

Q.—Speaking about the apprentice system: do you think a compulsory indenture system would be beneficial to the boy as an employer would be compelled by law to teach him his trade thoroughly? A.—I think we could hardly get that to day. Trades have become so divided up by the use of machinery that an employer cannot undertake to teach a boy thoroughly all the branches of a trade so as to make him a thorough workman. Very often a boy is set to work to attend a machine. He does it well and his employer keeps him at it because it pays him to do so.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is that not because he is not compelled to teach him his trade? A.—It would be impossible I think to get an employer to teach a boy his trade, to undertake to do so. He could scarcely do it very well and he would be obliged to have his workmen to do it. This would mean that every workman would become a teacher and the workmen would resent that.

Q.—If the law said that an employer taking a boy on as an apprentice should teach the apprentice his trade would it not compel the employer to do it? A.—That is a question of law.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you find many cases where a boy after he has served his apprenticeship is discharged and a new boy taken on, for the purpose of getting the work done cheaply? A.—I think that prevails to a very considerable extent.

Q.—They desire cheap labor, and do not retain apprentices who have completed their indentures? A.—They get all they can out of the boys. Some boys get very proficient after they have been two or three years at the trade, and if an apprentice has been there five years he is probably bringing in to his employer as much as a journeyman; but that only applies to very few trades probably.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Is it not the case that most trades, such as the boot and shoe trade, are divided into different departments? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think that an employer should be obliged to teach an apprentice every part of the trade—do you think it is possible? A.—I think it is impossible. I think the technical school must come in.

Q.—If we attempted to do so would we not have to revert to the old system in force two or three hundred years ago? A.—Yes; either that or have schools. Schools can do the work efficiently.

Q.—Without schools, in order to carry out that system, would it not have to be done by the people in their houses? A.—Yes, if you want to return to the old system of apprenticeship that is what we must have. Under present conditions you cannot look for that.

Q.—Under present conditions the thing is impossible? A.—Yes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you not consider the present condition of things a wrong? A.—I consider the present condition of things might be ameliorated to a very great extent if we had a system of manual training in our public schools, by which our boys and girls would be prepared for the work they have to do in after life. Our present system of education in Canada makes no provision for practical work of that nature, and leaves our young people who enter our establishments entirely ignorant of the use of tools. It takes a boy about a year to be acquainted with the tools and the materials in which he is to be employed, whereas there might be instruction in the public schools in regard to those simple matters, and thus afford him a preliminary preparation to a considerable extent for the work in which he is to be employed during his apprenticeship. If such a system were carried out the period of apprenticeship might be considerably shortened.

Q.—Do you think if industrial training were to take place in the public school, some of the branches of education now taught would have to be dropped? A.—Not necessarily so, and if it were the case it would not be a direct loss.

Q.—Would it not have to be done in some cases? A.—It would not necessarily do away with any of the branches taught at present, and if it did I think it would be a good rather than an evil.

Q.—That is with some branches of education? A.—Yes. I think probably in many of our public schools Greek and Latin might be dropped and more practical scientific subjects taught, which would be clearly to the good of the public. Those subjects would be valuable in after life, whereas Greek and Latin would be of no use to boys passing through the public schools.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How many children of the laboring classes are taught Latin and Greek in the public schools? A.—I am talking of our academies and public schools. There are many boys go to trades who have learned Latin and Greek.

Q.—How many children of the working people remain in the schools sufficiently long to study Latin and Greek? A.—That is a question that I could not answer.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Has this system of technical schools not been tried with success in Chicago, New York, Great Britain and France? A.—Technical schools have existed in England and France and other European countries for some years, and have produced very excellent results. The system of technical education is being largely introduced in various cities in the United States, and in the public schools of Philadelphia manual training has been introduced.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q. Are you aware that there is a technical school carried on by the Hebrews, that has been successfully in operation in New York for three years? A.—Yes; and a number of others in New York.

By Mr. CORÉ:—

Q.—Speaking of apprentices, you have said there was no regular system of apprenticeship. Take large establishments in Montreal, where they make doors, windows and blinds, how could a large establishment of that kind instruct a boy in the carpentering business, and in all these special branches. Suppose a proprietor of one of these establishments took a boy, how could he teach him the trade? A.—I think he could not.

Q.—Is that not due to the fact that the work is so divided that a boy would only know how to make a window or a door, but would not have a thorough knowledge of other parts of the carpentering trade? A.—That is quite true.

Q.—Is it not a fact that, under the present system, from that cause, it would be very difficult to adopt the apprenticeship system? A.—The old system of apprenticeship is virtually extinct.

Q.—Take large machine shops, as a rule, can they teach the machinist trade to a young boy entering there? A.—I think they might, by a proper arrangement. I do not think they have ever tried to arrange the work in such a way that a boy might spend so many months on one branch and so many at another, until he became an efficient workman. I think an employer finds out where a boy gives the best results and where he makes the most money for his employer.

Q.—Then if a boy gets into one of the large establishments, they learn the kind of work he can do best and most profitably? A.—Yes; and if he can work well there, they will keep him there.

Q.—If he has talent, energy and ability, will he not push himself through and learn the whole trade? A.—Exactly.

Q.—There is no regular system of apprenticeship in those large establishments?
 A.—I think even in those large establishments they do take lads as apprentices, though there may be no regular system of instructing them thoroughly in the trade.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you think the people of Lower Canada would consent to have their children placed as apprentices for five or six years under a master? A.—I do not think they would object to have their children apprenticed, if they could be satisfied that they would learn the trade thoroughly.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Would the boys not be more likely to learn their trade by being apprenticed than they would by picking it up in the shop? A.—Most certainly. The proper way for a boy to learn his trade is to commence early and have proper instruction.

Q.—Can you tell us the percentage of the children of the working classes who attain to the higher branches of education in the common schools? A.—I could not reply to that question.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Are there not very large establishments in the old country that build vessels and do dockyard work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have they not the very latest improved machinery? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do the boys who are apprenticed there go out as good journeymen? A.—I could not reply to that; I have not had a sufficient knowledge of the men coming from there.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you not think that in regard to the matter of apprentices, supposing I had a son and was going to apprentice him to you and you were the employer; would you be satisfied to take him as an apprentice and teach him all the different branches? A.—I would, probably, if I was paid for doing it; otherwise I would scarcely undertake it.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Was it not the case in earlier times? A.—I am not quite positive it was; I believe such was the case.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Do not the boys get higher wages by reason of working under the present system than they would be able to obtain if they were indentured? A.—I am not thoroughly well posted on the wages question, but I believe that when a boy becomes proficient in doing his work, say in connection with some part of a machine, he commands higher wages.

Q.—In the old time when boys were regularly indentured was it not the custom instead of the employer giving wages for the parents of the boy to pay a premium for his instructions? A.—That did exist.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How long ago? A.—In some professions it exists yet in England; boys have to pay to go into architects' or merchants' offices.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you believe it would be advisable to go back to the system prevailing at the time of the middle ages when apprentices were required to produce a master

piece before they could become workmen? A.—No; I certainly think not; but I think if we want efficient and skilled workmen we must devise some means, either by giving thorough instruction in the workshop or in technical schools, to enable them to become proficient.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—If an employer was required to give a boy this instruction, to an apprentice, would he not claim that he was entitled to have him at lower wages? A.—He probably would, but I do not look to any large employer taking hold of the question of educating apprentices. He has a large establishment for the purpose of making money by manufacturing, not for the purpose of teaching a school and teaching apprentices.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—And he has the work in his establishment divided into departments? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Did you observe whether your pupils followed your lectures regularly or if they were often absent. A.—I find that they attend very regularly. There are numbers who come in every year from mere curiosity and who cease to attend after a week or so, but we have a very fair attendance considering that it is not obligatory to attend.

Q.—From what you have said must we conclude that the apprenticeship system is very bad for apprentices? A.—I think that the apprenticeship system is in a very bad state, not only in Montreal but throughout the country generally; that is that apprentices, as a rule, enter into the employment of their masters and serve their time, but that they don't receive the instruction which apprenticeship implies. In olden times apprenticeship was in a very different condition from what it is to-day. Before the invention of steam and water powers the apprentice lived with his master under his roof and the master himself was a workman, and he himself taught his apprentice how to become a skilled workman. As it is to-day, the master generally is not a workman, he is generally the one who looks after the management, financing and securing the orders and various things connected with the administration of the business. Consequently the apprentice, as a rule, has to pick up what knowledge he can rather than be instructed.

Q.—Do you not consider that such a system has a very bad effect on labor? A.—I certainly think that it has that effect. Workmen are turned out who are not thorough workmen in many branches. If a lad is attentive and anxious to attain all that he can he may become a good workman, but it is certainly not due to the trouble of his employer in teaching him.

Q.—Can you point out, without mentioning names, some instances where apprentices who attended your lectures, obtained for that reason, higher wages after their apprenticeship was over? A.—I know a number of cases where workmen who were pupils of our schools have obtained higher knowledge of their work and better wages.

Q.—In lithography, for instance? A.—I know of no special case there but I believe that such is the case.

Q.—Do you consider that a general system of technical schools would lead to the manufacturing in Canada of such articles that are now imported? A.—I certainly think it would have that effect. I think that a national system of technical education should be established, if such was possible.

MONTREAL, 6th February 1888.

SAMUEL CARSLY, Dry Goods Merchant, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—You are acquainted with the dry goods trade in Montreal, I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—I understand there are a large number of persons employed in the dry goods business in this city? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the hour at which dry goods establishments generally open in the morning in this city? A.—At eight o'clock.

Q.—What hour do they generally close? A.—We and several other establishments close at six o'clock.

Q.—What is the general rule? A.—A great many keep open to nine o'clock; on Saturday nights till ten or eleven.

Q.—Do you think there is any great necessity for keeping open in the evening? A.—I am sure there is not.

Q.—What are the ages of the people employed in dry goods stores? A.—We had them in our store as cash boys at twelve years, and we have men up to seventy years of age.

Q.—Is that general throughout the city? A.—No. The general rule is from ten to fifty-five years; the bulk of them will be between eighteen and thirty years.

Q.—Those who are employed at such an age as ten years are all cash boys, I presume? A.—Yes.

Q.—At what age do they begin to go behind the counter? A.—We don't take them as apprentices to learn the business until they are about sixteen years of age.

Q.—Is that the custom throughout the city? A.—I think so—fifteen or sixteen years.

Q.—How is it with young ladies who become clerks? A.—They generally commence about sixteen, at fifteen or sixteen.

Q.—Have you any employment for girls under that age in your establishment; and allow me to say that I am not enquiring into your private business, but in regard to the general custom of establishments throughout the city? A.—Do you mean are there any girls younger than that employed in any capacity in the workshop?

Q.—I am speaking of clerks now? A.—Not as saleswomen.

Q.—Are female clerks compelled to stand on their feet all day or are they permitted to sit? A.—In our store there are seats provided for them.

Q.—Do you know whether that is the rule in establishments in the city or not? A.—I don't know; I don't think it is, but I don't know.

Q.—Are men and women or girls employed in the same departments? A.—Sometimes they are.

Q.—Are there separate conveniences provided for females and males? A.—With us there are, in different parts of the building.

Q.—Do you know how it is generally? A.—I believe in a great many cases there are not.

Q.—Is there any law in the Province of Quebec regulating that matter? A.—I believe not; not that I know of.

Q.—Is there an inspection made as to whether the sanitary condition is complied with, that is, any inspection by the Government officer? A.—None whatever that I know of.

Q.—We have been told of course about the inspection made by your municipal authorities, and it is not necessary to question you respecting that matter? A.—I have never known an inspection made by them.

Q.—What would be the average wages of a female clerk when she begins the business? A.—The regular Montreal terms for an apprentice to learn the dry goods

is that they are apprenticed for three years, and the payment for the three years is \$60.00, \$80.00 and \$100.00 a year; these are the regular standard Montreal terms.

Q.—And the people board themselves? A.—Yes; apprentices I am speaking of now.

Q.—After they have passed their apprenticeship what wages are they able to earn? A.—The value varies very much, very much indeed.

Q.—The minimum would be about how much do you think? A.—Supposing they came out of their apprenticeship when they are 18—I am speaking of boys now more particularly, because the girls are not so often apprenticed—they ought to be worth from \$5.00 to \$6.00 per week then, say about \$5.00 per week. Some are worth a good deal more, and some are not worth that.

Q.—Young ladies when they become fairly skilled, what wages do they command? A.—I am sure I don't know. I can tell you the two extremes. A sales-woman after she has served her time will range as regards wages, from four dollars to 15.00 a week; we have them at both those figures. It all depends on the girls themselves. It is not like a mercantile business.

Q.—Is the supply of young women for these positions equal to the demand? A.—Yes.

Q.—I suppose they are required generally to understand both languages? A.—It is not necessary, but it is all the better if they do.

Q.—Are sewing rooms attached to any of the dry goods shops in Montreal? A.—Yes; almost all of them.

Q.—Are apprentices received in these sewing rooms? A.—We don't take apprentices now; they may be, I think they are in some shops. In fact I think apprentices are taken.

Q.—What would they receive on beginning work? A.—Do you mean in both dressmaking, mantle making and millinery rooms?

Q.—Yes, what wages would they receive in each of these departments. A.—I think the apprentices in a great many of those places do not get anything, and if so, it is a nominal amount.

Q.—Do they learn their trade effectively? A.—They ought to be able to learn it.

Q.—After they learn their trade what would they be able to earn? A.—They would be able to earn—I am speaking of the dry goods, millinery and mantle making, and I am not speaking of factories, but of work-rooms in connection with the dry goods business—from four dollars to eight dollars a week. They will receive more, of course, if they are skilful, such as cutters; they will receive a great deal more if they become skilled cutters.

Q.—Would an average skilled woman be able to earn nearer four dollars than eight dollars a week? A.—The average would be nearer four dollars than eight dollars. I am speaking of those who have served an apprenticeship, not of an odd girl who drops in and does not know much about the business. I am speaking of people who have learned the business properly.

Q.—A casual sewing woman, what would she earn? A.—We don't employ them—I could not say. They are not of much use in our business.

Q.—During what hours would they work? A.—Our hands always work ten hours per day, that is from eight to six.

Q.—Is that the rule throughout the city? A.—I believe in some millinery establishments they work them very late.

Q.—Do they pay them extra when they work them late? A.—No; I believe not. Ours work the ten hours a day; if they work extra they are paid extra.

Q.—During those ten hours what time have they for luncheon? A.—One hour.

Q.—Then they work nine hours a day? A.—They work from eight to six, taking off one hour for luncheon.

Q.—Are the sewing rooms, as a general rule, large enough to comply with the

sanitary condition? A.—I have not seen any sewing rooms in Montreal except my own, and I could not speak in regard to that matter.

Q.—How frequently are the clerks and other employees of the dry goods establishments paid? A.—We pay ours weekly.

Q.—Is that the rule throughout the city? A.—I believe not.

Q.—Is there a society in Montreal for the protection of women and young children? A.—Yes, there is a society for the protection of women and children.

Q.—Can you give us some idea of the work accomplished by that society? A.—I cannot remember all the members now. I know every year they have a number of cases to attend to.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Are those cases of destitution? A.—There are cases of destitution and cases of cruelty.

Q.—Cruelty of women in the workrooms, do you mean? A.—No.

Q.—What cruelty do you refer to? A.—Sometimes the beating of children, sometimes neglecting them; drunken father neglecting to support his family and beating his wife and children.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Are any efforts made to prevent the employment of very young children in this city? A.—They have taken means to try to get the Factory Act put into operation in certain places where it is not in operation. The Act only applies to places where there are twenty or more people employed, and I believe the greatest abuses exist often where there is the smallest number employed—by far the greatest number of abuses occur in those places. In the small stores and in the small factories are where the abuses occur; where there are a large number of people together they will in a great measure look after each other, but that is not the case where there are a few employed, and to such places the Factory Act does not apply.

Q.—Are any efforts being made to keep children out of the streets, such as very young children selling newspapers late at night. A.—Yes; that has been stopped in a good many cases.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you know anything of the wages earned by shirt makers? A.—No, I do not. The fact that all classes of the working population are not paid weekly prevents people from paying cash and compels them to pay on credit, thus giving a great deal of trouble. I think it would be well that every man and woman should be paid every week, notwithstanding any rule existing to the contrary, no matter whether they are engaged by the year or month. Railway companies and other companies make you pay before you get on board the train to begin the trip, and if they bring freight to you they will make you pay before you receive it, and a man is entitled to have his labor paid as promptly as those companies are paid. Great suffering is caused by the non-payment of wages weekly, and also by the non-payment regularly of hands working by the piece when they have delivered goods; and the non-payment of working girls by the week is one great shame in our city, in my opinion.

Q.—Are the wages of working people frequently garnished? A.—Yes they are, and it is the cause of a great deal of suffering. They come and seize the wages of a man who has only a few cents coming to him to enable him to buy provisions for his family.

Q.—I am requested to ask whether it is not the rule in Montreal to pay weekly?

A.—I believe not. Some of the stores have done it, I believe, but it is not the rule.

Q.—Do you know whether it is the rule in factories or not? A.—I don't think it is the rule anywhere in Canada to pay weekly, not either as regards private firms or corporations.

Q.—What day in the week in your opinion would be the best pay day? A.—I think Thursday or Friday; so long as the wages are paid by the week, it is all right.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—Do you think the hours of female labor are excessive? A.—Yes, in Montreal.

Q.—The hours of sewing girls? A.—I could not say. In the small firms I think they are.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Those are the places where the long hours prevail? A.—Yes; the Government ignored the small factories, where the abuses are the worst.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—What positions do women occupy in millinery and dress-making departments who receive \$15 per week? A.—They are cutters, and some saleswomen will receive as much as that. Cutters, in fact, receive more.

Q.—Are milliners generally employed throughout the year? A.—More or less. The milliners, as a general thing, are not regularly employed throughout the year.

Q.—Provided their earnings were spread over the year, what average wages would they earn? A.—Some standard hands are kept on the year round, and others are engaged only for the season.

Q.—Take the trade as a whole? A.—If those who are only at work for the season did not employ themselves at something else during the idle season, their total earnings for the year would be very small.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Do you know of any employment they could get during the dull time? A.—I do not.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Do you know whether the factories are closed during any considerable part of the year in Montreal? A.—I could not speak for the factories; I do not know.

Q.—Do you know anything about the condition of the homes of the people who are employed in dry goods stores; do they live comfortably and have plenty of space or otherwise? A.—I could not say. I know they complain a good deal about not being able to get houses for a reasonable rent.

Q.—Do you know whether any people employed in dry goods stores here save money; whether they have money to put in the Post Office Savings Bank or invest in any other way? A.—Yes.

Q.—You think they do? A.—I think a great number do.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Has the Society for the Protection of Women and Children asked for the Factory Act to be put in force as regards smaller establishments? A.—They are asking it.

Q.—Does the Society approve of the Factory Act? A.—They approve of it as being good, but not good enough; they don't say it is perfect by any means.

Q.—Do they believe a girl under 12 years is able to work in a factory? A.—I think they should not work under 12 years of age in a factory.

Q.—Do they believe a child should work 12½ hours a day, or 72 hours a week, for six weeks in the year? A.—I think a child should never, under any circumstances, be allowed to work more than ten hours in any one day.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are not the wages of the children very important to the parents in a great many cases? A.—Yes.

Q.—If the parents are unable to maintain their families by their own labor, how would you have them assisted? A.—You mean that if they require the services of their children to assist them, what would I suggest? I would suggest that they send them to work if they are obliged to do so, but that they should not be allowed to work more than the number of hours I have stated.

Q.—Would it be better for the child to get work during those shorter hours? A.—Yes; I think there is no necessity for any female to work more than that number of hours in any factory at a time.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is it not dangerous to the health of a child of that age to go to the factory before six o'clock in the morning in the winter in this climate? A.—I think before six o'clock is too early for a child to go to work in a factory.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Do you think the law should be amended so that in place of 12 years there should be inserted 14 years, and that no young boy or girl should be allowed to work in the factory under 14 years of age? A.—I think it would be better if it was 14 years instead of 12 years; but in the case of a widow being left with children whom it is necessary to send to work, the age might be brought down to 12.

Q.—Do you not think if such exceptions were allowed, it would gradually get the age down from 11 to 10 and 9 years? A.—We, ourselves, have boys, as cash boys, at 10 years, but there is not much work about that. I am speaking of factories where there is close application and hard work all the time the boys are there.

Q.—Do you not think your cash boys would be better at school than carrying in the store? A.—I think they would be very much better.

Q.—And a boy going to your store at 10 years of age cannot, of course, go to school? A.—No; he would be much better at school.

Q.—You believe then that the law should be made so that those children should not be allowed to go to work, either in stores or factories, under the age of 14 years? A.—No; I don't think that.

Q.—You believe they should not be allowed? A.—I believe in cases of necessity they should be allowed to go to light work.

Q.—Do you not believe that a city, or town, or corporation should take great care of the necessitous people? Are you aware that frequently children of 10 or 11 years of age are employed at a mill, while their father is either lazy or drunken? A.—I don't know of any case.

Q.—Do you believe there are such cases? A.—Yes, I expect there are.

Q.—And then you believe that if boys were not allowed to be sent to work before they were 14, the men would be working? A.—A man with a family who is lazy and drunken, and who will not support his family should be flogged every morning. That is my opinion about such a man.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you know of any case in Montreal where children are employed to work instead of their parents? A.—No. Instead of the father, you mean?

Q.—Yes. A.—No.

Q.—Do you know of any fining of employees at your business when they are late? A.—Yes. Every store I believe fines them if they are not there on time, and it is so wherever I have been.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Is it simply deducting the amount of wages that would be due to them, or is a fine imposed? A.—The usual way is, when the employees have to be at the store at a certain hour, they are generally given ten minutes or fifteen minutes, grace, and if they are there later than that time they are fined. They are never fined because they are not promptly on time, but if they are after those ten minutes they are fined.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you ever known cases in which the fines would make a large hole in the wages of a young girl? A.—No; they never get fined very much.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—It would be the girl's own neglect if she were fined, would it not? A.—It would be her own fault if she were fined. It is not the firm, but the girls who fine themselves.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you not think it would be a hardship if because, a girl was ten minutes late at work, she should be kept out in the cold, and have to go home? A.—I should think so. I have never heard of any girls having to go home again for that reason.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—What is the system of fines? A.—I could not tell you—it is a trifling amount, a few cents.

Q.—I have heard that a proportion of the wages, the wages for a little more than the time would cover, was deducted: do you know if such is the case? A.—Generally they get perquisites more than their wages quite sufficient to pay the fines, and they hardly ever interfere with their wages. In fact, I don't know of any case where the fines touched the wages.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—From whom do they receive perquisites, from the firm or from the public? A.—From the firm by way of commission. I never knew of any case where the fines touched their wages.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Are you aware of any such thing as news boys, who are very young in some cases, belonging to parents who were respectable and could provide for them, and yet they allowed them to go on the streets and sell newspapers? A.—I don't know of any such cases.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you any suggestion to make to the Commission in regard to the Factory Act, or in regard to the protection of women and children that has not been covered by the questions asked? A.—I think not.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—What would be your opinion with regard to young children selling news-

papers about the streets? A.—I think they should not be allowed to do so under a certain age, say under ten years.

Q.—And what hours should they be allowed upon the streets? A.—I think they should never be allowed later than seven o'clock, just late enough to catch the people coming from the stores.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you mean summer and winter? A.—In the winter.

Q.—Do you think they should be out to nine o'clock in the summer? A.—No; they should be in bed at that time. I say seven o'clock is late enough the year round.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Would you not have more decided objections to little girls selling newspapers on the streets? A.—I have a very decided objection to them—it is very objectionable.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—I suppose you would approve of a law that would allow children to work in stores and factories under fourteen years of age? A.—I think I would say twelve years. I think fourteen would be decidedly better. But the reason I have mentioned about people being forced to get them to help them brings me down to twelve years.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—That is fourteen years, and twelve years under exceptional circumstances? A.—I would think fourteen should be the best age and twelve under exceptional circumstances.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—You can make the circumstances then apply to all cases? A.—I would like to mention in regard to the Factory Act, that by the non-taking in of small factories, the object of the Act has failed to be attained. I think it should also take in work-rooms.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You have a decided objection to the word "Twenty" in the Act? A.—Yes, because the Act thereby leaves out the very parties who require to be protected, and I repeat that I think it should also include work-rooms such as our own. All work-rooms are factories, and nothing else.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—By the word "Factory" should be included all places where work is carried on? A.—Yes; all dress-making, millinery and mantle rooms; there is just as great a necessity for inspection in one case as there is in the other. Our work-room should be inspected just the same as factories.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you know if many people are employed working in tenement houses? A.—I don't know.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Have we in Montreal anything like the tenement houses in New York? A.—I don't think we have good tenement houses.

Q.—Are there any such houses owned by manufacturers here? A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—Nor connected with any factory? A.—No.

—

Translation.

ELIE MASSY, Cigar-maker, of the City of Montreal, thirty-eight years old, sworn:

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How long have you been a cigar-maker? A.—About seventeen years.

Q.—At Montreal? A.—Yes, at Montreal.

Q.—Could you tell us the number of working men or people employed at Montreal in the manufacture of cigars, as cigar-makers? A.—I cannot exactly say from memory, but it must be about twelve or thirteen hundred—that is, generally all those that are employed.

Q.—Out of this number of people working in cigars can you tell us how many are men, women and children? A.—We have prepared statistics on that head.

Q.—Can you supply the Commission with these statistics? A.—Yes, I could do so.

Q.—As a rule, what is the age of children engaged in cigar factories? Which are the youngest? A.—Well, the youngest is eleven years old, and even he is not yet eleven.

Q.—To your knowledge are there at the present time employed in cigar factories children eleven years old or under? A.—Well, I could not say.

Q.—Are there any under twelve years? A.—As to twelve years I can say that there are some because I made enquiries about it.

Q.—Girls or boys? A.—Boys; and one little girl I think. I asked her age and she told me she was ten and a half years old.

Q.—Are these children mechanics or apprentices? A.—They are apprentices.

Q.—How long does this apprenticeship last? A.—Three or four years.

Q.—At the end of these three or four years do the children know the trade, generally speaking? A.—Well, that depends. In general they do.

Q.—That means that a boy, at the age, say of twelve, who has gone into a factory, is workingman or journeyman, if you like, at fifteen? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Does he get a journeyman's wages? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are these children well treated in the factories? A.—Well, sir, after the inquiry that we ourselves made, we found that they were badly treated.

Q.—What do you mean by bad treatment? A.—They are beaten and fined, for talking or some petty disobedience. Often, they are sent before the Recorder.

Q.—Have you witnessed the beating of children in factories? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Were they beaten lightly, or with some kind of a weapon? A.—Beaten with the hand, and pretty brutally too.

Q.—To your knowledge, have any of these children been taken sick after such treatment? A.—No; not to my knowledge.

Q.—Have you seen little girls whipped? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Could you tell us why these children were whipped? What had they done? A.—From what I could see, it was because they talked among themselves, while at work.

Q.—In the factories, where they were punished for talking, were there not printed notices forbidding them from speaking? A.—I did not see any, where I saw the children beaten.

Q.—Are we to conclude from your reply that the bad treatment of children is due only to the foreman or overseer? A. Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you aware that, in some cigar factories, there is what is called a special constable? A.—Yes, sir, there is such in one factory.

Q.—Do you know what are the duties of this special constable? A.—To watch the young children and to see that they learn their trade.

Q.—Have you seen, or do you know, that a special constable has himself arrested, in the factory, a child or children, and led them to the police station? A.—I never saw it, but have heard of it.

Q.—What was the offence these children had committed that they should be brought before the Recorder? A.—The offence was the exchange of work with another; work that looked alike.

Q.—Can you tell us more fully what the child had done? A.—I did not see it.

Q.—You spoke just now of fines; are these fines imposed in virtue of a printed notice, or merely at the foreman's will? A.—I do not know. I cannot say, but only that the committee gathered proof and that they will come before the Commission to make declaration upon them.

Q.—Were you, yourself, ever fined? A.—No, sir; I do not remember.

Q.—Are the mechanics fined in certain factories? A.—Well, no; not fined. But this is what is done in certain factories: a man is engaged at so much per 1000 cigars, and then when he brings his work, at noon or in the evening or during the course of the day, some cigars are taken out of his bundles on the ground that they are no good.

Q.—That means that when you fetch your work, say, some one or two hundred cigars, the foreman draws a certain number from them? A.—Yes.

Q.—Why? A.—(On the pretence that they are not well made, and cannot be sold.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Is it only a pretence, or are the cigars really ill made? A.—Only a pretence.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What do they do with those cigars? A.—I do not know.

Q.—Where do they put them? A.—They put them in a drawer that is handy, hard by the overseer's, and no one knows what becomes of them.

Q.—What are the wages usually paid cigar-makers? A.—The average of wages made by cigar-makers is about \$7 a week.

Q.—How much a thousand? A.—Well, from \$4 up, I should say, to \$11. It depends on the quality of the cigar.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—You say that this is the average wages? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Does that include the young boys with the men? A.—That is to say, the journeymen.

Q.—Those who are 15? A.—Yes, sir; old and young.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—To make \$7 a week, how many hours must a journeyman work during the week? A.—Well, I cannot say. About nine hours a day.

Q.—Is work steady during the year, or do you knock off sometimes? A.—We knock off.

Q.—How often and how long on an average? A.—About a couple of months every year.

By Mr. CORÉ:—

Q.—What wages do the best mechanics make a week,—those who work by the piece? A.—It is well known that there are exceptions even among the best workmen, but the best go as high as \$15.

Q.—And the worst? A.—From \$4 to \$5. At \$4 there are very few, but at \$5 there are plenty.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are there many workingmen who make \$15 a week? A.—No; very few.

Q.—Is this particularly due to their skill, or to the kind of work which they are made to do? A.—It depends on both; on the skill and the kind of work.

Q.—What are the wages of girls? A.—I cannot say. As I told you a while ago, we have this down in our statistics, which we made out ourselves, but as they are not at hand just now, it is hard for me to answer, but I can get them for you.

Q.—Is the number of cigar-makers employed at present in Montreal greater than it was five or six years ago. A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are the salaries higher than they were ten years since? A.—I do not remember, and I could not tell you just at present.

Q.—What is generally the sanitary condition of the factories? In what conditions of health are they kept? A.—Well, I think the factories are pretty well ventilated now. We cannot complain on that score.

Q.—Are the water closets in good shape as a general thing? A.—Yes, sir, generally.

Q.—Are there water closets for the females and water closets for the men, separated from each other? A.—Yes.

Q.—Thoroughly separated? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are the females obliged to pass through the men's shops to get to their work? A.—No; not to my knowledge.

Q.—How is the standard of wages as between Canada and the United States? A.—For \$4 work here \$8 are paid there, \$8.50 and \$9.

By Mr. CORÉ:—

Q.—At what place in the United States? A.—At Brattleborough, Vt. There, what is made in the moulds is marked \$8.50, \$9, \$9.50, compared to work rated here at \$4, \$5 and \$5.50; and at Boston they give \$8 to \$11.50 for what fetches here from \$4 to \$5.50.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—There are no cigars made in the gaols and prisons here? A.—Not at present, but they have been.

Q.—In how many years? A.—To the best of my knowledge, for a couple of years. For a year or two at the Reformatory here.

Q.—That has been given up? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Why so? A.—I could not tell you why.

Q.—Do any of the bosses object to employ union men? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Are any of the men blacklisted, that is, are their names handed about from one employer to another, to hinder their being engaged? A.—No. That was tried on once but it did not last. A kind of society was established binding on the employer, when called upon by a hand for work. The employer obliged the man to produce a certificate from the employer whom he had just left, otherwise he could not get work. But this did not last long.

Q.—It does not exist to-day? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Is there a difference in the prices paid to union men and those paid to non-union men? A.—Certainly, there is a difference of price.

Q.—What is the difference? A.—I could not say, but there is a difference in any case.

By Mr. CORRÉ:—

Q.—Are there any manufactures where the men are organized in societies. A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In those factories do the men allow non-union men to work? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Everywhere? A.—No, sir. Except the employers who belong to the union and have union shops. They do not allow non-union men to work on account of a certain mark called “label” which we carry. The boss cannot have this “label” unless the man belongs to the union.

Q.—I asked you if, in certain factories or in all cigar factories here, workingmen were allowed to work? A.—In certain factories they are not allowed.

Q.—Is it the employer who refuses to employ union men, or the workingman who refuses to work alongside of a non-union man? A.—In union shops, it is the boss who refuses.

Q.—What is an union shop? A.—An union shop requires first that men only be employed, and then a certain number of apprentices regulated by the by-laws of the union.

Q.—How is an union shop established? Is it by the will of the employer or the will of the employed? A.—The will of the employer.

Q.—What advantage does an employer derive from the union shop? A.—The advantage is, first that the bodies of workingmen as they stand to-day, recognize a ticket, called a “label,” and this “label” is encouraged by the workmen’s societies. This is the advantage which the boss can reap. He is surer to sell cigars than another, because he has this “label,” and because the men encourage and prefer to buy cigars from that factory.

Q.—That “label” is pasted only on the cigar boxes coming from factories accepting the by-laws of the Union, is it not? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Cannot the factories not belonging to the Union, and employers who have not signed the rules of the Union, make use of these marks? A.—No, sir.

Q.—And do the men in these factories allow non-Union men to work therein? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How many cigars can a good workman turn out in a week—say, cigars of \$4.50? A.—If he makes a full week, he can turned out from 1,200 to 2,000 cigars as it is common work.

(Translation.)

THÉOPHILE CHARRON, Journeyman Cigar-maker, aged 14, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How old are you? A.—I was 14 on the 10th January last.

Q.—When you call yourself a cigar-maker, you mean that you have served your apprenticeship, do you not? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long? A.—Three years.

Q.—You began working at 11 years? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What wages do you get now? Are you paid by the piece? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Your receive the same wages as the workingmen? A.—Yes.

Q.—What wages did you get during your apprenticeship? A.—One dollar a week for the first year, \$1.50 for the second year, and \$2 for the third year. When I worked extra I got more.

- Q.—When you worked extra you got more? A.—Yes.
- Q.—What do you mean by working extra? What was the amount that you were expected to do? A.—We got 10 cents by 100 cigars, and when we made a certain quantity above that we were paid 10 cents a hundred.
- Q.—Is the rolling done by apprentices, or are there men who roll as well? A.—There are men who roll also.
- Q.—How much does the rolling fetch? A.—Twenty-five cents a hundred.
- Q.—The first year, how many hundred cigars were you required to make a week—roll them? A.—We were not told. If we made our cigars we were paid all the same.
- Q.—To make out whether you got extras or not, you must have been asked a certain quantity a week? A.—We had to make 1000 for \$1, and if we made more than 1000 we were paid extra.
- Q.—Did you do your 1000 regularly? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—In other words, you did for \$1 the work that a man got \$2.50 for doing? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Did you have any fines to pay during your apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Many? A.—A good number.
- Q.—Do you remember how many? A.—No.
- Q.—Do you remember the most you paid in one week? A.—Twenty-five cents.
- Q.—This is the highest you paid? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—How many hours did you work a day? A.—Sometimes ten hours, other times eight hours. It was just as they wanted it.
- Q.—Do you remember why you paid these fines? A.—Sometimes for talking too much; mostly for that.
- Q.—You were never licked? A.—Yes; not licked so as any harm was done me, but sometimes they would come along, and if we happened to be cutting our leaf wrong, they would give us a crack across the head with the fist.
- Q.—Was it usual to beat children like that? A.—Often.
- Q.—Were you beaten during the first year of your apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—That is, you were beaten at eleven years? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—You were never sent before the Recorder? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—How much do you make nowadays? A.—That depends. I have not yet made my full time since I am a journeyman.
- Q.—Have you worked since the 10th January? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—How much have you made a week, thereabouts, since the 10th January? Which was your best week? A.—\$4.45.
- Q.—Why did you not work more? Was it for lack of work? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Have you seen other children beaten? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Did you see them beaten worse than yourself? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—Do you know of a factory where there is a blackhole? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Have you seen children put in that blackhole? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—How old were these children? A.—I could not tell the age.
- Q.—Younger than yourself. A.—No, sir.
- Q.—Why were they put into the blackhole? A.—Because they lost time.
- Q.—Who put them into the blackhole? A.—The man who kept the press.
- Q.—Do you know whether this man wears a constable's medal? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Do the children cry out? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—Were they taken to the blackhole brutally? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—How long did they stop in the hole, as a general thing? A.—Some of them stopped there till seven o'clock.
- Q.—When were they put in? A.—In the afternoon.
- Q.—Was it seven o'clock in the evening or seven hours of time? A.—Seven o'clock in the evening. They put them in during the afternoon until seven in the evening.

Q.—At what time do the men leave the factory? A.—Generally at five o'clock and sometimes at six.

Q.—Do you mean to say that those children were kept in the blackhole after the men had left the factory? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Who let them out? The same that put them in? A.—Yes, sir, I think so, but I never saw him.

Q.—Was this blackhole heated? A.—I don't know, sir.

Q.—In what floor of the factory is this blackhole? A.—In the cellar.

Q.—Is there a furnace in the cellar? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is the blackhole near the furnace? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Is there a window therein? A.—No.

Q.—When children were shut in there, you never heard them cry to get some one to let them out? A.—No, sir.

Q.—At what age did you quit school? A.—At ten years and a half.

Q.—Can you read and write? A.—A little.

Q.—Are you an orphan? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you know your four rules? A.—I cannot say whether I remember them.

Q.—Did you see little girls put into the blackhole? A.—No.

Q.—Have you seen little girls beaten? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you work in the same shop as the little girls? A.—Sometimes, yes.

Translation.

ACHILLE DAGENAIS, Cigar-maker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are a cigar-maker? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You served your apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—At what age? A.—At the age of twelve.

Q.—At what age did you close your apprenticeship? A.—At fifteen.

Q.—Did you get the same wages as the witness just heard, during the apprenticeship? A.—No. I had \$1 a week for the first year, \$2 for the second, and \$3 for the third.

Q.—Were you obliged, like your predecessor, or were you asked, to do a certain amount of work a week? A.—No. We were put to job work. If we did more than our week's work very often more than half of what we did extra was taken from us, and very often, too, we got nothing at all.

Q.—Did you pay fines during your apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you remember how much you paid during your three years? A.—I paid as high as \$1.10 a week of fines.

Q.—Was that during your first year? A.—Beg pardon, during my second and third years.

Q.—In your second year. When you paid \$1.10 of fines a week it follows that you got only 90 cents for your week's wages? A.—I will tell you. We were put on job work and whatever we made extra was given us, very often we drew nothing and very often we got only half.

Q.—When you paid \$1.10 of fines a week do you remember how much you got that week? A.—I cannot say. I did not take notice.

Q.—That \$1.10—was it taken from your regular \$2 wages a week? A.—That money was taken from my extras. When we did not do more the money was taken off our regular wages.

Q.—Do you pay fines at present as workingman? A.—No, sir. I have not had to pay anything up to date.

Q.—Do they sometimes take cigars from the quantity that you make on the ground that they are not well made? A.—Where I work they have not done that yet.

Q.—Were you ever employed in factories where this was done? A.—Yes; I have been in factories where that was done.

Q.—Has that thing happened to yourself? A.—Yes, sir, it has happened to myself.

Q.—What was done with these cigars taken from you? A.—We had to give them others, and these they set aside as not being good.

Q.—You do not know what they did with them? A.—No, sir. I know nothing about it.

Q.—Were these cigars really not well made? A.—They could pass muster. I have seen worse pass.

Q.—Did they show you the flaws in the cigars? A.—They did not show us the flaws in the cigars but simply took the cigars. They called us by our numbers and said to us: "You will fetch 30 cigars."

Q.—"You will fetch 30 cigars" to replace those they took from you, eh? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Were you ever beaten during your apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Why? A.—I was talking to the others, and some of the boys were teasing me. The boss came up to me, and tried to hush me up. I said: "If you don't make the others hush, I won't hush."

Q.—Then he struck you? A.—He kicked me and struck me with his fist.

Q.—Did this treatment make you sick? A.—No, sir.

Q.—It did you no good, at all events? A.—That's quite probable.

Q.—Were you beaten often? A.—Only that once.

Q.—How old were you then? A.—I was about 14.

Q.—Do you know of a factory where they have a blackhole? A.—Yes, sir, to my personal knowledge.

Q.—Were you ever in the blackhole yourself? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you know the blackhole of your own knowledge? Have you seen it? A.—Yes, sir. I have seen it.

Q.—On cold days, is this blackhole anyway heated? A.—I could not say. I never saw anyone put in it.

Q.—Do you know that it is heated? A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Have you seen little girls put in the blackhole? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Have you seen small boys? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Are you aware, that, in one Montreal factory, there is what we call a special constable, a man wearing the badge of a policeman? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What is the man who leads children to the blackhole? A.—I could not say.

Q.—Is it this special constable who keeps order among the children? A.—He does, but there are others also.

Q.—Is this constable a factory hand? A.—I cannot say. I have never seen him at work.

Q.—In that factory where there is a constable, are there more children at work than men? A.—It's a close shave if there are not more. I could not exactly say.

Q.—How many workingmen are employed in that factory? A.—I could not say. I never counted and paid no attention.

Q.—How long is it since you were at work at Montreal, as a journeyman? A.—Three years.

Q.—In the factories where you have worked, either as apprentice, or as maker, have you noticed that there were many sick children? A.—I could not say.

Q.—Are you aware that, two or three years ago, a Montreal factory imported cigar makers from abroad? A.—I could not say.

(Translation.)

FERDINAND BRISSETTE, Cigar-maker, 17 years old, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You are a cigar-maker? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—At what age did you begin your apprenticeship? A.—Twelve years.

Q.—You served three years? A.—I had a bargain made for three years, but served only two.

Q.—At the end of two years, did you become a journeyman? A.—I became a journeyman because they sent me away from the shop. They happened to be working only eight hours. They happened to have little work.

Q.—When you left and had finished your apprenticeship at the end of two years, you went to work as a journeyman in another establishment? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You were 14 years old at the time? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And you got men's wages? A.—Yes; but I was not very ready in making cigars. I received just about the wages of an apprentice.

Q.—How much did you make a week during your two years of apprenticeship—say the first year? A.—The bargain was \$1 a week for the first year, \$2 for the second, and \$3 for the third.

Q.—So that, taking in the first year at \$1, and the second at \$2, you got \$156 for your two years? A.—No,

Q.—Did you work every week during your apprenticeship? A.—Yes; I worked every week.

Q.—Did you have fines to pay? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you know what amount of fines you paid during your apprenticeship? A.—I do not know.

Q.—But did you pay fines when an apprentice? A.—Yes.

Q.—You do not remember what amount of fines you paid during one week, the biggest week? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How much? A.—\$1.75.

Q.—Was that the first year? A.—I cannot tell whether it was the first year or the second year.

Q.—Do you remember if the week you paid the \$1.75 you drew anything in the way of money—a balance of wages? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did they not give you a quarter of a dollar? A.—No. I had made only \$1.60 that week, and when I went to the office to get paid, they asked me if I had 15 cents to give them.

Q.—And at that time you worked only eight hours a day? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—That is to say, that after working forty-eight hours for a week you owed your employer 15 cents? A.—Yes. At that time it was ten hours a day that I worked.

Q.—You had worked sixty hours during that week, and at the end of it you owed the employer 15 cents? A.—Yes, sir; except on the Saturday, when we worked only seven hours.

Q.—You came back to the factory on the Monday? A.—Yes; I came back with my father.

Q.—What did your father say? A.—He tried to get back my fine, but the boss would not give it to him.

Q.—What did the boss tell him? A.—I was not with him when he went in. I was working at the time.

Q.—Is that the only week that you owed your employer money? A.—Yes; the only week.

Q.—Have you paid many other fines? A.—Yes.

Q.—You have no notion of what you paid in all during your apprenticeship? A.—About \$25 or \$30.

- Q.—Why did you have to pay these fines? A.—Because we talked too much and threw stones at each other.
- Q.—It was not for work badly done? A.—No.
- Q.—You were not ill during your apprenticeship? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—Can you read and write? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Could you read and write on beginning your apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—You have no knowledge of the blackhole? A.—No, sir.

(Translation.)

EDMOND GAUTHIER, 15 years old, Journeyman Cigar-maker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

- Q.—You are a cigar-maker? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—How old are you? A.—Fifteen.
- Q.—How long have you been working as cigar-maker? A.—These six months.
- Q.—You were a workingman at fifteen years and a half? A.—Yes.
- Q.—How long an apprenticeship did you serve? A.—Three years.
- Q.—You began your apprenticeship at eleven years and a half? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Can you read and write? A.—Yes.
- Q.—How much did you make the first year of your apprenticeship? A.—The first year, \$1 a week; the second, \$1.50; the third, \$2.
- Q.—Had you fines to pay? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Many? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—You do not remember how many? A.—No.
- Q.—Do you remember the highest fine you had to pay in any one week? A.—Twenty-five cents.
- Q.—Why? A.—For having talked with my neighbour.
- Q.—Did you know it was forbidden to talk? A.—No, they never forbade us talking together.
- Q.—Were you ever beaten? A.—Never beaten to bear marks.
- Q.—How were you beaten? A.—By slaps across the head.
- Q.—With hand or fist? A.—Sometimes with hand and fist.
- Q.—Often? A.—Often enough.
- Q.—Every week? A.—No; not every week.
- Q.—Why were you beaten? A.—Because I sometimes talked.
- Q.—It was not for work badly done? A.—Yes, also for work badly done.
- Q.—Who showed you how to work? Who taught you your trade? Was it one of the hands or the foreman? A.—The foreman.
- Q.—Did he take much trouble to teach you the trade? A.—He came around once a day.
- Q.—Do you know your trade well, at present? Are you able to turn out a cigar from the beginning to the end? A.—I can do it from the mould, but I was never shown how to do it by hand.
- Q.—Thus, you served your time and do not know your trade? A.—No, sir.

Translation.

EDOUARD MIRON, Journeyman Cigar-maker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

- Q.—You are a workman cigar-maker? A.—Yes.

- Q.—How old are you? A.—Twenty-two years of age.
- Q.—At what age did you go into apprenticeship? A.—At sixteen.
- Q.—How long did you serve? A.—Three years.
- Q.—How much did you make the first year? A.—\$1 the first year, \$2 the second and \$3 the third.
- Q.—When you began your apprenticeship did you make an engagement with your employer? A.—Yes.
- Q.—You signed it? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—You were ten years old then? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Were you ever sent before the Recorder? A.—I was never sent before the Recorder but was taken up.
- Q.—By whom were you taken up? A.—I cannot give his name.
- Q.—Were you taken up by a factory hand where you worked, or by a policeman? A.—By a policeman.
- Q.—What for? A.—Because I had lost an afternoon to go to the circus.
- Q.—How did that matter turn out? A.—He had to pay the whole thing.
- Q.—Were you taken to the police station? A.—Yes. I was locked up from one o'clock till ten in the evening in a cell at the City Hall.
- Q.—That was the day after you went to the circus? A.—I went to the circus on the Saturday and was arrested on the Monday following.
- Q.—You were not at the factory on the Saturday? A.—Yes. I worked there.
- Q.—Did you get pay on that Saturday? A.—Yes.
- Q.—You had no fine to pay for the day you missed? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—He simply forfeited your day, then? A.—Yes.
- Q.—You mean that you went to the factory on Saturday morning, when he kept back your money and had you arrested on Monday? A.—Yes; between noon and one o'clock.
- Q.—You do not remember in what year, thereabouts, you were arrested? A.—It was in my second year of apprenticeship.
- Q.—What year was that? A.—About five years ago.
- Q.—At night you were let out? Yes, because my father sought Mr. DeMontigny and got a writing from him to let me go. Without that I could not get away.
- Q.—Did you pay any fines during your apprenticeship? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Do you remember how much? A.—I could not tell you the amount. I paid too much.
- Q.—Do you remember what was the highest fine you paid in a whole week? A.—It was not much at a time. It was fifty or sixty cents.
- Q.—A week? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Did you pay fifty or sixty cents the first year you worked? A.—No.
- Q.—Did you pay any fines the first year you worked? A.—I do not remember.
- Q.—Did you pay many fines? A.—Often. Nearly every week I had fines to pay.
- Q.—Why? A.—Sometimes it was because we were sick and lost time. If we did not fetch a doctor's certificate we were fined fifty cents.
- Q.—Do you mean that they kept fifty cents from you over and above the time you lost? A.—Yes. When we lost any time, and they asked us why, and we did not tell, they kept back fifty cents at times, although not always.
- Q.—Were you ever beaten? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—Do you know anything of a cell, a blackhole, in a certain factory? A.—I know nothing, personally. I only heard of it,

ALPHONSE LAFRANCE, Cigar-maker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are a cigar maker? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How old are you? A.—Twenty-four.

Q.—At what age did you start your apprenticeship? A.—At 16 years of age.

Q.—How much did you get during your three years of apprenticeship? A.—I was engaged for two years.

Q.—Were you engaged by writing or word of mouth? A.—Before a notary.

Q.—Have you your engagement? A.—No; it is in the possession of the lawyer Pagnuelo. I had a copy made out to leave the place where I was, and it is there.

Q.—Could you get a copy? A.—I do not know whether lawyer Pagnuelo would let me have it.

Q.—When you had finished your two years' apprenticeship, were you able to make a cigar by hand? A.—No; I knew only how to roll.

Q.—Do you remember whether, in virtue of your agreement, your employer engaged to teach you the trade? A.—Yes, *full trade cigar maker*.

Q.—And you knew nothing about it after your two years' apprenticeship? A.—No.

Q.—How much did you make the first year? A.—One dollar a week for the first six months; one dollar and a half for the second six months and two dollars for the balance of the engagement.

Q.—Did you ever pay fines? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Many? A.—Yes, sir. Every week.

Q.—Which is the heaviest fine you paid in one week? A.—I think it was three dollars and ten cents.

Q.—How did you make that? A.—I had made three dollars and ten cents, or three dollars and twenty-five cents, and I owed him ten cents.

Q.—How many days had you worked? A.—Six days.

Q.—How many hours a day? A.—Ten hours a day. I had made six thousand cigars that week.

Q.—You had made six thousand cigars during the week? A.—Yes, rolled.

Q.—And after making six thousand cigars you owed your employer ten cents? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What would have been a maker's pay for those six thousand cigars?

A.—At that time they paid cigar makers two dollars and seventy-five cents for a thousand cigars.

Q.—So that, in one week, you made sixteen dollars and fifty cents of a man's work, and you owed your employer ten cents? A.—Yes; but he made me a present of them.

Q.—You have heard the evidence of the gentlemen who preceded you? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you anything to add to what they said? A.—I have seen apprentices beaten.

Q.—Have you seen any beaten brutally? A.—Sharp slaps right in the face.

Q.—Why? A.—The party was sweeping and the foreman told him to pick up the tobacco leaves. The apprentice went on sweeping and did not pick them up. The foreman took him by the ear, bent him down to the ground and said to him: "why did you not pick up that tobacco?" It was a child only twelve or fourteen years old, and he did not reply. The foreman made him get up by slapping him in the face.

Q.—Have you seen young girls beaten too? A.—No.

Q.—Have you paid for gas? A.—Yes. Ten cents a week.

Q.—In how many weeks? A.—For a about six months.

Q.—Six months of the year? A.—No. I paid in one place for about five months.

Q.—Consecutively? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you pay ten cents for gas whether you worked the six days of the week or not? A.—Yes. If we worked only one day we paid the same, and if the gas was not lighted we paid all the same again.

PATRICK J. RYAN, Cigar-maker, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are you a journeyman cigar-maker? A.—Yes; and I have been so for seven years.

Q.—What is the difference in prices prevailing as between Quebec, Ontario and the United States? A.—In Lower Canada, at the present time, the rate is from \$4 to \$11, that is, journeymen cigar-makers, per thousand. The rate runs from \$4 to \$6 for mould work, and from \$6 up for hand work. In St. Catherines they pay \$7 for clear seed mould work, which we don't make here. The work we make here would cost half a dollar extra in Ontario. In Battleboro', Vermont, the lowest price is \$8 and the highest price is \$14. For the class they would get \$8.50 there, we would receive \$4 here at the present time. In Boston the lowest price is \$7.50; that kind of work is not done in Montreal. The highest price there is \$15. Here we get \$10 for the \$15 work in Boston, and \$4 for the \$7 work there. In Toronto the lowest price is \$6, I believe.

Q.—Are there Ontario-made cigars sold in the Province of Quebec? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do any come from Ontario to Quebec? A.—Yes. There were some that came from St. Catherines here some time ago; whether it is a rule or not, I don't know.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What grade of cigars were they? A.—A cheap grade.

Q.—Cheap cigars were sent from Ontario to the Province of Quebec? A.—I believe the venture was a failure. Some firm failed and the cigars were sent down here.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—As a general thing, I believe, Ontario-made cigars are not sold in this province? A.—No.

Q.—Can you give the Commission statistics in regard to the number of people employed in Montreal at cigar making. A.—We have 1,264 employed in the cigar industry in Montreal. Of union men there are 192, non-union 262, apprentices 389, small boys 282, small girls 110. There are of strippers, who prepare the tobacco, 274, who are women mostly. The number of married men is 112, single men 233. There are 120 girls, journeywomen cigar-makers. I hand in the following paper:—

TABLE OF EMPLOYEES, INCLUDING MEN, APPRENTICES, BOYS AND GIRLS, IN THE CIGAR INDUSTRY IN MONTREAL.

Name of Manufacturer.	Union Men.	Non-union Men.	Apprentices.	Little Boys. App.	Little Girls. App.	Strippers.	Married Men.	Single Men.	Journeywo- men.	Total Cigar- makers.
J. M. Fortier.....	14	111	75	50	25	45	30	95	30	275
S. Davis & Son.....	75	67	185	125	60	100	47	67	30	457
Tassé & Wood.....	15	..	33	33	..	30	15	96
Rattray.....	15	19	..	12	..	20	19	85
H. Jacob.....	50	30	20	30	..	80
Smith & Fichel.....	9	25	40	20	20	20	6	28	20	114
P. Pelletier.....	12	2	2	3	4	8	..	19
Goulet & Brothers.....	..	10	17	17	..	8	35
T. Larue.....	..	1	2	2	1	..	3
P. Jones.....	..	1	5	5	1	6
H. Swain.....	5	..	5	4	1	7	3	2	..	17
S. Foret.....	..	1	6	6	..	2	1	1	..	9
V. Foret.....	4	4	4
J. Clough.....	10	6	4	10
Z. Davis.....	..	1	5	5	..	2	..	1	4	18
Cardinal.....	..	7	3	10
Roman.....	6	17	..	3	..	4	2	32
	192	262	389	282	110	274	112	233	120	1264

Q.—Are the small boys and girls given separately, under the table? A.—Yes, the boys and girls are 389 together. A certain number of boys to a certain number of girls. Out of the total of 1,264 there are 380 apprentices—one apprentice for every three or four men. That proportion has not continued for a very long time.

Q.—How long is it since the employers have increased the number of their apprentices? A.—Probably four or five years. The wages of the men have decreased since that time. Five years ago they received \$5 for what they receive \$4 at present.

By MR. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you know what is the cause of the reduction? A.—A strike that followed the reduction in the Internal Revenue. When the reduction of \$3 was made in duty, we expected to get one dollar and the manufacturer one dollar and the consumer one dollar, and as this was not done, a strike occurred, which lasted in the neighborhood of six months—I was not here at the time—and I believe there was a compromise offered, but one of the parties would not accept of it. Since then the wages have been reduced, and this has occurred regularly in the winter for the last two or three years, and in fact there are now winter prices and summer prices, there being a reduction of \$1 in the winter. For the last two years this has been done by certain manufacturers.

Q.—When the excise duty was reduced three dollars, did the employers at the same time reduce the wages of the men one dollar? A.—That was after the strike—six months after, I understand, because the strike lasted about six months which was shortly after the reduction took place.

Q.—Is it a fact that compared with five years ago the employers are making \$3 out of the excise and \$1 out of the journeymen? A.—Yes, for the time being. The Internal Revenue duty was, however, changed and \$3 was placed on Canadian manufactured tobacco, \$6 instead of 40 cents a pound.

Q.—Will you explain that matter to the Commission? A.—It is according to selling price of the different grades of material manufactured. A clear seed cigar would cost \$3.60. I hand in the following paper which gives some statistics:

TABLE.—COST AND SELLING PRICES OF DIFFERENT QUALITIES OF CIGARS MANUFACTURED IN MONTREAL.

	Wrappers.	Binders.	Fillers.	Boxes.	Packing.	Stripping.	Wages.	Excise.	Cost Prices.	Selling Prices.	Net Profit.
Clear Seed Cigars	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
of 4½ inches	3 60	1 05	0 40	0 50	0 50	0 57	4 00	6 00	16 62	25 00	8 38
4½ " "	3 60	1 05	0 40	0 50	0 50	0 57	4 00	6 00	16 67	27 50	10 83
Havana Seed, Mould											
Work, 4½ inches	3 60	1 19	2 70	0 50	0 50	0 57	5 00	6 00	20 06	30 00	9 94
4½ " "	3 60	1 19	1 80	0 50	0 50	0 57	5 50	6 00	19 16	27 50	8 34
4½ " "	3 60	1 19	3 00	0 50	0 50	0 57	6 00	6 00	21 36	32 50	11 14
Seed Havana Hand											
Work, 4½ inches	3 60	1 19	2 70	0 60	0 50	0 57	7 00	6 00	22 16	32 50	10 44
4½ " "	3 60	1 19	2 70	0 60	0 50	0 57	7 00	6 00	22 46	35 00	12 54
4½ " "	3 60	1 19	3 00	0 75	0 60	0 60	8 00	6 00	24 51	50 00	25 49
4½ " "	3 60	1 36	3 60	1 00	0 60	0 70	10 00	6 00	28 80	60 00	31 20
5 " "	4 50	1 50	4 50	1 00	0 60	0 70	10 00	6 00	28 80	60 00	31 20
UNION SHOPS.											
H. Jacob, Stonewall											
Jackson, Seed and											
Havana Cigar,											
4½ inches	3 60	1 50	2 40	0 75	0 50	1 50	9 00	6 00	25 25	32 50	7 25
Fumar, 4½ " "	3 60	1 50	2 40	0 75	0 75	1 50	10 00	6 00	26 50	35 00	8 50
Mr. Monette,											
Seed and Havana,											
Mould Work,											
4½ inches	2 10	1 19	1 80	0 75	0 50	0 60	6 00	6 00	18 94	25 00	6 00

TABLE OF CHILD LABOR AND THEIR SALARIES, BENEFITS OF MANUFACTURERS
DERIVED BY THE SYSTEM OF APPRENTICES IN MONTREAL.

	Wrappers.	Binders.	Fillers.	Boxes.	Packing.	Stripping.	Wages.	Excise.	Cost Prices.	Selling Prices.	Net Profit.
Clear Seed, Mould Work, 4½ inches	\$ cts. 1 05	\$ cts. 0 40	\$ cts. 0 50	\$ cts. 0 57	\$ cts. 0 50	\$ cts. 0 57	\$ cts. 1 50	\$ cts. 6 00	\$ cts. 14 12	\$ cts. 25 00	\$ cts. 10 85
4½ " "	1 05	0 45	0 50	0 57	0 50	0 57	2 00	6 00	14 67	27 50	12 83
Seed Havana, Mould Work, 4½ inches	3 60	1 19	2 70	0 50	0 50	0 57	2 00	6 00	17 06	30 00	12 94
4½ " "	3 60	1 19	1 80	0 50	0 50	0 57	2 50	6 00	16 16	27 50	11 34
4½ " "	3 60	1 19	3 00	0 50	0 50	0 57	3 00	6 00	18 36	32 50	14 14
Seed Havana, Hand Work, 4½ inches	3 60	1 19	2 70	0 60	0 50	0 57	3 50	6 00	18 66	32 50	13 94
4½ " "	3 60	1 19	3 00	0 60	0 50	0 57	3 50	6 00	18 96	35 00	16 04
4½ " "	3 60	1 36	3 60	0 75	0 60	0 60	4 00	6 00	20 51	50 00	29 49
5 " "	4 50	1 50	4 50	1 00	0 60	0 70	5 00	6 00	23 80	60 00	36 20
Girls Rolling B'nch's Clear Seed Ma- chine Bunches.	3 60	1 19	0 75	0 50	0 50	0 40	2 85	6 00	15 76	25 00	7 21
Machine Bunches, 60c. per 1,000 Ci- gars.											
Roller Apprentices, 5c. to 7½c., 10c. to 12c. per 100, which comes to amount of \$1.10, \$1.60 to \$1.85 per 1,000 Ci- gars.	1 00	0 50	0 20	0 50	0 30	0 15	1 10	6 00	9 75	19 00	9 25

By Mr. Coré:—

Q.—I see this table shows the cost price and the selling price of cigars. I observe it does not take into consideration the cost of tobacco, nor rent or interest on capital. I see that on cigars selling at \$25.00, you say there is a profit of \$8.38, and on those sold at \$27.50 there is \$10.83 profit—how do you establish the profits?

A.—By taking the cost of the tobacco and the cost of manufacturing it into cigars, and the price they obtain when they sell them.

Q.—What amount of business do those manufacturers do? A.—Quite a large amount.

Q.—Would you have any idea as to the extent, as to how many thousand cigars would be sold by one manufacturer? A.—I understand a certain manufacturer exceeded 19,000,000 cigars last year.

Q.—At a profit of \$10.83 per thousand? A.—That amount was composed of the the different grades.

Q.—The average profit I observe by your list would be about \$10.00 per thousand? A.—Yes, that would be the average on what they sell their cigars for.

Q.—Are the cigar manufacturers millionaires? A.—They are getting to be so.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Are those prices selling at retail or wholesale? A.—At whole

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are there factories in Montreal where the cost of the gas is charged to the employees? A.—Yes, there are two factories. One charges five cents per week and another shop ten cents per week.

Q.—For how many months? A.—As I never paid for any gas myself it would be impossible for me to say.

Q.—Did you ever see any apprentice beaten? A.—No, I never did. I am not personally acquainted with any black-hole, but I have heard of it. There is a Cigar-Makers' Union in existence which gives its members five dollars per week if they are sick. There is also a death benefit of \$50.00, and the amount has been lately increased so that a member of five years, standing is entitled to \$250.00; of ten years, standing, \$350.00; of fifteen years, standing, \$550.00. There is a Union label but it is only given to Union shops. A Union shop is composed of members of the Union, and the people who wish to be employed there at any time have to become members of the Union, or they will not be allowed to work in such a shop. The employers have the privilege of using the Union label as a proof that the cigars have not been made by scab labour, or child labour, or apprenticeship labour. That is the object of the label. The men also have more advantages when working in a Union shop than in an open shop or in a non-Union shop. They will get a certain number of cigars every week for their own personal use, and in case of wishing to go out they can do so without asking leave, and if they return in fifteen minutes or half an hour it is all right. But in an open shop or in a non-Union shop the men have to pass through a civil service examination, for they want to know why you want to go out and so on, and if you do so you must lose a morning or an afternoon or whatever the time may be. The bosses voluntarily ask for the Union label, and by that means say that they will employ none but Union hands; when they obtain such a label they of course have to employ none but Union men. It is a benefit to the shops, because it guarantees to the consumers that the cigars have been made by men and not by apprentices, and that the men who make the cigars have received an equal share of the profits made from their wages, or at all events better wages than non-Union hands. There are two or three Union shops in Montreal; one employs sixty or sixty-five hands, and the others are small shops.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—In addition to the apprentices employed in the cigar shops, are there many children employed as strippers? A.—It would be impossible for me to say as a fact, but I believe some very young children are employed as strippers. I have been told they have to work from seven or eight o'clock in the morning till nine or ten at night in certain shops at some seasons of the year. They have to work right along with the exception of the hour for dinner, and I have been told they work and eat at the same time.

Q.—Are there not a number of children employed as strippers? A.—There must be.

Q.—Are they generally younger than the apprentices? A.—They are about the same age I should judge.

Q.—Are there many girls? A.—They are principally girls we employ as strippers.

Q.—Do you know what wages they get? A.—No; I don't. Some I know get \$4.00 per week, but they are first-class hands.

Q.—You don't know what they commence at? A.—At about one dollar; sometimes they are put on piece work, three cents per pound. I think they can make from seventy cents to one dollar a week.

Q.—Are the strippers employed by the men or by the firms? A.—By the firms.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Are there any manufacturers in Montreal who refuse to employ men belonging to the Union? A.—It has never happened to me, but I have heard that certain manufacturers some time ago would not have Union men in their employ.

Q.—Do the Union men receive more per thousand for cigars than non-Union men? A.—Yes; in the Union shops they receive a higher rate.

Q.—Do you know any factory that recently imported men from Germany? A.—I am aware of one.

Q.—Was it under the plea that cigar makers were scarce in Montreal and Canada? A.—That was the plea made to the public I believe.

Q.—Do you know what actually occurred after the men had come out? A.—Some time after they had gone to work in the factory they did not seem to agree with their employer, and there was some difficulty. He wanted them to pay for gas; but that was not in the contract. When he took it off, he was obliged to take it off those who had been paying for it right along. Then there was some trouble about the men. Some of them left because they could not make enough to support themselves, and they thought they could do better in the United States, and some others refused to work any longer and found employment in other shops, and one or two of them were arrested and fined \$20.00, I believe, or ten days, or one month in default of paying the \$20.00.

Q.—Did those men come out to this country under contract? A.—Yes; under contract.

Q.—Were they induced to leave their situations in Europe and come out here to better their condition? A.—There was a letter addressed to one of the gentlemen.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You must say whether you know of this person or not. A.—I don't know the person.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—At the time those people were brought out here, was there any scarcity of labor in the cigar trade in Montreal? A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—Did you know any cigar makers out of employment at that time? A.—There might have been a few, but I was not aware of any.

Q.—Were any thrown out of employment by bringing those men out? A.—No; there were none thrown out; there were some taken on, but it was a question whether the Manufacturer needed them or not. There were several articles in the newspapers on the matter, and he answered them saying that his demand compelled him to import these Germans.

Q.—Were they better workmen than the Canadian workmen? A.—No better.

Q.—Did the introduction of these German workmen have any effect on the wages paid? A.—No; they mostly did good jobs,

Q.—Did they receive the same wages as Montreal cigar makers? A.—Yes; but they did the good jobs, the best jobs in the shop; some of them had low grades of work.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Did they better their condition? A.—Not a bit. Some said they had earned as much in Germany as they got here, and they were at more expense here.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Did they receive the wages that were paid here? A.—Yes.

Q.—And those wages did not come up to the expectations they had formed? A.—No; not at all.

Q.—Have you any knowledge of the fact that those people were dissatisfied as to what they could earn? A.—Not personally.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Is the work in a cigar factory unhealthy? A.—Yes it is. When I was at Ogdensburg I was told there by a doctor that if I desired to obtain my health I must not work in a cigar factory. I asked him to prescribe something, but he said it was no use, for it was tobacco that was injuring me. There are persons working in tobacco factories who have been told by the doctors they must not do it.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Are there any tenement-house made cigars here? A.—Not in Montreal.

Translation.

ALPHONSE LAFRANCE, Cigar-maker, of Montreal, recalled.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Those packages of cigars given to make cigars are weighed, are they not? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are the leaves all of the same thickness and weight? A.—No, sir.

Q.—So that, in one parcel, there may be more or less of leaves? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are the leaves counted? A.—No; that is not usually done.

Q.—So that, when an apprentice or a journeyman has a leaf in hand, it depends on the package and the weight of the leaves? A.—Yes; sometimes they give us a package of rolls fifty sides of which shall be counted and sometimes there will be ten with too many holes or too much torn to make cigars with.

Q.—You have been an apprentice? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are those spoiled leaves counted as missing leaves? A.—No, sir. They are counted as leaves present.

Q.—So that if you have fifty cigars to cover, and if in a package there are only thirty-five good leaves, are the perforated leaves counted as missing leaves? A.—No, they are counted as leaves that are present?

Q.—Well, an apprentice is not responsible for the number of rolls which are in a package, is he? A.—No; when I was an apprentice, they charged me with them all the same.

Q.—And as a journeyman, you deem it unjust to have to pay the missing leaves, do you not? A.—Yes.

CHARLES WEIR, Journeyman Cigar-maker, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—How old are you? A.—Eighteen years.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—How long have you worked in a cigar factory? A.—About five and one-half years.

Q.—In whose factory are you working? A.—In Jacob's.

Q.—How long did you serve an apprenticeship there? A.—I served three years at Fortier's.

Q.—Did you quit Fortier's when your time was up? A.—No; I worked one year after my time was up.

Q.—What wages did you receive when you were an apprentice? A.—From \$2 to \$3 per week.

Q.—What did you get the first year? A.—I was put on piece work as soon as I went there.

Q.—How much could you earn? A.—I earned \$1.50 to \$1.75 a week.

Q.—The first year? A.—Yes.

Q.—How much did you earn the last year? A.—I made \$3 or \$3.50.

Q.—What wages are you able to earn now? A.—\$9 and \$10 a week.

Q.—How many hours a day do you work at the present time? A.—Eight hours.

Q.—And working eight hours a day for six days in the week can you earn \$9 or \$10? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you able to work the whole of the year round? A.—Yes.

Q.—You don't lose any time? A.—No; except sickness, that is all.

Q.—Do you make more than others make or about the same wages? A.—About the same wages as journeymen make.

Q.—Are there many of them who make as much wages as you do? A.—There are plenty of men.

Q.—Did you ever see any boys put in the black hole at Fortier's when you were there? A.—I never saw any put in there; I was put in myself.

Q.—Do you care to tell us for what offence you were put in? A.—No; I don't care if I do.

Q.—What was it? A.—I had an argument over a mould with a girl who was working there, and the foreman came over and struck me. I told him he should not strike me, and he caught hold of me and took me downstairs and put me in the black hole.

Q.—How long did you remain there? A.—It seemed about two hours to me.

Q.—Were you ever fined? A.—Once.

Q.—Q.—For what were you fined? A.—One night I went home at five o'clock.

Q.—Were you fined in addition to the loss of your time? A.—There were fifteen cents kept off my pay.

Q.—It was simply because you went home early then? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Are your father and mother living? A.—My mother is.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you know of other boys being put into this black hole? A.—I heard tell of them, but I never saw any of them being put in.

Q.—Do you know of boys being fined? A.—Yes, I have often heard the foreman say he would fine such and such a fellow 25 cents.

Q.—Were you ever struck at any other time except that of which you have told us? A.—Once only; with a mould.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Where were you struck with the mould? A.—Across the wrist.

Translation.

STANISLAS GOYETTE, Cigar-maker, of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Mr. Goyette, you are a cigar-maker? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How old are you? A.—Twenty years old.

Q.—At what age did you begin your apprenticeship? A.—At the age of fourteen.

Q.—You served for three years? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What were your wages the first year? A.—One dollar a week.

Q.—And the second year? A.—One dollar and a half a week.

Q.—And the third year? A.—Three dollars a week.

Q.—Did you pay any fines during your apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir; that is never wanting.

Q.—Did you pay many fines? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you know how much you paid in fines during the three years of your apprenticeship? A.—I could not tell you, there were so many.

Q.—Thereabouts? A.—I could not say how many.

Q.—Do you remember the largest fine you paid in one week? A.—I could not say.

Q.—Has it ever happened to you, at the end of the week, to give your employer money, instead of receiving any from him? A.—As to that, I did not take notice. I could not tell you.

Q.—Were you ever beaten during your apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How old were you? A.—I might have been fourteen or fifteen.

Q.—Who beat you? A.—The foreman.

Q.—Why did he beat you? A.—For all sorts of reasons.

Q.—You do not remember why? A.—Sometimes because I would not work after the regular hours. Indeed, it was oftenest because I would not work after the regular hours.

Q.—Did he strike you with his hand, his fist or some tool? A.—With whatever he had in his hand. He baulked at nothing.

Q.—With a piece of wood—a stick? A.—Yes; wood and mould covers.

Q.—Were you beaten so as to be sick from the effects of it? A.—Yes, sir; I feel it to this day.

Q.—How long were you sick? A.—Four years.

Q.—Were you sick in bed? Yes; in bed, from time to time.

Q.—Were you forced to stop at home immediately after the beating? A.—I could not tell you; I did not take notice of that point.

Q.—Are you in good health now? A.—No, sir.

Q.—You attribute your present health to the blows you received? A.—Yes; to the blows I received.

Q.—What physician attended you? A.—I could not say. It was at the English Hospital that I was cared for. The first doctor who attended me was Dr. Demers.

Q.—Do you know where Dr. Demers lives? A.—Yes, sir,

Q.—Where does he live? A.—On St. Catharine street, corner of Dufresne street and St. Catharine street,

Q.—Were you attended by other doctors? A.—Yes, at the English Hospital,

Q.—One of the Commissioners asks you to say, if you care to say it, in what establishment you were thus treated? A.—At Mr. Fortier's.

Q.—Do you know an establishment where there is a blackhole? A.—Yes, sir; at Mr. Fortier's.

Q.—Were you ever in that blackhole? A.—It seems to me that I was, but I am not quite sure.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—It is only from hearsay, then, that you say there was a blackhole? A.—The blackhole? I saw it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Where is it situated? A.—In the cellar.

Q.—Have you seen children put in the blackhole? A.—No, sir; I did not see any.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Were these things done with the employer's knowledge? Is this bad treatment inflicted with the knowledge of the proprietor? A.—No, sir.

Q.—The boss knew nothing about it? A.—He knew it surely, but did not see it.

Q.—He knew the apprentices were treated in the manner you have described? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you receive any damages or any indemnity from Mr. Fortier during your illness? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you call on the authorities to protect you? A.—No, sir.

Q.—You were never sent before the Recorder? A.—No, sir.

— — — — —
Translation.

— — — — —, Cigar-maker, of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Mr. ———, were you foreman at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir, I was employed as foreman for four years.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—How did you beat the apprentices when you were foreman? A.—I never treated them exactly as the last witness related a moment ago. Only sometimes I had several discussions with a subaltern, so to speak. There was a young man by the name of Prud'homme who was employed with me, and with whom I had discussions. I left that job because it is very likely that I should have become as infamous as Mr. Fortier himself.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How many foremen were there in your time? A.—We were four.

Q.—Which means that the act of which we have just heard might have been committed by a foreman other than yourself? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Can you say whether Mr. Fortier knew in what manner his apprentices were treated? A.—Certainly, he knew it as well as I did; only when the superintendent told him something of the sort, he would burst out laughing.

Q.—Do you know whether any apprentices were beaten under his orders? A.—I remember only once, about two years ago now, that they took off the trousers of a young man.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—By whose order? A.—By Mr. McGregor's order:—

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Did they beat that child? A.—Yes, they beat him.

Q.—With what? A.—With a plank about 3 or 4 feet long and six inches broad.

Q.—You saw that yourself? A.—Yes, sir, I saw it myself.

Q.—Was it the general rule to beat the apprentices? A.—Not precisely. But whenever there was a chance, they made use of it.

Q.—What do you mean by a "chance"? Did that child do any act that deserved such punishment? A.—If a child did anything, that is, if he looked on

one side or other, or spoke. he would say: I'm going to make you pay 10 cents fine, and if the same were repeated three or four times, he would seize a stick or a plank, and beat him with it.

Q.—Is there a rule posted up in the factory about these fines? A.—I do not remember having ever seen any.

Q.—How did foremen apply the fines? was it merely after their own will, or after the rules laid down by Mr. Fortier? A.—I do not think it was after Mr. Fortier. I think it was very likely after the foreman.

Q.—What was done with the money from the fines? A.—It is hard for me to tell you that.

Q.—Were there any funds created in the establishment, or did that money go to the cash box? A.—It is very likely that it went to the cash box.

Q.—Are you aware that apprentices have paid more fines than they had wages to receive a week? A.—No, not while I was there. I do not remember having ever seen such things, but I have certainly heard them talked of.

Q.—Could you state the several kinds of fines that were imposed? Were there some of ten cents and twenty cents? What were the prices? A.—There were apprentices sometimes who had fines of seventy cents to one dollar.

Q.—How? What had these people done? A.—For having talked, turned their head, or for not attending to their work.

Q.—Do you mean to say that for merely turning the head the foreman imposed a tax of one dollar on a child? A.—Not exactly one dollar. But, for instance, if he imposed a fine of ten cents, at the end of the week, with all these ten cents a dollar was made up. Very often he warned them four or five times, and then if he imposed a fine, at the end of the week it amounted to a dollar.

Q.—What is the largest fine, to your knowledge, imposed at one time? A.—Twenty-five cents. I saw this two or three times—thus, an apprentice made three or four dollars during the week, and he would say to him: "I will take two dollars off your wages." I am certain that this was repeated two or three times.

Q.—Do you know the black hole at Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir. I have seen it several times.

Q.—Are children put in there summer and winter? A.—Over and over again. I have seen them put there in winter and also in summer. What is called the black hole is a sort of coal box. The coals are stored there, and when the children don't behave they stick them among the coals.

Q.—On what floor is it? A.—In the cellar.

Q.—Under the ground? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is this black hole in any way heated? A.—It is not heated, but the warmth reaches there, as the building is heated by steam.

Q.—Is it cold there in winter? A.—Pretty cold in winter.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Did you yourself ever put any one into that black hole when you were serving under Mr. Fortier? A.—Never. I never was so infamous as to put a prisoner there.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you know whether little girls were ever put into that black hole? A.—No; I do not remember having seen any.

Q.—How long did the children stop in the black hole? A.—It seems to me that there was a young fellow by the name of Charley Weir who stopped there about one hour or two, but I am not positive as to the time. But one hour or two was the shortest time he was in.

Q.—Who led them to the black hole? A.—The most of the time there was a certain man whom we called the constable, Mr. Goudreau.

Q.—Does that policeman wear a police badge? A.—Yes, he wears one.

Q.—Is he employed by the factory or is he simply a policeman? A.—He is employed in the factory, but I think he was formerly in the police, and that is why he kept his badge.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you know that he belonged to the police? A.—I am not certain.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are the men fined? A.—No. Never the men; only the apprentices. Only on three or four occasions I heard a certain foreman, named Henry Fortier, repeat several times to the men: "If you do not fetch your cuttings I will charge you twenty-five cents." He spoke to the journeymen.

By Mr. CORÉ:—

Q.—It was to oblige them to fetch the balance of the tobacco they had in hand? A.—Certainly.

Q.—Do you think it was the duty of these men to fetch the foreman the balance of the tobacco? A.—No. They might just as well leave it in the drawer. The drawer is an opening in the front of the table.

Q.—Is it customary to fetch the tobacco cuttings, as you say? A.—Yes, it is a habit they have formed, but the most of the time, they fetch these themselves, having them picked up by two small apprentice boys.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are cigars taken from the men when they fetch their work, sometimes? A.—Yes, from each maker. Thus, when a man fetches fifty cigars, the foreman takes out three or four, on the plea that they are not right. If Mr. Fortier or Mr. McGregor, who is superintendent, or no matter what other foreman, wants a smoke, instead of taking cigars on which excise duty has been paid, they take these other cigars and smoke them.

Q.—They pay no excise on those cigars? A.—No.

Q.—Did you yourself ever take cigars from the men—I do not want to go into your private business—but I ask this if you choose to reply? A.—There is no secret about it. Any how I come here, this evening, to make a general confession.

Q.—Well, if you are about making a general confession, have you taken cigars yourself sometimes? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Were there among these cigars good ones, and that could have been sold? A.—Yes, almost all those cigars could be sold, as Mr. Fortier himself said when there were too many for his use, "You will choose the best that there are there; you will send them to the packing house and there they will be sold all the same." This was repeated during the four years that I was engaged there, say about twenty times.

Q.—Did you take those cigars by order of Mr. Fortier? A.—No, sir; but it was the custom.

Q.—If you had not done it, would your situation have been imperilled? A.—It would be hard for me to answer that question. Only two or three times, the superintendent and Mr. Fortier, once, told me: "How is it that there are no more cigars than this to-night? If there are not more than that, you will be obliged to smoke common cigars," that is, a cigar worth three for five cents. He was in the habit of taking twelve, a dozen or fifteen every evening.

Q.—You and all the other foremen took away cigars that you knew to be good cigars? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You had reason to act thus? A.—There were certain cigars which I might easily have let pass, but they had a slight flaw and I then said: "One or two I will take out. That will do him no harm."

Q.—Speaking generally, about how many cigars might a man lose a week, under those conditions? A.—I never took out many, but I have seen some foremen, like Henry Fortier, brother of Mr. J. M. Fortier, Mr. Ryan and another foreman, whom I prefer not to name, over and over take ten or fifteen out of fifty.

Q.—When a child was well behaved and did his work well, was he ever rewarded? A.—Never, sir, was a child rewarded who did well.

Q.—Nor any other hand either? A.—No; and not any other hand. I served my apprenticeship with Mr. Fortier; I was employed there three years first as apprentice and then as foreman, for four years. I say nothing of the time when I was foreman, for, in that time, once, he gave me a box of cigars, but during my apprenticeship I got nothing from him. I always was on good terms with him, however, and he always used me well.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that when an employee had done his duty and every thing that was required of him, any bonus or reward was given to him for his general diligence and good conduct? A.—Never was an employee rewarded.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—The workmen paid the gas at Mr. Fortier's, did they not? A.—Yes, sir; ten cents a week for each hand.

Q.—For how many weeks? A.—So soon as it begins to grow dark in the fall until spring, they have to pay ten cents a week.

Q.—How many men in the factory pay for the gas? A.—About one hundred and twenty-five.

Q.—Do they pay for the gas whether they work or not? A.—Whether the gas burns or does not burn, they pay all the same.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—How many men are there usually to each gas light? Can more than one man work by a light? A.—Eight or ten can work by one light.

Q.—And these ten pay each ten cents a week? A.—Yes, these ten pay each ten cents a week.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are the apprentices who serve their three years good workmen when they come out of there? A.—The greater number are good workmen, but I believe that it is more than likely the one-half of those boys who serve their three years of apprenticeship at Mr. Fortier's do nothing at all, inasmuch as there are some apprentices who begin at ten years old.

Q.—Are there many who can neither read nor write? A.—I believe that you could not find ten in a hundred who can sign their names.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Where are you employed at present? Do you still work at your trade as cigar-maker? A.—Yes, I am engaged with Mr. Jacobs just now.

Q.—Are you foreman with Mr. Jacobs? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You are a maker? A.—Yes, a simple maker.

Q.—Are apprentices at Mr. Jacobs treated in the same way as they are treated at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Well, they have no apprentices. I am sure that Mr. Jacobs, being a perfect gentleman, would treat them better than Mr. Fortier did.

Q.—In that case you believe that the system just mentioned by you exists only at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes. I believe that it is the only factory using that system.

Q.—In the other factories do you judge that the hands are well used? A.—I

never worked in other factories. Lately when I was at Mr. Fortier's, not wishing to become like him, I left and went straight to Mr. Jacobs,

Q.—Are cigars confiscated at Mr. Jacobs' as at Mr. Fortier's? A.—No; never. Instead of making a profit out of the men Mr. Jacobs will give you a couple of cigars in the evening and five on Saturdays.

Q.—What do they do with poor cigars at Mr. Jacobs? A.—They do nothing at all. Only all the hands at Mr. Jacobs are all first-rate cigar-makers.

Q.—One of the Commissioners would like to know the general condition of the workmen; how they are treated, workmen and apprentices, as a rule, in tobacco factories? Do you believe, after your own experience, after your own knowledge, and meeting with your comrades, that the condition of things which you have just described exists only at Mr. Fortier's? A.—There is no such infamous factory as Mr. Fortier's.

Q.—But do you say that outside of Fortier's the men are suitably treated? A.—On that point it is hard for me to answer, but I believe that there is not a single factory in Montreal where the men are so badly treated as at Fortier's.

Q.—You have said that already, but I want to know if it is an exception or if it is the rule, from what you have heard from the workmen, in general, whom you meet, that they are well treated elsewhere? A.—I cannot so speak for other places.

Q.—Is the factory of Mr. Jacobs one of the factories called Union factories? A.—Yes, they use the Union label,

Q.—That means that the hands working with him belong to the workmen's Union? A.—Yes, they are all Union men,

Q.—And at Mr. Fortier's? A.—At Mr. Fortier's I think they employ about three or four belonging to the Union. The remainder do not belong to it.

Q.—Is there any difference of price between the factories of Mr. Fortier and Mr. Jacobs? A.—There is a great difference of price between the factories of Mr. Fortier and Mr. Jacobs.

Q.—Mr. Jacobs pays higher rates? A.—Mr. Jacobs makes a straight cigar, called "Stonewall Jackson." He pays nine dollars for those cigars and the Union label asks only eight dollars a thousand. Mr. Fortier, for a cigar which usually pays seven or eight dollars, will pay you six dollars. In the reductions which he generally makes every winter, for a cigar that you manufacture at, say, ten dollars, he will give you eight dollars, for the same reduction, and for the second he will offer you six dollars, as was the case lately.

Q.—Have you heard that the state of things at Mr. Fortier's exists elsewhere? As a cigar-maker have you ever heard of any other factories where such a state exists? A.—No, sir; never.

Q.—How many cigar factories are there here in Montreal? A.—Some six or seven, I think.

Q.—Do you think that cigar-makers, as a general rule, except at Mr. Fortier's are as well treated and as well paid as the workmen in other factories? No, sir.

Q.—You believe, in that case, that this condition of things is to be found only at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Only at Mr. Fortier's.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is Canadian tobacco used in the manufacture of cigars? A.—I think there was formerly a factory of Canadian tobacco. It was run by Mr. Forest, but I think that there is none now.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—What wages do you earn usually as cigar-maker? You are not obliged to answer that question, unless you want to? A.—All makers have not the advantage of being swift, some are very slow in making cigars. I am new at Mr. Jacobs. I never worked there before.

Q.—Of course, those who go fastest are paid more? A.—Those who go fastest are paid more.

Q.—At what age did you begin to work in cigar factories? A.—I think I was seventeen years old.

Q.—You are well educated? A.—I went through a full course of study.

6th February, 1888.

GEORGE ROBLEY, Cigar-maker, of Montreel, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have heard the evidence given by the witness who has just spoken? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Can you give us more details as to the manner apprentices are treated in general? A.—In general, apprentices are treated more or less as slaves; moreover, in Mr. Fortier's factory, apprentices learn nothing but blackguarding and blasphemy from morning to night. Two years ago, this factory was nothing less than a theatre of lewdness. I am now speaking the truth. I have seen girls in pregnancy promenading in a factory, and the proprietor and boss said nothing against that. These girls were allowed to circulate amongst the men, the employees, women, girls and children.

Q.—To what do you attribute this state of immorality? A.—A little to the carelessness of the bosses. If the bosses had a little more care of their factory, things of that kind would not be allowed there.

Q.—Are girls and men in contact with boys in the factory? A.—They were for a time, now they are in different departments; the men are on one side, and some boys apprentices go along with what they call the bunch makers, that is those that make the inside of the cigars.

Q.—Has this separation of men and women not had the effect of improving the morality of the establishment? A.—No, sir; it was to fill up both establishments; there was a door of communication between the two buildings so as to fill up both sides; men were placed on one side and the girls on the other.

Q.—What do you know about the black-hole? A.—Nothing but what the other witnesses have stated.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You have seen the black-hole? A.—I have seen it, and I have seen boys put in it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—No girls? A.—I have got a faint idea that there was a girl put in it, but there was another that was threatened to be put in it.

Q.—But you did not see her put in it? A.—No, sir. In the factory, they have got what they call fire-proof stairs, and from the street there is an ascending stair to the different departments, and under that is the cellar; there is a place where they generally put in old pieces of cloth and stuff that tie tobacco, and when an apprentice has been caught taking one or two cigars, or perhaps for an inferior offence, he is put in that until a would-be detective takes him out and takes him to the station.

Q.—Do you mean the man who bears the name of constable? A.—Yes.

Q.—He, then arrests children? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—He puts them in the black-hole? A.—Yes; until he is ready to bring them to the station, and searches the men portion of the employees in the factory.

Q.—How long are children kept in the black hole? A.—It is pretty hard to say. When a man is caught, he is put in there, and he must wait.

Q.—Is there a padlock on the door? A.—No, it is an iron bar.

Q.—Is there a window? A.—No sir, he is in the dark.

Q.—Is there any vermin in this black hole? A.—I could not say.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How long have you known anyone to be in there? A.—I could not say.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is anything to drink and to eat given to children in the black hole? A.—No, sir; sometimes, one is put in there under the influence of the weather, so to say, and remains in there until he is sobered up.

Q.—In winter, is it cold in that place? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What do you know about the fines imposed on apprentices? A.—There are fines that don't exactly go under the name of fines. The boys are on piece work, every one of the apprentices, and when a boy has the advantage of being pretty lively at work, he makes a pretty good week. On the Saturday evening, according to the caprice of the boss, or for any little offence that he may have made, this extra, as they call it, is taken from the boy. I remember myself having to pay forty cents for a small piece of bread.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How is that? A.—We happened to come out of the factory, and the foreman sent a boy for his lunch; and after he had taken his lunch, just fooling more than anything else, I took a piece of bread, and the other boy took a potato, and it cost the other boy one dollar and thirty-five cents, and as I had made only forty cents, it cost me only forty cents. On another occasion, on the 8th of September, I don't remember the year (I have been looking for the book where I had it marked, but I could not find it), I ran out with the idea that it was the feast of the Immaculate Conception, and I told one or two of the boys that it was the feast of the Immaculate Conception the next day. I left off work and I went to go to church. Father told me: You are foolish, it is not the feast of the Immaculate Conception, and the boss pretended to get me arrested. I don't know if he got a warrant or not; any way it cost me one dollar and eighty cents, being all my week's work. I don't think I will ever forget it; and twenty-five cents, fine was an every day occurrence; and I am sorry to say I was not the only one that way.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Did any one complain to the authorities about this state of things?

A.—About the fine business?

Q.—No; about the black hole? A.—About the black hole, it never went to the authorities.

Q.—No one spoke to the police about that pretended constable? A.—No, sir.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you seen this constable wearing his badge? A.—Yes, sir, I have seen him with a badge. I don't know if they are his initials on it. His name is Ernest Boudreau, and on the bottom of the badge there are the initials "E. B."

Q.—Is anything else written on this badge? A.—Yes; but I cannot say what it is. I know he has been watchman on St. Lawrence street, and through his own love for drink he was discharged.

Q.—You have seen children beaten? A.—Yes, sir,

Q.—Will you tell us if you saw any brutally beaten? A.—Well, you may judge

it yourself. There are two that I have seen beaten—one by the name of Plante, an apprentice, and the other named Rodgers.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—What were they beaten with? A.—With a piece of hoop that is put around cases; their pants were taken off.

Q.—Were they beaten severely so as to leave marks? A.—Yes, sir; and after they had been beaten, the book-keeper then, who is now keeping a factory with Mr. Wood, that is Mr. Tassé, started to laugh at the boy who was beaten.

By Mr. HELBRONNER—

Q.—What was the child's age? A.—It is pretty hard to say.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Were they small boys? They were middle size boys; fifteen or sixteen years old.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—But to take a child's pants off, they must have been two? A.—There were more than two there.

Q.—More than two to beat the child? A.—Certainly. This constable is a Handy Andy around the shop and works at everything; he searches the boys, imposes the fines, turns bunches just the same as the foremen or auxiliaries.

Q.—Speaking of the child you saw beaten, how many men seized him to beat him. A.—Three; they said:—"Come on, hurry up, take off your pants," and it appears that the boy did not hurry up, they gave him a hand at it, and one of them, who is now examining cigars, and who himself is no workman, was the hangman for the occasion.

Q.—Could you tell us something you know about the cigars taken from the men? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Give us the details you know? A.—Cigars are examined. A man brings in fifty cigars at a time, that is to say, the hand-worked cigars, and a cigar that is considered a little shorter than the other, is taken out.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Is the man allowed anything at all for that cigar? A.—He is allowed to bring another to replace it. Then, a cigar with a small hole in it, is considered as a bad cigar also and taken out, and when a cigar is what we call a tuck, that is being a little too full of tobacco, it is taken out; the same thing for not being full enough, cigars are taken out. For several other reasons, too numerous to mention, cigars are taken out and must be replaced, or else the man is sacked, or if he is not sacked, he is not paid for his work—the good cigars are not paid for.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—He not only loses his bad cigars but also his good ones? A.—He loses them if he does not want to replace them.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What becomes of those bad cigars? A.—They are sent to the packing room when there are too many to bring down to the office for smokers and I have packed some of those cigars myself in an empty box on which the excise stamp had been used before; the box was a canvas-back box, a fifty-box. When I would not do the work, the foreman would do it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Are those cigars sold ? A.—No, sir. We use them for smokers. A new excise officer happened to be there, and he wanted to do things according to his own conscience, according to the law, and so as to close his eyes, if the word may be admitted, these cigars were used: the box was packed over and left in the office for smokers.

Q.—Are workingmen's wages higher this year than they were some years ago ? A.—Last year they were a little higher than they were the year before, because we worked at night.

Q.—You did not get more a thousand ? A.—One dollar a thousand more, and we worked at night.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—You work more time ? A.—Yes, Sir, we had about sixteen hours of work.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—How much do you earn a week by working sixteen hours a day ? A.—On an average about three dollars and a half a day, but it must be admitted that I consider myself a pretty fast workman on that kind of work.

Q.—Has the employment of children the effect of diminishing considerably men's salary ? A.—In winter time a man has got to work for any price the boss will give him, or else work elsewhere.

Q.—How long have children been employed in factories in such large numbers ? A.—About seven years. I must say it is a very few years previous to that, that the same boss started his factory.

Q.—Were wages better nine years ago ? A.—About the same thing. Last year everybody felt the benefit of the wages.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—Will you tell us where you are now working ? A.—At Mr. Jacob's.

Q.—There are no apprentices at Mr. Jacob's ? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Are there apprentices in other factories as well as at Mr. Fortier's ? A.—In every factory there are apprentices, except at Jacob's.

Q.—Are they well treated generally or badly treated ? A.—According to what I hear it is Fortier's apprentices that are the worse treated.

Q.—You consider that elsewhere apprentices are well enough treated ? A.—Well, we may say so. It is pretty hard to say. There is one factory where there are scarcely any men, they are all apprentices. It is at Messrs. Goulet & Company.

Q.—How do they treat their apprentices ? A.—I could not say.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—You never heard any complaints ? A.—No, sir. I do not associate with those boys at all.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—You have heard these complaints generally only from Fortier's factory ? A.—I have worked there, and that is how I have come to know the difference ?

Q.—Does Mr. Fortier employ more apprentices now than in former years. A.—Not at present.

Q.—Are there more apprentices than journeymen at Mr. Fortier's ? A.—Well, they are all apprentices now ; there are only a few journeymen.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Would the members of the Union work for Mr. Fortier ? Are they allowed to work for Mr. Fortier ? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You never knew of any that did work? A.—I have worked there a few weeks ago. Mr. Fortier must have heard about this Royal Commission affair, because the apprentices that were under a certain age, I think fourteen years old, were sent away from the factory. I don't think that their indentures were broken, but they were sent away.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Did this manufacturer know that you were a Union man when you went there? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Are machines used to make cigars? A.—Yes; six machines which may turn out between the six of them an average of twenty-five thousand (25,000) bunches in a day, equal to the work of twenty-five swift hands.

Q.—Are there any in all the cigar factories? A.—I could not say, I have not seen any in other factories.

Q.—How do those machines work? A.—By steam.

Q.—Are they governed by a man or a boy? A.—They are governed by a girl.

Q.—Are those machines dangerous for the girls who govern them? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you know if there are many Canadian cigar makers in the United States? A.—There are many.

Q.—Who previously worked in Canada? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And what was the cause of their leaving, to your knowledge? A.—Because prices were not sufficient here in the city.

Q.—Have you known any who were married and had families? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did they leave with their families? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are any coming back? A.—Very few.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Do the girls get the same pay as the men for the same work? A.—Yes, sir; the apprentices work for an inferior price and do the same work as the men.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Do any of the women belong to your Union? A.—Not in Canada.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you consider the cigar-makers of Montreal underpaid in comparison with the cigar-makers of other cities in the Dominion? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Will you give the difference in the percentage? A.—It is pretty hard to talk about the percentage. What we consider the bill of prices is paid in nearly every town besides Montreal.

Q.—Do you know anything about the cost of living in Toronto? A.—No, sir.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Did you ever work in the United States? A.—No, sir; the furthest I have worked is in Granby, in Canada.

By Mr. Coté :—

Q.—Are there many cigars imported into Canada from the United States? A.—I could not tell.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Are the manufacturers of Montreal organized among themselves? A.—I have heard it.

Q.—Have the cigars-makers ever sent a demand to their employers for higher wages and the improvement of their condition? A.—In the spring, after having resisted a little reduction in jobs, men would go and ask for the old prices, and it was when the men said they would not work any more that they would get something like that, or wait on the boss.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Would the boss give them a reason when they would wait on him? A.—He would give them the summer prices when he would think fit.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have ever the men applied to the employers for receiving similar prices in winter time as they would get in summer? A.—They have very often, and very often the boss did not know about the reduction.

Q.—When he did know about the reduction, would he increase the prices to summer rates? A.—Well, as I have said, the boss would wait until he thought it fair and give the summer prices.

Q.—Are there some of the bosses still waiting? A.—Yes, sir; some of the men have been obliged to change factories owing to the diminution of the prices.

Q.—Do many of the cigar-makers in Montreal own their own homes? A.—Do you mean to say their property?

Q.—Yes; their house and lot? A.—I know of one.

Q.—Did you hear if he got it out of his wages? A.—I could not say, I think he got it from his wife.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Are the prices better at Mr. Jacob's than at Mr. Fortier's for the same work? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—It appears, then, that it is only in that manufactory that they pay such low wages and treat the apprentices in the manner that was mentioned? A.—According to what I hear of other factories, things don't go to perfection; but in that factory, that is at Fortier's, well, there is no name for it.

(Translation.)

JOSEPH GAGNON, Cigar-maker, of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How old are you? A.—I am eighteen.

Q.—You are in apprenticeship now? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—At Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you paid any fines lately? A.—Yes, sir. I paid fines of twenty-five cents, fifty cents, seventy-five cents, a week.

Q.—How much were you earning when you paid these fines? A.—That depended on what I made—two dollars, one dollar, one dollar and a half or a dollar and seventy-five cents, a week.

Q.—You are an apprentice and work by the job? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And you work by the job? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you not an apprentice to learn your trade? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you make a contract with Mr. Fortier, or did your father make one for you? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Was the contract made before a notary? A.—No, sir.

- Q.—Did you sign the contract? A.—I signed, and my father signed.
- Q.—The contract is at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir, but I have a copy at the house.
- Q.—How long is it since you have paid a fine? A.—It is some time back since I have paid a fine, but three or four months ago I paid one.
- Q.—How much was that fine you paid three or four months ago? A.—One week I had made one dollar and seventy-five cents, and he took from me seventy-five cents in the week.
- Q.—Are the fines that you pay sometimes remitted to you? A.—No, sir; they are never returned.
- Q.—Do you know whether they have been remitted to others? A.—I do not think they have been remitted to others.
- Q.—Do you know the blackhole at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir; I was put into it.
- Q.—How long ago is that? A.—It may be about one year and a half ago.
- Q.—Do you remember what you had done to go to the blackhole? A.—It was the first day that I was learning another kind of work. I was learning to roll cigars. In the evening, I took three to take home and show my parents what I was making, but I meant to fetch them back in the morning. Then Mr. Ernest Goudrias laid hold of me that evening and took me down stairs where he kept me an hour's time.
- Q.—Did he lay hold of you brutally to take you down? A.—Pretty roughly, roughly enough, but not sufficient to hurt me.
- Q.—Was it after working hours that he put you in the blackhole or during work hours? A.—A half hour during work hours and a half hour afterward.
- Q.—When you got out, was the factory closed? A.—No. I came out of the blackhole, and went into the office, and there I asked whether he would let me go. He began talking to me, and sent me off with one of the hands.
- Q.—He did not send you back to the blackhole; he let you go out? A.—Yes, he let me go out, but telling me that it was to take me to the central police office.
- Q.—The day that you were put into the blackhole were you fined for having carried away the three cigars? A.—No, sir; I was not fined.
- Q.—At what time of the year, if you can remember, were you put into the blackhole? Was it in summer or in winter? A.—I do not remember.
- Q.—Do you remember why you were fined; for instance, why you were fined seventy-five cents, as you said? A.—It was because we did not make cigars enough or because we did not carry out the regulations of the foreman exactly, or else, because, being an apprentice, I could not do the work as well as others for the stock that he gave me. That is the reason he fined me.
- Q.—What were the regulations that you did not follow? Are these regulations posted in the factory? A.—I know that there are some regulations posted up, but the regulations about fines and other punishments are not posted.

— — — — —
(Translation.)

LÉON GIRANDIAS, Cigar-maker, of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

- Q.—You are a cigar-maker? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Is it long since you finished your apprenticeship? A.—Some seven or eight years, I think.
- Q.—You served your apprenticeship at Montreal? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—How long did you serve? A.—Three years.
- Q.—Did you pay any fines during your apprenticeship. A.—No sir; not at all.

Q.—In what factory did you serve your apprenticeship? A.—I learned my trade at Mr. Lesser's.

Q.—Fines are not imposed in that factory? A.—No, sir.

Q.—You have worked in several factories? A.—Yes sir; I have worked in several factories.

Q.—Have you seen children beaten in several factories? A.—No sir; not in several, but I have seen them beaten in the factory where I worked at Messrs. Tassé & Wood. I saw a child beaten with a mould. I saw him struck with it three times.

Q.—What is a mould? How large is it? A.—A mould is about twenty-five inches long.

Q.—And how large? A.—The size is about three inches.

Q.—Was he beaten brutally? A.—He received three blows. That hurt him, I can tell you.

Q.—Could the child move after that? A.—Yes. He moved in spite of himself.

Q.—How old was he? A.—I think he was about fourteen years old. The foreman sent for the police, and the police not coming in time, he beat him.

Q.—What had the child done? A.—I could not tell you exactly. I think he had a row with a little girl. I think it was on account of a brush that the quarrel arose.

Q.—The brush is a part of your work is it not? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—On what part of the body did he beat him? A.—On the buttocks and on the hips.

Q.—Did they take off his trousers? A.—No.

Q.—Did only one man beat him? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is that the only child you saw beaten? A.—I saw another child beaten quite brutally.

Q.—In the same factory? A.—Yes; in the same factory.

Q.—How was he beaten? A.—The boy had caused a pair of scales to fall. The scales were not broken, and he when he saw this . . .

Q.—Whom do you mean? The foreman? A.—Yes; the foreman. He took the broom and he gave him at least five or six blows on the shoulders.

Q.—How old was the child? A.—I think he was about fifteen years old. The foreman told him to hurry up. The little fellow did not go fast enough, and the foreman, who had a punch in his hand, a steel punch to punch the cases, threw the punch and struck him in the side, with all the strength of his arm.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What then happened? A.—That nearly choked him. He did not go fast enough. He struck him another blow on the shoulders to make him get on.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Did you see others? A.—I have seen others slap, but that meant nothing.

Q.—In the factories where you have worked, are the apprentices fined? A.—It is at Mr. Fortier's that I saw it.

Q.—You did see fines imposed in other factories. A.—No.

Q.—Is it long since you worked for Messrs. Tassé & Wood? A.—It is nearly one year and a half.

Q.—Were there more children than journeymen? A.—Yes; I think there were more children than journeymen.

Q.—Did they also take cigars from the men there? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In the same conditions as were stated by the other witnesses? A.—Yes. They took cigars and said that they were bad, but they were quite good. They were only passable. I assure you that the work was good. It is when they want cigars that they take them to smoke. Sometimes I have seen eighty taken at one time.

Q.—Out of how many? A.—I guess there were two hundred and fifty made cigars.

Q.—When they take cigars from you do they show the flaws in them, or do they merely take them without showing the flaws? A.—They do not show them, and if you ask them to show the flaws, they have time to fold up the cigars and pierce them to make them bad.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How can such things happen and the men are silent? Why do they not complain to the authorities? A.—Why you see we are not in sufficient force?

Q.—What do you mean by not being in sufficient force? A.—The Union is not strong enough.

Q.—When the children are beaten, why is it that complaints are not laid before the authorities? A.—They should complain.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How is it the fathers of these boys did not complain? A.—I could not tell you that. In regard to the cigars just spoken of, they take these cigars under the plea that they are bad, so as not to have to take them from the boxes. I have myself seen fourteen taken out in one day and given to parties coming into the shop, rather than take them from the box in which duty was paid.

Q.—You have seen fourteen cigars taken from the men? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And given to gentlemen who were in the shop? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What was said to you when the cigars were taken? A.—They told me nothing.

Q.—Were you paid for these cigars? A.—Not at all. If I had asked, he would have told me to mind my business.

Q.—In what factory did this happen to you? A.—At Messrs. Tassé & Wood. I could tell you all about it from this till to-morrow morning.

(Translation.)

——, cigar-maker, of the city of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have heard the evidence of the witness who has just been examined? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You have nothing to say for or against what he said? A.—What I could say is in regard to what Mr. Gerandias saw at Messrs. Tassé & Wood, in the case of the boy who was beaten by a mould,

Q.—Did you see the child beaten with a mould? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You have children? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In that case, what was your impression when you saw that child beaten? A.—If we had had little work at the time, I should have got up and taken his part there.

Q.—Was he beaten as brutally as the witness said? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you see the punch thrown? A.—No; I did not see the punch thrown.

Q.—Do you know what the child had actually done to be beaten in that fashion? A.—In the evening there had been a dispute about a cigar in a bunch, between a young girl, the little boy and the foreman. The dispute was put off till the next morning, and the next morning they began the discussion again, one saying that it was the other, the other that it was the first, and I think the foreman leaned a little more to the side of the young girl than to the side of the little boy. The little boy said that it was not he, but he was so much afraid of the foreman that I fear the latter made him acknowledge himself guilty when he was not. Then the foreman

began shaking him a bit, and he took him, and put him on his belly on a counter, and there taking up a mould cover, he struck him with it three times with all his might.

Q.—On his loins? A.—On the posterior. Then I saw the police come, and the policeman told him that he had no right to strike the child, and the foreman replied a couple of times that he had the right. The police replied again that he had not, and then the foreman called the policeman near him at his desk, and gave him a few cigars.

Q.—Why did the police come? Who sent for them? A.—It was he himself, the foreman, who sent for the police, on account of the dispute over the cigar.

Q.—Why did he summon the police? A.—That is more than I can say.

Q.—Was there any noise in the factory? A.—Yes; there was a discussion about the cigar or the bunch.

Q.—Between the little boy and the little girl? A.—Yes. When the policeman came, he saw the little boy at the door crying.

Q.—How old might the little girl be? A.—About ten or eleven years old.

Q.—The little boy? A.—Thirteen or fourteen years old.

Q.—You did not see the little girl beaten? A.—No.

Q.—You saw no little girl at all beaten in the factory? A.—No; I saw no little girl beaten. I saw slaps given to the little boy and boxes over the ears.

Q.—The little boys, according to this evidence, appear to be under an impression of terror in that factory, are they not? A.—It looks much like it.

Q.—You would not like to see your own children thus treated? A.—I think not.

By Mr. Corré:—

Q.—Are you aware that the foreman attempted to have a present made to himself by the apprentices in that factory? A.—I heard it spoken of, but I cannot speak from my own knowledge.

GEORGE S. WARREN, cigar-maker, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How long have children been employed in the manufacture of cigars? A.—According to my knowledge since 1873.

Q.—Were children employed in 1863 as apprentices? A.—In 1863 there was a mould invented for cigar-making; before that time we did not know what it was to have a lot of apprentices in the shops. The system of making cigars by moulds caused a great many children to go to work at the trade. Manufacturers found they could get cigars made more cheaply by children, and that is how so many children are employed in the trade. Before that time there were only a certain number of apprentices employed according to the number of men in the shop, as is the case in Upper Canada at present.

Q.—What was the scale of wages in 1873? A.—Cigar-makers from 1873 to 1875 earned as average wages from \$12 to \$18 per week; the lowest amount earned then was \$9 a week.

Q.—Were the prices of cigars higher in 1873 than they are now, take corresponding qualities? A.—In regard to certain cigars, no, but in other grades, yes, because the labour of children is cheaper.

Q.—Do you mean that manufacturers have not gained by the employment of children? A.—Certainly, they make more profit by child labor than formerly. There is a great deal of stock that is wasted, but they pay so small wages to the children that the manufacturers can compete and sell the cigars at cheap rates.

Q.—What is the average rate of wages for a cigar-maker to-day? A.—To-day

the wages of a cigar-maker will run on one class of work, \$6.00, and on another class perhaps \$7.50 or \$8.00; probably he may some weeks make as high as \$15.00, but in other weeks there would be very little work and he would not make much, or there might be a change of job so that the average might be placed at about \$8.00 per week, the lowest \$6.00 or \$5.50.

Q.—Do you mean by an average the amount per week for the whole year round?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you believe that the reduction in wages is due to child labour? A.—Yes, I do.

Q.—Are you aware whether the quantity of domestic cigars manufactured has increased since 1873? A.—I know it has.

Q.—Have you any figures? A.—I have not any figures at hand, but I am sure the amount has increased by the number of people employed and the children who are in the shops.

Q.—Are cigar-makers in great demand in Montreal, or are there more hands than there is work for them to do? A.—They would be in demand, but on account of so many children being employed most of our men have to go to the States, and that is what makes the difference in the number of men working now, compared with formerly. As a general rule in the winter time there is less work in the factories and our wages are regularly lowered every winter.

Q.—Do those reductions in winter take place regularly every year? A.—Yes; they take place regularly every year in certain factories.

Q.—How long does that reduction continue? A.—It generally lasts until spring and sometimes into July.

Q.—And it starts when? A.—It generally starts in the holidays, when it is getting very cold.

Q.—Does it last about six months? A.—Yes.

Q.—Take for instance men working at other trades possessing the same amount of intelligence and spending as much time to learn the trade, do they earn as much as cigar-makers? A.—Ours is a trade at which we work by piece work. We don't earn more than those employed at other trades.

Q.—Is the cigar business a very easy or a difficult business to learn? A.—It is an easy business to learn, but it takes quite a time before a man is a proficient cigar-maker.

Q.—Is the making of cigars easy; is the work in the factory easy work? A.—Yes; under the system we now have.

Q.—And you think, after taking into consideration the time it takes to learn the trade and the time it takes to learn other trades, that the cigar-makers are paid as well as other trades? A.—Yes.

By MR. HELLBRONNER:—

Q.—Are you acquainted with the importation of cigar-makers here? A.—Yes. I remember one firm in the city which went to Europe and brought cigar-makers here.

Q.—What firm? A.—S. Davis & Sons.

Q.—At what time of the year did these emigrants arrive? A.—I don't remember exactly; I think it was in summer, for they came by the steamship line.

Q.—Were cigar-makers not sufficiently numerous in Montreal? A.—There were sufficient cigar-makers; but, as I have said, they could not get enough cigar-makers for the simple reason that most of our men had gone away to the States.

Q.—How many workmen were imported at that time? A.—Somewhere in the vicinity of 200, I believe.

Q.—Tell us all you know relating to the matter? A.—So far as I can tell you, it was this—and other cigar-makers will tell you the same story—we learned that there were a number of foreign workmen, cigar-makers, coming into this country who were hired by the firm I have named. When they arrived we were

notified of it; but I must say that no men were discharged while they were here. There were about 200 of them, and they set to work, but after a little time they all went away to the States.

Q.—Why? A.—They calculated they could not make enough, I suppose. I never spoke to any of them personally about it.

Q.—Were those workmen engaged in their own country by contract? A.—I don't know; I was not there. They went there and got them.

Q.—Did any of the workmen tell you he had been engaged by contract? A.—What I heard was that the firm went there and hired them to come out to work—that there was work in Canada, and they wanted the men to come to Montreal.

Q.—Then those men came out here without having received any guarantees? A.—They guaranteed them work, of course; for I suppose men would not come a distance like that without being guaranteed work.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that one of the workmen was arrested. A.—Two were.

Q.—Why were they arrested? A.—Because they left their work, or refused to obey, or something like that.

Q.—How long had they been in the country when they were arrested? A.—I could not say, but I think a month or so.

Q.—Were they brought before the court? A.—Certainly they must have been brought before the court before they were sent to prison. They were condemned to a month's imprisonment and fined. I didn't assist at the trial.

Q.—How long have you been at work in Montreal as a cigar-maker? A.—Since I returned from the United States, in 1870; I have been in the trade for twenty-two years.

Q.—Have you been employed at several factories in Montreal? A.—I have worked at only two factories.

Q.—What treatment did the apprentices receive where you worked? A.—Most of the shops where I have been working, such as Swain's and Jacob's, have hardly any apprentices. I am not well acquainted with what is done in such factories as Fortier's. I worked there once for five days, and I could not judge as to how the apprentices were treated. Where I am working to-day, at Sam Davis' factory, the apprentices are up stairs and I am down stairs; they are divided into apartments—the apprentices don't work together.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Are there many apprentices there? A.—There are 125 up stairs, and 210 men on our floor.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is the number of apprentices in Davis' factory in conformity with the rules of your Union? A.—No. Davis' shop is an open shop, and Union men work there. The number is certainly not in conformity with the Union rules.

Q.—You are not acquainted with the treatment received by apprentices at Davis' factory? A.—No.

Q.—Have you heard of any complaints or charges made against Davis of ill-treatment of apprentices? A.—No; I have not.

Q.—At the factory where you were employed, are cigars taken from the men? A.—No; they don't do that.

Q.—Do they compel the men to pay for gas? A.—No; they don't.

Q.—Have any difficulties arisen between Davis and his employees? A.—Yes; there have been some.

Q.—What were the difficulties? A.—The difficulties were these: at one time we adopted the scale of prices, which we put before Mr. Davis, and a little while afterwards he accepted it. The Government then charjed the Internal Revenue

tax, which went down \$3, and we demanded not only from Mr. Davis, but from every manufacturer—and we appointed a committee to arbitrate with them—for a share of that amount. The bosses would not give it. That was the trouble that occurred, and it occurred not only in regard to Mr. Davis, but in regard to all the cigar manufacturers in Montreal.

Q.—Did the reduction in the excise duty benefit the workmen? A.—No; it did not then.

Q.—Did it benefit the smoker? A.—That I could not tell you; I presume it did.

Q.—Was there any arbitration between employers and employees? A.—We tried to arbitrate many times, but it did not seem to take at all. The bosses said they knew their business. We tried by all possible means to come to an agreement, but certain bosses said they were not going to be dictated to by a lot of men like us, and they would carry on their business as they pleased.....and off you go.

Q.—What was the result of your demand? A.—The result was nothing whatever; the wages were not raised, but Mr. Jacob and Mr. Swain, who keep the Union shops, maintained their scale of prices.

Q.—Have you any suggestion to make to the Commissioner? A.—I desire to speak in regard to the differences existing between prices in Ontario and here, as shown yesterday in the bill of prices. Manufacturers in Quebec claim that they cannot get along without apprentices. I don't know why they should not adopt the same system as is adopted in Ontario. In Ontario they have a law by which so many apprentices are allowed to so many journeymen, and if they cannot find sufficient men to work, all they do is to insert advertisements in their newspapers, and men come from the United States. But here we are short of hands, because American cigar-makers will not come farther than Toronto. The cigar-makers in Montreal desire that a special law should be passed, so that apprentices should not enter cigar factories before a certain age; because, if the shops are allowed to continue under their present system, with this machinery that makes 5,500 bunches in one day, with a little girl working it, I ask what will become of cigar-makers?

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—At what age in your estimation should a boy be allowed to become an apprentice? A.—According to medical authorities, and I had an interview with some of the most eminent physicians in this city, a boy should not enter into a tobacco works until he is at least 15 years of age.

Q.—What is the average age to-day? A.—They come in at any age.

Q.—To what age do you refer? A.—They take them from ten years, although there are factories that would not take them so young as that, I must say.

By Mr. CORÉ:—

Q.—Then you desire a special law relating to cigar-makers? A.—Yes; and in the name of the cigar-makers, I hope the commission will have the matter brought before the Government.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—With respect to the difficulty at Davis'; was it the understanding between the employers that they should resist an increase of wages? A.—When the scale of prices was submitted it was resisted by the manufacturers. Q.—Did the employers come together as a body to resist the increase of wages requested on the part of the men? A.—That I could not say, but they resisted it.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—If a General Factory Act were passed for the Dominion would that meet the requirements of the cigar-makers? A.—It certainly would.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—That is, if the Dominion Parliament had the right to pass such an act.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Those physicians of whom you have spoken did they say that tobacco itself is injurious to young children? A.—Yes, very injurious, and injurious to men too, because most of our men, and we can produce certificates to that effect, die from working in tobacco factories, for it is a poisonous trade, and although it takes a long time it will kill at last.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Then would not the best law that could be enacted be one to prevent the use of tobacco? A.—No; that is not the thing at all.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is there a cigar-maker's Union? A.—Yes.

Q.—Was the Union acquainted with the facts which were revealed here relating to apprentices? A.—Yes; we knew of them certainly.

Q.—How is it the Union did not take steps to put an end to that state of things? A.—We endeavoured to do so, but it seemed to be no use. We call on the news-papers when we have any grievances, but if a cigar-maker goes writing to the paper he is choked off, and he does not know where to go.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Why don't the Union, or some of its members, prosecute the proprietors of the factories in question? A.—Our society is not allowed by law to prosecute any one. We can be sued, but we cannot sue anybody.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What benefits do you derive from your Union so far as work is concerned?

A.—We receive, if we are taken sick, \$6.00 a week.

Q.—What benefits do you derive from your Union so far as wages are concerned?

A.—Here we do not derive very much, because there are only three Union shops, but as a general rule we obtain better wages. After we get the people to smoke our Union trade mark cigars we would no doubt get better wages, and live better than we are able to do now; but it seems as if this cannot be understood. We have expended thousands of dollars in making the Union trade mark known, and in similar matters, but it seems as if the people would rather smoke child labor cigars than any other.

Q.—Are they better? A.—I think a man who has worked twenty-five years at his trade should be able to make better cigars than a child can do, and make them cleaner, too.

Q.—With regard to cigars manufactured by men, is there less danger to the consumer than from cigars made by children? A.—That I could not say.

Q.—Are they more cleanly made? A.—A man is more careful about doing his work than a child would be, naturally.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Does your Union recognize apprentices? A.—Certainly we do.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How many apprentices are employed in comparison with the number of men? A.—The Union allows an apprentice to every shop first of all, and then to

the first five men another apprentice, and so on, the limit being about ten in some cities and in other cities a little more.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do the manufacturers sell child-made cigars at a cheaper rate than they do cigars made by men? A.—Certainly, because they don't pay as much for making them.

Q.—Do they retail them at a cheaper rate? A.—That is where the trouble is, for you pay five cents for a child-made cigar as you do for a cigar made by a journeyman. There may be cases where there are two sold for five cents.

Q.—The only benefit then is on the side of the employer, from what I can see? A.—If there is a benefit I believe it is divided between the employer and the retailer, and that is the restaurant-keeper or the bar-keeper—in fact he gets the best of it. He sells the cigar for five cents, anyway.

Q.—Is it a principle with your Union during the prevalence of labor troubles to resort to arbitration before you go on strike? A.—The first law in our society is to avoid strikes.

Rev. S. H. DIXON, Rector of St. Jude's Church, Montreal, called and sworn :

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—You have been more or less connected with emigrants coming to Montreal, have you not? A.—Yes.

Q.—For how long a period? A.—I acted for four years as chaplain of the Colonial and Continental Church Society of London, England, and of the Diocese of Montreal.

Q.—What is the condition of these emigrants who came out and who have remained in this province? A.—I may say that the first class of emigrants sent out was not satisfactory. A great many of those sent out by the different benevolent societies in the old country were not of the class that Canada requires; but of late years a much better class of emigrants is reaching here. In my capacity as chaplain of the society, I wrote to several periodicals in the old country asking benevolent associations to be more careful in the selection of emigrants they send out. I took care to say that this country needed emigrants, and we had plenty of room for them in the country districts, not so much in the cities, where they were really not required, but we wanted as many as they could send to the country districts.

Q.—Do you know anything in regard to the condition of most of those who remained here of those who came out in 1886? A.—I know that a great many of them have already made a start and are beginning to get on. I could give you many instances.

Q.—Are you acquainted with the district north of Montreal, where there are settlers from the old country? A.—I know the district north of here, and in the vicinity of Buckingham.

Q.—Was the whole of that district settled by people with money or were they poor? A.—The majority of the people there were poor people, and they have been able to make homes for themselves, and while they are not wealthy, they are comfortably off, and have brought up families. I know the descendants of many of them are living in the cities doing their share towards bringing up the country.

Q.—I suppose your experience is like that of many others, that the sons of poor people become well off, and the sons of rich people become poor. A.—Yes; in a good many cases.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you speak of people sent out here by benevolent societies? A.—Some of them are already beginning to do well.

Q.—Are you speaking of those people who have settled and raised families as being sent out by those societies? A.—I don't know how they were sent out. I think they came out pretty much on their own account.

Q.—They were not assisted by benevolent societies? A.—Yes. The present ones have been assisted. I have thought a good deal of the subject of emigration, and I am of the opinion that neither the Government nor those societies should be allowed to send people who are not really adapted to the country. I feel that every such person is an injury to the country and an injury to the old country, too, because they get back again and they give a false account of Canada.

Q.—From your knowledge of the class of people who have come out during the last two years, what proportion would you consider is not adapted to the country? A.—During the last two years the majority of them have been adapted.

Q.—What proportion of those not adapted would be pauper emigrants? A.—I think I mentioned that I wrote to the periodicals which would reach the very class of people who were sending them out; and I know a good many people over there, having been there some time now; and then the St. George's Society and a number of other societies here have made representations which have prevented unsuitable people from coming here, and I don't think there are many of that class reaching the country now. That has been stopped in a great measure.

Q.—Do you know what class of emigrants the Benevolent Societies principally assist from the old country? A.—They are now assisting deserving people that I know will get along; but at first they were inclined to be indiscriminate.

Q.—Are those selected from the trade or from the agricultural districts? A.—From both, and many of them are in this city now getting on well.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Are the people who are so aided to come to Canada by this Society of which you speak, chiefly adults? A.—The children are always cared for, but those I have been speaking of are adults, because the children are followed and taken care of.

Q.—Were their fares wholly paid by the Society or partly paid by them? A.—I could not say as to that.

Q.—Was any means taken to ascertain whether they had money when arriving in Canada or not? A.—I think those I met with, had unfortunately, very little.

Q.—They were just dumped on our shores and left to shift for themselves? A.—That applies rather to two years ago than to now.

Q.—You think that now means are taken to provide for them on their arrival? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are they looked after or aided on their arrival? A.—Not from the other side.

Q.—Have the Societies that send them out any agents in Canada to look after them? A.—They are beginning now to have agents. A pamphlet was sent to me yesterday in which it was stated that they were coming out in parties under the charge of some one, and it asked for help from the various sources in Canada to assist in placing the people.

Q.—Are they single persons mostly or people with families? A.—Both kinds. There is about a fair per centage of each.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—In some cases does not the father come out and the family follow after a short time? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Do you know of any taken from the poor houses? A.—I don't think so at present; three or four years ago there were.

Q.—Are there any ex-convicts? A.—Not that I am aware of.

Q.—Are they as a rule physically fitted for this country? A.—At the present time I think the country is receiving a finer class of emigrants than ever before.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you know the class brought out by Dr. Barnardo? A.—They are just boys from the streets, they are waifs and strays; but they are taken care of for a certain length of time over there and then they are taken care of for a time here. He has numbers of applications for them just as they are taken off the streets, but he will not give a boy out, or girl either, whom he has not had in training for a certain length of time.

Q.—At whose expense are they taken care of on this side? A.—At the expense of benevolent people in the old country. I met the doctor when I was on the other side, and the company he was in, I am sure, would not have endorsed him if they had not believed him to be doing good work.

Q.—In regard to mechanics; is there a system of assisted passages in existence for them now? A.—I could not tell you that, but I think there ought not to be for any except agricultural laborers and servant girls. I think there might be for those two classes, but as regards the others I think an injury has been done, and the supply has been more than the demand at certain times just from that cause.

Q.—The girls Miss Rye brought out; are they also brought out at the expense of the Home Societies? A.—Some of them are not.

Q.—Are they taken care of till they find situations? A.—They do not require much care, because there is any amount of demand for servant girls: you can place them immediately. They are taken care of.

Q.—Could you tell the proportions so far as regards Montreal that remain in the city, and the proportion that goes to the country? A.—No; I could not off hand. What we find now is that of the emigrants coming out, a much larger proportion are willing to go to the country than formerly. Previously if they were sent to the country it was like transportation to them, and they did not wish to go. When they were sent they would soon find their way back to the cities, but that is not occurring now. There is a very small per centage of those arriving now who are not willing to do their share of work.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you any idea of the percentage who are mechanics? A.—I have not; I have never kept any record of them. But I know that even as regards mechanics quite a number of them have done well in this city. Men have come out here and have started work and have sent for their friends and brought them out, and are living here now in their own little homes comfortably off.

By Mr. CORÉ:—

Q.—Is your experience only with English emigrants, or does it apply to those coming from Ireland and Scotland as well? A.—It is in connection with Protestants altogether. They are from England, Ireland and Scotland, the majority were from England during that period.

Q.—You are not speaking then of Roman Catholic emigrants? A.—No; I have nothing to do with them.

Q.—You could not then say to what class they belonged, or as to what benefit the country has derived from them? A.—No. I have been able to help a good many of them to get employment by giving them letters to employers; but that was not any part of my duty.

Q.—Roman Catholics would be a majority in most cases? A.—A good many of the emigrants came from Ireland and a large majority of them were Roman Catholics.

Q.—There were emigrants from other countries also, from Germany? A.—Yes; and a good many Belgians have come here.

Q.—Also from Italy? A.—Not a great many from Italy.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—During your experience have you found any antipathy on the part of young girls coming to this country to go into domestic service? A.—I did find it at first for they were misinformed as to the wages they ought to receive, and a good many other things; but I don't think that is so much the case now as it was. I find them more willing to go to work, but they very often expect with very little experience to receive very high wages and they were disappointed, and they generally had to go to one or two places before they gave satisfaction. But I think that has been changed.

Q.—Do you not find on the part of young women a disposition to go into factories or workshops rather than into domestic service? A.—Not with those who come from the old country; that applies more to our own young people.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Do you know whether the emigration from England or elsewhere has any influence on the wages paid to working people in factories or workshops? A.—I don't think so. Of course if the people belong to the wrong class I don't see how that could affect the rate of wages.

Q.—Do you not think it would have the effect of lowering the wages? A.—No; I don't think so. A large number of them go to the country and create a demand for manufactured articles. More of them have gone to the country than have remained in the cities, and as that is the case they need manufactured articles.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—In fact every man who settles on a farm becomes a consumer? A.—Yes.

(Translation.)

CHARLES PHILIP NÆGELÉ, Deputy-Chief of Police, of Montreal, 66 years old, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Mr. Naegelé, how are the special constables of Montreal appointed? A.—They are sworn in either by the Recorder or the Police Magistrate.

Q.—As Chief of Police, have you a list of the special constables? A.—Yes. I have a list of all those sworn in by the Recorder.

Q.—And those sworn by the Police Magistrate, have you no list of them? A.—No, sir; we do not know them, nor anything about them.

Q.—As Chief of Police you have no control over the special constables? A.—No, sir; we have none.

Q.—In the lists which you have in your keeping, is there the name of Ernest Goudreau? A.—The name is not there.

Q.—Do you know whether he was ever sworn in? A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Do you know whether Mr. Ernest Goudreau has belonged, at any time, to the regular Police? A.—He was in the Police force eight or nine years ago.

Q.—Witnesses deposed, under oath, here yesterday, that Mr. Ernest Goudreau was a special constable at Mr. Fortier's. Can you inform us of his duties as constable?

A.—A special constable has the same duties to fulfil, under certain circumstances, as a sub-constable of Police. But if he is sworn for a certain district, to guard goods or

property, he fulfils his duty and watches the property, but, generally, when anything happens, as if he comes across a drunken man, or is assailed, he calls the Police.

Q.—He has the same duties, but has no one above him to see that he fulfils these duties? A.—No one, sir.

Q.—When a special constable arrests anybody, what does he do with his prisoner? A.—He must take him to the Police Station.

Q.—Without delay? A.—Yes; without delay, or before the Magistrate.

Q.—He has no right therefore to arrest anybody, and shut him up in a room, and then take him to the Police when he feels like it. A.—No, Sir; he has no such right.

Q.—Are the cases in which a special constable can arrest a party the same as those of an ordinary constable when he makes an arrest? A.—Yes, sir; he has the same right.

Q.—Has a special constable the right to lay a hand on a child talking in a factory? A.—Those are matters of internal management.

Q.—But has he the right to do it? A.—I do not think he has.

Q.—What would you do, as Chief Constable, to a constable who took upon himself to beat a child? A.—I would discharge him at once.

Q.—It follows, then, that a special constable who does the same thing ought to be discharged, does it not? A.—Yes, sir, most certainly; such an officer is no man at all.

Q.—Do you know whether there are many factories in Montreal where there are special constables? A.—I know Mr. Fortier's. There is one at the Macdonald factory below. As to the others, I know nothing.

Q.—How are they appointed? A.—They are appointed as I told you just now. They come with a petition signed by two or three names, at most, either to the office of the Recorder or of the Police Magistrate. When they go to the Recorder, the latter sends them to me. I inscribe their name in a book, and that is the whole routine. They are sworn in like the other constables.

Q.—How long are they held to serve? A.—There is no fixed time. A man is a special constable until such time as he is dismissed.

Q.—Does that special constable stop always inside the factory? A.—They are employed by their masters.

Q.—And they are paid by their master? A.—Yes, sir. It is the boss who engages them and pays them.

Q.—Can you supply us with a list of the special constables employed in factories? You have the list of the special constables sworn before the Recorder, have you not? A.—Yes; but there is not a single one in the factories of these sworn in before the Recorder.

Q.—We shall find that list in the office of the Police Magistrate, shall we not? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What class of citizens may demand the appointment of a special constable? Must they be landlords? A.—It is the same as for those who guard stores. It is they themselves that go around for signatures—say, along a whole street for instance, or the part of a street—they get the landlords and the people of that street to sign, and they come before the Police Court with the petition. If it is for a factory, it is in the name of the owner of the factory.

Q.—If a man has been discharged from the Police force, will the Magistrate accept him as special constable? A.—There have been those who were discharged from the Police force and who have been sworn in as special constables.

EDWARD LUSHER, Manager Montreal Street Railway Co., called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How many lines of track does your Company control? A.—About five, I think.

Q.—How many people have you in your employ? A.—We have more in our employ at some seasons than at others. Do you mean at present?

Q.—I mean an average number? A.—The average number will be about 350.

Q.—Take the drivers on cars; how many hours in a day are they required to work? A.—Drivers, of course, work the same number of hours as conductors, about 12 hours a day.

Q.—Is that from the time at which they start with their first car until they bring in their last car in the evening? A.—No, that is the time of their actual labor. They start out say at six o'clock in the morning; they go off at nine; and they have two hours relief. Then they come on later in the day and again they get two hours more relief. They lie off four hours during the day.

Q.—And they finish work at what hour at night? A.—That depends altogether on the car they have. The car that comes in last to-night is the first car out to-morrow morning.

Q.—Take the man who starts at six o'clock in the morning with his car; at what hour at night will he have finished his work? A.—He will have finished his work about nine o'clock.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have they to be on their feet all the time? A.—No; they can go home and smoke a pipe and do what they please.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do the conductors work the same number of hours as the drivers? A.—They do.

Q.—Have the drivers anything to do with the horses when they are not on the cars? A.—No; they are engaged simply in driving.

Q.—What are the average wages of a driver? A.—The same as a conductor—\$8.00 a week; and on some lines \$7.50 per week.

Q.—Is there any Sunday work? A.—There is.

Q.—Do they work the same hours on Sunday as on other days? A.—They do not.

Q.—How many hours do they work on Sunday? A.—They work three hours less.

Q.—Is there any difference in the rates of wages paid in summer and winter? A.—There was until two years ago when we made the winter wages precisely the same as the summer. The custom formerly was to reduce the wages to the winter rate immediately the sleighs had begun to run.

Q.—Are the drivers permitted to sit at their work or must they stand all the time? A.—In the winter time we have seats provided on the sleighs. In the summer time they stand on the cars.

Q.—Of course, the conductor must stand all the time? A.—He ought to do so and he generally does so.

Q.—Is he required to do so by the rules of the company? A.—No; but he is not allowed to sit inside of a car and there is no where else he can sit.

Q.—Are there more applicants for positions than there are positions to offer or do you find difficulty in filling vacant positions? A.—We find on an average there are about 20 men every morning applying for positions, for which we have no positions to give. That is about a fair average throughout the year from 15 to 20 every day.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—At what time would a man going on his car at six o'clock in the morning have to report? A.—He would have to report at, say, ten minutes to six to be in time for his car.

Q.—After a man comes in with his car at night how long is he kept at the office before he can report? A.—Not a moment.

Q.—From the time a man goes on, ten minutes to six, until the time he leaves off at night, how many hours will he require to be up without rest? A.—I should say about twelve hours.

Q.—Twelve hours at work and how many off? A.—Four off.

Q.—Then a man has to be sixteen hours? A.—Sixteen hours.

Q.—A man has to be on duty sixteen hours from the time he starts from his home in the morning till he arrives home at night? A.—It is the same as if you were on duty eighteen hours, but had an opportunity to sleep five hours out of the eighteen.

Q.—A man has to be sixteen hours out of bed before he can return to bed again? A.—No; I don't say that. He has an hour to sleep during the day if he chooses—he has two hours relief twice a day.

Q.—You say some drivers receive \$7.50 a week; is that for seven days work? A.—Yes; I don't say some drivers but the drivers on one small line.

Q.—What wages do you pay stablemen? A.—Seven dollars a week.

Q.—For seven days' work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are they required to be on duty all day Sunday? A.—Yes, of course, on Sunday.

Q.—What hours do they work? A.—They work rather less than the conductors and drivers. They work from ten to twelve hours.

Q.—Is that the reason they get less pay? A.—No; it is not.

Q.—Is their work easier? A.—It is easier work.

Q.—They are not so much exposed to the weather, I suppose? A.—They are not so exposed to the weather.

Q.—In severe weather how frequently do you change drivers and conductors? A.—It depends on the severity of the weather.

Q.—Take severe weather—take weather like last week? A.—When a Notre-Dame Street car arrives at Hochelaga if the driver and conductor were very cold we would have reliefs there to finish the trip.

Q.—Is it optional with the men in severe weather to get off the cars and ask for other men to be put on? A.—It is optional for them to ask for it.

Q.—Is there any rule as regards the length of time? A.—No. We provide for and look after the men.

Q.—How frequently are the changes made? A.—They are frequently made every trip—besides providing them with hot coffee at all the stations.

Q.—Are the men employed on the City Street Railway Company required to sign any agreement when they go to work? A.—No; they are not.

Q.—How frequently do the men change on the road—how frequently do they leave the service? A.—They leave very frequently, that is many of them. Some don't. We have a large number of men of that kind, and of course you find after a short experience that some men are not fitted for the work.

Q.—Suppose a man is five minutes late in the morning what will be the consequence? A.—If a man is five minutes late he is suspended and another man is put in his place.

Q.—For how long is he suspended? A.—Probably for one day, unless he can give some satisfactory reason for being late.

Q.—He would lose a day's pay I suppose? A.—It does not follow that he should lose a day's pay.

Q.—You would not pay him for time he is not working, I suppose? A.—I don't know; we frequently do.

Q.—Do you provide any relief for your men in case of sickness through exposure to the weather and so forth? A.—We have a regular system, and if a man, a good man, is sick, and he has been some time in the Company's service it is the custom of the Company to give him his full pay for two or three or four weeks. Then if he is sick longer than that they give him half pay.

Q.—What proportion of men would be entitled to such benefit on the Street Railway? A.—There are very few of them.

Q.—Do you provide medical attendance for your men in any shape? A.—No. They get medical attendance, and occasionally we pay for it.

Q.—Does the Railway provide that attendance in case of sickness? A.—Occasionally.

Q.—Would it be in case of accident or in case of sickness? A.—In case of accident.

Q.—In case a man is injured on the road do you provide for him until he is able to return to work? A.—Generally. It depends on whether the man has had any length of service in the Company. Old servants we always look after better than new ones.

Q.—You employ a good many clerks in the Company, I suppose? A.—No.

Q.—You employ some? A.—Yes.

Q.—What would be the salary of a clerk in Montreal in the Street Railway Co's employ? A.—It depends on his position.

Q.—Take a junior clerk in the office who sells tickets and so on? A.—The clerks who sell tickets get from \$700 to \$900 or a thousand dollars a year.

Q.—Is their work very laborious? A.—They are relieved like everybody else—it is a perfect system. They have certain responsibilities of course.

Q.—How frequently do you change horses on the cars? A.—Every trip.

Q.—In all weather? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many trips in a day would be considered a day's work for a horse? A.—It depends on the length of the trips.

Q.—Take the Notre Dame Street cars. A.—You wish the number of miles a horse goes, I suppose?

Q.—How many hours a horse travels to complete a day's work? A.—Not over four hours.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have many of your men been in the Company's service for any length of time? A.—Yes. We have a number of men who have been in the Company's employ twenty or twenty-five years; some who have been with it ever since it has been in existence, twenty-seven years. We have quite a number who have been with the Company twenty years, and several who have been ten, five and so on.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—What positions do they hold? A.—All three positions—conductors, drivers and stablemen.

Q.—Have they ever asked for an advance of wages? A.—Occasionally.

Q.—What has been the result? A.—We found they didn't want the wages reduced in winter and so we acceded to it.

Q.—Do you not think they should receive as much money in winter as in summer? A.—The work is harder in winter from the exposure.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have any of your working people homes of their own which have been obtained from money earned in the employ of the Company? A.—Yes. Some of the men who have been in the Company's service a long time own property—several of them do—which they have bought out of money obtained from their wages. One man must have saved four thousand dollars; another man owns three cottages, and

another man two—several own property of that kind. They are men who have been in the Company's employ twenty or twenty-five years, who are good straightforward men, and who are always at work.

Q.—Have they obtained this money from wages received from the Company?
A.—Yes, by wages obtained in working for the Company. They are saving men, and they are stablemen chiefly.

Q.—The Company does not keep any drunken men in its employ? A.—No. The qualifications of our men consist of three things, sobriety, honesty and intelligence. These are the three qualifications; we don't ask a man for anything else.

Q.—The men, I suppose, cannot spend much during the day on cigars. A.—I don't think they do.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—How frequently do you pay your men? A.—Every Saturday morning.

By Mr. CORÉ :—

Q.—You have been asked in regard to the wages the Company is paying; do you consider you are paying a fair price for the amount of intelligence requisite, and the work done, comparing the wages with what is paid in Montreal in other trades? A.—Yes, and judging by the result that men on those wages are enabled to become property owners.

Q.—Can you obtain as many men as you require, and are they satisfied to remain in your service? A.—Yes. On engaging our men we ask no questions than as to whether they are sober, honest and intelligent.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You do not ask whether they are union or non-union men? A.—No. We don't care whether they are Pagans, or Roman Catholics, or whatever they are. What we want are men who will do the work faithfully, honestly and well, and give satisfaction to the public, if that is possible.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you demand security from the men? A.—Yes, \$100. It is not in the shape of money; it is more *pro forma* than anything else.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Is it provided by the man himself? A.—Yes.

Q.—Through the Company? A.—No. It is generally through the person who recommends the man. He gives a printed document holding himself responsible for \$100 while the man is in the Company's service. The only thing a man can steal from us is his box, and that unfortunately never holds \$100.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Do you not think a man who is honest, sober and intelligent and works on the Street Railway, and has to listen to the abuse of a good many people, and has to try and be civil throughout, and has to work 16 hours a day, is worth more than seven dollars a week? A.—If I were working as a conductor and had to take the abuse which the public give them, I think it would be worth a good deal more.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Is there any system of fining employees? A.—No; we have no fines.

Q.—Are they never fined for offences? A.—No.

Q.—Are they suspended? A.—They are suspended.

Q.—For what offences are they suspended? A.—They are suspended for being

impertinent to passengers, breaking the rules, being late in the morning which upsets the whole line—for when a conductor is not there to take his car it gives great inconvenience—and for minor offences, and if he is found not guilty his full pay is given to him. On the report of such cases an investigation is made into the matter complained of, and if the conductor is found to be right he loses no time.

Q.—For how long do you suspend them? A.—It depends on the nature of the offence.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Do you fine conductors sometimes for allowing passengers to smoke on the platform? A.—We don't fine them but we suspend them for breaking the rules.

Q.—When they are suspended do you not fine them one day's pay? A.—If a conductor infringes the rules we don't fine him one day's pay, but we put another man in his place.

Q.—Do you pay a man when he is suspended? A.—That depends. A man may be suspended and yet it may be proved that he was all right in what he did. We want to see justice done to those men, and we do it, and I think they will all bear testimony to that fact. We look first after our horses and then after our men.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Those men who have accumulated property have families to support, I suppose? A.—They have.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—In case of a complaint being made by a lady or gentleman in regard to a conductor, do you take their word in preference to that of a conductor? A.—No; we give the conductor the benefit of the doubt, always, where the evidence is equal. We immediately investigate the matter and we find that the public are very often hard to please and make reports that are unfounded.

Q.—Can you tell us how many suspensions occurred among conductors last year? A.—Probably there was a conductor suspended on an average throughout the year every third day. There might have been 80 or 100 suspensions last year.

Q.—How many times were they paid for days on which they were suspended? A.—I cannot tell you that; that depends on the nature of the offence and so on.

Q.—You have some kind of an idea I suppose; cannot you give us an average? A.—I could not. We have to be very particular of course. The city by-laws are very strict and the public are very exacting, and we have to be more or less strict in endeavoring to carry out the by-laws. Sometimes some men may suffer innocently as is always the case in this world, but we endeavor to do justice to the men and to the public as far as possible.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you know what rent a conductor or driver would pay for a respectable house, say a man with four of a family? A.—That depends, on where the house was situated. Some of our men or conductors will pay \$2.00 and others \$4.00 a month.

Q.—What kind of a house will a man get for \$2.00 a month? A.—It will not be in the centre of the city. Some of our depots are in outside localities where rents are cheap.

Q.—How many rooms would there be in the house? A.—I don't know.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are men ever suspended for as long as a week? A.—Yes; but when they are, they are, as a general rule, discharged.

Q.—Have men who have been suspended for a week been set to work again in any case? A.—Yes; they have.

Q.—They would lose the whole week's pay? A.—Yes; and think themselves very lucky to do it and get into the Company's service again.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Are the conductors compelled to wear a certain costume? A.—Yes; in summer.

Q.—What is the value of that costume, do you think? A.—They have got to have a cap and a coat whether they are in uniform or not. The cap I suppose would cost one dollar and the coat three or four dollars.

Q.—I suppose the Company supplies them with those articles? A.—I don't think they do. All we want our men to do is to look clean and respectable. It does not cost any more to have a clean coat on than a dirty one. In winter there is no rule about dress.

(Translation.)

AUGUSTIN DUVAL, Cigar-maker, of Montreal, 18 years of age, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You are a cigar-maker? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You have served your time as an apprentice? A.—Yes, sir, at Mr. Grothé's.

Q.—At what age did you enter upon your apprenticeship? A.—At fifteen years of age.

Q.—How many years of apprenticeship did you serve? A.—Three years.

Q.—What wages were you to get when you entered upon your engagement? A.—It was understood that I should get \$1.00 a week for the first year; \$1.50 for the second; and \$3 for the third.

Q.—Did you pay any fines during your apprenticeship? A.—Yes; I remember paying a fine of twenty-five cents once.

Q.—Only once? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Were you ever beaten? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Often? A.—Twice.

Q.—Brutally? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—With what? With the hand or the fist? A.—With the hand.

Q.—By whom were you beaten? A.—By the foreman.

Q.—Did he give you only one blow? A.—He gave me several blows.

Q.—What had you done? A.—I had talked.

Q.—Was it the habit in that factory to beat the apprentices? A.—Several were beaten at several times.

Q.—Never with sticks or a piece of wood? A.—As to that, sir, I never noticed anything like that.

Q.—Were your wages paid you regularly? A.—No, sir.

Q.—How much did you get? A.—They gave us 1,200 cigars to make in a week and bunches to roll.

Q.—When you were an apprentice? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Well, and when you did not do the 1,200? A.—They paid us only as we made them.

Q.—How much do they pay a 100? A.—I could not tell you how much they pay a 100.

Q.—The first year did you get your \$1 a week all the time? A.—Not all the time.

- Q.—What is the lowest pay you got in one week? A.—Eighty cents.
- Q.—How many hours a day did you work? A.—Not quite ten hours.
- Q.—And on Saturdays? A.—On Saturdays we got through at three o'clock.
- Q.—Was it possible for an apprentice, working according to conscience, to make his 1,200 bunches a week, by hard work? A.—Yes; it was possible.
- Q.—The other years, did you get your \$1.50 and your \$2.00 regularly? A.—Not all the time neither.
- Q.—What was the lowest pay you got the second year? A.—One dollar and twenty-five cents.
- Q.—And the third year? A.—The third year, I always got my \$2.00.
- Q.—Had you a quantity of work laid out for the second and the third year? A.—When we did more, we were paid more.
- Q.—More than what? A.—More than our \$2.00.
- Q.—Was it also 1,200 for the second and third year? A.—Yes, 1,200 all the time.
- Q.—They required you to do as much the first year as the second and third? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—When you got through your apprenticeship were you well up in your trade? A.—Not very.
- Q.—Was that through your fault, or because you had not been taught? A.—That depended a little on myself, but it was also a little the fault of the foreman.
- Q.—Did he not teach you your trade suitably? A.—He came along only once a week.
- Q.—There is no blackhole at Mr. Grothé's? A.—No; but there is the hot room.
- Q.—What is the hot room? A.—It is a room where the tobacco is put to sweat.
- Q.—Have you seen apprentices put in there? A.—They put one down, though I did not see him put in. He was taken, however, to be put in.
- Q.—You do not know whether he was put in? A.—No.
- Q.—Do you know the name of that apprentice. A.—Quenault.
- Q.—Do you know where he lives? A.—I think he lives at St. John Baptist Village.
- Q.—There is no other punishment than beating and putting you into the hot room? But do you not know what took place in the hot room? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—How are the water-closets? A.—The water-closets are not in very good order.
- Q.—Are they near the workshops? A.—On the same flat as ourselves.
- Q.—Are there separate water-closets for the girls and the boys? A.—They are the same closets.
- Q.—Do you work there still, at present? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—How long since you left? A.—Six months.
- Q.—How many hands are there in that factory? A.—I could not tell you.
- Q.—Are there more than twenty? A.—There are more than that. Last week, twenty-five went out of there.
- Q.—You were never brought before the Recorder? A.—No, sir. There are mornings when you cannot stop in that shop when they are putting the tobacco in cases. They do not change water often enough, the water in which the tobacco is encased.
- Q.—Do you know why the twenty-five left Mr. Grothé? A.—Because he lowered the wages.
- Q.—Lowered by how much? Do you know? A.—One dollar.
- Q.—One dollar a thousand? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—You say that Mr. Quenault gave up cigar making—do you know why? A.—The doctor said it did him harm.

(Translation.)

DAME ROSE DE LIMA LAVOIE, widow of Stanislas Goyette, of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are the mother of the young Stanislas Goyette who was here yesterday giving evidence before the Commission. A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you remember that your child came home, one day, complaining that he had been beaten at Mr. Fortier's. A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Was he ailing very much when he came in? A.—Yes, sir. He was brought to me by the tramway, and he was carried upstairs to me, not being able to come up without help.

Q.—You say that he was brought to you—was it a working man from Mr. Fortier's who brought him to you? Yes, sir; it was a cousin of his.

Q.—Will you please give us the name of that cousin? A.—Yes, sir; his name is Adelard Lavoie.

Q.—Do you know where he dwells at present? A.—He is here in this room.

Q.—How many years was that ago? A.—I think that it must be about four years and a half ago.

Q.—How old was the boy? A.—I think he was about fifteen years of age.

Q.—Did your child then tell you that he had been beaten at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir. He told me that he had been thrown to the ground.

Q.—Did he tell you by whom he had been thrown to the ground? A.—I do not remember, but I think it was by a foreman.

Q.—He was laid up after that? A.—Since he got that blow, he has always been sick, and since that time, if he has worked two years, it is the most I can say.

Q.—And that happened four years ago? A.—It is more than four years ago. I think that his sickness comes from that blow.

Q.—You are a widow, madam? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Your late husband was not dead at the time that this happened? A.—No, sir; he died a few months later. But he was sick at that time.

Q.—Did your late husband, Mr. Goyette, take any steps with Mr. Fortier, about this matter to ascertain why his son had been beaten? A.—I do not know whether he went to see Mr. Fortier, because of his sickness, he could not go out, but I know that he went out with his boy.

Q.—You do not know whether your husband meant to sue Mr. Fortier for damages? A.—An action was taken, and I think my husband went to a lawyer's, but I cannot say whether he went to Mr. Fortier's before, or if he went after.

Q.—Do you know to what lawyer your husband went. A.—To a lawyer named Demers.

Q.—The action was not taken? A.—I do not know. They made arrangements at all events. I cannot say whether the case went to court, but anyhow there was an arrangement made.

Q.—What do you call an arrangement? A.—I could not tell you more. They fixed it among themselves.

Q.—It was arranged between Mr. Fortier and the lawyer? A.—I think so.

Q.—Did you receive anything? A.—No, sir; the foreman came to the house to make an arrangement, as he could not see my husband, owing to his sickness, and I answered that it was in the hands of the lawyer, and that he must see the lawyer.

Q.—There is no doubt, madam, that your child was made ill by the blows he received at Mr. Fortier's? A.—I do think they were the cause of his sickness.

Q.—You are so convinced? A.—I do think so.

Q.—I do not want to intrude on your private business, madam, but I wish to ask you if you will answer the question, whether you need your son's work for your

livelihood? A.—When we are not rich, we need the help of our children's work. I have been a widow these four years.

Q.—Is that the only child you have? A.—Pardon, sir, I have six, two boys and four girls.

Q.—Is he the eldest of whom we have been speaking? A.—No; he is not the eldest.

(Translation.)

ADELARD LAVOIE, cigar-maker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Mr. Lavoie, you have heard what Madam Goyette has just been saying?
A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—It was you who brought the young Stanislas Goyette back to his mother?
A.—Yes; it is I that brought him back from the shop. I saw everything that took place in the shop.

Q.—You saw everything that took place in the shop at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir; I did.

Q.—Will you tell what took place? A.—It was after working hours, and the foreman asked him to do the sweeping and he handed him the broom for that purpose. The little boy said no; that he would not sweep. Then the foreman seized the cover of a mould and threatened to strike him.

Q.—Can you tell what a cover of a mould is? A.—Yes, sir. It is a plank about two and one-half feet long and six inches in width.

Q.—What took place then? A.—The foreman threatened to strike him with the mould and the little boy said no—that he would not sweep. Then the foreman took him by the arm and gave him a blow, saying: "will you sweep?" And the little fellow said: "No."

Q.—On what part of the body did he strike him? A.—On the loins. Then the foreman took him by the arm and led him into an alley handing him the broom which the little fellow would not take, when the foreman saw that he would not sweep, he took him with both hands on the hips—he is a man of my size—and sank him down on his knees. There the young man stopped on the ground for about three or four minutes without stirring.

Q.—Had he lost his senses? A.—He did not know what he was doing. It was then I took him up, and he asked me to help him on the sill of a window. He stayed there about twenty minutes before leaving the shop, without being able to walk. I took him up and led him outside. It was hard work doing this, as he could scarcely bear up as far as the corner of St. Maurice Street, there I took the cars and saw him home.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Did you see the boy's mother at the house? A.—Yes.

Q.—You are his cousin? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How old were you then? A.—I was then sixteen.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you any more to tell us on the case? A.—No, sir.

Q.—You have worked at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you see other children beaten? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Brutally? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you know anything about the black-hole? A.—Yes, sir. I was in it myself, although I do not remember why it was I got in there.

Q.—How many times were you put in? A.—Once, only.

Q.—Do you remember how long you were kept there that time? A.—I was there twelve or fifteen minutes only, as far as I remember.

Q.—Was it in winter or in summer? A.—It was in the fall.

Q.—Is it warmer or colder in that black-hole than in the store? A.—It is cold; it is a wall two feet and a-half thick. It is like an ice-box.

Q.—Can it possibly be heated in winter? A.—Even if it were heated, it cannot possibly be warm. It is always cold there. The place is moist.

Q.—Is it warm in the factory? A.—No, not much. It is not warm.

Q.—What is the man's name who beat the boy, your cousin? A.—His name is John Ryan.

Q.—Is he always in the employ of Mr. Fortier? A.—Since that time he left, but has gone back again.

Q.—Where is he now? Is he there? A.—Yes, he is.

Q.—So far as you know, was Mr. Fortier acquainted with this incident? A.—If he knew of it, he did not let on.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You do not know whether he heard of it? A.—No, sir.

Q.—And no complaints were made to Mr. Fortier by the hands? A.—No, sir.

Translation.

JOSEPH FAILLE, cigar-maker, of the city of Montreal, sworn :

By Mr. HELBRONNER —

Q.—You are a cigar-maker? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In what firm did you serve your apprenticeship? A.—At Mr. Fortier's.

Q.—Did you ever pay fines at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir; many of them.

Q.—Which is the largest fine you paid in one week? A.—Sometimes we were working extra, and I was making three or four dollars a week. The week ends on Friday and, on Friday afternoon, I happened, for instance, to speak to my neighbour, or to amuse myself a little, when he would say to me : " Faille, your extra is taken from you;" Sometimes I had two or three dollars of extra pay coming to me.

Q.—There were no rules about fines posted up in the factory, were there? A.—Not at all. I never saw any.

Q.—The foreman could just as well give you a fine of three dollars as one of twenty-five cents? A.—Yes, just the same. It depended on the extras I made.

Q.—When you worked hard and had many extras, the fine was heavier? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—This was an encouragement to work, was it not? A.—Yes; and there were times when he charged me ten cents of fine and I asked him what it meant, he would say : " It will be twenty-five cents."

Q.—Do you know what was done with those fines? A.—I could not say, but I rather think they went into Mr. Fortier's pocket?

Q.—Are you aware that any of those fines were ever returned. A.—No; not to my knowledge.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Did any ever go back to your pocket? A.—No; not at all.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you remember or did you keep anything like a more or less full account of the fines you paid during your apprenticeship ? A.—I could not say exactly, at present, but I am inclined to think that, during my three years of apprenticeship, the amount was between seventy-five dollars to one hundred and twenty-five dollars.

Q.—You were engaged by contract ? A.—Yes; by contract.

Q.—You have not kept a copy of the contract ? A.—No; I have not, but I think I could get one.

Q.—You did three years of apprenticeship ? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How much did you make the first year ? A.—One dollar the first year; one dollar and a half the second year; and two dollars the third year, per week.

Q.—Was your contract signed before a notary ? A. Yes, sir.

Q.—Before what notary ? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—Were you beaten during your apprenticeship ? A.—Yes, sir; I was struck by Mr. Fortier. I got a kick.

Q.—From Mr. Fortier, the proprietor ? A.—Yes, sir; from Mr. Fortier, the boss of the factory.

Q.—Why were you struck ? What had you done ? A.—I was playing on a little truck on which they put the cases to carry them from one part of the factory to the other.

Q.—Was it during working hours ? A.—I think it was about five or ten minutes to one.

Q.—It was, then, during the dinner hour ? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Was the kick hard enough to hurt you ? A.—It did hurt me, certainly.

Q.—On what part of the body did he strike you ? A.—On the posterior.

Q.—Were you struck by foremen during your apprenticeship ? A.—I was not struck, but one day, I was talking to a neighbour, along side of me, when John Ryan, the foreman, told me to keep still. After a little while, I talked again and Mr. Ryan caught me by the throat and choked me. The first foreman was before me and he began laughing at me, saying : “ You will keep still now ” ?

Q.—Who was the first foreman ? A.—Mr. Alexander McGregor.

Q.—Did you have to pay certain sums of money for quantities of robes which you got, either more or less. A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Will you explain what you had to pay and why you had to pay it ? A.—First, the foreman told us : “ If you do not make as many cigars by the bundle—sometimes fifty or a hundred cigars—you shall pay ten or twenty five cents fine per bundle.”

Q.—These packages are of tobacco leaves given you to roll around the bunch, are they not ? A.—Yes.

Q.—When they are given out are they counted ? A.—No sir; they are weighed.

Q.—Thus, in a package, you have to make a certain number of cigars ? A.—What they tell me to make.

Q.—And if you do not make that number of cigars, that is, if there are bunches left you, and you have no robes, what happens ? A.—Well, in that case, he made us pay them.

Q.—You had no means of control to know whether the number of robes was enough to cover your bunches ? A.—When one is an apprentice, he is not a journeyman and does not know the trade like a journeyman.

Q.—When you had too many what did you do with them ? A.—We kept them for the other fifty or the other hundred.

Q.—You did not return them to the foreman ? A.—No; we kept them.

(Translation.)

ALPHONSE LAFRANCE, Cigar Maker, of Montreal.—(Recalled.)

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is it you that has brought this mould now lying on the table? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Was it a tool of this description to which the witnesses referred when they said that they had been beaten with a mould or the cover of a mould? A.—Yes, sir. There are moulds of four inches and a half and of four inches and three-quarters in width, but this one is five inches. We could not get a narrower one this evening.

(Translation.)

HORACE LAFRAMBOISE, Cigar Maker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—In what house did you serve your apprenticeship? A.—In that of Messrs. Goulet & Frère.

Q.—At what age did you begin your apprenticeship? A.—At the age of thirteen years.

Q.—How many years did you serve as an apprentice? A.—Three years.

Q.—How old are you? A.—I will be seventeen years old, this month.

Q.—Did you make a contract with your employer before a notary? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Before what notary? A.—The notary Morin.

Q.—Have you a copy of that contract at home? A.—No; I have not.

Q.—Did you pay any fines during your apprenticeship? A.—I paid fines often.

Q.—Do you remember what was the largest fine you paid in one week? A.—I think it was one dollar.

Q.—Was it a fine that was imposed on you, at one time or at several times, during the week? A.—I think it was at one time.

Q.—Do you recollect why you were fined? A.—I was not told. He had us taken up before, and he had lost, and he put us out. He sent me off.

Q.—You say he had you taken up before? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What do you mean by that? were you taken before the Recorder? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Why? A.—Because I had pushed another boy in the shop.

Q.—Did you undergo your trial? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And then, how did it end? A.—I won. I was acquitted, and he did not know how to make it up, and he kept a dollar fine from me, and he put me out. He sent me away from his service.

Q.—Messrs. Goulet & Frère brought you before the Recorder? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And you underwent your trial? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And you won? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And Messrs. Goulet & Frère, on account of that, imposed on you a fine of one dollar? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You won your case? A.—Yes, sir; I won it.

Q.—But you lost a day's work and a fine of one dollar? A.—Yes, sir; I had lost three days at that time.

Q.—You had lost three days beside the fine of one dollar? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And Mr. Goulet sent you away? A.—Yes; he sent me away.

Q.—Had you finished your apprenticeship at that time? A.—I still had eight months to go.

Q.—Did he compensate you for the eight months of apprenticeship which you had not concluded? A.—No, sir.

Q.—On leaving Mr. Goulet did you go to another factory? A.—Yes; I went to another shop.

Q.—Were you obliged to go through another term of apprenticeship, or did you engage as journeyman? A.—As journeyman.

Q.—At what hour did you go to the shop, at Mr. Goulet's? A.—At half past seven in the morning.

Q.—At what time did you go to dinner? At what hour did the bell ring for dinner? A. At noon.

Q.—Did the hands go to dinner at home? A.—No; Mr. Goulet would not have it.

Q.—And the apprentices neither? A.—No; there were no journeymen, they were all apprentices.

Q.—You were not allowed to go home to your dinner? A.—No; he would not allow it.

Q.—You dined at the factory? A.—Yes; at the factory, in the tobacco dust.

Q.—Had you not a special room to dine in? A.—No; we ate in the same room where we worked.

Q.—Who taught you your trade? A.—The Messrs. Goulet themselves.

Q.—They taught you your trade? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—When you left there, were you able to work as journeyman at once? A.—I had some little trouble to do that.

Q.—Do you believe that if you had stopped eight months longer, that is, the whole length of your apprenticeship, you would have gone forth a good workman? A.—I think so.

Q.—The room in which you did your work and took your dinner, was it a wholesome apartment and a well ventilated? A.—No; we were not allowed to open the windows.

Q.—Not even in summer? A.—In summer, if we opened them, we were fined.

Q.—Fined how much? A.—Fifty cents, or twenty-five cents as it happened. If they chanced to be in good humor, it was twenty-five cents.

Q.—Were you beaten during your apprenticeship? A.—No; but many others were beaten.

Q.—Did you see them beaten? A.—Yes; I saw them beaten.

Q.—Were they beaten brutally? A.—Yes, brutally enough.

Q.—With the hand? A.—With the feet. He had seized him to fling him down stairs, but the other defended himself.

Q.—Who was the other? A.—Mr. Prénoveau.

Q.—Is that the name of the apprentice or that of the foreman? A.—It is the name of the apprentice.

Q.—What is the name of the foreman who beat the apprentice? A.—Mr. Théodore Gauthier.

Q.—What is Mr. Prénoveau's christian name? A.—David Prénoveau.

Q.—Do you know where he is at present? A.—He works at Mr. Davis'.

Q.—Did you see others beaten? A.—No; I saw only him beaten. The foreman sometimes called us to his table and talked evil discourse with us, and then he would send us back to our places and charge us with a fine.

Q.—Why did he fine you? Because you would not listen to him too well? A.—We listened to him, but it all depended on how he felt, if he was in good humor or not.

Q.—There is no mistake about this, is there? the foreman called you to his table? A.—Sometimes, we happened to go there ourselves.

Q.—And he indulged in bad conversation before you and then sent you back to your places and imposed a fine on you? A.—Yes; and swearing at us.

Q.—It was the foreman Théodore Gauthier that did that? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you have a fine imposed on you under those circumstances? A.—Yes; I had already been fined for that.

Q.—For having been to his table and sent back? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you know of any other factory, but that of Messrs. Goulet, where there are no journeymen? A.—No.

(Translation.)

WILLIAM PLANTE, Cigar-maker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBONNER:—

Q.—You are a cigar-maker? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How old are you? A.—I am sixteen years old.

Q.—At what age did you serve your apprenticeship? A.—I began at thirteen years of age.

Q.—You had three years of apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—With whom? A.—With Mr. Fortier.

Q.—Were you beaten during apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Often? A.—I was beaten only once. They put down my trousers.

Q.—They put down your trousers? It must have taken several to do that, eh?
A.—Yes. There were several, but only three got hold of me.

Q.—Three men? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Who gave them orders to take down your trousers? A.—I did not see who gave the orders? There was one of them who gagged my mouth with his hand.

Q.—Why did they beat you? A.—It was because of my trying to carry off some cigars.

Q.—Were you beaten with the hand? A.—With a stick.

Q.—Did you receive many blows? A.—Yes, sir; several.

Q.—At what hour does the factory close? A.—That evening it closed at about half-past seven.

Q.—Were you made ill by this for several days? A.—I did not notice it at once, but I found it out later.

Q.—What do you mean by “later”? Did you suffer so as not to be able to work for several days? A.—No; that did not prevent me from working, but it hurt me to sit down.

Q.—Did they fine you at the same time that they beat you? A.—No, sir.

Q.—You admit that you took those cigars to carry them off? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How many were there? A.—There were five.

Q.—Did the constable find them on your person? A.—No; it was the foreman.

Q.—It was not Mr. Goudreau? A.—No, sir.

Q.—When he found the cigars, he seized upon you? A.—Yes; and he put me into the blackhole.

Q.—You were put into the blackhole, before being beaten? A.—Yes; before.

Q.—How long did you stop in the blackhole? A.—About two hours.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—It seemed to you two hours; are you sure you were in there that long? A.—Yes, from half-past five to half-past seven.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—At what hour does the factory close? A.—That evening it had closed at about half-past seven.

Q.—Were the hands still there? A.—No; only the foreman.

Q.—And you stopped two hours in the blackhole? A.—Yes.

Q.—Who got you out of there? A.—I do not remember.

Q.—Was it one of the foremen? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—From there where did he take you; did he take you up-stairs? A.—No. They hid me in the cellar.

Q.—How many men were there? A.—There were all the foremen, beside Mr. McGregor.

Q.—That was a great number of men—all the foremen, so far as you can remember? A.—About five or six.

Q.—Then, they took you out of the blackhole, and what happened after that? A.—Then they seized me, and licked me as I have said.

Q.—Five or six men were present when you were beaten? A.—They did not all touch me; only two or three beat me.

Q.—And the others looked on while the two or three were beating you? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How were you shut up in there? Was the door locked to shut you in? A.—Yes, sir. They had locked me in a place where coals are stored.

Q.—Were there any bales of tobacco there? A.—No, sir. There was nothing but coals in there.

Q.—Was it in summer or in winter? A.—It was in the spring.

Q.—Was there still snow on the ground? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—You did not suffer from the cold? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Was the door locked when once you were inside the blackhole? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How old were you at the time? Was it the first year, the second year, or the third year of your apprenticeship? A.—It was the second year, if I do not make a mistake.

Q.—You were then about fifteen years old? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Was that the only time you were beaten? A.—Yes.

Q.—Was it the only time you were put into the blackhole? A.—No; I was put into the blackhole twice after.

Q.—Why were you put into the blackhole these two other times? A.—These two other times, it was because I would not do the sweeping.

Q.—Was this after work hours? A.—It was one half-hour before the end of working hours?

Q.—You signed an agreement or contract? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you a copy of it at home? A.—No.

A.—Who locked you in the blackhole? A.—It was Mr. Ernest Goudreau.

Q.—Who was the superintendent of the factory at the time? A.—It was John Ryan, at the time they beat me.

Q.—Were apprentices allowed out for their dinner at Mr. Fortier's? A.—There were times when he would not allow us out.

Q.—Where did you eat, then? A.—There were several who fetched their dinner, and we ate it in the shop.

Q.—Were you ever sent into the cellar to eat your dinner? A.—Sometimes we wanted to go out, and tried to get out, and we could not. Then it was that we were fined.

Q.—That is not the question which I asked you. Were you ever sent into the cellar to eat your dinner? A.—No.

(Translation.)

GEORGE ROBINSON, Tobacco-Caser, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER: —

Q.—Do you know anything about the black-hole at Fortier's? A.—I worked in the cellar with two other young men, and the special constable would bring down a

boy and he would catch hold of us and would say, "Put him in and lock the door." we had no lock on the door, but we put large long nails through the door.

Q.—You closed the door with nails? A.—Yes.

Q.—How long was the boy kept there? A.—According to the fancy of the foreman—sometimes half an hour, sometimes one hour, and sometimes two hours. I went home two nights and left them in myself.

Q.—Did you find them there the next morning? A.—No.

Q.—Were they placed there in the winter as well as in the summer? A.—Yes; and it was a very cold place too, as it was near the entrance. There is a stone wall all round, and it used to be a sweat room at one time. The wall was half a foot thick.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Was it always damp? A.—Yes; and cold in the winter time.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How far is that room from the furnace? A.—It is about eight or nine feet, but the wall is too thick for the furnace to do any good. It is a pretty thick stone wall.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have you worked in several factories? A.—Yes, at Fortier's, Goulet Bros., Tassé & Wood, Jacob's, and the "Stonewall Jackson" factory.

Q.—Do you know if any children were beaten in other factories? A.—Yes.

Q.—Mention the name of the factory? A.—At Tassé & Wood's.

Q.—Have you yourself seen them beaten? A.—Yes.

Q.—Brutally? A.—Not brutally, but they got beaten.

Q.—Was there any other black-hole in any other factory except Fortier's. A.—No.

Q.—Have you seen any little girls placed there? A.—No.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Have you seen any girls beaten? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you know if there are special constables in other factories besides Fortier's? A.—No; not that I know of.

Q.—Have you anything to say in regard to any of the factories which has not been brought out by the questions put to you? A.—There have been children beaten in other factories. I myself stopped a foreman last summer from beating apprentices.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Do you know of any other factory besides Goulet Brothers where there are no journeymen employed? A.—I could not tell you about Goulet's.

Q.—Do you know of any other in which there are no journeymen employed? A.—Wherever I have worked there have always been journeymen.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you remember two or three years ago that the *Witness* brought up this subject of child labour in factories? A.—I don't remember.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—In regard to this black-hole were the boys put there to await the arrival of a policeman to take them away? A.—They were not. It was just according to the fancy of the foreman whether he let them go or not. Sometimes they would forget and leave them there.

Q.—Was the lock-up looked upon as a place of confinement? A.—Yes; for any offence.

Q.—The hands treated it as such? A.—Yes; I worked in the cellar all my time—it was the place where I had to work.

(Translation.)

JOSEPH FOURNIER, cigar-maker, of Montreal.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You were employed at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Could you tell us what you saw about the black-hole and the treatment of the apprentices? A.—About the black-hole I have little to say. I was employed in Mr. Fortier's factory for only about two years, and was never put into the black-hole myself, but I know that there were apprentices who were put into the black-hole. What I have to say is, that one evening Mr. Fortier gave a young girl a beating.

Q.—Mr. J. M. Fortier himself? A.—Yes, Mr. J. M. Fortier. He beat her brutally.

Q.—How old was that young girl? A.—She was about fifteen years of age.

Q.—How did he beat her, with his feet, or his hands? A.—No. First he asked her to sweep and she would not sweep. Then he seized her and set her on the floor. He held her down on the ground with one hand and his knee, with the other hand he took a mould cover, and struck her several times with it on the body. The young girl wept. When he let her go, she was so weak that she had hard work to get up.

Q.—You saw this yourself? A.—Yes, sir; I saw that.

Q.—How old were you then? A.—I was twenty years old at the time.

Q.—You did not shout for the police? A.—Even if I had called the police, it would be the special constable who would come, and he would rather have taken sides with Mr. Fortier than with the young girl. If I had felt myself strong enough to take the young girl's part, I should have done so, but I was not strong enough.

Q.—Do you know anything about the fines imposed? A.—I know that there are several apprentices who had fines imposed on them, but I could say nothing about them personally.

Q.—As a workingman, were cigars ever taken from you? A.—Yes, sir; very often.

Q.—Was this for good and sound reasons? A.—More or less; this happened in two or three shops.

Q.—Name them? A.—First, at Messrs. Tassé & Wood. One day I had about two hundred cigars made on my table, when Mr. Tassé made a review or examination, as he was in the habit of doing, from what had been told me. It was at the beginning of the time that I was there. He came to my table and took away about twenty-five cigars.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is Mr. Tassé a practical cigar-maker? A.—No, sir; he knows nothing about the making of cigars.

Q.—On taking those cigars did he say to you: "Here are cigars that are bad?" Did he tell you why he took them away? A.—He told me that they were bad, but they were no such thing.

Q.—He took them up one by one, I presume? A.—He was in want of cigars or something else, and when he had examined a cigar from end to end, and found

the least little bump he sank his thumb into it, and when the holes were made, they were no longer good. He might have made a whole 200 cigars bad in that way, and he told me that if I did not like it, I could go. And that is what I did.

Q.—How were you engaged, by the week or the month? A.—By the job.

Q.—You say that Mr. Tassé said you might go, if you did not like it? A.—Certainly he did.

Q.—And you went? A.—Yes; I started at once.

Q.—Did Mr. Tassé have children or men taken up and brought before the Recorder? A.—No; not to my knowledge.

Q.—Were you an apprentice or a journeyman when he took your cigars? A.—I was a journeyman, I did not serve out my three years as apprentice. I did only two years. I had no agreement made. I thought I was workman enough to be able to go out of my own accord.

Q.—Your memory does not fail you, does it? You are quite certain that you saw Mr. Fortier beat that young girl, as you said a moment ago. A.—Yes, sir. I could give you the name of the victim, if you liked.

Q.—What is her name? A.—Georgina Loisselle.

Q.—Where does she work? A.—She works at Mr. Fortier's still, to-day.

Q.—How long since is it that she was beaten? A.—About four or four and a half years ago.

Q.—Is she the only girl you ever saw beaten? A.—Yes, sir; the only one.

(Translation.)

EDOUARD ARCOUETTE, Cigar-Maker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How old are you? A.—I am going on nineteen.

Q.—You served your apprenticeship with Mr. Fortier? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—At what age did you begin? A.—I was going on sixteen years.

Q.—You were sent before the Recorder? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Once or several times? A.—Only once, sir.

Q.—Is that long since? A.—It was in my second year of apprenticeship.

Q.—Why were you sent before the Recorder? A.—There was an apprentice beside me who had a fine packet of robes and mine was bad. Then, I took his and gave him mine.

Q.—You wanted to take his packet of robes; what happened then? A.—The other young man came up and said: "You have changed my robes." I said: "No." Then, the foreman arrived and began to toss me about, and slap me on the head. When I saw that, I got up, and the foreman said: "Since he will not do what is right, bring him down to the blackhole." Then he took me down into the blackhole. About ten minutes later, the foreman said to Mr. Ernest Goudreau: "take him and bring him before the Recorder."

Q.—What is the name of the foreman who told Mr. Goudreau to put you into the blackhole? A.—It is Mr. McGregor.

Q.—You were taken before the Recorder? A.—Yes.

Q.—And were you sentenced? A.—No; the Recorder said to me: "Go back and do better." I wished to say something in my defence but he said: "Hush! hush! go on with you and try to do better."

Q.—You were not sentenced then? A.—No, sir.

Q.—How many days did you lose for having been brought before the Recorder? Were you sent before the Recorder the next day? A.—No, sir.

Q.—You were brought before the Recorder on issuing from the black-hole? A.

—Yes; it was about five or ten minutes before noon when he took me down, and then I was taken before the judge and had to wait till one o'clock.

Q.—And you went back to work the same day? A.—Yes. Then the foreman came up himself and asked me whether I would do better. That was to shield himself for what he had done. On leaving work he took me to a tavern, a little further on, and made me take a little liquor.

Q.—How old were you then? A.—I was about sixteen and a half.

Q.—Was it Mr. Goudreau or Mr. McGregor who brought you to the hotel? A.

—It was Mr. Lefebvre who returned with him. He had given me two or three slaps when Mr. McGregor came up, and let me have two more.

Q.—Were you beaten at other times? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Often? Sometimes? A.—Now and again he took up a mould cover and would strike me several times with it on the loins.

Q.—Why? What did you do? A.—Sometimes because we laughed, played and talked together.

Q.—All that was nothing to you; it was a regular settled thing, was it not? A.—It was a pretty rough settled thing.

Q.—You were never sore from the blows you received? A.—Sometimes.

Q.—Were you ever drawn by the hair? A.—Yes, indeed.

Q.—Hard enough to have tufts of your hair stick to the hands of those that pulled it? A.—Yes, sir. My hair has stopped growing.

Q.—Did you ever pay fines? A.—Yes; sometimes, also.

Q.—Often? A.—In my three years they may have kept from fifty to sixty dollars off my wages.

Q.—Why had you these fines to pay? A.—Sometimes because he gave one packet of robes and if we made only forty cigars he charged us ten cents fine.

Q.—You lost none of the robes, but the account was short, eh? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Did you not cut up capers now and again in the factory? A.—Sometimes. We are not always guardian angels.

Translation.

JACQUES CLAUDE, cigar-maker, of Montreal, sworn :

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You served your apprenticeship with Mr. Fortier? A.—Yes, sir, my apprenticeship lasted three months.

Q.—When you left, were you a journeyman? A.—I will tell you how all this stood. I had signed an agreement for three years; I worked three months, and said that he did not pay me. During the three months that I worked I got only one dollar. The last week that I worked there he said to three of us, before we left at noon, it being a Saturday, that those who missed should be put to a fine. We were in no condition to work that day, so that we did not turn up for work. In the evening, when we called for our money, he said to me: "You have nothing to draw and you owe me twenty cents." Of the two others who were with me, one received thirty-five cents, and the other got twenty-five cents.

Q.—For that week? A.—Yes; and the following week, when I saw that I could not learn my trade, nor get any money, I took a notion to play them a trick. I pretended to have epileptic fits, and kept up that game for a fortnight.

Q.—Did he pay you during these two weeks? A.—It was always fines. I think he was right in fining me, because I did him much damage. When he saw that I did

him so much damage he put his hand to his head, in the shop, before every body and said to me : " I discharge you from your agreement. I do not want to see you in my shop any more." When I saw that, I went away and never returned. That is all on that point. But still I worked there again later. When I worked there, as a journeyman, I had a job to roll. I had two dollars a thousand. The girls had the choice. There were two jobs, one job that paid better than the other, and the girls had the choice and the highest price. We picked up what was left behind. It was in winter, and you know that, during winter, the times are hard, one must bear as well as he can, and, over and above, he was reduced into that state of things. He brought us every evening about twenty bunches which he made us work at for nothing, and if we did not choose to roll them into the bargain, our job was done and we had to go.

GEORGE S. WARREN, re-called :

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Is there any factory where journeymen cigar makers are not employed excepting Goulet Brothers ? A.—Goulet Brothers to my knowledge have never employed a journeyman until lately. Foret's is another factory where they hardly employ a journeyman. Fortier's began in 1870 with apprentices, and it was that firm that introduced the system here. It is only during the last few years that they have had any workmen there. There is another factory on Ontario street—I don't know if it is in existence now—which never employed a journeyman to amount to anything. In fact, we don't know whether there are any journeymen there; they may employ some hands who have not served two years, and then become journeymen, but they are not considered journeymen by us.

8th February.

THOMAS GRATOREX, Labourer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—I understand you want to make some statement in regard to the increase of rents in this city ? A.—Yes. I live in a house in the rear of De Salaberry street. It has three rooms. The rent on the first of May, 1886, was \$5 a month; for 1887, \$5.50; for 1888, \$6.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Is that a fair sample of the advance that has been made in the rents of workmen's houses during the past two or three years in Montreal ? A.—Yes; it is a fair sample. It is only the smallest item; it is the smallest part of the increase; I am aware of houses in which the rents are \$2 in advance this year.

Q.—What was the original rent on which an advance of \$2 a month would be asked ? A.—\$10.

Q.—And \$12 was demanded ? A.—Yes. In the case to which I have referred certain parties left the house and applicants were asked \$12.

Q.—You now say you are paying \$6 this year ? A.—Yes.

Q.—For a house of three rooms ? A.—Yes.

Q.—How far from the business centre of the city is your house situated ? A.—It depends on what you call the business centre.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How far is it from here? A.—It is down at St. Mary's church.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Give us the distance in miles? A.—It is about three-quarters of a mile from here.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—North, east or west? A.—Due east.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Is that in a fairly comfortable and respectable neighbourhood? A.—Fairly respectable only; rather doubtful some of it.

Q.—Are there sewers on the street? A.—Yes; there is no complaint to make about that,—my complaint is of the houses next to mine; take the next house, there are three men, three women and three children occupying the three rooms of which the house consists. This system of having two or three families in the same house is breeding disease in this city and is occasioning all the contagious diseases.

Q.—How large are the rooms? A.—The room downstairs is, I think, twenty feet by ten feet, and that would be divided into two, upstairs.

Q.—So the two rooms upstairs would not be more than ten feet square each? A.—That is as near as I can tell you.

Q.—The water is carried into the tenement, I suppose? A.—Yes. There is no complaint about the water or the sink either; it is only the extortionate amount of rent charged.

Q.—What kind of water in each is provided? A.—It is fairly good.

Q.—Is the sanitary condition of the house good? A.—It is fair.

Q.—Would this be a fair sample house occupied by the average working man of Montreal? A.—You may call it above the average of them so far as I can find out; it is above the average. A skilled mechanic, of course, will be able to afford a better house. He should be able to do so but he could not, I think, on the rate of pay he receives at the present time. He could not afford to pay exorbitant rents, and, in fact, it is a matter of impossibility for any man to pay them, because the average pay of a mechanic now is \$3 per day.

Q.—What is the assessed value of the house you occupy? A.—I could not say. But I could tell you what the other four tenements cost which now bring in \$38 a month rent. I can tell you what the ground and the house altogether cost which bring in the rent I have named.

Q.—And that is how much? A.—\$2,800.

Q.—Your only complaint in so far as your house is concerned is that you think the rent has increased more rapidly than it should have increased? A.—Not only my rent but the rent of the whole of the houses occupied by the working classes around the east end. It is the same wherever you go to look for a house. They are all on the increase from fifty cents to \$1.50 and \$2 per month.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Does the water rate rise with the rent? A.—Yes; and it means \$2 more for water rate.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Does the tenant pay the water rate? A.—Yes.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—How do you engage a house in the city? A.—You sign a lease in the presence of the landlord, either in the presence of a notary, or as between the landlord

and yourself, (both are binding), that you will pay a certain rent, that you will also pay a share towards the cleaning of the closets, keep the snow cleaned off the sidewalk in front of the premises and pay water taxes, and if you do not mind they will make you pay the other tax. You will have to sign the lease for fifteen months. My lease has to be signed for the first of next May, so that leaves me nearly fifteen months. If I was thrown out of employment at the east end and got a situation at the west end I would have to remain in my present house for fifteen months, for I could not move. In that way the system is a hardship; for in such a case as I have spoken of, I would have to pay extra for street cars.

Q.—How much notice have you to give in order to leave the house? A.—From now to the first of May. You have to give a notice now in order to be able to leave the first of May. My lease was signed to-night and I can leave that house only on the first of next May of the following year.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What is the amount of your water rate? A.—It is hard to say what the assessor will value the property at. He valued it last year at \$7.50 for water rate; according to the rent it would be about \$6.50, so they made \$1 there. If you go to the office and tell them that such is not the rent you are paying they will tell you the house is worth more than you are paying, and you have to pay the water rate unless you go to one of the aldermen who has offered to take up the grievances in regard to water rates, and if you do so you have to lose your own time.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Have you not a Court of Revision? A.—I never saw one.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What kind of house can you obtain in Montreal for \$2 a month? A.—I could not get my wood shed for that.

Q.—Do you know of any persons living in houses at a rental of \$2 a month? A.—I do not.

Q.—Do you think it possible for a man to get a house for himself and family at that rent? A.—It may be possible, but it is very improbable.

Q.—Have the wages of workmen advanced in proportion to the increase in rent? A.—Not a cent.

Q.—What would be the average wages of a labouring man in Montreal? A.—They would run from eighty cents to \$1.25 and \$1.30.

Q.—They would average about \$1? A.—They would average about \$1.15.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do they get steady employment throughout the year? A.—If you work at the wharf you can put the average down at \$1 a day the year round, for the men only work seven months. Many firms here reduce the pay in winter, and there are also a great many firms who do not reduce it. There is one large firm which reduces the pay two or three dollars per week in winter.

Q.—What is the reason of making that reduction? A.—I could not say; the same amount of work is performed as in the summer.

Q.—Has the cost of living increased during the past few years? A.—Yes, the cost of living has increased twenty per cent.

Q.—What do you pay for good beef-steak in Montreal? A.—At present you can get it at twelve and a half cents per pound.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What is charged for a four pound loaf of bread here? A.—The loaf here is five pounds and we get it for sixteen cents.

Q.—What would such meat as is used for boiling purposes or for making soup cost? A.—Four cents, five cents, six cents, seven cents; shank is four cents, the second cut from the shank is five cents, the brisket is seven and eight cents, some as high as nine cents, according to quality. I have seen it up as high as ten cents.

By MR. CLARKE:—

Q.—Did you work anywhere else except in Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—Where? A.—In England.

Q.—Anywhere else in Canada? A.—No.

Q.—Did you ever work in the United States? A.—No.

By MR. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Tell us the difference in the cost of living for a workingman occupying your position in England as compared with your expenses in Montreal? A.—The difference in the cost of living will be about one half.

Q.—Comparing the wages of a workingman and living, would a workingman in your opinion be better off in England or in Montreal? A.—Taking a workingman's wages in England at one pound sterling, and let him work on the same principle as here, and the man in the old country will be better off at the end of the year. You have to pay \$6.00 a ton for coal here, and it takes four tons, working very carefully with it, and having an average warm house. That will cost \$24.00. You can buy that same quantity of coal in England for \$10.00, and on each ton you get two hundred and forty pounds more than you will receive here. Here you only receive 2,000 pounds to the ton, and in England you get the long ton, 2,240 pounds. It costs you here \$22.00 for a stove. In England there is a range inside the house, and there is on one side a boiler for hot water and on the other side a grate; so there is no necessity to travel around with a stove.

By MR. CARSON:—

Q.—About what part of the country are you speaking? A.—About Macclesfield.

Q.—How does that city compare in size and population with Montreal? A.—I suppose before these new places were taken into Montreal, it would be about the same size as this city is. There are about seventeen silk factories there which employ over twenty-five thousand people.

By MR. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you think, as a general rule, workingmen are better off in the old country than in this country? A.—I do; if they will take care of their money and not drink so much beer, and I think it would be better for them to stop there. But as a general rule the working classes in England do not think they have had any dinner, tea or supper unless they have beer, and although they only pay four cents a gallon for it, yet it runs away with the money.

By THE CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How many times a day does a labouring man in England eat meat? A.—I can only answer for myself. I eat meat once a day.

Q.—Are there some who do not eat meat once a day in England? A.—I dare say there may be.

Q.—How many times a day do you eat meat in Canada? A.—Once a day.

Q.—How many times a day does the average workingman eat meat here? A.—I cannot say. Perhaps twice.

Q.—Would you believe that he eats meat three times a day, morning, noon and night? A.—It may not be for his own benefit.

Q.—Do you not believe that the workingman eats meat three times a day in Canada? A.—He may.

Q.—You say merely he may? A.—Yes.

By MR. HEAKES:—

Q.—You do not know whether a Canadian workman eats meat three times a day? A.—No.

Q.—It is not your practice? A.—No.

Q.—You are basing your testimony on your own practice? A.—Yes.

By MR. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you know the condition of the living of people outside yourself? A.—Merely from what they tell me.

Q.—You are a man of pretty keen observation and from the surroundings of those you have seen in England and in this country can you form an estimate of the relative position of men in similar situations in both countries: whether he is better off in this country or in England? A.—I have told you that before, and you must remember that I was giving you a statement with regard to a man earning \$5.00 a week in England.

Q.—I am not asking for the rates of wages, but your opinion as to the circumstances of the people in the old country as compared with here; whether they are better off or worse off than are the people in similar positions in this country? A.—I consider they are as well off there as they are here.

By MR. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What was the amount of your water rates? A.—\$6.54 for that year.

Q.—What will they be for 1887? A.—\$7.50.

Q.—You had a judgment given against you some years ago? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember what year? A.—I think in 1881; either in 1880 or 1881.

Q.—That judgment was executed against you, I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—Your goods were seized and you were sold out? A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the amount of the debt? A.—\$22.50, being three months' rent at \$7.50 a month.

Q.—Was it a judgment to eject you from the house? A.—It was a judgment for ejectment and for rent.

Q.—You were ejected? A.—I was ejected on the 30th of April after the time was up, and this took place in the other part of April.

Q.—Your furniture was sold? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you receive any account of the proceeds of the sale? A.—I did not.

Q.—No receipt was given you of the products of the sale or any account rendered showing your indebtedness to the landlord? A.—None whatever.

Q.—In your opinion had you sufficient furniture to pay the debt of which you have spoken? A.—The furniture was worth \$165.00.

Q.—Was all your furniture sold? A.—The whole furniture. The parlor set worth \$100.00—the greater part was taken; the bureau worth \$25.00 was taken, and the dining room and kitchen tables, and one stove and a parlor table.

Q.—Did you attend the sale? A.—I did.

Q.—Do you remember the amount which the sale brought? A.—I do not.

Q.—Do you believe that by the results of the sale you paid the full amount of the judgment and costs included? A.—That was my opinion.

Q.—What happened after that? A.—Six years afterwards there was a judgment made against me and an assessment made on my wages for the amount of more than the original debt.

Q.—You considered that the original costs and debt had been paid by your furniture when it was sold? A.—Yes.

Q.—And in 1886 the amount of more than the original debt was claimed against you? A.—Yes; there is a balance of \$32.50, and they bring it down afterwards to \$61.26. There are \$10 for the bailiff to collect it, \$15 for the lawyer to make out the papers, and \$17.75 for interest.

Q.—Did you take the precaution to submit that amount to the prothonotary for examination? A.—It has been taken to him by our paymaster several times.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—What did the prothonotary say to the person who submitted the balance for the taxation of costs? A.—I could not tell you. It was brought to the debtor's court by our paymaster, because our Company was seized as well as myself. This occurred six years after the sale of the furniture.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What amount did you pay subsequently? A.—I cannot tell you exactly, but I paid half a dollar a week for the other two years.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—You commenced with a debt of \$22.50? A.—Yes.

Q.—Then they sold \$150 worth of your furniture? A.—Yes.

Q.—And then you owed them \$32.50? A.—Yes.

Q.—And you paid \$48.50 subsequently? A.—\$48.01 this last two years.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Was the sale public? A.—It was in the back yard.

Q.—Was the sale public? A.—Yes.

Q.—And at the public sale the goods brought how much? A.—I cannot tell you because I was not notified.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

They appear to have brought \$29.20.

JOHN BURGESS, Government Steamboat Inspector for the Montreal Division, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you inspect all steamers here? A.—All in this division.

Q.—What does your division embrace? A.—From here up the Ottawa to Lake Nippising and west to the boundary line between Ontario and Quebec, somewhere about Coteau Landing or Cornwall. Cornwall, I believe, is in Ontario.

Q.—Have you to inspect the hulls of vessels? A.—Not now. About three years ago there was an Inspector appointed for hulls. My duties now are merely to inspect the machinery and all connected with that department.

Q.—And boilers? A.—Yes, boilers and machinery.

Q.—For the last three years have your duties been confined to this entirely? A.—I think about three years; I am not quite certain; it has been since the hull Inspector was appointed.

Q.—As a general rule how do you find the boilers and machinery in the boats that are under your inspection? A.—Some of them, of course, I find a little deficient.

Of course I stop them until they are remedied, so far as strength and safety is concerned. Safety is the principal object in this matter,—safety of the lives on board.

Q.—I suppose scarcely any of those are sea-going vessels? A.—Not many of them. There are about three or four sea-going steamers coming into this port; all the others are river boats.

Q.—Have you any authority with regard to the freight or passengers? A.—Nothing further than regulating the number of passengers that each steamer shall carry. That is according to what the Inspector considers she is able to carry safely.

Q.—Have you any regulation except the mere tonnage with respect to the amount for freight? A.—No.

Q.—You have nothing to do with that? A.—No.

Q.—Are the passenger laws generally observed on the steamers? A.—Yes; that is so far as the Inspector is concerned. But, of course, it is impossible for the Inspector to be on the wharf to see the number of passengers that go on board. The number of passengers a boat is entitled to carry is placed on her certificate, and if the Company or owner is known to take more passengers on board than what is stated in her certificate, then, of course, he is liable to be fined. The amount of the fine is mentioned in the Act, but I forget it for the moment.

Q.—Have you any regulations with respect to the kind of cargo a vessel shall carry or anything of that kind with respect to a cargo of a dangerous character being on board? A.—Yes; there is. That comes under the duty of the hull Inspectors. There is a law regulating that, so far as inflammable matter is concerned, coal oil or cotton, and that kind of thing, and that, of course, comes under the duty of the hull Inspector.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Who is he? A.—Mr. Brunell.

Q.—Where does he reside? A.—His office is in Quebec and he lives at Point Levis.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—At what particular times do you make this inspection? A.—We are supposed to make it in the spring of the year. We commence about the month of April and we get through most of it in April, May and June; in two or three months we get through most of our work but the inspection of some of them extends further in the year.

Q.—After you have made a satisfactory inspection when do you inspect the steamers again? A.—The law states that all certificates granted shall be good for twelve months from the date of the certificate; but an Inspector can visit a vessel at any time he thinks proper, whenever he is in doubt, but, as I have said, the certificate is good for twelve months.

Q.—Suppose something should arise that might possibly not have been noticed by you, could you revoke that certificate within the twelve months? A.—Yes; there is no trouble about doing that.

Q.—At any time when you thought it was dangerous to allow the vessel to proceed? A.—At any time we think there is any danger whatever as regards the carrying of passengers, or danger to life, we can revoke the certificate and stop the steamer.

Q.—Have you any special standard with regard to the pressure that boilers should stand? A.—Yes; we have an Act to guide us.

Q.—Are those matters uniform with regard to steamers? A.—Yes; it is uniform so far as the Inspectors carry it out. Of course it is perfectly impossible for all the Inspectors to give the same opinion about the danger from a boiler or any other part of the machinery. They will differ a little but their business is to guard the public against accident and to prevent loss of life.

Q.—What I mean by a uniform inspection is not that every boiler should be obliged to stand the same pressure or anything of that kind? A.—No.

Q.—With regard to the boilers: from the nature of a boiler and the capacity it is supposed to have according to its register, did you at all times find those boilers equal to the test, or what test is it necessary for those to stand to get the certificate? A.—We have a rule for that.

Q.—What is the rule? A.—If I had thought of it I would have brought a copy of the Act here.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—The Act explains itself? A.—I am afraid if I began to explain matters to the Commission the members would not understand it. I will get copies of the Act and will send them.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—On the certificate you give you state the pressure permitted, of course? A.—Certainly; the pressure is given exactly on the certificate.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Are they all licensed engineers on those boats? A.—They are all licensed on passenger steamers; that is, all steamers carrying passengers are required to have engineers holding certificates from the Board of Steamboat Inspectors.

Q.—Do the tugs carry certificated engineers? A.—It is not compulsory, but there are very few tug boats running without engineers having certificates. The law does not, however, compel them to hold certificates.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—In your opinion, should the law be extended to engineers on tugs? A.—That is a question for the Government to decide. The Government have decided that it is not necessary to have certificated engineers on tug boats; therefore I do not feel disposed to give my opinion on the question.

Q.—Can you tell us the proportion of explosions on tug boats as compared with the number of passenger boats? A.—There have been very few indeed so far as explosions are concerned.

Q.—Have you known of any explosions on tug boats? A.—No; I do not recollect any at present.

(Translation.)

MISS GEORGIANA LOISELLE, Cigar Maker of Montreal, sworn.

By MR. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—In what factory do you work, Miss? A.—At Mr. Fortier's.

Q.—In what establishment did you serve your apprenticeship? A.—At Mr. Fortier's.

Q.—Were you beaten when at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Will you tell us in what way you were beaten? A.—It was Mr. Fortier who beat me with a mould cover.

Q.—Is it a tool such as you see before you on the table? A.—Yes; it was the cover.

Q.—Why did he beat you? A.—I would not make one hundred cigars which he gave me to make. I refused to make them, and he beat me with the mould cover.

Q.—Did he seize you before beating you? A.—I was sitting, and he took hold of me by the arm, and tried to throw me on the ground. He did throw me on the ground and beat me with the mould cover.

Q.—Did he beat you when you were down? A.—Yes, I tried to rise and he kept me down on the floor.

Q.—Were you able to rise at once after being beaten? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you suffer from the blows he gave you? A.—No, sir; I bore no marks.

Q.—Were there young girls, workmen or boys in the factory? A.—There were other girls, but I did not notice the girls. I noticed only the foreman, Mr. Fournier.

Q.—Mr. Fournier said nothing? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q. Did anyone go to see you to-day to prevent you giving evidence this evening? A.—No, sir.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q. How old were you when you were beaten? A.—I was going on eighteen years.

Q.—How long is it since you were beaten? A.—I am now twenty-three years old.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Was that any part of your work, the making of the hundred cigars? A.—Yes; I had made only two hundred cigars during the day, and he wanted me to make more. I was able to make more.

Q.—Do you work by the day or by the job? A.—I work by the job, but, at that time, I was working by the week. I was an apprentice.

Q.—Did you quit Mr. Fortier after that? A.—Yes; after my apprenticeship was over.

Q.—And you went back to work for him? A.—Yes; and I still work there for him.

JOHN ROGERS, Cigar Maker, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Where did you work? A.—At Fortier's.

Q.—Do you work there now? A.—I now work at Davis'.

Q.—How long have you worked at Davis'? A.—A couple of weeks.

Q.—Are there any apprentices at Davis'? A.—Yes.

Q.—How are the apprentices treated at Davis'? A.—I don't know anything about them; we don't work with the apprentices.

Q.—Where did you serve your time as an apprentice? A.—At J. M. Fortier's.

Q.—At what age did you commence? A.—I guess at 13 or 14.

Q.—How long did you serve? A.—Three years.

Q.—Were you beaten at Fortier's? A.—Yes, I was beaten.

Q.—How were you beaten? A.—I was beaten with a stick the first year. I staid off one Saturday, and when I went for my pay Mr. Fortier said to me "Where were you to-day?" I said, I had a cold and could not come. Said he, "What is that?" I had in my hand a pipe which I was filling for a man. He said to me "You go upstairs." I went up stairs to McGregor, and he brought me over to the closet and said, "Take the broom and clean the closet." I said, No; I would not do it. I am not sure whether he hit me or not. He went down-stairs and picked up a

board half as big as a mould and hit me across the legs with it. That was the first time. Then I removed to the corner of St. Sacramento and St. Peter Street. He didn't want to let me out at six one night, and he wanted me to take the tobacco off the floor for him. Goudreau, Robley and McGregor and J. M. Fortier got hold of me and brought me over to the tap. They said, "We will duck you here. Did you ever go in for a swim?" "Yes," said I, "You are going to get a good ducking," they said; and because I would not shout and cry out they let me go. I very often got my ears pulled and was beaten around the head because I would not make 400 or 500 cigars every day. I then went to St. Maurice Street, and I stole three cigars one day, and they brought me down to the cellar and took down my pants and beat me: McGregor,—I am not sure—Goudreau, Robley, Tassé, and J. M. Wood. They beat me with a hoop.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Was it part of your duty to take this tobacco from the floor? A.—It was after my hours.

Q.—Were you discharged from Fortier's? A.—No.

Q.—Did you leave of your own accord? A.—I left to go to Tassé & Wood's when I had finished my apprenticeship. I went back to Fortier's again, and I left him again at the time he got slack and lowered our wages.

Q.—You left wholly of your own accord? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—What time of the day was it when Fortier sent you up-stairs? A.—It was about four o'clock on Saturday afternoon.

Q.—Were you so sick you could not clean the floor that day? A.—That is not the day at all.

Q.—Is that part of the apprentices' work? A.—I don't know. It is the apprentices' work to learn cigar making.

Q.—Did you ever see apprentices doing that kind of work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did the apprentices do it? A.—I don't know. Lots of them did it—I have seen others do it.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You would not do it? A.—I would not do it.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Were you ever put in the black hole? A.—Yes; I was.

Q.—What was it for? A.—Because I didn't make enough cigars and for loafing, or something like that.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Were you indentured? A.—Yes; I was bound.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—How long did you remain in the black hole? A.—I don't know.

Q.—Was it a day? A.—I don't know. It was inside of one hour, I think.

Q.—How many cigars were you required to make in a day? A.—I don't know. I was bound by the week.

Q.—How many were given as a stint for a day's work? A.—There was no such thing.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Were you required to make a certain quantity every day? A.—No; there was nothing about that in my binding.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How many were you expected to make every day? A.—500, 600 or 700—500 every day.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—How many did you succeed in making? A.—400 or 300; 500 some days and 600.

ALEXANDER MACGREGOR, Manager of J. M. Fortier's Cigar Factory, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How long have you been in the employ of Mr. Fortier? A.—About six years.

Q.—Have you been Manager all that time? A.—Yes; I have always been head of the interior of the manufactory.

Q.—Have you been thoroughly familiar with the operations in the working rooms? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you ever seen boys beaten in that establishment? A.—Well; I have seen them chastised; yes.

Q.—Have you frequently seen them beaten? A.—Not frequently.

Q.—What would they be struck with? A.—Sometimes with a small rule on the hand, or merely a tap to call their attention that they were destroying tobacco or some such thing.

Q.—Have you ever seen any kicked? A.—I have never seen any kicked to my knowledge.

Q.—Have you ever seen any of them beaten with a board like the top of this mould? A.—No.

Q.—Have you ever known any of them to be put in the black hole? A.—I really do not understand you when you say a "black hole."

Q.—A coal hole or room in which they were locked up. A.—Yes; we have an enclosure in the factory where we have secured thieves when we have detected them thieving, until we had searched the balance of the hands to see if they were thieving, and when we had searched the hands we have taken those first detected to the station house.

Q.—Have you ever known any to be locked up who were not subsequently taken to the station house? A.—We have at times pardoned some because they repented for what they had done.

Q.—Have you heard the evidence given to-night by a female witness, a young lady? A.—I have.

Q.—Do you know anything about that circumstance? A.—Not directly.

Q.—You only know of it by hearsay? A.—Yes; by hearsay.

Q.—Did you ever know of any boys having been locked in a room in order to be afterwards flogged or beaten? A.—I have had parents come to me and instruct me to do it.

Q.—Have you ever known it to be done? A.—Just indirectly. I have told the foreman at different times that such and such a parent had come and told me that I might remove any part of the boy's clothing and chastise them, as I would my own children. I have instructed foremen this way, that such and such a boy is a very bad boy, and if he does anything, his parents have instructed me to do so and so.

Q.—Have you known it to be done? A.—Indirectly, as I said before.

Q.—You have known it indirectly? A.—Yes; indirectly.

Q.—You have not seen it? A.—I have not seen it.

Q.—Are you going through the workshops all the time? A.—Yes; from six in the morning to six or seven at night.

Q.—How many appartments are there in the factory? A.—There are five flats.

Q.—Could any punishment be inflicted and you not be present at the time?

A.—There could be; I might be on the bottom flat and punishments might be inflicted on the top flats.

Q.—Have you ever known anything of a boy being thrown to the ground so that his health was injured? A.—I have not direct knowledge of that.

Q.—Do you know Stanislas Goulet? A.—I know him.

Q.—Were you present when he was punished? A.—I was not. I was present when the circumstances took place, and when he claims he was injured.

Q.—Explain? A.—I consider that the boy injured himself. He refused to do his duty when the foreman asked him, and the foreman took him by the arm, and he refused to go and commenced to wrestle with the foreman and fell down on the floor. He wrestled and refused to do his duty.

Q.—Was the foreman moving him along? A.—He was moving him along.

Q.—Had he hold of him by the arm? A.—He had hold of him by the arm.

Q.—Or by both arms? A.—By one arm.

Q.—Was he holding him firmly? A.—I could not say; I didn't see his grasp exactly. The boy refused to do his duty. He pulled him by the arm to make him obey.

Q.—What duty did he refuse to do? A.—To pick tobacco out of the sweepings.

Q.—At what time of the day was this? A.—I cannot swear to the exact time, but I should judge about a quarter to six.

Q.—Did the boy try to throw the foreman down? A.—He tried to hit him with a mould. This mould on the table is an extraordinarily large one. We usually work with moulds one quarter of an inch shorter than that, and they are not usually encircled in zinc like this—there are some like it there.

Q.—He tried to strike the foreman? A.—With the cover of a mould.

Q.—Did he succeed? A.—No; the foreman warded off the blow.

Q.—What did the foreman do then? A.—As I said, he tried to strike the foreman with the mould, and wrestle with him, and fell down on the floor.

Q.—What did the foreman do? A.—He pushed him along to his work; the boy wrestled with him and fell on the floor. Then I came and said that such proceedings could not continue in the factory. The boy commenced to cry and holler out. I said: "You should not do such a thing as disobey your foreman, but you should obey him at all times."

BY MR. KERWIN:—

Q.—You saw all this tussle? A.—Yes.

BY MR. FREED:—

Q.—Was the boy able to speak? A.—Yes. I went to the boy's house the next day to enquire for him; I heard he was hurt seriously. I spoke to his mother and asked her where the boy was. She said he was out playing. I said: "Then he cannot be seriously hurt?" She said: "He is such a wicked boy that I cannot get any good from him." "I am not surprised at your not getting any good from him." I said: "In that case he must come back to work." As I said before he was such a wicked and ill-tempered fellow, that, rather than have any trouble with him, we broke his indenture and let him go. That was five or six years ago. Two months ago he came and asked for work. I was surprised to see him; he had grown up quite a big fellow. He rather thought I would not give him work, but I gave him work, and he worked on till this disagreement occurred in the regard to the reduction of wages.

Q.—Was any demand ever made upon the firm or upon anybody connected with the establishment for damages or reparation in consequence of injuries done that boy? A.—No.

Q.—Did the father of the boy ever visit the firm? A.—That I could not answer without referring to Mr. Fortier.

Q.—Did any legal gentleman ever visit the firm in connection with the matter? A.—That I could not answer. I am not aware of any.

Q.—Do you know whether he was too weak after that to work in any other establishment? A.—I don't know; but he certainly must have worked in another establishment, as when he came to work with us he was rather a fair cigar maker.

Q.—Did he give good satisfaction during the last term of service up to the time of the disagreement about the wages broke out? A.—Yes; fairly good satisfaction, that of any ordinary cigar maker.

Q.—Was he frequently fined during his apprenticeship for any cause whatever? A.—I don't remember of his ever being fined.

Q.—Do you know of his ever having been punished at any other time than that of which you have just spoken? A.—No.

Q.—Do you know of his ever having been put into what has been called the black hole? A.—No.

Q.—Locked up in any way? A.—No.

Q.—When apprentices have been punished, either by locking up or by corporal punishment, have they been dismissed? A.—No; not as a rule.

Q.—Under what circumstances are apprentices fined in Mr. Fortier's establishment? A.—There are several reasons why they are fined. The fines are very rarely exacted. They are sometimes inflicted, and more especially by two witnesses who came before the Commission a day or two ago. The list of fines is handed to me to exact every Saturday. I have as a general rule spoken to the foremen and asked them to suspend judgment on those fines, and spoke to the different people they had fined in order to make them better boys for the ensuing week, and remitted the fines at the end of that week. In most cases we have remitted the fines.

Q.—What has been the amount of each separate fine? A.—As a general rule about ten cents.

Q.—What would be the average? A.—Not more than 12½ cents.

Q.—What is the highest fine imposed within your knowledge? A.—Twenty-five cents.

Q.—Do you know of every case of fining that took place in the establishment? A.—Yes; as I pay off and have control of the pay sheet.

Q.—They all pass directly under your eye? A.—Directly under my eye, and I am accountable for every cent that goes out.

Q.—Have you known cases in which the fines inflicted upon boys in a single week have exceeded the amount of their wages? A.—No; never in my superintendence of the factory.

Q.—Are you able to go back and fix the aggregate amounts of fines by consulting the books of the establishment? A.—Yes; I would not like to say I could indicate every apprentice or every person in our employ, but if you mention one, two or three cases, I shall be happy to lay a statement in regard to them before the Commission. I can say, more especially in the case of Joseph Faille, who gave evidence and said he was fined \$125.00. Such is not the case or anything near it.

Q.—Have you consulted the books to get evidence in regard to that boy? A.—I know it from memory.

Q.—Can you carry in your memory all the fines? A.—Not every particular fine, but I can go pretty near it.

Q.—Can you tell us the amount of fines that Joseph Faille did pay during the term of his apprenticeship? A.—No; not without consulting the books accurately.

Q.—What would be the offences for which those boys were fined? A.—They

are different. There is destroying tobacco, throwing tobacco to one another, profane language and disturbances and thieving.

Q.—What do you consider disturbances? A.—Loud, and profane talk.

Q.—If a boy happens in his ordinary tone to say a few words to anyone working near him would he be fined for that? A.—No; not at all.

Q.—Is it the custom for them to speak and talk with their neighbours? A.—We don't make a custom of it because the boys must pay attention to their work. We don't forbid boys saying a word or two, but when they get noisy or interfere with others in their work, we have to check them.

Q.—Have you a policeman, a special constable in your shop? A.—We have an ex-special constable.

Q.—Is he not a special constable now? A.—That I could not say without referring to the Police Magistrate. I know he was a special constable previous to entering our factory.

Q.—What are his duties in the factory? A.—Pressing the bunches, and searching the boys and men on going out, to see that they don't take any cigars away.

Q.—Do you search all on leaving the place? A.—Yes; except the female employees.

Q.—Are they searched at every exit? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you frequently find them taking away cigars? A.—Very often.

Q.—Is there any understanding by which any person employed in the establishment is permitted to take cigars in small numbers? A.—No.

Q.—They are not permitted to take away cigars at all? A.—No.

Q.—Nor any tobacco? A.—No.

Q.—Have you ever known of fines having been imposed before you were foreman or superintendent? A.—I could not say anything about that. I decline to answer anything I have no personal knowledge of.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Have you ever locked up boys for any reason except stealing? A.—I have never, myself.

Q.—Has it come to your knowledge that that has been done? A.—It has in an indirect way, but never directly.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Whose duty is it to lock up those boys? A.—Sometimes the foreman's, but it is usually done by the advice of their parents that they must be punished.

Q.—Are those boys when they commit an offence taken to the black hole without any reference to the manager? A.—Sometimes. Sometimes he will be out. There may have been cases of that happen when I was out.

Q.—Have foremen power to lock up the boys without consulting the manager? A.—That, I don't know, as to the power. I don't know that it has ever been done; that I could not answer.

Q.—Have you not heard of boys being locked up without there being any consultation between you and the foreman? A.—No.

Q.—Have you never heard of a boy being locked up without the case being first reported to you? A.—No.

Q.—Have you ever known of cigars that have been taken from the men being repacked in boxes; cigars that were culled out? A.—That is a question of which I have not the slightest knowledge. I have seen cigars culled out, and especially by the two previous witnesses, Lefebvre and Robley, foremen, and I made strong objections to it. I have told them: "You must not take advantage of such a man because he is a little weak, so to speak; because he cannot defend himself. You must not take out a lot of cigars from him, but examine and give justice to everybody, more especially to those poor fellows who cannot defend themselves." I have

repeatedly told them they must not take cigars from such hands. Lefebvre has taken cigars out of bundles that he had no business to take, and I have told him so myself. He has taken cigars out, and never had them replaced. He would, perhaps, send 2,000 to the packing room, and there would be 30 or 40 cigars missing. The foreman would come down to Lefebvre and say: "There are 40 missing out of the 2,000 or 2,500." He would say: "Don't say a word, I will make it up later on." That ran on for a little time, and the foreman of the packing room reported a deficiency of 600 or 700 cigars that Lefebvre had culled from the workmen and never replaced—imperfectly made cigars culled from the workmen and never replaced. I asked how that was, and he could not account for it—they must have been stolen from the boxes. I knew he had culled them from the boxes and never had them replaced by proper ones. When Lefebvre left our employment his department owed the packing room 600 or 700 cigars. We have to keep a check on every department from the beginning to the end. As soon as cigars are made they are credited to each operative. We have had instances where operatives were 50 short; that was through the omission of an entry of 50 cigars. I usually take stock of the cigars perhaps four or five times a week,—sometimes every night. I might find 50 of a certain brand over, which must have belonged to some operative who is not credited with them. I have had the foreman go around and enquire to whom those 50 belonged, or how many each party had made, and he would say: "There are 250 cigars and only 200 credited," and he would give the other 50 to some one of them. I have had 50 over at the end of the week, and two or three operatives would claim them. I had instances where one of our foremen omitted to credit some operative with fifty cigars, and he has turned round with that same 50, since I found it out, credited one of his friends with them. They were in collusion in drawing the amount of money for those fifty cigars.

Q.—Have you ever known as to what becomes of cigars culled out? A.—We put them into the press again and grind them up. Very often the men come along and smoke them.

By THE CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Any laborer? A.—No.

Q.—Any man? A.—Any of the staff.

By MR. HEAKES;—

Q.—Have you ever known any person in the establishment to take those cigars and give them to their friends? A.—Yes; I have.

Q.—Would you consider those cigars good enough to smoke? A.—They were good enough to smoke, but not to sell. The quality was there, but they were imperfect.

Q.—What are some of the causes for which cigars are culled out? A.—I might explain that, but unless a practical man was listening to me I don't think he would understand it.

Q.—We have had some causes stated here? A.—Sometimes they are not properly filled. Sometimes the wrappers were cut and not put on properly, and some of them were too short, and some too thick, and not the proper size—various causes.

By MR. KERWIN :—

Q.—I understood you to say in the first part of your evidence that the parents of the children gave you permission to take down their trousers and beat them in the manner you have described? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you, in justice to yourself and Mr. Fortier, give us the names of three or four of those parents? A.—I can instance you one in a moment.

Q.—I want to know if you will give us the names of some of the parents? A.—Roger, the previous witness. His mother came to me and told me I could use any

means in my power to chastise the boy as she could not get any good at all out of him.

Q.—Give us the names of the parents, the fathers and mothers? A.—You asked me for three or four cases and I have answered you by giving you Rogers. I can go on and give you another. There was a boy named Piché whose father gave me particular instructions to chastise him, the same as I would if he was one of my own boys.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Would you chastise one of your boys with the cover of one of those moulds? A.—I have never done such a thing. I have never stated so.

Q.—It has been stated that the cover of a mould was used? A.—I don't know.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Have you had the permission of parents to put children in the black hole? A.—I have never done it directly.

Q.—I mean in the factory? A.—No; we never had any to my knowledge. They may have come through Mr. Fortier. I am not always there.

Q.—I also understood you to say that operatives were searched on going out. Is that so? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are the girls searched? A.—No. I may say that occasionally it has occurred that girls have lost different articles, and such and such a girl has been suspected. We endeavor to cull out such a girl from the establishment. I have had a female, probably the forewoman of the establishment, to search all the girls in order to discover the guilty party.

Q.—Is there any iron clad document in your trade? A.—There is no such thing. You may term it what you like, but there is no iron clad rule in our shop.

Q.—I have a copy of one of your indentures before me. It says, "The apprentice shall not join any association or body of workmen for any purpose whatever." What has that to do with a boy's apprenticeship? A.—It has a great deal to do with it. That is not an iron clad rule; it is not so by my interpretation, or I think by that of any thinking citizen.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—If a boy after signing those indentures joins such a society, what would be the consequences to that boy? A.—That boy is under the guardianship of the person to whom he is indentured.

Q.—What would be the consequences to the boy if he joined a labor organization? A.—We have never had any experience, and I could not answer that question.

Q.—Could any of those boys be beaten by other foremen without it coming to your knowledge? A.—Possibly they might.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—What becomes of the fines imposed on those boys? A.—They are really exacted as I have said.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What becomes of them when they are exacted? A.—They go right into the cash box.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you know any occasion where boys were charged twenty cents, and one dollar and thirty-five cents for a potato and a piece of bread? A.—Yes; I think the whole of the circumstances have not been related properly. That happens to be a private affair of my own. I was four or five years ago compelled to send for my lunch to my private house, and I usually got a little boy to carry it for me. One

day the boy was attacked on the street by Robley and Joley, and my lunch was taken out of the basket. When the boy returned I asked him how that happened. He commenced to cry, and said that Robley and Joley had attacked him and taken the lunch out of the basket. I said nothing, but on Saturday when those boys came for their pay, I said to Robley, "You have not extras and no surplus." They usually made \$2.00, \$3.00 or \$4.00 wages, sometimes forty cents. In that case Robley's surplus was about forty cents. I said that would be an example to him not to take my lunch basket on the street again, and I took his surplus away. I acted with Joley in the same way and took his surplus away.

By Mr. FREED;—

Q.—How much? A.—\$1.35. It was more a matter of principle than anything else, for attacking my lunch basket on the street.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—It was a very expensive lunch? A.—That may be your opinion, but I can tell you you would not like it done to yourself.

Q.—Do you know occasions when reporters visited your factory? A.—Several occasions.

Q.—What became of the boys; were they put on the hoist and kept going up and down until the reporters left the building? A.—No; never.

Q.—Do you pay as much per thousand as is paid in Jacobs' shop? A.—I know nothing about Jacob's establishment.

Q.—How much per thousand do you pay? A.—From seven dollars to one dollar per thousand, and we have paid as high as \$25.00 per thousand.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is \$7.00 the lowest? A.—No; we pay less for inferior cigars.

Q.—Give us the lowest as well as the highest? A.—We pay \$2.25 for any doing the work. About \$3.75 or \$4.00 for the work right through; that is the lowest.

Q.—How many cigars is an apprentice supposed to make in a week the first year of his apprenticeship? A.—There is no particular number. Sometimes a boy will make four hundred or five hundred in a day. There are other boys who do not make more than two hundred or three hundred.

Q.—How many do you require for a week's work? A.—There is no particular standard. Sometimes when the boy is capable of doing a certain amount of work we try to make him do that in order to earn his money.

Q.—Have you any fixed quantity of cigars that a boy should turn out as a week's work in the second year? A.—No quantity. Some boys get lazy and will not earn as much as their indenture calls for. We therefore endeavor, in order to make them quick workmen to make them make a quantity, to have them make enough to cover the amount to be paid under the indenture.

Q.—How many would you consider a sufficient number to cover that amount? A.—In the second year?

Q.—Yes. A.—That depends on the class of work. About three or four hundred a day would cover a day's pay to the apprentices.

Q.—That would amount to about 1,800 a week for the apprentices? A.—From 1,500 to 1,800.

Q.—If the boys do not make that number do you fine them? A.—No; not if he is not capable of doing it.

Q.—Have boys ever been fined for not making a sufficient quantity? A.—Certainly; when they get lazy and become in any way noisy and bothersome during the work. Sometimes a boy will bother a foreman enough to upset the whole shop.

Q.—When you give a boy a bundle of wrappers are the leaves in the bundle weighed? A.—Often they are counted and often they are weighed.

Q.—If the boy is not able to turn out the requisite number of cigars that bundle of leaves calls for, is he fined? A.—If the boy destroys the wrappers, certainly he is fined.

Q.—Suppose a boy has a bundle, you say the bundle is weighed, how can you tell whether there will be sufficient number of leaves to do the amount of work? A.—We always use fair judgment in matters of that kind.

Q.—If a boy does not turn out the requisite number do you punish him? No; not at all times. It is only when they destroy the tobacco, they are fined.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What will a boy at the expiration of his apprenticeship earn as a journeyman? A.—It depends on the capacity of the boy. Some are quicker than others.

Q.—Tell us the lowest and the highest? A.—From \$6.00 to \$13.00 or \$14.00 a week.

Q.—A boy just out of his apprenticeship will make from \$6.00 to \$13.00 or \$14.00 a week? A.—Yes; if he works.

Q.—What wages are paid during the apprenticeship? A.—Under the indentures \$1.00, \$1.50 and \$2.00 per week.

Q.—What are the sanitary arrangements of the factory with regard to water closets? A.—They are first class in that respect.

Q.—How many water closets are there in the factory? A.—One on each flat.

Q.—Are there separate water closets for the male and female employees? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are the approaches to these separate? A.—Yes; they are on different flats. The girls working on the third flat have to come down a stair-case to the second flat.

Q.—How many stories are there in the factory? A.—There are five, including the basement.

Q.—What means of escape are provided in case of fire? A.—We have two stair-cases.

Q.—Do the doors open outward? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How wide are those stair-cases? A.—They are both about ten feet square, ten feet wide, and ten feet long.

Q.—Are they winding stairs? A.—Yes; you might call them so.

Q.—Is there a railing to protect people going down? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it a substantial railing in case of a crowd? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do the outer doors open outward? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are there two stair-cases to each story? A.—Yes, one on each side of the building. There are two separate buildings, with arches from one to the other; one in that building and one in this.

Q.—Are there means of communication on every story from one building to the other? A.—Arches about six feet wide.

Q.—Is there a party wall between the two buildings? A.—Yes. Some employees work on one side and some on the other.

Q.—How many people as a rule are employed in the factory? A.—They are coming and going all the time, and perhaps there are about 350, to be candid. Ten may go to-day and ten may come to-morrow, and we never have an exact number, but the average would probably be about 350.

Q.—Are the hands crowded so that the air becomes vitiated? A.—No; not in any respect.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are the outer doors of the factory kept locked in the day time? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the object of that? A.—The hands are all on piece work. We allow them to a quarter past eight o'clock to come in. If we allowed them to come in later than that some of them would not come in until a quarter past nine.

Q.—Are the doors locked to 12 o'clock? A.—They are locked to five minutes to 12.

Q.—Where is the key of the door? A.—The foreman has one and I have one.

Q.—In the event of a panic taking place in the factory, are the keys where they could be got at easily? A.—They are always on the person of one or the other.

Q.—Might not that person be in the fifth story? A.—He might be, but it is not probable that both of us will be there together. There are two keys to each door.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Is it probable that both would be out of the factory at the same time? A.—Not very much, and if we have to be, we leave the key behind us. We also have on each flat a barrel containing about thirty gallons of water with four water pails on each flat, in case of fire.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you a time-keeper? A.—It is not necessary, because all our hands are piece workers; we have men to count the work and credit each operative as they bring in their cigars.

Q.—Will you say the cost of making a thousand bunches by mould? A.—I object very much to doing so.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—How often is the water changed in the buckets or tanks? A.—It is changed just as soon as it becomes stagnant.

Q.—How often is that? A.—I don't know.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—I suppose it depends on the different seasons? A.—Yes; and upon the temperature of the factory. On some of the floors the temperature is higher than on others. On one floor the temperature is not more than forty. We have no hands working there.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Do you change the water twice a year? A.—Yes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do any clergymen visit your factory? A.—Yes; it has been visited in connection with a young man named Robley. A reverend gentleman belonging to the French Church came and enquired about his conduct, and his welfare as well, and I gave him a very favorable report about him, and the reverend gentleman was very glad to hear it. His name is Rev. Father Gibeau.

Q.—Is it true that apprentices are informed that they must clean themselves up and dress themselves for the expected visit of a clergyman? A.—I don't remember such a thing as that.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Is proper attention given to the water closets to see that they are kept clean? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you ever known the water in those water closets to run out on the floor into the workrooms? A.—That would be on account of the neglect of people

going there. It would have to run a good deal, as the closets are marble lined inside, and there is an elevation in front of the door of at least two inches.

Q.—Are the apprentices permitted to go home at noon for dinner? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do they all go home? A.—Not all.

Q.—Do those who remain take their dinner in the same rooms where they work? A.—Sometimes; and sometimes they go into another room and eat their lunch.

Q.—They eat among the tobacco; is there not a place in which tobacco is not manufactured that they can go? A.—There is always more or less tobacco manufactured. Sometimes they prefer to sit at the table where they work and eat their lunch there. They are on piece work and continue working.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Tell us what the duties of an apprentice consist of? A.—He must obey the superintendent, the foreman or proprietor of the establishment in any reasonable work he may ask him to perform.

Q.—Are they supposed to do the cleaning up about the factory? A.—Yes; that is generally the rule for all young apprentices who come at first.

Q.—Is it thoroughly understood when the boy or girl is indentured that he or she will have to clean the factory? A.—We don't specially mention that. They have to do all reasonable work; that is all work that I or Mr. Fortier would do ourselves.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Did I understand you to say that you gave the clergyman a favorable report in regard to Robley at that time? A.—Yes

Q.—Was it after he had stolen your lunch? A.—About that time.

Q.—Was it after? A.—Yes. I didn't want to condemn a boy of fourteen to his clergyman. It would not have been a very fair or manly act on my part to do it.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—It was the first offence and you pardoned it? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEIBRONNER:—

Q.—What is the custom prevailing in your factory when an apprentice does not turn up in the morning at the proper hour? A.—Sometimes we notify his parents that he has not turned up. At other times if he repeats the offence we have him arrested. We have had parents come to us over and over again and threaten to hold us responsible if we did not make the apprentices attend to their work.

Q.—Is it the custom to send somebody to find out the reason why a boy has not turned up? A.—Sometimes; and sometimes we notify them by letter.

Q.—Who is the person required to go and see the boy? A.—No person in particular.

Q.—Have you done it? A.—I have often notified them by both letter and message.

Q.—Did you go yourself to visit the parents? A.—Sometimes I have done so.

Q.—Can you name any parents you visited? A.—No; I could not name any parents without referring to the books.

Q.—Have you been there yourself during the last six years? A.—Yes.

Q.—And you have no recollection of any particular instance in which you visited the parents? A.—I said in the first part of my evidence I went to see young Goulett's mother. That is one case.

Q.—How long ago was that? A.—Four or five years ago.

Q.—Do you remember ever having visited any other parents? A.—I might have visited them but I don't remember any particular one.

Q.—You only remember in regard to young Goulett? A.—At present I do.

Q.—If you had been to any other parents of apprentices would you have remembered it? A.—If the name was recalled to me, perhaps, I might remember it.

Q.—Has Goulett's name been mentioned? A.—It had not been mentioned here.

Q.—Why do you remember Goulett's case more particularly than any other? A.—I cannot answer that, but it came into my memory.

Q.—Are there any particular circumstances that brought those to your memory? A.—No.

Q.—Have you seen children beaten after their trowsers had been lowered? A.—No; I have never seen them.

Q.—Do you know this witness (Rogers)? A.—I do.

Q.—Have you ever locked him in the black hole? A.—No.

Q.—Have you in your employ a man by the name of Ernest Goudreau? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is he a special constable? A.—That I could not say without referring to the police magistrate.

Q.—Have you seen him wear a badge? A.—Yes; I have seen him wear a badge.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—In your establishment? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he wear a badge as if he were a constable? A.—Yes; as if he were a constable.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Is that badge the same as is worn by a regular constable? A.—I don't know; I don't know exactly what their badge is.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you not know what a policeman's badge is? A.—No. I think his badge says something like "Special Constable."

Q.—Does it look like a regular policeman's badge? A.—I am not used to seeing them with badges.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Is it a distinct badge for the constable in your employ? A.—No; we have no distinct badge.

By Mr. FREED:

Q.—Have certain employees to pay gas? A.—Yes; journeymen who wish to use it.

Q.—Have they had to pay for gas when they did not use it? A.—That is sometimes. Very often a workman would go off at three in the afternoon, and, of course, he would work when he was not using gas; he would have to pay for it.

Q.—And he has to pay for it? A.—He pays ten cents a week. Gas burns the same as if he were there.

By Mr. WALSH:

Q.—Is the gas supposed to be needed for his special use? A.—Yes; without the gas he could not work.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—And how is it when he is not there? A.—One light lights up three men.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—If the gas is not required for the four men, and if the men are not there, do you light the gas? A.—No.

Q.—Then does a man pay for it in his absence? A.—As to all the four men absenting themselves I could not answer unless I referred to the books.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You say that four men use one gas jet? A.—That is as near as I can recollect; perhaps there are more. There are perhaps four, and perhaps only two, and I could not be positive as to that statement.

Q.—When four men use a gas jet they pay ten cents each? A.—There may be two and there may be four. I cannot answer that.

Q.—You say there may be two men or four to the gas jet? A.—I do.

Q.—If there are four do they each pay ten cents? A.—Yes.

Q.—If there are two they pay ten cents also? Yes.

Q.—So that there are gas jets bringing in twenty cents, and others which bring in forty cents per week? A.—That I could not answer. There may be three out of the four working, or two out of the four, or one out of the four, or the four men working. I have not got it down so accurately as that, and I could not answer the question.

Q.—Then the men who pay for the gas do so during a certain number of weeks? A.—During the weeks we require gas to work by; after that it is suspended.

Q.—That is they pay during the winter months? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Are apprentices charged for gas? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Are your gas jets not so placed that as many workmen as possible may work under them? A.—They are placed to best advantage.

Q.—Would one man work one day at one spot and another day at another spot? A.—They may sometimes, very rarely. Only men who work two days in the week do that. Steady men have always the same place.

Q.—Do men who work two days per week pay ten cents per week for gas like the others? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Is there any reduction of wages in the winter? A.—Yes; there is also some increase in the summer.

Q.—Is this reduction made on the weekly hands, or is it a reduced price per thousand? A.—It is a reduced price per thousand, and the increase is also an increase per thousand.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—With regard to this man who was stated to be a special constable by some witness; could that man be there as a constable without you as a Manager knowing him as such? A.—I said before he was an ex-constable.

Q.—Acting as a special constable? A.—He is an ex-special constable.

Q.—But for you he is a constable? A.—No.

Q.—He could not be there as such without your knowing it? A.—I don't understand you. You say a special constable; do you mean authorized by the Government or a Magistrate?

Q.—Has he authority to your knowledge to arrest a boy and put him in the black hole? A.—In what black hole do you refer to?

Q.—The place where you lock the boys up? A.—I have made no reference to the black hole.

Q.—You say they have been locked up. A.—We have an inclosure used in

connection with the business, and we have had them sometimes in Mr. Fortier's private office.

Q.—You say that the boys have been locked up? A.—They sometimes have in Mr. Fortier's private office.

Q.—Have you a man there to your knowledge who has authority to lock those boys up? A.—Authority from whom, authority from Mr. Fortier?

Q.—From him or from anybody in the firm or out of the firm? A.—When we catch a thief we take the authority.

Q.—You have him there for that purpose? A.—No; he is a presser.

Q.—He acts in the capacity of a constable? A.—When we catch a thief we usually tell him to take the boy to the Station House.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—When a boy is not caught thieving he is locked up; who gives him authority to do that? A.—Sometimes Mr. Fortier himself.

Q.—He has authority to do such things? A.—He generally gets the authority.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—You said the boys were frequently beaten; what do you call frequently, once a week or a month? A.—I don't remember saying frequently. I said not frequently.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Tell us why the man who is ex-special constable wears a badge; is it for the purpose of intimidating the apprentices? A.—No.

Q.—For what purpose does he wear it? A.—That I could not tell you. He is summoned and you can ask him. He has never had authority from either Mr. Fortier or myself to wear it.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Is it customary in tobacco factories to have those constables? A.—I know nothing about any other than our own factory.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you know this young man (Jules Chartrand)? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you ever place Chartrand in the place you call an enclosure? A.—I don't remember any such thing. We have sent him to the Reformatory prison, where he has served between seven and nine months, through the advice of his mother.

Q.—Do you remember ever having placed Chartrand in the enclosure? A.—No.

Q.—If you had placed him there, would you remember it? A.—I think so.

Q.—You are not certain you could recollect it? A.—No.

Q.—You have sworn that you have placed nobody in that enclosure? A.—Not personally; I have not.

Q.—You remember well that you placed no one there? A.—Yes.

Q.—And now you state you cannot remember whether you placed him there or not? A.—Now you have brought him face to face, I say I don't remember doing so.

Q.—I wish to ascertain if you remember having placed anybody in that place? A.—Not personally, as I said before.

Q.—If you had placed anybody there you would have remembered it? A.—Yes.

(Translation.)

JULES CHARTRAND, Cigar Maker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You were an apprentice at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Were you put into the blackhole during your apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long is that ago? A.—Two and a half years.

Q.—How many times? A.—Once.

Q.—Who put you in the blackhole? A.—Mr. McGregor.

Q.—Where did he take you to put you into the blackhole? A.—In the place where I worked.

Q.—Above stairs or down stairs? A.—Above stairs.

Q.—He took you down there himself? A.—Yes, sir. He took me down into the blackhole himself.

Q.—And put you into the blackhole? A.—Yes.

Q.—And he himself shut the door? A.—He shut the door and locked it, and put iron bars on the door.

Q.—You are quite positive it was Mr. McGregor who took you to the blackhole? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long did you stop in there? A.—I was there the length of a whole day; from eight o'clock in the morning until six o'clock in the evening.

Q.—Were you given anything to eat? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you get anything to drink? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Was it in summer or winter? A.—In summer.

Q.—Who let you out? A.—It was he himself let me out, and he wanted to take me to the station at six o'clock in the evening.

Q.—What had you done? A.—I had done nothing. I had only missed one day or two days, I think.

Q.—You had not come to the factory for two days? A.—For one day or two days, I do not remember which.

Q.—And, in the morning when you came in, he stuck you into the blackhole? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How old are you? A.—I am nineteen years of age, and near twenty.

Q.—You were seventeen, then, when you went to the blackhole? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. HELBRONNER, at the suggestion of Mr. McGregor:—

Q.—Were you at the Reformatory School two and a half years ago? A.—Three years ago.

Q.—You were put into the blackhole after going to the Reformatory School? A.—No, sir; before.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Were you beaten while at Mr. Fortier's? A.—No; I was never beaten by him, but Mr. McGregor pulled my ears, and slapped me in the face.

Q.—Why were you sent to the Reformatory? A.—I was sent to the Reformatory because I did not work.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Because you were lazy? A.—No; I was not lazy, but I missed some days of work.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Was it the Recorder sent you to the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Who led you before the Recorder after being away from your work? A.—It was Mr. Goudreau.

Q.—How old were you when taken before the Recorder? A.—The first time I was fifteen.

Q.—You had done no wrong; the judgment was rendered because you refused to work? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. FREED, at Mr. McGregor's suggestion:—

Q.—Did you ever have Mr. McGregor arrested for having beaten you? A.—Yes; I had him arrested once.

A.—The case went before the Recorder? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And what was the result? A.—I think we came out about even.

Q.—Did you testify before the Recorder against Mr. McGregor? A.—I did, sir.

Q.—Did you swear before the Recorder that you were at the factory on a certain day, when, in fact, you were not there? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you swear before the Recorder that you were at the factory on a certain day, that is, the day on which you swore to having been beaten; and did not the Recorder dismiss the case because it was proven that you were not at the factory on that day? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Why did you lose your case? A.—I did not lose it.

Q.—You said you had got even with Mr. McGregor? A.—I lost because I had no witnesses.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Was it proven before the Recorder that you were not present on that day on which you swore having been present at the factory and been beaten? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—When you swore that you were at the factory on a certain day, did you believe, at that time, that you really were there? A.—Yes, I was there.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Mr. McGregor proved that you were not there? A.—No.

Q.—Mr. McGregor was defended by a lawyer? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And you; you had a lawyer? A.—Yes, sir; I had a lawyer.

By Mr. FREED, at Mr. McGregor's suggestion:—

Q.—When you were sent to the Reformatory, did your mother testify against you in court? A.—Yes, sir; she gave evidence against me.

Q.—Did she want you sent to the Reformatory? A.—No, sir; she did not want it, but it was I myself that wanted it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Why? A.—Because I was too badly treated at the factory.

WILLIAM WAINWRIGHT, Assistant General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—How long have you been in the position of Assistant Manager of the Grand Trunk? A.—Seven years.

- Q.—On all your trains are there supposed to be competent engineers? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Have those engineers certificates as to ability and character before you take them into your employ? A.—Always.
- Q.—That is an understood matter so far as engineers on the Grand Trunk are concerned? A.—If they come on as engineers.
- Q.—If they are engineers when they are engaged? A.—If they be engineers when they are engaged.
- Q.—If they are promoted from subordinate positions to be engineers are they also examined in a similar way? A.—Yes; as to their fitness.
- Q.—With regard to the running of cars upon the Grand Trunk: what time is supposed to be allowed a conductor for rest; or what length of time are they supposed to run without rest. A.—Do you allude to a freight conductor or a passenger conductor.
- Q.—I allude to either. Take a conductor on a passenger car, provided the train was behind time or was stuck in the snow, he would have to work with the rest of the men? A.—Until he could be relieved.
- Q.—If he was in such a condition how long is he supposed to be at work? A.—He is not supposed to be at work certainly over ten hours.
- Q.—Is it within your knowledge that they have been longer than that? A.—Certainly.
- Q.—What was the cause? A.—It would be trains were detained at different points on account of storms, when it might be impossible to relieve them.
- Q.—That is the only time? A.—Only in case of emergency.
- Q.—Then with regard to freight trains: how long are conductors on freight trains supposed to be at work without being relieved? A.—They run in districts, and the run is about ten hours.
- Q.—What is supposed to be the average mileage they are to make? A.—About one hundred and twenty miles, from Montreal to Brockville, one hundred and twenty-five miles or so.
- Q.—What are the wages paid to your conductors? A.—It varies according to the work they perform.
- Q.—Take freight trains for instance: how are those men paid, the conductors? A.—A conductor on a freight train will probably make from \$70 to \$80 per month.
- Q.—What is the reason some are paid a higher rate than others? A.—They are paid according to their service and the class of train they run.
- Q.—They have a certain duty to perform, and if they perform that efficiently the pay is increased? A.—Yes.
- Q.—If those men from any unforeseen circumstances are kept out for a long time is there any system by which you have those men relieved when they get into difficulty? A.—Yes.
- Q.—How do you manage that? A.—Either by exchanging them with men on other trains they may pass, or when they come to terminal points we have them released by men who take their places.
- Q.—Have you ever known men who have been for twenty-four hours or longer without being relieved? A.—I cannot give you any particulars of such cases; it may have been so in exceptional cases.
- Q.—What do you think is the longest time your men have been without being relieved? A.—I cannot tell you without referring to our papers, but any such cases would be exceedingly exceptional. It might have happened in a very bad winter when we have had very bad snow storms that men have been twenty-four hours or longer. I could not tell you without referring to our records.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

- Q.—That is when the trains were blocked? A.—Yes; simply in exceptional cases.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—It is presumed that all your freight trains, as well as other trains, are supplied with every necessary appliance? A.—Yes.

Q.—Now, take the matter of bell ropes on freight trains, have you heard any complaint in regard to the management of bell ropes and their efficiency in stopping trains? A.—Yes; there are complaints about that; sometimes when they are required they do not act.

Q.—Why do they not act? A.—By enquiries we can generally find out the trouble. They break, or the train may possibly be going around a curve, or the train may be too long, and all sorts of things. There are occasions in which bell ropes do not act on freight trains.

Q.—On what occasion was that? A.—I cannot give you any particular case. I say there are cases sometimes where they do not act.

Q.—You are without doubt aware that some of those cars are of different heights from others? A.—Some of the cars are. We run all sorts of cars belonging to all companies over our lines.

Q.—Do you think the difference in the height of cars, there being one low car, for example, between two high ones, has anything to do with it? A.—No; I do not think it has much, to my knowledge.

Q.—If a bell rope breaks, have you a man aboard the train who is able to splice it properly so that it can run in a right manner? A.—Yes; we carry an additional bell rope in case of one breaking.

Q.—You do not think there is any danger from that source? A.—I do not think so. Our experience has not shown us there is any danger.

Q.—You will understand that if a bell rope is broken and a man endeavors to knot it how difficult it is to make the bell rope work? A.—No; we do not find any difficulty from that.

Q.—You have heard no complaints on that account? A.—No.

Q.—You know nothing of it from your own knowledge? A.—No.

Q.—Do all the freight trains on other lines carry bell ropes? A.—I do not think so. I do not think they use them on freight trains in the United States to any extent.

Q.—Do you think there is any necessity for them here? A.—No.

Q.—Are they in all cases reliable? A.—No.

Q.—Do you know anything to substitute for them? A.—No.

Q.—You think, then, that it is safer to run freight trains without bell ropes? A.—No. I say it is a certain protection, but I do not think it is necessary to put bell ropes on them, and I do not think it is of any great value, but it is a certain amount of protection which in Canada the railway companies extend to those trains, more so than they do in any other part of the world.

Q.—If you rely upon bell ropes to be sure means of communication and they do not act, do you think it is actually more dangerous than if they were not there? A.—No; because the bell ropes do not in any way release our train men.

Q.—Did any instance ever occur of the train parting in the centre and the bell rope not giving the signal? A.—Yes; the bell rope is not in any way to be depended upon by the engine men. Our rules and regulations provide that our train men shall act in the same way as if there was no bell rope whatever. It has nothing to do with their duties in connection with what we call a break-loose.

Q.—Did you ever know of any case where a bell rope on account of its not running freely was carried on to the deck of the cars and men's feet became entangled in them? A.—No; I cannot say I remember any such case.

Q.—Then you consider a bell rope with all its faults is a necessity or at all events an advantage? A.—It is an advantage.

Q.—You think that? A.—Yes.

Q.—With regard to running boards on the decks of cars: do you think the pre-

sent system of running boards is sufficiently safe, or, at all events, is as effective as you can make it? A.—Yes; I do. We have studied that subject very closely, and I do not think we know of anything we could do to improve the matter. Our great care is for the safety of our men.

Q.—What is the standard width of running boards at the present time? A.—I cannot tell you exactly, but I think about two feet.

Q.—Are they all two feet wide? A.—I cannot say positively.

Q.—Is there any standard by which they are guided; are running boards in the cars that are now being constructed wider than formerly? A.—That I cannot say.

Q.—You think that ordinarily they are about two feet? A.—About two feet.

Q.—Did you ever know any not to be more than one foot wide? A.—No.

Q.—From your information you think they are about two feet? A.—I think about two feet.

Q.—Do you think two feet is security enough for the men running in those cars in all kinds of weather, slippery, drifty weather, and such as usually accompanies our Canadian winter? A.—I think so, for this reason: whereas it is a very hazardous occupation, I admit, it is a very singular thing that the men who are injured or killed, are invariably old servants and not young servants. Our insurance fund shows that. I therefore judge, and I can only judge by statistics, that if ordinary care is used by the men it is a protection to them, inasmuch as boys who have been at the work only a week or so escape without accident, while men who have been at the work for years are sometimes killed or injured.

Q.—Granting that that may be the case, can you devise a better means for the safety of the men? A.—Yes, I can.

Q.—Let us hear it? A.—If you can find some one who can invent a brake applicable to freight trains of a similar character to the one we have applicable to passenger trains, and one that Railway Companies can afford to use, I think that certainly would be a great protection.

Q.—An air brake, you mean? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you not think that it is a very difficult matter for a man going along the decks of a train on a blustering night, with ice on the cars, leaping and jumping from one car to another? A.—I do.

Q.—Is not such work very hazardous? A.—I think it is very dangerous.

Q.—In case a man slips he cannot be saved by anyone in the world, nor by any human hand; could not some means be devised to arrest that man in his fall so that he could not get crushed or thrown on the road? Have you ever given this question any thought? A.—Yes; I have given it serious thought. We have never, however, been able to devise anything which we thought would make matters more satisfactory than they are at present.

Q.—Nothing better than the plan of running boards? A.—Yes.

Q.—I may state to you that in other places we have had opinions on this matter. I do not know whether it will agree with your opinion or not, but we have had it stated to us that if a railing were placed along the edge and equal to the height of the brake rods,—I mean that if a bar were placed on the edge of the car the height of the brake rods that that would be a means of security to men who might be in danger of slipping off the boards, either that or a bar placed along the side of the running boards the height of the brake rods? A.—It might be a certain protection. That has been talked of; it is not a new idea and I think it has been tried, but I have always understood that workmen preferred to be without it. That is my understanding.

Q.—I do not form so poor an opinion of the corporation of the Grand Trunk Railway as to think that a parsimonious idea would prevent them from doing it? A.—No.

Q.—But as you have had such long experience I wanted to obtain your opinion in regard to it? A.—I do not think it would be any great advantage, and as I have

told you it is a matter that has been tried before. It is not a new institution by any means.

Q.—With regard to brakes; is there no possible way of applying an air brake to freight trains? A.—It is a matter that is now seriously occupying the attention of railway managers, and I believe a time will come when something will be found that will be satisfactory.

Q.—Is there any likelihood of it engaging the attention of the railway magnates. I mean with respect to the uniform height of cars? A.—Do you mean freight cars?

Q.—Yes. Would there be any difficulty in that? A.—Yes. The difficulty is simply this, that it will have to be uniform all over the country.

Q.—That is what I mean? A.—Yes, including the United States.

Q.—I am not speaking of our Company, I am speaking of the United States? A.—Because there is not a train made up to-day on the Grand Trunk at Sarnia that is not composed of eight or ten different companies in the United States, and we have no control over them.

Q.—I understand that. Is there no possible way for all these Railway Companies coming to an understanding on the matter? They have the same difficulty with their cars? A.—I think so.

Q.—As we have with ours? A.—You understand there is a Master Builders' Association, and I believe the question to which you refer will be, in time, satisfactorily disposed of.

Q.—Do you not think if those railway magnates put their heads together to this matter that an understanding might be arrived at which would be an advantage to all concerned, and which might be carried out in a year or so? A.—I think it could.

Q.—Do you not think it would be an advantage to all concerned? A.—Yes.

Q.—As all concerned are interested in the security of life? A.—Certainly.

Q.—Now, what wages do brakemen on freight trains earn? A.—A brakeman can earn from \$30 to \$40 per month.

Q.—I suppose, with regard to want of rest, you would say the same about him as you have said in regard to a conductor, perhaps he requires more than any man? A.—We run two brakemen on the train and only one conductor. Of course they have just equal work, and if they are on duty equally long they are equally tired. We relieve them at the earliest possible moment, and the cases are very exceptional where they are required to be on duty over the usual length of time.

Q.—Do you think that in case of danger ahead, and a long train running, that two brakemen are sufficient to control the train and prevent accident? A.—Yes.

Q.—Take a train of forty cars? A.—We do not run them.

Q.—How many do you run? A.—About twenty-six or twenty-seven loaded cars.

Q.—Is that the number you run? A.—Yes; in some instances we cannot run that many, it depends on the grades.

Q.—With regard to Sunday running of trains, do you run cars on Sunday when you can possibly help it? A.—No, not when we can avoid it.

Q.—Under what conditions do you run them on Sunday? A.—When there is an absolute necessity for it.

Q.—Would it be possible to avoid running trains under these circumstances when it appears to be absolutely necessary? A.—Not in regard to stock trains.

Q.—What do you mean by stock trains? A.—Trains carrying cattle.

Q.—I suppose that is what you meant. I suppose that when such a train has once started the sooner it is sent over the road the better. A.—Yes.

Q.—Would it not be possible, with a little forethought, to prevent a great deal of the ordinary traffic and reduce the number of men employed on the trains on Sundays? Q.—I do not think it would be possible to reduce it very much, because, as I have previously stated, we only do it when there is an emergency. We do not run freight trains unless there is an emergency; it is against our rules to do so.

Q.—What system of promotion have you in regard to your brakemen or those who make themselves serviceable on the road? A.—Length of service.

Q.—Faithfulness of service? A.—Length and faithfulness of service.

Q.—If a man was discharged from your company for cause, would the company stand against him in his efforts to obtain employment elsewhere? A.—We would simply answer any enquiries that are made to us as to the reason why he left our service. We would not stand in his way more than answering any enquiries in a truthful manner.

Q.—Would you not give him a certificate of character? A.—If a man was discharged for cause we would give him a certificate, with a statement on the face of it, for what he was discharged.

Q.—You would not look further after the man to prevent him getting work elsewhere? A.—Certainly not.

Q.—That is the rule? A.—Yes.

Q.—Supposing your men have been out for a long time owing to a snow storm, or from accident, or from anything of that kind, do you think those men are really responsible for their acts; are they able to work after a certain length of time, so as to prevent any danger from accident if they are too long without sleep or rest? A.—Naturally, I would say, that if a man had been out so long as to become fatigued, and could not give proper attention to his duties, he would not be equal to his condition under different circumstances.

Q.—Have you any system by which you give notice or otherwise, or do you send any notice to your station officers or any others, when an accident has occurred, as to how the men should be relieved, or what they have to do under such circumstances?

A.—Our foremen at the terminal points and our agents all along the line, in case, not only of accident, but of detention, have orders not to allow men to go on trains if they complain that they have not had rest or have been out too long. Those orders are issued and are in the hands of our agents.

Q.—In case of an accident under exceptional circumstances, over which they have no control—take an accident that could not be prevented by any foresight on the part of the men—does the company indemnify them for any loss of service or loss of limb, or anything of that kind? A.—We have a Provident Society by which that is dealt with.

Q.—What does the company contribute to the Provident Society? A.—The company contributes \$10,000 a year.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you remember the experiment that took place near Hamilton, or rather between Hamilton and Toronto, some months ago with air brakes on freight trains?

A.—I cannot say I do.

Q.—Have you known of those experiments? A.—No.

Q.—It was stated to us in Hamilton, by the Mechanical Superintendent of the Grand Trunk there, that they had tested air brakes on freight trains running at thirty miles an hour, and the train was brought to a standstill in two and a half times its length. Do you think that possible? A.—Yes, I do.

Q.—Do you not think that air brakes applied to freight trains that are capable of controlling cars to that extent, would be preferable to the present system of hand breaking? A.—Yes. I do not think there are two opinions on that subject.

Q.—How long, with a heavy freight train running twenty-five miles an hour, would elapse, with the present system of hand breaking, before that train would be brought to a standstill? A.—That is an unknown quantity. It would depend entirely on how quickly the men got on top of the cars and how many breaks they applied.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—And what was the grade? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Take a grade of one in eight, for which is the heaviest you have? A.—We carry one brakeman on the engine and one in the caboose with the conductor, and supposing them both in their places when they hear the whistle blow, they would not be able, probably, to get on very many brakes. It might take, if it was a down grade or the rails slipperly, about a quarter of a mile to stop the train.

Q.—Do you think they could stop a train in that distance if it was a heavy freight? A.—Yes, on a level.

Q.—We are not taking it altogether on a level, but according as it might happen? A.—I think probably it might be more than that if you take it without reference to grade.

Q.—Would you be surprised to hear that brakemen have stated to us that it would take three quarters of a mile on an average? A.—After they are called up?

Q.—From the time the signal was given till the train was brought to a stand still? A.—It would depend, of course, upon the speed the train was running when the brakes were applied.

Q.—Say a speed of twenty-five miles an hour? A.—We do not run our freight trains at such a speed. Our rule is fifteen miles an hour, and if the train was running at that speed I think my estimate is not very far off.

Q.—Do you not run faster than fifteen miles an hour? A.—They should not do so if they follow our rules and regulations. They do, possibly, but the men are responsible for it if they do it.

Q.—What is the objection if air brakes will stop a train within a distance of three hundred yards to their adoption by Railway Companies? A.—It has never been found necessary to adopt it, there has not been found any reason to adopt it. As I have already explained our freight trains are made up at different points, of cars belonging to different Companies. Take a train of twenty-seven cars, and you will probably find that the cars belong to ten or twelve different Companies, and what would be the use of endeavoring to apply such a system unless we could get all the railway companies in the United States to run the same brake?

Q.—Are not some of the companies in the United States experimenting with air brakes on freight trains? A.—Simply to report as I have explained, to the Master Car Builders' Association as to what is the best system of brake to adopt; and if a brake is adopted by that association, it then, although it may not become universal, will become so nearly so, that the majority of the railways will accept it.

Q.—Have you paid any special attention to the matter of coupling cars? A.—Yes.

Q.—Would it be possible to adopt either the Janey, the Ames, or the Miller coupler to freight trains? A.—That is another question that is in exactly the same position as the brake question; it is before the Association of Car Builders.

Q.—Would it be possible in your opinion to adopt such a system? A.—Certainly it would.

Q.—Would the adoption of such a method be the means of adding much security to the lives of brakemen? A.—Yes; certainly.

Q.—Are you aware that a certain railway company, for which you haul traffic over your line, has cars at present so constructed so that it is almost impossible to couple them without accident? A.—No.

Q.—I am not sure of the name of the company, but the deadwoods of the cars come so close together that it is impossible for a brakeman to couple them without great danger. I think the company is the Delaware and Lackawanna? A.—I have not heard of it.

Q.—Do you require your employees to sign a document of any sort before entering into the employment of the company? A.—Yes.

Q.—Does that document, whatever it may be, relieve the company of all responsibility in case of accidents to the men? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you require the employees entering into the service of the Grand Trunk to obtain a certificate of a guarantee company? A.—I do not exactly understand your question. Guarantee of what?

Q.—As a matter of security? A.—You mean a fidelity company?

Q.—I understand there is a company in Montreal called a guarantee company. Do you require your employees to obtain a certificate from that company before entering your employ? A.—I presume you mean the guarantee society of North America. If any of our men are handling money, such as cashiers and clerks, who handle our cash, we secure ourselves by a bond from the guarantee company; but we do not require them to supply it, the company supplies it and pays the premium.

Q.—Are no classes of train hands compelled to provide a guarantee? A.—Of fidelity and honesty,—No. All men in our employ, who handle the money of the company, have to be guaranteed. Just as bank clerks of Montreal have to be. They are guaranteed through the guarantee companies of Montreal, or the guarantee society of Toronto. There are three companies we deal with, and we get a bond out and pay a premium on it. But we only guarantee such men (we would be foolish to do otherwise, and pay premiums for nothing) as handle our cash, not the train men.

Q.—If a conductor is discharged, you do not send the cause to the guarantee company? A.—No.

Q.—It is not registered? A.—No; we do not guarantee our conductors.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You do not furnish information to the guarantee company, except as to what actually concerns you? A.—Yes; except in regard to those who pass through the society.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Would you give a man employment as a conductor without such a certificate? A.—From the guarantee society?

Q.—Yes. A.—Certainly; it would have no bearing whatever. Our conductors are promoted from one grade to another. A conductor on a passenger train rises from a way train, a freight train, and so on, and from being a brakeman; but there is no certificate of that kind required before he becomes a passenger conductor.

Q.—We have been told that they have to get such a certificate? A.—I know of no such arrangement.

Q.—What are a spotter's duties? A.—I believe the technical name is a detective, and I think a detective's duties are well known.

Q.—When he makes a charge against a man, who investigates the charge? A.—If he is put on by myself, or by the superintendent, or by the general manager, it will be a question as to what department would investigate the matter; it would most likely come within the superintendent's duties as our conductors are responsible to the superintendent. He would most likely be called upon under any circumstances to investigate it.

Q.—After the investigation is made, has the party so charged an appeal, and if so, to whom? A.—To the general manager.

Q.—Are employees against whom charges are made always notified to be present at the investigation? A.—As a rule, invariably. If the case is appealed it will be so.

Q.—But if it is not appealed? A.—If the appeal is allowed, I should have said. There have been cases where an appeal was not allowed, because the evidence was so convincing it was not necessary.

Q.—I am speaking of a spotter making a charge against a conductor. Would that conductor be notified of the charge and allowed an opportunity to defend himself? A.—Yes; invariably so.

Q.—Always? A.—Yes.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Are your Superintendents in all cases practical men? A.—Yes; in all cases.

Q.—You understand what I mean by a practical man? A.—I think so.

Q.—What I would convey to you by a practical man, is that they understand all the technicalities connected with their duties of running railways. A.—Yes.

Q.—Mechanical and otherwise? A.—No. You must designate what kind of a superintendent you refer to. A traffic superintendent is not a mechanical superintendent.

Q.—A mechanical superintendent is with respect to the mechanical department, but I speak of him as superintendent of the mechanical department? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you always or do you not always know that those men are practically fit for the position of mechanical superintendents? A.—Yes.

Q.—With respect to the traffic superintendents; are they for the most part, or are they in all cases, thoroughly practical men in their own department of railway management? A.—Yes. We have two superintendents on the Grand Trunk, one has been twenty-seven and the other thirty-one years at that kind of business.

Q.—Well, then, a gentleman in your position, I take it for granted that after what you have stated to-day you are pretty well up in your own business, and I suppose persons in your position are always practical men? A.—I do not think we attain to our positions until we have earned them. I have been thirty-one years railroading.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Does the Grand Trunk employ men unless they bring a certificate from the Company by which they were last employed? A.—There is an understanding between the railroads to that effect. I cannot tell you how particular they are in the United States; I do not know how far they follow our practice in that regard.

Q.—Suppose a man is discharged from your employ, does he require a certificate of service? A.—Yes; he gets it.

Q.—When he makes application to another Company does the Company enquire about him from the Grand Trunk? A.—Not necessarily so. They accept his certificate. In the case of clerks they frequently do so; we frequently get letters about clerks, but in our running department and our mechanical department we give a printed certificate signed by the head of the department, setting forth the length of service, if the conduct was satisfactory, and why the man left the service, and that generally carries him through.

Q.—Are there many crossings in the city limits of Montreal over which Grand Trunk trains pass? A.—Level crossings?

Q.—Yes. A.—Yes; a great many.

Q.—Are there many men employed to look after them? A.—Yes; our gate men.

Q.—How many hours out of the twenty-four do they work? A.—A great many work twelve hours but it is very light work.

Q.—Still a man's brains cannot be quite clear being out that length of time? A.—Quite so.

Q.—Are there many accidents on crossings within the city limits of Montreal? A.—I do not consider there are many; we have heard a great deal about them.

Q.—How many accidents have happened within the last twelve months? A.—I cannot tell you; I can furnish you a list, but I cannot tell you from memory.

Q.—What wages per week do the gate keepers receive? A.—I think \$1.00 a day.

Q.—Are they paid weekly, fortnightly or monthly? A.—They are paid every four weeks; our pay rolls are made up every four weeks; there are thirteen payments in the year.

Q.—Are your men ever garnisheed for debt? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are they discharged when they are garnisheed? A.—No; not on the first occasion; under our rules they are dismissed on the second occasion.

Q.—Do you not think fortnightly or weekly payments would decrease the garnishees? A.—I do not think so. I do not see why it should.

Q.—Do you not think that the man earning \$1.00 a day would be in a better position if he received his wages weekly rather than once a month? A.—I do not see it. If his creditors ascertain that he has permanent employment, I do not see there will be any difference between payments weekly or monthly.

Q.—Do you not think a man on small wages would have to resort to the pass book system? A.—Certainly I do. I do not see any harm in it.

Q.—Would not the man be more independent and be, perhaps, able to buy his goods a little cheaper if he went to the store with cash? A.—That is not my experience. I take credit, and I do not think I pay any more.

Q.—Have you had any experience of the kind? A.—Certainly. I pay my accounts monthly, and I can get my goods just as cheap as others. That is my experience.

Q.—Do you do that now? A.—Yes.

Q.—But between your salary and that of an ordinary man there is a great deal of difference? A.—I do not see why I should get my goods cheaper paying monthly than he would do so long as he were a permanent employee, and he could satisfy his creditors that he could pay them at the right time. I do not see why goods should cost any more if a man is paid monthly than fortnightly. I say that frankly. In a large corporation like ours, more frequent payment of the men would mean a very great increase of labour, for it would involve a more frequent making up of the pay rolls over four thousand miles of road.

Q.—Did the men ever ask to be paid more frequently than once a month? A.—I think some departments have made that request.

Q.—Is it compulsory on the part of the employees to join the Benefit Association? A.—Yes; if they are entering our service.

Q.—Is it compulsory on all employees? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you ever hear that any of them showed umbrage against such a step? A.—We have heard some complaints from a few men in the West.

Q.—Suppose a man joined the Company, who at that time belonged to some other Benefit Society and did not wish to join the Provident Society, what would be done? A.—We would not take him on; it is not our system.

By Mr. CLARKE:—

Q.—How many days does it take a freight train to go from Montreal to Toronto? A.—In good weather, about two days.

Q.—How long after the arrival of cars in Montreal, how long are they there before they are made up and sent West? A.—Do you mean arriving from the east or south?

Q.—Say from the Maritime Provinces? A.—In ordinary times when there is any trouble with snow, or a block, it would not take more than five or six hours to make up a train.

Q.—Have you ever heard any complaint with regard to perishable goods being destroyed while going from Montreal to Toronto? A.—Not of late. In years gone by, of course, we had such cases.

Q.—How long since? A.—I do not think we have had any such case during the last three or four years.

Q.—What was the description of the goods? A.—I cannot give you any particular case, because I say we have not had any complaints during the last three or four years. Our system now, of running trains, between Montreal and Toronto, and taking goods delivered to us by the Intercolonial is such that we have received nothing but praise during the last three or four years, for the time we have made from Halifax to Toronto.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You have spoken in regard to the running of trains on Sunday; is that

necessary on account of increased competition? A.—Yes; our neighbors do it, and we are obliged to do it.

Q.—Is it due to Sunday competition that you run the train west? A.—No; we commenced it before other companies.

Q.—When you were in the possession of the North Shore you were satisfied with running only one train on Sunday? A.—Yes; only one train.

Q.—You now do it because it was done when you acquired the road? A.—Yes; and we found the people demanded it, and if we had taken it off, great fault would have been found.

Q.—You have never run a morning train? A.—No; only one train.

Q.—As regards your line on the South Shore? A.—We do not run any train on Sunday, east

By Mr. CLARKE :—

Q.—Three or four years ago when the trouble occurred to which I have referred, were any claims made on the company for damages? A.—I do not remember.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Tell us how many men you have engaged at the Mountain Street crossing? A.—I think, two day and two night, four in all. I will not make the statement positively; but I believe that is the case.

Q.—What class of men are they who work twelve hours for \$1.00; are they old men who cannot work at anything else? A.—No.

Q.—Are they young men who prefer that sort of work? A.—Some of them.

Q.—Can you tell us how many hours per day men work who handle freight in your shed. A.—About ten hours.

Q.—Tell us what wages they receive? A.—I think they are getting now \$1.15 a day. I do not state that positively, for I am not prepared with figures.

Q.—In regard to the Nun's Station at Lachine; is it not closed at eight o'clock or half past eight at night, and passengers have to stand around the place when the train is turning around? A.—I could not tell you. It is unknown to me if such is the case.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Is it true that in order to obtain employment on the Grand Trunk, a man must not be over forty-five years of age? A.—Forty-five is the limit under our rules.

Q.—Has a man of the age of forty-five, or under, to pass a medical examination? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you tell us the reason? A.—Because we desire him to enter the Provident Society, and we wish to know from the doctor if he is a fit subject for the risk we are running in taking him. That is the reason.

Q.—Supposing a man who had been in your employ got sick, and was unfit for work at that time, and was over forty-five years of age, and after a time got better and was able to work, would you take him on again if he could not pass the doctor? A.—We have a certain rule in connection with our Provident Society by which such a man could accept a certain amount and retire from the service. If he does not accept that, and is able to work, although not fit for the position he occupied, we endeavor to find employment for him in some other department. But if he is entirely incapacitated he can take the amount which the Provident Society pays, and retire altogether from service.

Q.—I have reference to a man who does not belong to the Provident Society, who is an old employee, and over forty-five years of age? A.—Of course, if he does not belong to the Provident Society, and is not able to do his duty, we would not consider it desirable to retain him in the service.

Q.—He might have become sick, and become well? A.—Then we would endeavor to find him a position if possible.

Q.—And he would not have to pass another medical examination? A.—No.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you treat your men in a different manner from other corporations and employers? A.—We always take care of our men, and if we can retain them we do.

Q.—Your corporation is not a benefit society for your men any more than any other corporation? A.—No; but I think we are to a great extent.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you heard any complaints in regard to the signal lights at night? A.—No.

Q.—You have never heard engine drivers, or brakemen, complain that they were confusing? A.—No; I have not. We have had a great many men before us at different times, but I have never heard any such complaint as that.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have the engineers to pass an examination in regard to color blindness? A.—Yes.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Does a man on his retirement receive the amount in cash or a paid up policy from the Provident Society? A.—A man, by paying up his dues, can retain his connection with the insurance society, even if he leaves the company's service. He does not need to retire from the insurance society, if he does so, any more than if he were insured in any other society.

Q.—Suppose you discharge him, or he leaves of his own free will, does he get the amount in cash or a paid up policy? A.—Mr. Moore, the Secretary-Treasurer of the Provident Association is present, and he is *au fait* in all those matters.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you keep a record of all the accidents that take place on your railway? A.—Yes; they are all investigated.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q.—Do you send a statement to the Government? A.—Yes; of all accidents.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are you able to state whether the majority of accidents, in connection with coupling cars, occurs in coupling cars or uncoupling them? A.—In coupling, I think.

Q.—Probably you will be able on consulting your statistics to tell us exactly whether the majority of accidents occur in coupling or uncoupling? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you kindly furnish those statistics? A.—Yes.

Q.—Has the air brake, got up by Mr. Hall, of Hamilton, ever been called to your attention? A.—I do not remember.

Q.—An air brake for freight trains? A.—It has not come under my notice. It may have been under the notice of our mechanical superintendent.

Q.—Is there a law in Canada relating to the proper filling up of frogs with wooden blocks? A.—I think not.

Q.—You do not know of any such law? A.—I do not. We have done it.

Q.—Is it done in Montreal? A.—It is done in our yard here.

Q.—It is so now? A.—Yes; I do not know that we filled up all our frogs, but our engineer has got orders to do so, and he is doing so now.

Q.—At what period of the month are the men paid? A.—They are paid in the middle of the month.

Q.—And they are paid up to what period? A.—Up to the first.

Q.—So the time for which they are not paid is how long? A.—Fourteen days.

Q.—How do the engineers discover the number of the engines they pass on the road at night? A.—They get their orders for crossing, and the conductor ascertains at the station where he crosses such trains, whether the numbers agree with his crossing orders.

Q.—If he meets a certain train can he know by signal, or in any other way, whether that train is the train he expected to meet? A.—Not necessarily so. He might, but he could do it without ascertaining it in that way. He would go to the telegraph office and ascertain it, and he would obtain information there as to whether the train he was to meet had arrived, and was on the siding or not. It is his duty to find that out from the operator.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY OF CANADA.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT MANAGER.

MONTREAL, Feb. 15th, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR,—As requested by your Commission, I hand you statement showing accidents over the system, caused by coupling, and at level crossings in the Bonaventure Branch during the year 1887. I may observe that nearly all the first-named accidents occur in the act of coupling; but, although the number injured appears large, the majority come under the head of "crushed fingers." You will understand that all the casualties of this nature happening upon the line are regularly reported to the Government.

Yours respectfully,

W. WAINRIGHT.

Hon. Judge Armstrong,
President Labour Commission.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY OF CANADA.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT MANAGER.

Casualty Department.

MONTREAL, Feb. 10th, 1888.

Statement of casualties resulting from coupling cars, over the whole system in Canada, and also casualties at level crossings on the Bonaventure Branch for year ending December 31st, 1887:—

COUPLING.		AT LEVEL CROSSINGS.	
Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.
2.	130.	3.	3.

HENRY B. MOORE, Secretary-Treasurer of the Grand Trunk Railway Provident Society, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you a copy of the constitution and rules of the society of which you are Secretary-Treasurer? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES:

Q.—Will you please give the Commission a description of the work of the society, how it is formed, where the funds come from, and how they are disposed of?

A.—The fund consists of two claims, an insurance scheme, and a provident scheme. It is composed of all the members joining the Grand Trunk Railway Company, under the age of forty years. That has been the age up to the present time, although it is proposed to raise it to forty-five years. The funds of the society are composed of a monthly subscription by the members, according to the class of work at which they are employed, forty cents, or fifty cents, depending on whether the work is hazardous or otherwise, which provides an allowance in case of sickness, and also medical attendance. Further, the insurance claims each month are paid by a direct levy on the members for the amount required to pay such claims. I think that is generally about the whole scheme.

Q.—What is the allowance per week to a member of the society who is ill?

A.—\$3.00.

Q.—In all cases? A.—In all cases,

Q.—Do you not divide the insurers up into a number of classes? A.—The insured are divided into classes from A to F, there being a maximum, the maximum amount being \$2,000.00, and the minimum \$250.00.

Q.—What is the amount assessed for the lowest figure? A.—The highest amount that can be assessed for the lowest class is five cents a member, but if the membership acquired more than is required to make up that \$250.00, the assessment is reduced proportionately. At present it takes about two and a half cents a levy on each member to pay \$250.00

Q.—Is the levy on all classes? A.—Every class pays the same for that.

F? Q.—Suppose there is a death in A class, what would be the assessment in class A? A.—Five cents all the same.

Q.—And in class A? A.—Fifty cents.

Q.—Have you known the assessment to overrun the amount required to pay a death claim? A.—They overrun in all the classes up to class G, in which it is very nearly equal.

Q.—When an assessment is levied for a death in class A is the assessment sufficient to cover the insurance? A.—With the present membership it does not count as a maximum insurance if the death is in class A, the deceased having been paying the levy required for \$2,000.00.

Q.—What will his family receive? A.—At the present rate of assessment, his family would receive about \$1,250.00.

Q.—You charged him just the same for \$2,000.00? A.—No; he did not pay the same as if the membership was such as to give him \$2,000.00.

Q.—Is not the rate struck? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do not the members of class A understand they are insured for \$2,000.00? A.—No; the rate only provides that the maximum amount they can receive in that class is \$2,000.00.

Q.—It does not provide that they have become insured for a certain sum? A.—No; that is the great mistake which unfortunately our members make, and which causes a great deal of dissatisfaction, although our rules are very plain.

Q.—When the surplus is received from the assessment on class F, or any class over C, is the surplus divided? A.—There is no such thing as a surplus allowed. I have explained to you that the assessment is made for each death by itself. The calculation in respect to each death is made separate and distinct. We will take class F, for example, \$250.00. There are ten thousand members, and an assessment is made either for two or two and a half cents. If we assess one death at two and a half cents, there will, of course, be a slight balance, and accordingly for the next death in that class the assessment will be two cents. We assess the exact amount in all cases.

Q.—Who controls the funds of the society? A.—They are controlled by a committee of management.

Q.—How is that committee appointed? A.—By a certain number of *ex-officio* members, being officers of the company, and certain members nominated from what we call the executive committees, that is to say, local committees who are again composed of *ex-officio* and elected members already selected by the members themselves. They nominate again by vote two members of each committee to form part of the general managing committee.

Q.—What proportion of the managing committee is nominated by the company itself and what proportion is elected by the men? A.—The rules state the exact number. I find that eight members of the committee are elected by the men.

Q.—Is it correct that the men elect eight out of twenty-one members? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think this mode of electing officers has been satisfactory to the men? A.—I really cannot say that it is or is not. I am not in a position to say.

Q.—I mean either as regards the proportion of members or as regards the method of election? A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Have you heard any complaints on that head? A.—I cannot say, I have not received any complaints directly.

Q.—Have you ever known cases of men in the employ of the Grand Trunk who for years had been members of this society, had been taken ill, and after being ill for a couple of months had been discharged and their names marked off the list of members? A.—I cannot say that I do know of any such cases. There may have been lots of members of the society sick, who, from not understanding the rules of the society, failed to receive the benefits. I cannot answer that question, but I may say that I am not aware of any man having been discharged from the company's service who has not had the benefit of the society.

Q.—After a member of the society has taken ill for what length of time does the Grand Trunk Company pay him his allowance? A.—The Grand Trunk Company does not pay him anything. You mean, I suppose, how long he gets an allowance from the Provident Society?

Q.—How long after a man has taken sick is he entitled to receive the allowance which this society provides? A.—He is entitled to \$3.00 per week for twenty-six weeks, and as long thereafter as there is a doubt as to his recovery. If, at the end of the twenty-six weeks, the local district surgeon of the society reports that he is incurable or unfit for further work in the company's service, the chief medical officer, after examination of the case, certifies accordingly. If he is unfit for further work he receives \$100.00. If he is totally unable to work in any other way he is open to receiving half the insurance, or as much more as the committee of management thinks it advisable to grant him.

Q.—If an accident takes place any distance from the residence of the company's medical officer, does the company provide medical attendance? A.—We always authorize the necessary surgical attendance to be given.

Q.—If a man is within four or five miles of the residence of the assistant surgeon does the company provide him free transportation backwards or forwards to see the surgeon? A.—Yes.

Q.—Always? A.—Yes.

Q.—If a man is taken sick does the company provide free transportation for the surgeon or the man? A.—The company gives passes to our regular appointed surgeons.

Q.—And to the men? A.—The men themselves do not get passes. They pay their fares and the money is refunded to them.

Q.—If a man passes over the road to visit the surgeon he pays his fare? A.—Yes; but it is refunded to him.

Q.—Is that so in all cases? A.—Yes; in all cases.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—The sums paid in, under the head of fees, are they for the sick allowance?
A.—That covers the sick allowance and management.

Q.—And the levies are solely for that? A.—They are solely to pay the insurance. In fact, the fees cover the working of the insurance as well, and in addition there is the company's contribution. The levies are supposed to go directly to the members themselves without any deduction whatever.

Q.—What proportion do the levies bear to the premiums which the men would pay in an ordinary stock company? A.—They cannot, of course, exceed the death rate, and the death rate has been something under one per cent., so our levies are under one per cent. per annum.

Q.—Of the amount insured? A.—Yes. The average levies collected are under one per cent. of the amount received.

Q.—How would that sum compare with the premiums paid in an ordinary life insurance company? A.—I think the amount would be nearly half, taking the average. I do not think the insurances outside the society, could pay them under two per cent.

Q.—What would be the average, taking one with another, that is, the average levy upon a man in class F? A.—Class F has been a little over one per cent., nearly one and a half, which is consequent upon nearly all our deaths being in the middle classes. That must average itself in a few more years, and the average will come back either higher or lower and bring class F down.

Q.—How much will a man in class F pay in a year? A.—He will pay a little over \$3.00 a year for \$250.00.

Q.—If he paid twenty-eight cents a month that would be further over the average payment, I suppose? A.—Yes.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Are all the doctors in the employ of the company paid out of the Provident Association? A.—Do I understand you to mean by the company or by the association? The company pays certain doctors as well, who also give aid to the society free of charge. The chief medical officer is paid by the company altogether, and his services are given gratuitously to the society as are the services of his two assistants. All the other surgeons are paid by the society itself.

Q.—Then you have surgeons outside of the association who are paid by the company? A.—Yes; directly by the company.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Have you ever heard objections raised on the part of the men to joining the Provident Association? A.—Yes; a number of them.

Q.—Have you ever heard any declaration made by them that they would prefer to be open to take advantage of the Employer's Liability Act rather than to be members of the association? A.—Yes; a number would prefer that.

Q.—But it is compulsory to join the association? A.—It is a provision in connection with joining the company's service.

J. M. FORTIER, Cigar Manufacturer, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you wish that I should question you, or would you rather prefer to make a voluntary statement to the Commission? A.—It is immaterial to me.

Q.—You employ a certain number of apprentices in your factory, I believe?
A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you give us the number at present? A.—I cannot state the exact number. I know we have a good many apprentices as journeymen at present. I cannot say exactly the number; I never look into those matters. Mr. McGregor must have given you that, I think.

Q.—Do you know the age of the youngest apprentice at present employed in your factory? A.—I do not know; I have given strict instructions not to have any boy younger than fourteen years.

Q.—How long is it since you gave that order? A.—That order was given a couple of years ago; but lately, since about a couple of months ago, I noticed there were a few who worked there that might not be of that age, and I have since given strict instructions to the manager to have nobody there of less than fourteen years.

Q.—When you employ an apprentice you have an indenture passed, I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you mention the age of the apprentice in the contract? A.—Yes.

Q.—So that if you employ a child too young, it is either the fault of the father or the tutor? A.—Yes; because he wants to place the boy. It is generally the financial circumstances of the family that brings him to work so young.

Q.—Under whose control are the apprentices? A.—They are under the control of the manager and foremen.

Q.—Under whose control are they during the hours of work? A.—During the hours of work they are under the control of the foremen of the different departments and in general, of the manager.

Q.—How are those apprentices treated by the foremen? A.—Those apprentices are treated by the foremen in the same manner as if they were his own children, or in other words, as they would be treated at school.

Q.—Is it not to your knowledge that those children have been beaten? A.—It is not to my personal knowledge that those boys have been beaten, other than what they have deserved for wrongs they have committed, the same as a parent would punish his child, or I would punish my child, or a school master would punish a child who does not do what is right at school.

Q.—I understand by your reply the children have been beaten? A.—They have been beaten in the same manner; they have been beaten for correction.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that those children have been beaten? A.—It is not to my knowledge that those children have been beaten.

Q.—You have told us that the children have been beaten as they would have been by their parents, or at school, or for correction. A.—For correction.

Q.—So it is to your knowledge that some have been beaten? A.—For correction.

Q.—Do you believe it to be the duty of the foreman, or proprietor of a shop, to beat a child? A.—No.

Q.—Why did the foremen of your establishment beat them? A.—They did not beat them to my knowledge.

Q.—You have told us that the children have been beaten to correct them? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What do you understand by the word beaten? A.—I mean beaten when they were not deserving of it. By beating, I mean to hurt a child, punishing him severely, that is what I would mean by beating.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you believe a foreman, or proprietor of a factory, has a right to strike a child? A.—I believe the foremen of departments, over a certain number of boys of low age, like apprentices, have a right to touch the children with a ruler, or with their hands to correct them.

Q.—To your knowledge, then, correction has been applied in your establishment? A.—Yes.

Q.—Please give us the method of correction applied by yourself, or by your foremen, in the factories? A.—For instance: a boy will disobey orders. He is told to do certain things and he will not do them. What I am now speaking of, we have not had any experience of for about a year. We have had a very noisy class of boys within a year or two, and it was very hard to get them to do what they were ordered, but this last year we have had no experience of correcting a boy by hitting him on the fingers. In previous years we had lots of trouble with them; it was during the agitation of the strike, and so forth, and if we told a boy to do certain things, and he did not do them, or if he did not do right by taking tobacco or destroying tobacco, the foreman would very likely hit him on the fingers with a ruler.

Q.—With what? A.—With a little rule. He always carries something in his hands.

Q.—What kind of a rule? A.—A foot rule.

Q.—Is it not possible that some of your foremen could have beaten your children without your knowledge? A.—It has not been, so far.

Q.—Would it be possible? A.—It is possible, the same as this afternoon I am away from there.

Q.—From whom did the foremen receive instructions to beat the children? A.—They have never been authorized by me to beat any children.

Q.—Did you know they were touched? A.—I have given them instructions to correct them, and those instructions come from the Recorder down stairs.

Q.—In virtue of what law did the Recorder authorize you to correct the children? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—When the Recorder authorized you to correct the children, did he indicate the manner you were to employ? A.—Yes.

Q.—Was it in court? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember the date? A.—I do not remember the date, not exactly.

Q.—Were you in court specially for the purpose of asking the power of correcting your children from the Recorder? A.—No. I happened to be in court when there was a complaint about a foreman having hit a boy. The Recorder said he had no right to hit a boy, that he should not hit a boy. The foreman had slapped him on the face, I believe. The Recorder said: "you must not hit a boy on the head or on the face, but hit him on the fingers with a rule or something of that kind, the same as if he was at school."

Q.—How long ago was that? A.—It must have been four or five years ago, five or six years ago, I think.

Q.—What was the name of the foreman who struck the child? A.—I think it was Ryan.

Q.—Do you remember if he was condemned by the Recorder? A.—I do not remember.

Q.—You cannot give us the exact date of the conviction? A.—No.

Q.—Did you beat an apprentice, either boy or girl, yourself? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you give us the name of the person you struck? A.—Georgina Loiselle.

Q.—Were you present yesterday when Miss Georgina Loiselle gave her deposition? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you tell us what you can offer in contradiction of what she said? A.—I cannot contradict what she said, for she told the truth, that I asked her to make one hundred cigars. It was in the afternoon or in the morning before the quitting hour, and she said she was not going to do it; and she spoke in a very impertinent manner. I had had several troubles with the same young lady previous to that, and I had seen her mother, and her mother had prayed me to do the best I could and to correct her the best way I could. So after receiving those instructions, and as I had three or four of her brothers working for me at the time, I took a great interest in the girl—the mother being alone and supported by her children—to see

that the children were properly attended to. I took this young lady by the arm to have her sit down. She would not, so I turned her around and tried to sit her down. She would not. I took the cover of a mould and tried to sit her on my knee, but she was too heavy and fell on the floor. I held her on the floor and smacked her on the backside with the mould. I asked her if she would do it, and after a couple of strikes she said "I will." She got up and sat down at her table and made her one hundred bunches and went off quietly. She never lost one hour, and I think she is very glad to-day to have received the lesson she did, for she has been an obedient girl ever since then.

Q.—Is this what you call a mould (pointing to a mould on the table)? A.—It was not exactly that kind; that is a little too heavy.

Q.—Is it the same kind as that? A.—It is not the same as that; it is lighter than that.

Q.—Give the dimensions of the mould you did use? A. The cover may have been a little lighter than that, one eighth of an inch thinner; it would be about the same width, not quite so long.

Q.—How long ago is it since you beat her? A.—It must have been four or five years ago. I could not say exactly.

Q.—Was it before the Recorder authorized you to correct the apprentices or after? A.—Yes; after.

Q.—Do you mean to say you corrected her according to the instructions you received from the Recorder? A.—Yes. The Recorder spoke in this way; he said: "Correct them the same as you would your own child. Hit them there because it cannot hurt them, and they will be corrected."

Q.—Do you correct your child with such a mould as this? A.—If he deserved it, it would not hurt him to hit him on the backside with that as much as with the hand.

Q.—Would you allow the school-master to hit your child with such a machine as this? A.—Yes; if he did it the same as I did it.

Q.—You have stated that you took this young girl on your knees? A.—No; I tried to.

Q.—What position was she in when you corrected her? A.—She was sitting down when I first saw her. She got up and I tried to sit her down on her seat and she would not do it.

Q.—You have said you held this girl down? A.—Yes.

Q.—In what manner did you keep her down? A.—I held her down with my arm, like this, and struck her this way.

Q.—Do you believe it is decent for a man to place a girl of eighteen in that position? A.—When she is very disobedient and there are about fifty or sixty other girls there, I think it is only right that she should be taught a lesson when she deserves it.

Q.—One of the Commissioners is anxious to know would you allow one of your daughters, if you have any, to be placed in that position? A.—If she deserved it, I would.

Q.—By a stranger? A.—By a person to whom I had entrusted her, the same as this girl was to me; she was bound to me, and I was to represent her father. It is very important you should know that these girls and boys are bound to me. They are engaged by indentures, and, of course, under the engagement the mother and father must help me along as much as they can.

Q.—Do you know if that same system is employed in other cigar factories? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—You served your apprenticeship as a cigar maker? A.—As a cigar packer.

Q.—Were you beaten during your apprenticeship? A.—No; I did not happen to need it, I suppose; otherwise I should have been.

Q.—Was it the custom, the time you served your apprenticeship, for the manager or foreman or proprietor, to beat apprentices? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—Have you ever received any beating? A.—No; in the packing department there were only two or three employees at that time where I was learning my trade.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Did you put your knee on the girl's body to hold her down when you had her down? A.—No; my arm.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Did you ever strike an apprentice with your foot? A.—I cannot remember that. Joseph Faille says that, but I do not remember it. Such a thing may have happened, but I do not remember it.

Q.—Do you believe you have the right to kick an apprentice with your foot? A.—No.

Q.—You cannot, then, contradict the evidence given by Faille? A.—I do not remember ever kicking him. I know he was a very wild boy, but I do not remember ever kicking him.

Q.—The witness Faille states you kicked him with with your foot because he was playing on a truck, and he adds that it was during the dinner hour. Do you admit that this witness might have stated the truth or do you deny it? A.—I could not say: I do not remember ever kicking him. I think I would have remembered it, because if we did the least thing in that way we were always brought before the Recorder. We have always had enough union men about the factory to agitate anything, and to bring every case in regard to apprentices before the Recorder.

Q.—Were you brought before the Recorder for having corrected Miss Loiselle? A.—No.

Q.—Were you often brought before the Recorder yourself, or your foremen? A.—They were brought up three or four times, or two or three times.

Q.—Will you give us the names, as well as the dates, on which those foremen were brought before the Recorder? A.—I could not do that; I do not remember them.

Q.—Have you any other means of correcting children, other than striking them on the fingers? A.—There is a means of threatening them, or fining them.

Q.—Have you any special room in which you place them when you correct them? A.—No.

Q.—Mr. McGregor, your manager of the factory, told us yesterday of the fact that there was a certain room, which he styled an enclosure, in which children were locked up. A.—They were put away there for theft, or robbing, or anything of that kind. We have a system of searching the apprentices, and most of the men, and when they come down stairs—there are probably one hundred men—perhaps the tenth man has cigars about him that he should not have. Then this man goes to work and calls one of us, and says, "Take care of that man, I will finish searching the hands, and take him to the station house." Then the man is taken and put in the enclosure, this room or some other place.

Q.—At what time is this searching done? A.—The searching is done at noon before they go out, and in the evening when they leave.

Q.—How long do you allow children to remain in this room? A.—I do not know; I have never put any there myself; I cannot tell you that we ever kept any children there longer than until the man got through with the searching, and was ready to take them away. I do not know, I could not say.

Q.—Have all the children placed in that room, been brought before the Recorder? A.—No; in some instances they have been forgiven, for it was not very pleasant for the parents to hear of their children being brought before the Recorder and be sent for. They would be brought before me or the manager, and forgiven.

Q.—Were those who were brought before the Recorder brought there as soon as

the searching was done? A.—I could not tell you. I know some who were arrested for stealing cigars were brought there afterwards, and some were brought before me. I could not tell you. Some of the people who were arrested for stealing cigars were put in my own office. For instance, Frederick Lefebvre, who gave evidence here, and G. Joly stole cigars, and they were put in my office—they were not taken down stairs—and we took them to the station house. They were both together when they stole cigars, both at the same time, and they were brought before the Police Court next morning and the matter was amicably settled on account of the people being nice people, and I did not wish to have their names brought forward too much.

Q.—What time do apprentices begin work in your factory? A.—I could not tell you exactly how it is in winter. In summer they generally begin at seven o'clock; in winter I think it is between half past seven and eight. I am not positive.

Q.—At what time do they leave the factory? A.—They leave the factory between five and six o'clock, it may be a few minutes after six, that is those who stay to sweep.

Q.—What time do they dine? A.—At twelve o'clock.

Q.—They have one hour? A.—Yes; at present they take one hour. They used to take half an hour. The fact is, in regard to the running of the factory up stairs, I have paid very little attention to it within a few years, as I have a very good manager and I trust to him entirely. I may be mistaken in regard to the hour for dinner.

Q.—Are you aware that children were at any time placed in the blackhole from seven till twelve, or one till five, or during those hours? A.—I do not remember.

Q.—A witness swore he had been placed there from eight in the morning till six at night; the witness, Jules Chartrand. Could this be done without your knowledge? A.—It may be possible, for I sometimes leave the city, and am away for two or three months at a time. In regard to Jules Chartrand, we had particular instructions from his mother—at least the manager had, and she also has given me them too—to use our utmost endeavors to try and make a good boy of him. He was about the worst boy we had in the establishment. His mother asked me one day to try and have him punished or brought before the Recorder, or at least a magistrate, or do something to send him to the Reformatory, because while we might be able to handle him in the day time, she could not handle him at night. So I came here to see what I could do and she came with me, and we laid a complaint before the Recorder and he was sent to the Reformatory. I must say that at that time most of the parents who could not get along with their children, because they were in bad order and were bad boys, came to me as a cigar manufacturer and put them in my hands, and I tried to do what I could with them. As they could not correct them themselves they put them in my hands. They had seen my name so often before the Recorder that they knew if there was great trouble with them I would put them into the Reformatory.

Q.—The parents considered your factory as a species of Reformatory, or on the road to the Reformatory? A.—It was on the road to the Reformatory; it was to reform those bad boys or any bad boys who came there.

Q.—So then you would not be astonished if a boy had passed the whole of the time in that room? A.—I could not say.

Q.—This would not astonish you after the instructions you had received from the mother? A.— Yes; it would astonish me.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What would be the proportion of boys and men you found stealing tobacco, or what would be the quantity of tobacco you found stolen every day? A.—When I first started in the cigar business in Montreal I found that during the first six months I was 33 per cent. short on my goods. So I came to the conclusion that I was robbed by my employees, and I employed a detective, who visited the houses of some of them. In two instances we found tobacco. In one house I visited with the detective, there was a lady, who was working in my establishment, who employed

three cigar-makers at her house, making cigars from my tobacco. The room was equipped with moulds, presses and so forth, and she had some of my tobacco that I could identify very easily, because it was good Havana tobacco which could not be very easily got. Then I had her arrested, but as she was in very poor circumstances—she had a child sick with small-pox—I forgave her when she was brought before the Police Magistrate. I then came to the conclusion that the best thing I could do would be to search my employees. There was another man who was robbing me also, and we found tobacco in his house. After the system of searching came into force I got a letter from the Union Cigar Makers stating that if I did not quit that searching they would go on strike. They did go on strike, for I did not give up that system; and since that we have had probably twenty-five cases of robbing. In regard to that strike, we had a good deal of trouble with cigar-makers conspiring to prevent the hands coming to their places. We had a suit about it, which is not yet wound up. I see by the proceedings here that this is a continuation of the conspiracy.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

I object to that language.

WITNESS :—

I am talking about the cigar-makers of Montreal, I am not talking about the Commissioners.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Can Mr. Fortier state that this is a continuation of the conspiracy ?

WITNESS :—

I believe this thing is a continuation of the conspiracy.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Did the strike take place on account of the men telling you that you must abandon the practice of searching the employees? A.—Yes. The strike was proposed by people who were not working in my place, who were working in other factories. My own employees told me at the time that they were very sorry, but they had to obey the orders of the Union.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Who is it that examines the cigars when they are finished by the employees? A.—The foreman.

Q.—What proportion of the manufactured cigars are spoiled, as a rule? A.—I could not tell you exactly. Some of the workmen do not make any poor cigars, but make them all perfect; it depends a great deal on the workmen. I could not tell you the percentage.

Q.—Who examines those cigars? A.—We have a gentleman by the name of John Ryan. Up to six or seven months ago, so far as I can remember, we had a young man named Frederick Lefebvre, who gave his evidence yesterday—he was foreman up to about six or seven months ago. George Robley was also employed as examiner of cigars, and my brother was also there for a little time, but a very short time.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—When those people you have named condemned cigars, was there any appeal to any one else? A.—No; they were perfect judges; they were cigar-makers.

Q.—Once they decided the matter there was no appeal? A.—Yes; I have sometimes interfered and said, 'This cigar you shall pass.'

Q.—And how was it if you were not there? A.—Yes; unless they went to the manager.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Have you ever examined those cigars yourself? A.—Yes; I have.

Q.—Do you ever recollect examining cigars and taking some out of the manufactured cigars and giving them to your friends? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that thing commonly done? A.—We do that sometimes. We take them when they are well made also.

Q.—Have those cigars to be replaced by the employee when they are thrown out in that way? A.—Yes; because they are not perfect; that is when they are thrown out.

Q.—Are they not good enough to smoke? A.—Yes; to see if the cigar will smoke or not; but they do not look very well.

Q.—Are any of those cigars thus taken out ever packed in boxes? A.—I could not tell you, they may be. They may be packed as seconds or for the purpose of giving away or something of that kind. I could not tell you exactly in regard to that.

Q.—When you give any friend or any person a cigar as a sample do you not wish to give a good one? A.—Yes.

Q.—You would not like to give me an inferior cigar if I went down and looked at your place? A.—I would not mind what I give you because I would not think of selling you the cigar I show you in the factory. I might give you probably what would cost me the least or the most; it would depend a good deal on the person.

Q.—You would like to give a finished cigar no matter what grade it was I suppose? A.—I do not know about that.

Q.—What knowledge have you of the system of fines that prevails in your factory, for what are the apprentices fined and what amounts are they fined? A.—Of late, I do not know that they have been fined much, and I have no knowledge of how that is carried on at present. Mr. McGregor, the manager, has control of it.

Q.—There is such a system then in your establishment? A.—Yes.

Q.—You cannot give us the details? A.—No. Most of the boys get their fines back if they behave themselves the following week.

Q.—If a boy commits an offence outside of your factory do you consider you have a right to fine that boy? A.—No; I do not think I have.

Q.—Have you ever known an apprentice, who was in your employ, to be fined \$1.30 for taking a potato out of a basket, outside of your shop? A.—Yes; I suppose you have heard that story before and, there is no use in my repeating it.

Q.—Do you consider you have the power to fine a boy for doing acts outside of the shop? A.—I think it concerns the shop considerably when a boy takes the foreman's dinner away, it concerns the shop a good deal. I think it is an act done outside the shop, but it is closely connected with it, for it interferes with the health of the foreman who conducts the shop.

Q.—When the Recorder gave you permission to correct the boys did he give you permission at the same time to inflict fines? A.—No; he did not give me permission to inflict fines, nor did I ever speak to him about it, but it is specified in the engagement made by the boys and their parents.

Q.—For offences done outside the factory? A.—No.

Q.—When a hand carries away two or three cigars what do you call it? A.—If without permission, I think it is robbery.

Q.—Would it be considered the same if a boy in your employ went into the work shop and took three or four cigars out of a bunch and gave them to a friend to smoke? A.—That man would get his cigars back from the foreman or be credited with them, whatever is taken away from his table. If such a thing occurs a man goes to the foreman or the manager and says a certain number of cigars have been taken away from his table and the foreman would hand them back to him.

Q.—As a matter of fact when cigars are taken away in this manner, is the man from whom they are taken always asked to give them? A.—He might not be; no.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How many journeymen have you in your shop at the present time? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—Have you any Union men employed? A.—I believe there are some Union men; my shop is a Union shop, and we do not ask who they are or what they are. We want them to do their work, and that is all.

Q.—Do you pay, per thousand, what the union men call their scale? A.—We do on some work, and on other work we do not.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you a person you employ who is known as a special constable? A.—I have a man in my employ who used to be a special constable on St. Lawrence Main Street, who is in my factory now, and he is the man who does the searching at the door.

Q.—Was he appointed a special constable by the police commissioners, or by yourself? A.—I did not tell you I had a special constable. He was a special constable on St. Lawrence Main Street about fifteen or twenty years ago.

Q.—Does he not wear a badge, signifying that he is a special constable? A.—I think he has such a thing as that, yes; but he does not wear it all the time.

Q.—Does he wear that with your permission? A.—I have never questioned him in regard to that. I have paid no attention to that, whether he had it or not.

Q.—Will you tell us the duties of this special constable, inside the factory; what are the duties of this man Goudreau, inside the factory? A.—It is to look after things and keep them in general order,—the presses, and to open the door in the morning, and to close the factory at night, and to look around the place and to see that everything is straight, night and morning.

Q.—Has he ever been employed in removing boys from the shop to the enclosure in the cellar? A.—I could not tell you. When he searches them and finds one of them has been stealing, he must certainly put him there, if he wants to put him in the station house.

Q.—Is Goudreau the person recognized by the foreman as the proper man in the factory to lock the boys up? A.—There is nobody recognized to lock them up.

Q.—Is he the man usually employed for that purpose? A.—No; we might consider him the man to send for if there is any trouble. We would say 'Take that man to the station house,' he is the man to do that.

Q.—Who is it that puts the boys in the enclosure? A.—I have told you that I do not know of any boys who have been put there.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Is Goudreau entitled to wear a badge, without being sworn in by the magistrate? A.—I believe he was sworn in, fifteen or twenty years ago, as I have stated, if being sworn in so long as that is good, I suppose he has a title to wear that badge. I do not know whether it is the law or not.

Q.—If he were sworn in fifteen years ago, and he wears that badge, he must be looked upon in the eyes of the law as a special constable? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—Have there ever been placed in the enclosure, commonly called by newspapers the blackhole, boys who have not afterwards been taken to the police station? A.—I could not tell you.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have spoken of a strike in regard to which a suit is still pending? A.—I do not know that the suit has been wound up yet. I do not remember it ever having been decided.

Q.—Did you not once go before the Jury? A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the result? A.—The result was that the Jury disagreed, and it was taken to some other court, I understand.

Q.—Do you know how the Jury were divided? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—Was not the confiscation of cigars that were taken away from your men, made by your orders? A.—If cigars are not perfect, I do not wish to pay for them.

Q.—Did you at any time order your foremen to take away cigars from men when they were earning too high wages? A.—No.

Q.—Have you ever known of kicking Stanislas Goyette? A.—I have no recollection of it; I believe I was out of town at the time.

Q.—In regard to this matter, did you have an interview with Goyette's father, or with Mr. Demers, Advocate? A.—I do not remember anything of the parties you mention.

Q.—Do you remember if, after the occurrence, you, or one of your employees, effected a settlement with Mr. Demers, Advocate? A.—I have no recollection of such a settlement. I only know of it through Mr. McGregor telling me that there was such a thing, that there was such a settlement made at the time.

Q.—Mr. McGregor has told you that a settlement was then made? A.—Yes.

Q.—What did he mean by a settlement? A.—I understood by what Mr. McGregor said that the boy's indentures were broken, and that he was allowed to go without finishing his time.

Q.—There was no monetary settlement? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—Could you see by your books? A.—I could not say. They would be pretty old books now. I will look up for you if you wish.

Q.—Have you your books of four or five years ago? A.—The wages book would be all torn up, it is in sheets.

Q.—This is not a question of wages, but a settlement of damages done to a child? A.—I do not know. I will look up for you if you like.

Q.—Will you please look it up in your books, when you have an opportunity of doing so? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are there men in your factory who pay for gas? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many men work with one gas jet? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—Did you ever go up stairs in your establishment when the gas was burning? A.—Yes; but I never counted the number of men to one jet, or how many gas jets there were in the factory.

Q.—Are there not a certain number of places for men to work at around each gas jet? A.—There must be a certain number, but I do not know how many.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Did you make that law in your factory, charging ten cents for the use of gas?

A.—That is only in winter when the days are very short.

Q.—Did you make that law? A.—Yes; that is the arrangement we make with the men. When we want to work during the short days we charge them for gas, or they can go home quite early.

Q.—Still you are not able to say how many them work under a gas jet? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you deduct ten cents from the workmen who work one or two, or seven days? A.—I could not tell you; that is left to the discretion of Mr. McGregor, the manager.

Q.—What do you do with the fines that are inflicted upon the apprentices? A.—I could not tell you.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How is that? A.—I could not tell you because we remit them the most of the time.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What do you do with the fines that are not remitted? A.—I suppose they remain in the cash box.

Q.—Are they entered in your books as fines collected? A.—No; I do not think they are.

Q.—I am under the impression that Mr. McGregor told us yesterday that a special account was kept of the fines? A.—There may be, but I cannot tell you.

Q.—Did you ever authorize Mr. McGregor to take twenty cigars away from a workman and hand them to one of his friends? A.—I do not remember of ever having done that.

Q.—If you had given such an order you would have remembered it? A.—I could not say; I have given a good many orders. I think Mr. McGregor does not need to have any orders from me; he can do what he chooses for he has *carte blanche* to do what he likes in my factory; he handles the cash as he chooses and he has control of my establishment and the stock and everything.

Q.—In this room which has been called by a witness the blackhole is there a window? A.—No; it is the foundation of the stair-case.

Q.—What do you store there? A.—We put packing boxes there.

Q.—Is there a door? A.—Yes.

Q.—How does the door close? A.—It closes not perfectly.

Q.—Is it within your knowledge that children have been closed up within that room and the door itself has been fastened with nails or boards nailed thereon? A.—I do not remember.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How do you arrive at ten cents as being the proper amount to charge for gas per man? A.—I do not think I ever figured it out. Mr. McGregor has charge of that matter. I cannot say exactly how we arrived at it; but when I was an apprentice or worked in other factories, gas used to be charged to the workmen at ten cents per week, and for that reason, perhaps, we charge ten cents per week. Some months we cover the amount of the gas easily and sometimes we do not. During apprenticeship we never charge for gas. We try to make it as pleasant as we can for everybody.

Q.—How often do you pay your gas bills? A.—Every three months.

Q.—Please state to the Commission the average amount of your gas bill for that time? A.—I will look for one of the gas bills and will send it to you.

Q.—Do you keep a separate account of the ten cents per man paid for gas? A.—Yes; an account is kept.

Q.—Do you think the establishment makes a profit by charging ten cents per man? A.—I could not tell you; I do not think so.

Q.—Are the men charged for gas when they do not use it? A.—I could not tell you. I must say this: if we engage the men to go to work, it is not to loaf but to work. If we charge ten cents for gas it is his business to work, and one of the greatest difficulties we have to contend with in Montreal, is that many of the cigar people do not want to work more than three or four days per week. The family loses by that and we lose our time. It is to their benefit to work, and I want to try to oblige them to work.

Q.—Is the output of cigars during the last one or two years greater than it was five or six years ago? A.—It is.

Q.—Do you pay as much wages per thousand now as you did five or six years ago? A.—We pay more.

Q.—More per thousand? A.—Yes.

By Mr. CLARKE:—

Q.—Is your trade increasing? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you find that the operation of the Scott Act has a very injurious effect on your trade in any way? A.—It does affect it a little. It diminishes it a little in some places—the trade changes its course. We used to do business with hotel people; now we do it with grocery people and temperance people.

Q.—Does that lead to the manufacture of cheaper or dearer cigars? A.—To the manufacture of dearer cigars; but it decreases very much the consumption of cigars.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—From what country do you get your tobacco? A.—From Havana, and some from the United States, and from Holland.

Q.—Do you use any Canadian tobacco for cigars? A.—We do not use any Canadian tobacco because there is no quantity of it grown.

Q.—Is Canadian tobacco suitable for the manufacture of cigars? A.—I guess it could be used for cigars. I have seen some Canadian tobacco that was very good, but it is grown in such small quantities here, that we have no chance of getting a good tobacco and trying it. There is not enough tobacco grown in Canada to keep one factory going.

Q.—Do you think Canadian tobacco could be profitably cultivated? A.—I think so, to compete with American tobacco; but it is an industry that does not exist here. I believe this industry could be easily established if the Government were to place a duty on the raw material instead of putting it on cigars. Then the farmers who grow tobacco would be protected and the Government would receive the same amount of duty as they do now. At the same time the manufacturers would have the tobacco to do what they pleased with, and the Excise Department would have a little less to do.

RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE FACTORY.

10 HOURS CONSTITUTE A DAY'S WORK.

From 1st April to 31st September, all employes working by the week, must be to work at 7 o'clock A. M. and 1 o'clock P. M. and from 1st of October to 31st March 7-30 o'clock A. M. and 12-30 P. M.

Doors kept open 15 minutes later for piece work employes.

No one allowed to stop work during working hours. All employes to be searched before leaving factory. Loud or profane talking strictly prohibited.

All employes wasting or dropping tobacco on the floor will be fined for each offence.

No tobacco allowed to be left on the tables after work. Any one breaking these rules will be subject to a fine.

All instructions from the foreman to be strictly obeyed.

No one allowed to comb their hair in the factory.

No one allowed to leave their department.

J. M. FORTIER.

Montreal, 1st February, 1881.

A. H. DAVIS, cigar manufacturer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You are a cigar manufacturer I believe? A.—Yes; I am one of the firm of S. Davis & Sons.

Q.—How long have you been in business? A.—Myself personally?

- Q.—The firm? A.—The firm has been in business since 1862 as near as I can remember.
- Q.—Do you employ many hands? A.—We employ a considerable number of hands.
- Q.—Of what does your labor consist, men, women, girls or boys? A.—Men.
- Q.—How many men have you in your factory? A.—I cannot state positively, but we have between 600 and 700 operatives.
- Q.—About how many will be men and how many women? A.—I have a little memorandum here which I will consult. I see we have between 360 and 400 men.
- Q.—Will you tell us what the average earnings of a cigar maker are in your establishment? A.—Do you mean generally speaking?
- Q.—Give us the average earnings? A.—The average will be between \$9.00 and \$10.00.
- Q.—Will they earn that the year round? A.—We are generally able to give employment the year round.
- Q.—What will be the average for female operatives? A.—Of course, it depends entirely on the class of work on which she is employed. You mean generally speaking?
- Q.—Yes, I mean generally speaking. A.—That, I am not prepared to state positively.
- Q.—Tell us what would be the lowest wages a woman earns on cigar making? A.—Between \$4.00 and \$5.00 will be the average I think.
- Q.—Do you consider the work of a woman equal to that of a man? A.—We have women in our employ whom we consider as good as some of the men, but as a rule the men are better hands.
- Q.—Is the rate of wages paid to women based on the principle of equal pay for equal work? A.—We pay the women what we are able to afford for the class of work they are making; it depends on the class of work. If it is a superior class we pay higher.
- Q.—Do they receive the same pay for the same class of work that a man receives? A.—No; they do not.
- Q.—Is that because their labor is not equal to that of a man? A.—There must be different reasons, I suppose.
- Q.—What are the hours during which your employees are engaged during the year? A.—In the summer they go at seven or half past and have one hour for dinner, and quit at five. The journeymen leave at five, and the women at six.
- Q.—Do you employ many apprentices? A.—We have a few. We are compelled to keep apprentices owing to their being so much cheap labor in the market, competition compels us to do so. Our desire is to do away with them entirely as we are not in favor of a cheap class of goods.
- Q.—How are your apprentices paid? A.—We pay them by the week; some are paid by the piece. If we have young boys as apprentices we encourage them by paying them so much per thousand, or so much extra to induce them to make cigars properly and rapidly, and to give them something at the end of the week which would be to their advantage as well as to ours. Our object is to get the work done properly and to pay them for it and to give them encouragement.
- Q.—What age do you think it is proper for a boy or girl to enter upon an apprenticeship? A.—That depends; some people are comparatively old at fifteen or sixteen and others are young at that time.
- Q.—I suppose you endeavor to fix a minimum? A.—I think at fourteen or fifteen a boy should learn to do something, if he is dependent upon himself, or if others are dependent on him.
- Q.—How long do apprentices serve? A.—Four or five years.
- Q.—What would be the average earning of a boy each year for the four years? A.—That I am not prepared to state; it would depend entirely on how quick he was able to work, and whether he was able to make cigars properly. If he became an

adept at the business, he would make good wages. Our system is to encourage the boys. Instead of keeping them at wages of \$1.00 the first year, which the indenture calls for, we give them inducements by which they are able to earn \$2.00, \$3.00, \$4.00, and sometimes \$5.00, and even more than that. After apprentices are out of their time, we take them in as journeymen and give them journeymen's wages.

Q.—Have you any difficulty in controlling your apprentices? A.—No.

Q.—Do you find it necessary to rap them over the knuckles or to pull their ears? A.—No; that thing is foreign to our establishment.

Q.—You have none of that kind of punishment in your factory? A.—No.

Q.—Have you any system of fines? A.—No; we have to depend on the sale of our goods for our profit.

Q.—Do you keep a special constable in your establishment? A.—Not that I am aware of.

Q.—Do you search your employees on entering or leaving the factory? A.—I believe we have at times searched some apprentices when we have found it necessary. We do not make it a practice.

Q.—As a rule, do you find the cigar-makers in Montreal as steady and reliable as people employed at other trades? A.—We have found cigar-makers always to be pretty steady as a class. We have had no trouble with our men. On one occasion we had a little dispute, but it was amicably settled after a while.

Q.—Have you any difficulty in getting men to go to work in your establishment? A.—According to what the men said, they would rather work for less money with us, than with any body else. They have stated that in writing.

Q.—Do you consider the condition of the cigar-makers of Montreal, at the present time, better than it was ten years ago? A.—I cannot say that I do. Years ago we had foreign cigars to compete with, cigars made by cheap German labor, and notwithstanding that, we were able to pay higher wages, but the cheap labor at present used, compels us to compete with it. We do not make very cheap goods, and our desire is to pay our men all we possibly can. If we could do away entirely with the manufacture of cheap goods in our factory, we would be happy to do so; but we are obliged to govern ourselves according to the demands and requirements of the trade.

Q.—What do you call cheap labor? A.—I think you have had a pretty good illustration of what cheap labor is.

Q.—Do you mean child labor? A.—I do not say that child labor is necessarily cheap, because when children are learning the business, they necessarily destroy a great deal of stock, and, of course, that makes their labor expensive.

Q.—Do you know if the cigar business has increased, materially, during the past five years in Montreal? A.—Taking it on the average, I believe the business has increased in this respect, that there is a better class of goods sold. You see that the present Government having placed an import duty on foreign cigars, has enabled the manufacturers to make more cigars of a better class; consequently we get a better price. If we turn out finer goods at a better price, the workman also gets a better price for his work.

Q.—Do you think the increase in wages has been equal to the increase in the cost of living in Montreal? A.—I am not prepared to state. I know it costs us as much to sell cigars now as it ever did.

Q.—Is the supply of labor in your trade, equal to the demand? A.—At the present time it is; at one time we found it was not. I think there have been a good many comments in the press in regard to that matter.

Q.—Was that the time when the German emigrants were brought out by your firm? A.—Yes. We found it impossible to supply our demand for hands. We had advertised in different newspapers, and we could not get help; consequently we determined to bring out foreign workmen. We advanced the money, and when the men arrived we advanced them further money to enable them to furnish their houses and to get themselves to live respectably, or, at all events, in a half decent way. We calculated that by doing so we were benefiting the different trades.

as those people were consumers and producers. We brought out several hundred. At the same time while we were importing those people we were not taking the bread out of the mouths of the Canadian workmen, for I do not think any old hand was discharged. In fact, all the old hands were employed and were kept employed except two who misbehaved themselves. Those we had to discharge for the sake of the factory, for without order you cannot run an establishment, and we were compelled to discharge them.

Q.—Did you make an engagement with those people in Europe before bringing them out? A.—Yes; and we guaranteed them work for a certain time, and we paid them the same scale of wages as we paid our Canadian workmen.

Q.—Did you guarantee them a certain price for their work? A.—The same scale of wages as we paid the workmen in our establishment.

Q.—Did they know what that amounted to? A.—They had a pretty good idea. I believe, if I am not mistaken, that the prices were shown to them.

Q.—What were the reasons given by your firm in Germany to induce emigrants to come to this country? A.—That we required their help.

Q.—Was there no other reason given? A.—Not that I am aware of—probably that the advantages were better in this country, and I think they are.

Q.—Did these men, when they had been in your employ for a short time, complain that they were not receiving as much money as they expected? A.—Not that I am aware of; I have heard it.

Q.—Are they still in your employ? A.—Some are, others have left. Some are down east, and are in different places.

Q.—How many did you bring out at that time? A.—I could not say exactly, from 170 to 200.

Q.—Do you mean men and women? A.—About 200.

Q.—And how many have remained in your establishment? A.—I am not prepared to state; I know we guaranteed them work for a certain time, and that we carried out the contract, and I do not think they had any reason to find fault.

Q.—Then you had some trouble with the men after they arrived here? A.—I am not aware of any trouble.

Q.—Were not some of the men arrested and fined? A.—I have just stated that some were arrested and fined—some owed us money. We advanced money to furnish their houses, and finding that some of them intended to leave we had them capiased.

Q.—So, it was because they owed you money or because they absented themselves from work that they were imprisoned? A.—I do not know of any instance where a man has been arrested for absenting himself from work in our employ. I do not think we would be justified according to law in doing so. When people misbehave themselves we have no further use for them.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Was there any strike on hand when you went over for these men? A.—No; none whatever. I have the testimony of the men at the time to the effect that they were fully satisfied, that we had always acted fairly and justly by the men. That declaration is signed by all the old employees.

Q.—Do you object to employing hands if they belong to labor organizations? A.—No; not the union men who belong to labor organizations respectably carried on.

Q.—Do you find that you cannot get as much for your cigars in labor centres as you would wish because they have not the union label on them? A.—That is a little matter that I think I am not bound to answer. We have been able to sell by hard work, and in spite of much competition, all the goods we have manufactured.

By Mr. HEAKES.

Q.—When the duty was decreased to the amount of \$3.00, what was the result? A.—The workmen wanted the difference.

Q.—Did you give an increase in wages? A.—No; because although we would

have liked to have given it to the men, because workmen should get all the money they possibly can, yet the Company were compelled to reduce the price of our goods by \$3.00. The customer wanted his goods for less, and between the customers, and workmen, and competition, the \$3.00 disappeared and there was no margin left.

Q.—Were the wages lowered \$1.00 per thousand? A.—Not that I am aware of.

Q.—Were they lowered at all at that time? A.—Possibly they may have been; I do not know. I know that we pay at least the union scale, and in fact on some lines we pay more than the union scale; and on one or two, competition compels us to pay less.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—You say you pay the union rate of wages? A.—We pay more in some cases. Our scale of wages on the average is much higher than the union scale. There is a great prejudice against home manufactured cigars. The people all want imported cigars when they do not know anything about tobacco, and consequently we are shut out from making more fine goods than we otherwise would do.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—What is the difference in the wages paid for the different grades as between Montreal and Toronto? A.—I am not aware what the manufacturers in Toronto pay, or rather the manufacturers in the western country. Toronto manufacturers claim to pay more, but if you take the scale you will find that we pay more, because we make more fine goods. There has been a combination there against Davis & Sons' cigars on account of not using the union label, and the union men have assisted it. These manufacturers formed a combination to fight ourselves particularly, and in fact only ourselves.

Q.—Do the manufacturers of Montreal ever put their heads together to decrease wages? A.—No; we would not be a party to such a thing.

A. H. WOOD, Cigar Manufacturer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are a member of the firm of Tassé, Wood & Co.? A.—Yes, I am.

Q.—You have apprentices in your employ, I believe? A.—I have.

Q.—Do you engage them by indenture? A.—We do.

Q.—Have you one of the forms of indenture of the apprentices that you can submit to the Commission? A.—Yes; if you wish to see it. Yesterday you requested me to bring one, and I have done so, and at the same time, allow me to say that while I am willing that all the members of the Commission should see it, yet it is not for public inspection.

Q.—If it is your private business you had better keep it? A.—It is the usual form that you can go and obtain from any Notary with the names of the apprentices put in.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What is the objection you have to placing it before the Commission? A.—It is the same form as you get at any Notary's. I certainly object to outsiders inspecting it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—I see by the indenture you reserve to yourself the right to impose fines on apprentices for not conforming to the rules of the factory? A.—Yes; we reserve that right as you see by the indenture.

Q.—Are your rules printed and placed up in your factory? A.—No; we do not consider that necessary. There is only one rule, which is “to do right,” and we tell the apprentices to always carry that out.

Q.—I see you reserve the right in this indenture, to impose fines on apprentices for misbehaviour, disturbance, and for not conforming to the rules and regulations of the factory? A.—Yes; we reserve that right as you see.

Q.—Have you any rules of any kind that indicate to apprentices the amount of fines, and for what causes they may be called upon to pay them? A.—For disobeying any orders of the foreman; he gives them the work and tells them what to do.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—And what fine is imposed for disobeying his orders? A.—We have never imposed any fine. For misbehaviour and bad conduct we have imposed fines in two cases. We sent to the mother in one case, and to the father in the other to come to the factory and see us. When they came there, we gave them the money that we had kept back from the apprentices. We did it so that the apprentices on going home should be asked for their wages, which they had not received. Then as I have said we sent for the father and mother, and when they came we handed the wages over to them. So virtually we have never imposed any fine.

Q.—Are those the only two cases in which your apprentices have been fined? A.—Yes. We never kept the fines and did not intend to keep them, but we acted in that manner simply that the parents should know in regard to the matter, and the money was afterwards paid to the parents.

Q.—The money was remitted to the parents? A.—Yes; and I can produce evidence to show it.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that apprentices have been beaten in your factory? A.—Not at all, not to my knowledge. What is more, if I knew the foreman had beaten an apprentice—what I mean by that is injuring him, for he might cuff his ears or slap his hands the same as he would his own child—I would discharge him at once.

Q.—Are you acquainted with Léon Girandias? A.—When I saw his name in the newspaper I tried to recollect him and I could not. I asked my bookkeeper if he remembered him. He said he remembered him quite well for he came in and wanted to borrow money whether he was working or not.

Q.—The witness, Girandias, has testified under oath that he saw a child beaten in your factory with the cover of a mould? A.—In answering that question I can simply say that I know nothing about it. I might add if you will allow me, that I do not understand how the witness could give such evidence. Did any one ask how far from the mould he was, or its measurement? I know nothing about it and I am up through the factory fully a dozen times a day and sometimes more and I never heard anything of it and never knew anything of it.

Q.—The same witness has also testified that he saw another child beaten at your place because he had allowed a scale to fall, and he had been brutally beaten by the foreman with a broomstick? A.—That I know nothing of. I do remember of a scale having been broken, and remember we had a boy and a girl whose father had told them to steal cigars and bring them home, and they had taken them and their father had smoked them. I sent for their father and he came and admitted it. I had a letter sent to them dismissing them. My impression is that was the same boy. I would know if I was at the factory.

Q.—Do you believe the child in question was beaten? A.—I do not know that I never saw any apprentice we had, beaten at any time.

Q.—Have you, since this evidence has been published, questioned your foreman on the subject? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he supply you with information in regard to this evidence? A.—I

asked him I think yesterday, if he had in my absence, at any time beaten any of the boys, and he said most decidedly no.

Q.—Have you several foremen? A.—We have but one foreman.

Q.—Can you give us his name? A.—His name is Albert Rudlish.

Q.—Is he present in the room? A.—I have not seen him here.

Q.—Are you acquainted with the young man called George Robinson? A.—I am.

Q.—Has George Robinson worked in your establishment? A.—He has.

Q.—How long? A.—I cannot say; he was there twice. He was discharged once, and came back and promised to do better, and he was discharged again.

Q.—Why was he discharged? A.—He was discharged for gross laziness and carelessness.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Is that the first time? A.—The first time I don't know the reason; the last time, I know the reason was that which I have stated.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—George Robinson has also testified that he saw children beaten in your establishment? A.—I can only answer that question in this way, and that is by an explanation. Robinson worked in the Casing Room while the apprentices are all on the next flat, and how he would see a child beaten I don't know. He was a caser, that was his business and he worked in the Casing Room.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that your foreman corrected any of your apprentices in a more or less severe manner, or even in a slight manner? A.—I saw him on one or two occasions, when I was up-stairs, give a boy a little slap, or take hold of one of his ears. On one occasion it was to a boy who had put a pin on the seat which one of the apprentices was going to sit down on; but the slap was so slight I did not deem it necessary to speak to the foreman about it.

Q.—If children were corrected in your establishment, were they so corrected with your approbation, if corrected, how? A.—Not at all. Their parents come and ask us to do that. They have come with the children and said that they could not manage them, and a great many of the parents have come to us afterwards and have said how nicely they have got along, and have thanked us for treating them so nicely, and helping them along with their occupation so well.

Q.—What did you answer to the parents? A.—That, I could not say now, because I don't remember; it was of no great importance.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Cannot you recollect it in a general way? A.—I would not like to say what I said in a general way, for I don't remember it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Then, I understand you to say that no cases of brutality have come to your knowledge in your factory? A.—There never have; not one.

Q.—Are there any rules in your establishment concerning badly made cigars? A.—Badly made cigars, commonly called "plugs" among cigar-makers, we take out. I might here add, as the question has been brought up, that we wish they did not make any plugs, because it is a great loss to us. Tobacco, when it becomes plugs, is broken up and thrown into scrap, which we have to sell at four cents per pound.

By Mr. WALSH :—

A.—It actually becomes a loss to us. We have cigar-makers who work in our place a year, or even two years, who never make bad cigars. They are good and attentive hands, and make perfect work.

Q.—Has it happened that some workmen have had cigars taken from them that were well made? A.—They are not to be the judges, we are the judges of the work. I have already stated that we do not want to take any away, it would be better for us if they were all perfect cigars.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You say that you have never taken any away that you consider good? A.—If we take away good cigars, they are replaced by others. Any good cigars taken are replaced by apprentice made cigars, who are nearly out of their time, and who make, practically, as good cigars as journeymen.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Is that the case, good cigars taken from the men are replaced? A.—Yes; unless they are taken away as being poor cigars, not fit to pack in cases.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that fourteen cigars have been taken away from a workman, to be given to visitors to your establishment? A.—Not at all; I know nothing of the sort. It has never been done. I read that statement, however, but they were not good, and the man who made them was sent away.

Q.—Do you ask your workmen to pay for gas? A.—Yes. I might also add that there is plenty of day-light during which they might work if they would work steadily. In summer they quit at five o'clock. No matter when they use gas we charge only those who are journeymen, and who are working on piece work, and while they should pay all the gas, we only ask them to pay five cents per week. They work on piece work, as I have said; none of the apprentices have to pay for gas. That five cents per week is not more than one-eighth of the cost, and we pay the balance.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Are any of your apprentices ever locked up in any apartment in the factory? A.—No.

Q.—Have you found it necessary to bring any of your apprentices before the Recorder for misconduct? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that a frequent occurrence? A.—Well, about eight months ago we had four before the Recorder at one time; however, we had sentence suspended.

Q.—Sentence was suspended at your intercession? A.—Yes; at Mr. Tasse's intercession; he went up personally about the case.

Q.—Have any of your apprentices been sent to the Reformatory? A.—No. We are looking for one now whom we would like to get. His father wishes to have him sent there.

Q.—Do you search the apprentices and your other employees on leaving the establishment? A.—On some occasions we do; but it is nothing more than tapping the breast to see if they have any cigars.

Q.—Is it the rule? A.—We don't make it a general practice. We find it necessary at times.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you ask the apprentices to do other things than those laid down in the indentures? A.—No.

Q.—Do you ask them to work over-time? A.—No.

Q.—Nothing over ten hours a day? A.—No.

Q.—Have they ever worked over-time as a matter of punishment? A.—No; not as a matter of punishment. Sometimes they come in late, and they are kept to make up their time.

Q.—Could beating or correcting be done in your factory without your knowledge? A.—I don't think so; not to any extent.

Q.—Have you objected to giving a man a job because he was a Union man? A.—That I don't remember.

Q.—Do you discriminate between non-Union and Union men? A.—No; we have Union men in our shop, and they are good ones, too.

Q.—To your knowledge? A.—To our knowledge; men who have been there for two years; but I might add that they are Union men who work right along, and earn big wages, and have no time to come here and give exaggerated evidence.

Q.—Did you ever discharge a man because he was a prominent man in labor matters? A.—I have no recollection of doing so. I don't know of any prominent men in labor matters connected with the cigar trade.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest girl in your factory? A.—The youngest with us, I think is fourteen, the youngest age at which the law allows a girl to be taken.

Q.—When you take them on, do they produce certificates to that effect, that they are of that age, from their parents? A.—I don't think they produce a certificate from their parents; but their parents have to enter into the engagement with them, and they come and declare their age.

Q.—You do not take any under fourteen? A.—No; for it would be likely to lead us into trouble.

Q.—On those occasions of searching your employees are the young women searched? A.—No; on no occasion.

Q.—What would be the average wages you would pay a young woman who works on mould work? A.—I have taken from my pay list the wages during two months in the winter and two months in the summer, and the lowest wages of a man was \$8.10, and the highest was \$17.60, making an average of \$12.85. Those who earned \$17.00 are men who attend to their work and stay there day after day, quitting as they do on Saturday at noon. In regard to the young women the lowest wages was \$4.50, and the highest \$12.00, making an average of \$8.25 a week. These wages were for the months of December and January, and July and August.

Q.—Are those busy seasons in the cigar trade, with you? A.—December and January are the duller months, July and August are about the average months.

Q.—In regard to the wages you have given us for those two months, were the hands working on a special branch or a higher class? A.—No; not at that time.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you give that as an average? A.—Yes; they are working on a much higher brand now. They are working at an \$11.000 job now.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do any of the young girls scrub the floors in the factory? A.—Yes; but they are paid extra for doing so.

Q.—Are those young girls who do so on piece work or paid by the week? A.—They are generally strippers.

Q.—Were they ever fined because they did not do it, or threatened that they must do it? A.—No; we cannot compel them to do it. They are simply asked to do it, and they are paid for it.

Q.—And they have always been found willing to do it as over-time? A.—Yes; to my knowledge; that is, if they have been unwilling, I do not know it.

Q.—Would it be considered a cause for discharging them if they did not do it? A.—Not at all. In stripping tobacco it is not like any other part of the work; it can probably be taught within half an hour or an hour, while for other portions of the work the hands must serve a regular time.

Q.—You have said that \$4.50 per week is the lowest wages received by a young

woman during those months? A.—You asked me in regard to young women rolling cigars. I was telling you the smallest amount received in those two months, two months in the winter and two months in the summer.

Q.—Can you tell me how many hands are displaced by one mould in making cigars? A.—No; I could not.

Q.—How many cigars would an ordinary hand turn out in a day by moulds?

A.—They turn out all the way from 400 to 900, the number depending on how they work.

Q.—An ordinary hand doing an ordinary amount of work? A.—400 or 500, and some will turn out a great many more and some less.

HENRY HART, Manager of Jacob & Co.'s, Cigar Factory, Montreal, called and sworn :

By MR. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—How long have you been Manager of the establishment of Jacob & Co. ?
A.—Nearly four years.

Q.—Have you recently taken in any apprentices? A.—We never have had any apprentices.

Q.—Have you recently taken in any journeymen? A.—We took an apprentice, or rather there was a boy or young man came from Grothé's to our place and, the fact is, he did not know his trade.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you know he came from Grothé's? A.—I have the word of the young lad.

Q.—The young man may never have been there? A.—He said he was.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Did you ask the boy where he was employed last? A.—A gentleman came on behalf of his nephew to get him a job as an apprentice. We told him we never employed apprentices. He said the boy had worked at the trade, I think, four years.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Don't tell us what the boy said; we want your knowledge? A.—I never worked with the boy; I have only got the boy's statement.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Did the boy go to you as a journeyman? A.—He came to me with the intention of learning his trade.

Q.—To your knowledge, as a practical man, do you not think that boy was sufficiently instructed in cigar making, seeing he had been four years at the trade? A.—He had not, from the fact that he wanted to serve his time over again so as to learn hand making, so I do not think he had much knowledge of the business, or could make a living at it.

Q.—How many journeymen have you in your shop? A.—We have about 64 or 65 or nearly 70 men, somewhere in that neighborhood.

Q.—Are the men searched on leaving your establishment? A.—No.

Q.—How many young women have you? A.—We must have in the neighborhood of 25 in all branches of the business.

Q.—Is there a uniform scale of wages in connection with the different grades of cigars made in your establishment? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that the scale of wages prescribed by the organisation in this city? A.—Yes; and more.

Q.—All round? A.—Yes; all round.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest girl in your employ? A.—There is not a girl in our employ but is verging on womanhood.

Q.—What is the average wages a woman earns? A.—I don't think I ever averaged them. They are on piece work and some of them are much more skilful than others, and some will earn more and some less. We have women who earn \$6.00, \$5.00 and \$4.00 and \$3.50; they run from \$5.00 to \$12.00. We pay the best price in town, too.

Q.—Are they employed at night work? A.—We employ no young woman at that.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Why? Do they not make as good cigars as men? A.—To my personal knowledge I don't think they do, and consequently we don't engage them at the higher grades. We have all Union men.

Q.—Could you not have Union women? A.—I never came across any of them.

(Translation.)

OVIDE GROTHÉ, Cigar Manufacturer, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You are a cigar manufacturer? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You employ apprentices? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How many apprentices have you at present? A.—I have just now about twelve or fifteen apprentices. I spent the summer with about eight or ten apprentices.

Q.—How many journeymen have you? A.—The journeymen are in a great majority over the apprentices.

Q.—Can you give us the number, or thereabouts? A.—I can give you the most convincing proof. I have the pay list right here. According to the pay list I find that I have over thirty journeymen.

Q.—How do you engage your apprentices; is it by contract? A.—Yes; here is a copy of the engagement. They are all alike.

Q.—Have you a foreman in your establishment? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is it your foreman who has control over the apprentices? A.—I look to them almost as much as he does.

Q.—You have, as in other tobacco factories, what is called a warming room? A.—Yes, sir, I have.

Q.—Have you ever shut up an apprentice in that chamber? A.—Yes, sir, but I assume that you will allow me to give the reason why I did it.

Q.—Do you know the name of this apprentice? A.—Yes, sir; his name is Lefebvre, and not Enault, as he said it was. The reason why I shut up this boy was that, at noon, being the dinner hour, all the hands were in the shop having their dinner, and I have not one of the first establishments of the city, the girls are somewhat mingled with the men. Well, this boy, after he got through his dinner, he had finished one of the first, and others were still eating, while it is the habit among the hands to keep around the stove, this boy unbuttoned his trousers and exposed his person, urinating on the stove. I was informed of the fact, and my foreman came up in great wrath over the fact. Then we took this boy and set him in this room, of which you have before spoken, and I sent for his father. To the best of my knowledge, either the father was not at home, or the boy whom I had sent, did

not find the house, the father did not come that afternoon, but he came the next morning. Then, the following morning, after I had told the father the facts, as they had taken place, the boy himself acknowledged the deed to his father, he requested me to undress his son, if I had a place to put him, and to give him a good lacing. I then told the father that I had no such place, and besides it was his business and not mine. The father then urged me to have his boy arrested. I told him I thought a good hiding from him would answer just as well. The father told me he promised it him for that evening, and I think he got it. Later, this young man was sentenced to four years imprisonment by police magistrate Dugas.

Q.—How long is that ago? A.—About four years ago.

Q.—Was it for this offence that he was arrested and sentenced? A.—No; it was for having stolen, but not at my place.

Q.—How old was the child? A.—That boy must have been fifteen years old.

Q.—How long did he stop in that detention room of yours? A.—He must have stopped there a couple of hours, but I noticed that the room was not warm.

Q.—At what hour of the day was it? A.—It was after d'inner, about one or half-past.

R.—Do you use this chamber continually? Have you always tobacco in preparation there? A.—No.

Q.—Are you sure that the room was not heated that day? A.—Yes; I am sure

Q.—Do you fine your apprentices sometimes? A.—No sir. That may have happened to me sometimes, in the earlier days, but I had delicacy enough to restore these fines to the parents, though some of the hands, and I myself, on one occasion, remitted a fine to the father of a child, a certain Mr. Latendresse.

Q.—Are you certain of having returned all the fines imposed by you? A.—I assure you that I did not impose enough of them to have many left unredeemed.

Q.—How do you correct a youth in your establishment, that does not do his duty? A.—I have used gentleness as much as might be—a habit with me was to send a boy home sometimes, when he would not mind me. I would send him back to his people asking him to bring his father with him.

Q.—When you did not do that, what did you do? A.—It was my habit always to do that—send the child back to his home.

Q.—No child was ever struck in your factory? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Might children be beaten in your establishment without your knowledge? A.—That might happen, as I am not always in the factory. There are times when I am absent.

Q.—Are you aware that any children were beaten at your factory? A.—It happened that I received complaints two or three times, but no great harm had been done. I understand by "beating" having the ears pulled or the cheeks boxed.

Q.—If there was no harm done, why did the children complain? A.—You know as well as I do, I presume, and it is a thing which there is no need of teaching you, that there are plenty of children who whimper about nothing, often, and very often, too, complain about very little. I think that if you have children in your family you must have the same experience.

Q.—Do you know Mr. Auguste Duval? A.—Yes; he served his apprenticeship with me.

Q.—Auguste Duval has sworn that he had been badly beaten twice by your foreman for having talked? A.—This is what astonished me the most when I read it in the *Star* last night.

Q.—You do not know whether he was beaten or not? A.—Not to my knowledge. I did not see it.

Q.—Might not this case of Auguste Duval have been one of those which came to your knowledge, that is, might he not have complained that he had been beaten? A.—No; he never complained. Mr. Duval, whom I have myself protected very often, whom I have sometimes led, bare-headed in the streets, to shield him, not from

the foremen, but from the blows of his comrades at work—he never complained. He is here present, and I challenge him to deny it. He is a young fellow for whom I have cared as his own father would, and not have done more. As I have said, I led, not once only, but several times, and there is my brother-in-law in the factory, who led him too, even to his own home, in order to shield him, not from his boss or his foreman, but from his own fellow workmen. Now, if you will allow me, I will relate a fact to show you that I never persecuted Mr. Duval. One evening he had been charged with stealing, not his own cigars on his own table, but with stealing, through a broken window, from the packing room. There were one or two boxes of cigars emptied that evening. This young man was accused, along with several others, of this theft, and, to my great surprise, when I reached home for tea in the evening his father and mother were already there. They were quite pained, and the father asked my forgiveness for his son. Then I acted according to my habit. I never had an apprentice arrested on a charge of my own, and I forgave him that day for that deed, and many others besides.

Q.—Did he say that he was guilty that day? A.—Nobody confessed to me his guilt. They accused one another. But I tell you that I forgave that day in my own house without even having seen the youth.

Q.—You cannot say that he is a thief? A.—I could not find out who was the thief, but, all the same, my two boxes of cigars were gone.

Q.—It has been said here that all the hands who have given evidence here were thieves. Your evidence would lead to the conclusion that Mr. Duval is a thief. Now, I take it that the duty of the Commission is to learn whether the witnesses who came here are thieves or not. My question is very simple. On your oath, did Mr. Duval steal on that day? A.—I did not say that he had stolen on that day, but I declare that he stole cigars in my factory. Now, I may have two or three witnesses who told me he did steal on that day. But, as to other occasions, I am positive.

Q.—What did you do when he stole cigars? A.—I threatened to have him arrested. I threatened him in every possible way.

Q.—How many cigars did he steal? A.—He stole five or six, seven or eight, three or four, at different times. He owned that to me himself on the day the box of cigars was stolen.

Q. I see, by your contract, that you set the wages of apprentices for the week, during the first, second and third year? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you pay these wages regularly? A.—No, sir. I have here the pay list from the 31st July to the 31st December.

Q.—I do not care to have details of your private affairs. I want to know what principle you carry out in your factory? A.—I carry out a principle to encourage all my men to do their work.

Q.—There is an agreement in which you say: "This engagement is made at the rate of one dollar a week for the first year, of one dollar and a half for the second year, and of two dollars a week for the third year?" A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Will that youth who signed this contract receive, in no matter what circumstance, the wages set down in this contract, provided he does his duty? A.—They have always got them from me. They never received less than the wages set down in the contract, and there are some who have received three times, four times, and five times more than is here agreed upon. The witness Duval said, yesterday, that he had done work of two dollars a week, and that he had to make twelve hundred cigars, by dint of hard work, to get those two dollars from me. Now, I find here, on the list in my hands, that he made twelve hundred cigars in one week, that he lost two days in the week yet he drew three dollars for that week. Further, I find that a Mr. Alary, having one year of apprenticeship less than Mr. Duval, with wages at only one dollar and a half a week, got from me for his week, having worked four evenings, I believe, up till ten o'clock, eight dollars and ninety cents (8.90). As you see, this young man does nothing less than double and triple his wages. All his weeks are of five or six dollars, and if you look over this list you will find plenty more, whom I might name, and who are in the same position.

Q.—At what hour does work begin in your factory? A.—At half past seven in the winter.

Q.—And in summer? A.—At seven o'clock.

Q.—How old was the young Alary whom you speak of? A.—That young man must have been about sixteen or seventeen years of age.

Q.—Do you think that the health of an apprentice of sixteen or seventeen years is not put in danger by working three or four days a week from seven o'clock in the morning till ten at night? A.—If he worked continually thus, I should say "yes," but this has happened only three or four times since I have opened shop. This summer I think we have worked two weeks at night.

Q.—Do you take in apprentices to teach them the trade suitably at the same time that you do them a service, or to make them toil as workingmen? A.—My intention is to make workmen of them.

Q.—But to make them labour as workingmen? A.—What do you mean by "making them labour as workingmen?"

Q.—I mean this: According to your apprenticeship agreement the young man enters your factory to learn his trade, and the text says: "And the said sieur Grothé binds himself to teach the said minor, in the best way he can, during the said term, his trade of cigar manufacturer, and to show him progressively and completely, in such manner as to furnish him with the means of becoming a good mechanic, to act toward him as a good father of a family, and to oversee his behavior, and finally to employ him only in the work and services belonging to the trade of cigar manufacturer and within the bounds of his strength." Do you believe it is the business of a workingman to labour in any way, or under any circumstances, till ten o'clock at night? A.—Under any circumstances, no, sir; but I would have you observe that when these men, during these two weeks, worked at night, they were free to do so or not to do so. None of them were obliged to do the work.

Q.—Do you impose any tasks upon your apprentices? A.—There is no obligation, but to encourage my apprentices I do impose tasks upon them, and ask them to make a certain number of cigars, saying: "Make so many cigars, and all above that number I will pay so much, according to the quality of the cigars." If they made less than the number set down in the task, as, for instance, Mr. Alary, of whom I just spoke, if he made less than his task, I would lower him in consequence by the fact that I reward him when he makes more. The reason is that if he makes less than his task, he either loses his time or does less on purpose.

Q.—But in the case of a youth, less endowed than the Mr. Alary of whom you speak, and who does his best to fulfil his task, what would you do, or what do you do, if he fails? A.—I can show you whole lists of apprentices who never fulfilled their tasks during their apprenticeship, and who received their wages every week. They never had one cent less. If you allow me, I can cite you two or three instances of men called "slow," who cannot accomplish their task. I offered them their liberty, because I saw they were not men able to become good cigar-makers and earn a living. They were not men to make cigars, for to make a livelihood out of cigar manufacture requires speed.

Q.—What is the health state of your factory? A.—I look upon it as very good, seeing that we have the visit of the agents of the Health Office five or six times a year. I believe we had a call from them no later than yesterday.

Q.—Have you closets separated for men and girls? A.—No, sir. I am not the landlord of the building I use.

Q.—How many closets have you got? A.—I have two closets; but the girls work on the fourth flat and there are none there. They find it rather far to go down to the cellar for that purpose, and they prefer going to the closet on the third floor, where the men go. But many of the men very often go down to the cellar.

Q.—But the girls have to pass through the men's rooms to get to the closets?

A.—Yes, sir,

Q.—There is no partition between them? A.—There is the desk at the entrance of the stairway, where the foreman stands, and the girls pass behind this desk to reach the closets, which are three or four steps off.

Q.—Have a certain number of men left you? A.—Yes; last Saturday.

Q.—What was the cause of their leaving? A.—Lowering of wages.

Q.—What was the reduction a thousand? A.—One dollar.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Has your factory been able to turn out good men for the trade after three years of service? A.—As good as any other factory of Montreal.

Q.—How many cigar-makers have you at present in your employ? A.—I have a few less since Saturday, but, during the whole of the summer, I had from eighty to ninety hands.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest girl in your factory? A.—I never inquired, but when the Health Officer came yesterday, they told me, and, I think, the youngest they found was fifteen or sixteen years of age.

Q.—What is the average of girls whom you look upon as good workers? A.—I have girls making five or six, and seven or eight, and even up to ten dollars a week. I can prove this by my pay-sheet. There are others who make less; for instance: those who separate the stalks from the leaves make only four or four and a half dollars a week.

Q.—What is the proportion of girls making five dollars a week? A. I have never had more than four or five girls working at cigars for me. At present I have only three.

Q.—I should like to have new explanations on that heating room. Is tobacco always kept in that room? A.—No, sir; very seldom.

Q.—How many times a week do you use it just now? A.—We are sometimes several weeks without using it.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you not deal rather in tobacco leaves than in the making of cigars? A.—No; I am merely a cigar manufacturer.

(Translation.)

EDWARD GREAVES, carpenter, of Montreal. sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are a carpenter? A.—Yes, sir; I work in a saw mill.

Q.—How old are you? A.—I am going on twenty-three.

Q.—At what age did you begin working in a saw-mill? A.—At the age of ten years and a half.

Q.—Have you ever been hurt at your work? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How old were you when first hurt? A.—I was going on fourteen years; I was not that yet.

Q.—Will you show us how you were wounded? A.—I had the forefinger and thumb of the left hand cut off.

Q.—Will you tell us how your came to get wounded? A.—I was wounded on a round saw in sawing pieces of wood twelve feet in length. It is the work of two men and I was doing it alone.

Q.—Had you been working long at the round saw? A.—Yes.

Q.—Were you at all at fault in the accident? A.—It was no fault of mine. I

was put there to work. I was engaged and was bound to listen to the commands which were given me.

Q.—How much were you making at that time? A.—One dollar and a half a week.

Q.—Did you get any compensation from the firm for which you worked? A.—Not at all.

Q.—Does your mutilation prevent you to day from earning as much as you would earn if your hand were whole? A.—No. Because now I am used to it.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—When you were hurt, were you pushing the timber toward the saw, or were you drawing it to the other side? A.—I was pushing it because I was alone.

Q.—Were you alone to supply the wood? A.—Yes.

Q.—And you say that that work required two men? A.—Usually, to saw twelve foot lumber two men are needed. It generally takes one man to draw it to the other side.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Was there a guard behind the saws? A.—No.

—

Translation.

CHARLES LABELLE, Carpenter, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How old are you? A.—Sixteen years of age.

Q.—How old were you when you began to work in a saw-mill? A.—At the age of nine years.

Q.—Were you ever hurt? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How old were you when you got hurt? A.—Fourteen.

Q.—It is two years since you were hurt? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Will you show us your wound? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You had the fore and middle finger of the right hand cut off? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Will you tell us how you came to get hurt? A.—I was pushing a piece of timber and, in turning my head, my hand slipped on a knife of the boss-planer.

Q.—Did you get any compensation from the firm for which you worked? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How much? A.—Three dollars a week.

Q.—You received three dollars a week for how long? A.—For the whole time that I could not work.

Q.—But you received no compensation for the loss of your two fingers? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you go to the hospital? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How much were you making when hurt? A.—Three dollars a week.

Q.—They paid you your week? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—By whose orders were you working at the machine? A.—I was working of my own accord. I was fixing a saw, and I passed a piece of wood into the boss-planer, to fix my saw. Nobody had told me to work there. I worked of my own will.

Q.—Do you know whether there are young children employed at the same work at the factory, at present? A.—Not directly with me.

JOHN BRENNAN, Stevedore, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—How long have you been a stevedore? A.—About twenty-three years.

Q.—Will you tell us about the rate of wages prevailing in summer in this port, at your work? A.—There is a little difference in prices in different ports.

Q.—What are the Montreal rates? A.—There are in fact a couple or three rates; there are different rates for different classes of work.

Q.—What is the rate for handling dry goods for instance, discharging steamers inwards? A.—From \$1.75 to as high as \$2.00 to ordinary workingmen.

Q.—For how many hours? A.—That is upwards of 20 cents per hour, from 17½ to 20 cents.

Q.—What is the highest rate paid for that kind of work? A.—I don't know any difference.

Q.—Do you do much Sunday work here in your business? A.—Yes; occasionally considerable.

Q.—What rates of pay do you give on Sundays? A.—In some cases they get a time and a half in other cases not more.

Q.—Is there a good excuse for working on steamers on Sunday here? A.—I suppose the question of the mighty dollar comes in, in a good many cases.

Q.—What are the rates of wages per hour that grain trimmers receive? A.—There is not much difference more than at other jobs. There are some cases in which we have to pay an increase, according to the position in which we are placed.

Q.—How many hours are those men down in the hold of the steamer at work trimming grain? A.—It depends on the quantity of grain taken into the compartments.

Q.—As a general rule how many hours are they down without coming up into the atmosphere? A.—I suppose, on an average, about five hours.

Q.—What class of men are required to do this grain trimming; can an ordinary workman do it? A.—Not exactly an ordinary workman. Of course there are hundreds of workmen who cannot stand it constantly.

Q.—It requires then, a very strong man, and a man with strong lungs to go down and do that kind of work I suppose? A.—I should say so. Many men are sent by it to an early grave.

Q.—In regard to working at other cargoes; have you found men to work 20, 30 or 40 hours on a stretch? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many hours can a man work and be in fair condition? A.—To my mind, after a man has worked ten hours steadily at the different classes of work around the wharf, he should quit for he has done enough.

Q.—Are not those men engaged by the month; or are there lots of men engaged by the month around the wharves of Montreal? A.—I have heard of men being engaged by the Allan Company by the month—but not exactly by the month according to my understanding of it. They are engaged perhaps by the month, but they are paid by the hour.

Q.—Do you not think that ship owners would gain something by having fresh reliefs of men, changing them every ten hours, instead of one gang working 30 or 40 hours at a stretch? A.—I cannot say it would be any actual gain to the ship for this reason; the night work is done with a view to saving the time of the ship.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Yes; but could not this be done with relays of men? A.—The work would be better done.

Q.—And would not more be done? A.—Yes; more would be done in a given time.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Do you know anything about accidents that have occurred around the wharves where incompetent men have been set to work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Please relate some of those accidents? A.—In fact, to my mind, the majority of the accidents that happen around the wharves are through neglect.

Q.—Neglect on the part of the men working? A.—That partly is to blame for it, and partly employers and the material used.

Q.—Do you know anything about the inspection of the loading of ships? A.—A little.

Q.—Are there people appointed for that purpose? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do they do their duty? A.—In all cases? I would not like to swear positively in regard to that matter.

Q.—About the lining of a ship; is that looked after properly in a ship taking grain? A.—To my mind it is not in all cases.

Q.—Do you know of any casualty through the neglect of proper inspection of that kind? A.—I cannot refer to any special casualty this last while back on that line, but serious damage has happened to cargoes sometimes from such neglect.

Q.—When a man has worked for a long number of hours is he not inclined to drink after that time, and is he not very tired? A.—There can be no doubt that a man wants something to keep his spirits up, and I suppose there is a great tendency to take something stimulating.

Q.—Do you know anything about the condition of a ship's hold? Is its condition not very unhealthy sometimes? A.—In some cases it is almost insufferable.

Q.—But have not those men who work at grain to use some appliance when they go down? A.—Sometimes men carry a sponge over their mouths, others tie a handkerchief around their mouths, and nostrils; they have different appliances to try to prevent the dust from getting into their lungs.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Is there any competent appliance for that purpose? A.—Not what I would call a right patent; it is possible, no doubt, to get such a thing, but it is not generally in use here; in fact it is not sought for.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Do you know anything about the loading of cattle in this port? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you tell us whether any accidents have been caused through cattle being run across the wharves? A.—Do you mean in regard to loss of life?

Q.—Take first loss of cattle. A.—I have no direct knowledge of any human life being lost through the driving of cattle along the tracks.

Q.—Accident to human life? A.—I have known of people getting hurt by being jammed in owing to the rush of cattle.

Q.—Have you ever known of cattle put on board steamers before they were ready to leave port? A.—Very frequently.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Many of them the day before the vessel left port? A.—Yes.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Do you know the difference in the "Longshoremen's" pay as between this port and other ports? A.—I am perfectly sure there is a vast difference.

Q.—Between what ports? A.—Take New York for instance.

Q.—What is the difference in New York? A.—Labouring men as a general rule receive 40 cents per hour.

Q.—For the same class of work as is done here? A.—Ship work in all ports of the world is pretty much the same. Of course there are different cargoes.

By Mr. CLARKE :—

Q.—Is there a distinction between steamships and sailing vessels? A.—As a general rule, there is not much difference between one pound and two pounds.

Q.—Is there not a distinction here between steamship and sailing vessels in regard to loading and discharging, a different rate of wages paid per hour? A.—I have never found any difference.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—How often are the men paid around Montreal? A.—That is a question that is rather hard to answer, because I have paid men fifty times a day. Not to one individual but to several men.

Q.—Are they paid every week? A.—They are supposed to be paid every week but it is not so, there are exceptions.

Q.—When are they paid, every fortnight? A.—They get it when convenience suits.

Q.—Is it not an established rule in many places that work is just done through two, six or three hours? A.—There are some cases in which it happens in that way.

Q.—And a certain class of men take advantage of that kind of thing to make thirty or forty cents and “blow” it out? A.—That is an outside question.

Q.—Do you not know that to be the case? A.—You mean to ask if there are men here who work a couple of hours for the sake of getting thirty or forty cents for the satisfaction of drinking it.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You were asked if you did not know that men work two or three hours and get paid for that time, and then go and spend it for liquor? A.—I have known that to happen.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Would it not be a just way to pay once a week? A.—The system is so irregular, that there are no steady jobs, and the consequence is that this handling of money frequently has a tendency to demoralize a man.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—In loading grain do you have a special class of men for that work or has an ordinary man to go and load grain? A.—There is no special class of men for that purpose, but in fact we have to take men against their will, and almost force them to go because necessity compels us to do it. It is not every man who can load grain.

Q.—If a man knows he is physically unable to load grain, and refuses to go and do the work, do you place him at some work? A.—I would soon dispense with him.

Q.—Is he discharged? A.—As opportunity requires he has got to go.

Q.—What makes this loading of grain so severe on the men? A.—To my mind, it is the dust and the mixed substances that are through the grain. For instance, grain is perhaps heated on the way, and lime may be added to bring it back to its original state, and of course this, with the dust and smut in the grain, has a pretty bad effect on the human system.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Is there not a bad smell sometimes to the grain? A.—Yes; if it is in an unbound condition.

Q.—If it is heated, is there not a very strong and disagreeable smell? A.—The heat is not so bad as the dust.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Could not some system of relieving the men in the hold be adopted? A.—Yes.

Q.—Has it ever been tried? A.—I don't think it has to any great extent. I know one system that would get rid of a great deal of the trouble, but it would be more expensive to the trade; that is, to put the grain in bags.

Q.—And carry it on board? A.—Yes; I mean to store it as a cargo in bags instead of in bulk.

Q.—What precautions are taken at the present time against a cargo of grain shifting? A.—It all depends on what kind of a cargo goes on top of it.

Q.—In loading vessels with grain precautions are taken to prevent the cargo shifting? A.—If the vessel is loaded in bulk, entirely with grain, the first precaution is the system of lining, and the next is the system of trimming. These are the only two precautions.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—What is trimming? A.—To fill a space as nearly as possible to what it will contain.

Q.—Do you not put in cross-boards in the lining to prevent the grain from shifting? A.—I here are shifting boards as a general rule. They are in connection with the lining.

Q.—If you only put a small quantity of grain in a general cargo, on top, you have no need for shifting boards, I believe? A.—It all depends on the quantity of grain. A certain quantity of loose grain can be carried with safety with a sufficient amount of top weight.

Q.—Must not a vessel carrying grain as cargo have boards to prevent it from shifting? A.—Yes; the law requires shifting boards in each compartment where bulk grain is carried.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are those shifting boards always put in in cargoes of wheat? A.—Generally so.

Q.—Have you known them to be left out where the grain was in bulk? A.—No.

Q.—Have you known shifting boards to be left out where a vessel had been loaded with grain only? A.—No; not to my knowledge.

Q.—How long are the longshoremen generally engaged in the port of Montreal, and by whom? A.—By stevedores, as a general rule. Sometimes the stevedores employ foremen, and sometimes they engage the men. In fact, the way things have been going lately, it was not much trouble to engage men during the past two or three years.

Q.—Do the stevedores have contracts from the steamboat companies or do they work on their own account? A.—Sometimes the stevedores are engaged by shipping agents here. At other times they just take up jobs.

Q.—The men who are regularly engaged by the season, how are they paid? A.—I don't know any men regularly engaged by the season. If you mean stevedores I can answer that. They are paid by the ton.

Q.—No; I mean longshoremen? A.—I don't know of any engaged by the season.

By Mr. HELBRONNE:—

Q.—Is it within your knowledge that men have been paid to work on Sunday when it was not necessary to do so? A.—To my mind Sunday labor is only done in case of necessity.

Q.—Is it within your knowledge that men have been paid to work on Sunday when the ship did not leave port until, say the Tuesday following? A.—Yes.

Q.—In your opinion could not the work have been done as well on the Monday morning as on Sunday? A.—In my opinion a great deal better.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that men have worked 50 or 55 hours without rest? A.—Yes.

Q.—Were those men fit to work after that time? A.—No; they were not.

Q.—By compelling men to work 50 or 55 hours is there not danger of accident and damage in many ways? A.—In my opinion, to a great extent.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Have the Municipal authorities done anything in regard to Sunday work? A.—I cannot say that they have.

Q.—Is there no special law to prevent it? A.—We have a Sunday here; but in regard to shipping, in some cases, there is no Sunday.

Q.—Then practically, there is no Sunday for shipping in Montreal? A.—Practically, it is abolished to a great extent.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—From your experience is not Sunday morning work liable to induce men to drink? A.—I think it has a tendency to cause men to drink, because after a man breaks the Sabbath, he does not care what he does after that.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Are there taverns at which he could drink? A.—I think that is a question I should not answer.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—In your opinion are all precautions taken in the port of Montreal to protect the lives of longshoremen? A.—No.

Q.—Are you acquainted with the facts relating to an accident that occurred this summer to a man named Bergeron? A.—I was not present at the accident, but from information I received, I know something about it.

Q.—The manner in which a cargo is loaded is of vital importance to the safety of the ship, I believe? A.—Most decidedly so.

Q.—Does a cargo which has been improperly placed on board a ship endanger the lives of the passengers and the crew? A.—Most decidedly so.

Q.—In your opinion are men working twenty-four hours and even fifty hours at a stretch, as has happened, say, in the port of Montreal, able to place a cargo as it should be on board a ship? A.—Not in as good a condition as if those men were in their proper senses.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—How do you infer that those men would not be in their senses at that time? A.—I give that opinion from my own experience. I can say, that after a given time, for want of sleep, I am not in a proper state of mind or of feeling.

Q.—For the storing of cargoes? A.—Yes; or any other purpose.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You have been questioned in regard to the danger to which men are exposed from the dust in grain? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any suggestion to make to the Commission with a view to remedying that evil? A.—I am given to understand, of course, that there is a law in Canada as regards dust in factories endangering the health of employees, and I cannot see why that law should not be made applicable to the ports of this Dominion for all purposes.

Q.—Is it possible to apply other means known to you, to prevent the dust from reaching the lungs of the laborers? A.—There are; but they are cumbersome and expensive ones.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you think it would be almost impossible to apply them? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What means would you suggest to be applied? A.—There could be a suit adapted to the purpose, but, of course, men would suffer for the want of the full amount of air while they would be engaged in the work. It is possible to make a man dust-proof from the top of his head to his big toe.

Q.—In the loading of grain, could not certain arrangements be made so as to allow dust to settle? A.—Yes; there could be. That, of course, would afford a certain measure of relief.

Q.—How many hours more would be required for the work? A.—It might make a difference in that respect. I could not answer that question directly, but I would say that it would all depend upon the amount of bulk grain that went in to the compartments.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Are the stevedores who work on the vessels, in the port of Montreal, always competent men? A.—Not in all cases.

Q.—If a stevedore is not a competent man, who is controlling the loading of those vessels, is there not great danger attached to the work, especially to the men's lives? A.—Most decidedly so.

Q.—Do you know, as a fact, that there are any incompetent men engaged in that business? A.—Yes.

Q.—Does that frequently happen? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the reason it happens; is it because competent men are not on hand at the time, or are those men obtained for any special purpose? A.—There are several reasons that I might assign.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are any incompetent men engaged with a view to saving money? A.—That is a question I would not like to undertake to answer.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Yet you say there are incompetent men engaged for the purpose? A.—I say so from my experience.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are the men properly paid for their work? A.—I think that is rather a strange question to ask me. I think it is a question you should not press me on.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you object to answer it? A.—I don't seriously object, if I am asked to answer it.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Is it not more injurious to the constitution to work on grain in the hold of a vessel, than on coal? A.—It is a great deal more dangerous.

Q.—Why is work on coal less injurious than work on grain? A.—I have already explained that there is a certain per centage of matter injurious to the constitution, contained in grain, that there is not in coal. I know I would prefer to work twenty hours right along in coal dust, to working two hours in grain dust.

Q.—Has organization in your industry, a tendency to improve the condition of the working man, or to demoralize it? A.—It has a tendency to improve them.

Q.—Will you tell us some of the leading reasons for that? A.—I have known since there has been organization among the men in Montreal, around the Harbor and shipping especially, that the men entertain a great deal better feeling towards each other, and there have been no differences of any kind this last year or so. I would lay that to the credit of organization.

Q.—Have you had any labor difficulty in connection with the "longshoremen" in Montreal? A.—Not last year. There have been some I have heard of—what I hear I take for what it is worth.

Q.—The men are organized here? A.—Partly; not thoroughly.

Q.—Is it a cardinal principle with labor organization that the men should resort to arbitration rather than go on strike? A.—That is what they would like to do.

Q.—And they always ask for arbitration in case of trouble? A.—I find since the organization has been in force among the men around the wharves, that it is very easy to settle a difficulty as regards an employer and the men.

10th February.

R. A. SMITH, of Messrs. H. & A. Allan, Montreal, called and sworn:—

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—You are manager of the Allan line I believe? A.—No; I am a member of the firm of H. & A. Allan, and general agent of the Allan line.

Q.—How many months in the year do steamers run to this port? A.—From six and a half to seven months.

Q.—What is the total number of arrivals of your steamers the season past? A.—I am afraid I cannot tell you that.

Q.—About how many? A.—Upwards of 70 I think.

Q.—Has ocean carrying increased within the last ten years, inwards? A.—I think it is safe to say that it has increased within the past ten years.

Q.—Have the ocean rates for the carriage of those cargoes decreased or increased in that time? A.—Decreased materially.

Q.—In regard to outward cargoes; have outward cargoes, from here and cargoes from the west, increased, I mean the total volume? A.—It has increased in volume.

Q.—And have the rates increased or decreased? A.—The rates have decreased.

Q.—Your steamers, I believe, carry a lot of cattle during the summer months? A.—They do.

Q.—In Toronto, Alderman Franklin of that city, who claims to be the originator of the cattle trade, stated that cattle in this port were handled very badly, very roughly and were placed on board steamers before the proper hour, and that a number of cattle had been lost through that cause. Is there any truth in that statement? A.—In reply to that I would state in a general way, that I think the mortality on the Allan line of steamers has been lower than it has been on almost any other line, and possibly by any other route.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You cannot speak of the treatment of cattle on other lines? A.—I cannot.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—In regard to the cattle pens or stalls on board of your vessels, are they up to the standard in your estimation? A.—In regard to that I would suggest that you should examine Captain Barclay, our superintendent, whom I have asked to be present on this occasion, as he is more familiar with those facts than I am. I have no personal knowledge of the loading and handling of cattle on board ship.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Have you any knowledge of the condition in which the cattle reach the wharves? A.—No; not any personal knowledge.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Your firm I believe, employs a large number of men in the summer months? A.—A large number of laborers.

Q.—Have you any idea of the number engaged by your firm? A.—In regard to that also, I would say, that I have caused our paymaster, Mr. Urquhart, to be present and he will be in a position to supply you with reliable information of that character.

Q.—Can you tell us if you have received many garnishees through the office on the wages of your employees? A.—Not many.

Q.—About Sunday labor; is there much Sunday labor done in connection with your business? A.—Very little, and only under emergency.

Q.—It has been customary for several seasons past, I believe, for you to allow your men to work on your steamers in American ports? A.—No; at the close of the season it has been our practice to allow such as desired, to proceed to Portland to seek employment there from our contractors, to be furnished with passes to Portland, and with passes on their return; but we hold no interest in those men in any other way.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You merely allow them to do the best for themselves? A.—Yes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—In regard to the garnisheeing of your men, are the men paid weekly, fortnightly or monthly? A.—Our rule is to pay the men after the steamer leaves the port, and our payments are practically made two or three times a week.

Q.—Are the men discharged from the employ of the Company if they receive many garnishees? A.—No; we have never taken any action of that kind.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are the men who have charge of the loading of your vessels required to sign any contract with the Allan Company? A.—It has been our practice for the past two or three years to employ a certain number of men who are known as contract men. To those men we guarantee steady employment at the rate of 20 cents per hour, and last season we paid steady men who have been in our employ, under a similar contract, the previous year, a premium of one dollar per week at the end of the season.

Q.—Those men are obliged to sign the contract before they get that steady employment? A.—Not at all.

Q.—They are not obliged to sign it? A.—No; it is entirely optional with them.

Q.—Have you ever known cases where the paymaster went to men's houses to coerce them to sign the contract? A.—I have no knowledge of such a thing.

Q.—Where men are engaged to work on vessels on the river, is their time, going and returning, allowed them? A.—In regard to that, I presume Mr. Urquhart, our paymaster, will be able to give you the information. I am unable to speak in regard to that; but I believe they are.

Q.—Have the men ever expressed any dissatisfaction in regard to those contracts? A.—No.

Q.—Did you have some difficulty in getting men to work on your vessels some time ago? A.—We have never had any difficulty, to my knowledge, since the strike of 1881.

Q.—Where did you get men on that occasion to work your vessels? A.—We

employed the crews of vessels, and also employed such men as were willing to work for the wages we offered.

Q.—Did you not bring men from the old country to take the place of strikers here? A.—Not on that occasion.

Q.—Did you not do so on a previous occasion? A.—No; we did subsequently, in order to avoid the difficulties and loss which had attended the strike of the preceding year and previous strikes.

Q.—Did those men give general satisfaction who were brought out here? A.—In so far as I know, yes.

Q.—Did you ever hear of a foreman being discharged, who stated those men were not satisfactory? A.—No.

Q.—Is there any percentage of the wages kept off those contract men to the end of the season? A.—I shall be very happy to send you a copy of the contract; but I may state in general terms, that those men contract to work with us through the season at twenty cents per hour, we guaranteeing them full work during the period. We retain from their wages ten per cent which becomes forfeited in the event of their failure to complete the contract.

Q.—That is in the event of men leaving the service before the end of the season? A.—That amount is paid them at the end of the season with interest during the time it was in our possession.

Q.—In the event of a man leaving the employment of the Allan Company he would forfeit that amount? A.—It would be at our option whether he forfeited that amount or not.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—If he left you, you would be obliged to try and find some other man whether you wished it or not? A.—Precisely.

Q.—So, you consider the contract is as fair on one side as on the other? A.—We consider the contract to be fair. So far as my knowledge extends, it has been considered so by the workingmen. In regard to it, we have had no complaints, at any time, within my knowledge.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—In the event of any disagreement between the Company and the men, what terms are made to settle the disagreement, and in what way? A.—Our instructions to our Superintendent are, that in the event of any disagreement, the matter has to be referred to the firm.

Q.—Are the men heard in their own behalf? A.—Practically, we have had no complaints.

Q.—At the time of the strike, in 1881, were the men permitted to appear before the firm and plead their own cause? A.—We had no contract men at that time, and at that time we refused to have interviews with the men or their leaders in the matter. We offered certain rates of wages, which were practically the wages of to-day, to such men as were willing to work for us, but we declined to discuss other matters.

Q.—Has the Company ever been accused of not carrying out agreements made with the men? A.—Not within my recollection.

Q.—Would you kindly tell me what class of vessels Sunday labor is employed on? A.—Sunday labor, with us, is only employed in emergencies. Such as a mail steamer being detained on the inward voyage, and it would be necessary to hurry her work in order to ensure her departure on the contract day; or in the fall of the year, when the condition of the weather renders it absolutely necessary.

Q.—Is there any one line of vessels running from Montreal on which Sunday labor is always employed? A.—I can give no information in regard to lines outside of our own.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you, if such a thing happens? A.—I do not.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What is the difference of pay between work on an ordinary working day and on Sunday? A.—The current rate of wages with us is 20 cents per hour, with 5 cents an hour additional when the men are working at grain, and fifty per cent additional is paid for any time the men may be working between midnight on Saturday and midnight on Sunday.

Q.—What will be the difference between the pay in the day time and the night, for over time? A.—We have no difference.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—In your contract you guarantee a certain number of hours' work to your employees? A.—We guarantee those contract men full time, that is, six days, of ten hours each, per week.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—During the whole season? A.—During the whole season.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you pay them whether they work or not? A.—No; but we undertake to furnish them with a sufficiency of work to amount to full time.

Q.—What is the longest number of hours a man has worked at one time without taking any rest? A.—On that point, I would refer you to Captain Barclay, our Superintendent.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that all precautions are taken to ensure the safety of lives of persons employed on your vessels? A.—Our instructions are to that effect.

Q.—Did not an accident happen this year on board one of your vessels while in port? A.—Yes.

Q.—Describe the nature of that accident, and what caused it? A.—In regard to that, I would also refer you to Captain Barclay, as I have no personal knowledge in regard to that matter.

Q.—When your men work at night, does the Company furnish them with their meal? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know how the meal is served? A.—There, again, I must refer you also to our Superintendent.

Q.—Will you tell the Commission how the Company ensures its men against accidents? A.—We effected an arrangement with the Citizen's Insurance Company, by which, for a premium of one per cent, which is deducted from the men's wages, they pay from three to five dollars per week during the disability from accidents incurred in working at ships, and under this policy their families are entitled to \$500 in the event of death resulting from such injuries.

By Mr. FREED:

Q.—In case the injury is permanent, what do they get? A.—We have no provision for that, further than that they are entitled to five dollars per week, under their policy.

Q.—For what number of weeks does such apply? A.—I could not speak on that point without referring to the policy, a copy of which is at your service.

Q.—This amount of one per cent is paid on what system? A.—It is deducted from the men's wages on each pay day, and is paid over by the paymaster to the Insurance Company at stated intervals.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Has your Company any objection to employing men belonging to Labor Organizations? A.—We have no rule in regard to that, so far as I know.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—It might be an understanding by the Company, although there might be no definite rule laid down? A.—We have no objection.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Has there been any attempt made by Union men to prevent non-Union men working on your Line? A.—Not of late years.

Q.—Was there at any time? A.—During the period of the strike, in 1881, such was the case.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Is there any combination between the Steamship Companies of the Dominion, and of the United States, for the purpose of keeping up the rates of freight, or of making a uniform rate of freight? A.—No; I wish to make a statement and it is this: In the evidence of Mr. Brennan, a stevedore, he is reported in the morning papers to have stated that the rate for labor in New York was forty cents per hour. The rate for laborers in New York is twenty-five cents per hour for day work.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you know that as a fact? A.—I know it for a fact; I can produce, if desired, the laborers' vouchers for our steamships in New York.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is that the prevailing rate on all the wharves in New York? A.—So I believe. It is, on the wharves of the large steamship lines I refer to.

Q.—On other lines as well as your own? A.—The large steamship lines.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you believe twenty-five cents in New York is equal to the amount paid men here? A.—Having regard to the expense of living in New York as compared with the cost of living in Montreal, I would say that the rates were about equivalent.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—For how long a period in the year are your men employed in Montreal? A.—During last season for about seven months.

Q.—And what would be the difference in the period of employment between Montreal and New York? A.—In New York ship laborers are employed throughout the year.

Q.—In one case a man gets twenty cents per hour for seven months and in the other case he gets twenty-five cents per hour for work throughout the year? A.—In Montreal he can seek other employment in the winter months. As I have said, many obtain employment at the wharves of the Allan Line at Portland from the contractors for the line there.

THOMAS C. SHAUNNESSY, Assistant General Manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway, called and sworn:—

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How long have you held your present position? A.—About three years.

Q.—What wages do day laborers in eastern Canada, that is, in Ontario and Quebec, receive in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway? A.—From one dollar to one dollar and fifty cents a day, depending on the class of employment and the locality.

Q.—West of Ontario, do they receive higher or lower or the same rates? A.—When we pass Port Arthur and get into the North West, the rates run somewhat higher than that.

Q.—What wages do freight conductors receive? A.—On the Eastern Section of the line our freight conductors earn from \$65 to \$75 per month.

Q.—And what do passenger conductors earn? A.—My impression is that the uniform rate for passenger conductors on the Eastern Section of the Line is \$85 per month.

Q.—And what is the pay of a brakeman on freight trains? A.—They range on the pay roll from \$45 to \$60 per month.

Q.—And what do brakemen on passenger trains receive? A.—About the same.

Q.—How much is paid to your engine drivers? A.—They are paid on schedules of rates, which we have for each section of the line. For instance, on the Quebec Section, between Montreal and Quebec, engine drivers are paid from \$2.40 to \$4.00 per trip.

Q.—And I suppose a trip consists of a day's work? A.—Yes. That is if a passenger train occupies 5 hours or 5½ or 6 hours in making the trip, and that makes a day's work.

Q.—Engine drivers on freight trains, do they work longer hours? A.—Those engine drivers are paid, as a rule, on a mileage basis. Those on mixed and freight trains receive wages ranging from \$2.23 to \$3.77 on what we call our Quebec runs.

Q.—Would that be a fair average of the wages received by drivers in your employ? A.—I think so. I will file with the Commission, if you so desire it, the schedule which shows the rates. It will give the information in a specific form.

Q.—Are accidents to freight brakemen frequent on the Canadian Pacific Railway? A.—Not more frequent than on other lines of the same mileage; not so frequent I would say. Our men escape pretty well.

Q.—What arrangements are made, if any, for compensating those men in case of accident, or their families in case of death? A.—It has been always the policy of the Company to look after its men when they were injured either by their own fault or by the fault of somebody else. In most cases they have been cared for during the time they were sick, either by being allowed their wages or given compensation in some other way. In the event of death in every instance the Board has always given an allowance unless there were some very special reasons for doing otherwise. Up to this time we have never had any insurance system on the road, the Company itself assuming to compensate; but we are now considering the question of establishing an insurance fund.

Q.—There is as yet no fixed sum of which an employee may be assured in case of an accident, or his family may be assured, in case of his death? A.—No. Of course, the claim of the Company is that where a man is injured through his own fault, the Company is not liable; but where a man is injured through the fault of some one else the Company is liable, and the Company must either compensate him or submit to litigation. But notwithstanding the fact that an employee has been injured through his own fault, and the Company is not liable, the policy has been to prevent him from suffering in any event.

Q.—In case of nobody in particular being at fault; for example: the case of a man falling from the roof of a freight car while in motion, have the company, so far, given compensation? A.—Yes. In two cases which came before us within the last two months the company gave compensation in each case.

Q.—Do you think it possible to secure greater safety for the brakemen by placing guards at the side of the freight cars, or in any other position so as to make the men not liable to fall off? A.—I hardly think so. As I noticed it was remarked by another railway man here, we find the men most apt to be injured, are old men on

the road, men who have become careless from long experience, and who take chances that necessarily result in their meeting with an accident sooner or later.

Q.—Still your experience has not been very extensive on this road? A.—No.

Q.—Is that your experience as a railway man throughout? A.—I think I can safely say yes.

Q.—You have had considerable experience as a railway man? A.—Yes. Most of the accidents that occur are to those that have had considerable experience on the road.

Q.—Is it not probable that the most careful, the most experienced or the most inexperienced man may be thrown off the roof of freight cars from losing his footing? A.—The fact remains that when these accidents do occur they are never attributable to any cause of the kind. I have never known of any case on our road during the three years I have been in my present position where a man met with an accident from such a cause.

Q.—Would not it be a comparatively easy matter to place railings along the edge of the roofs of freight cars, extending as high as the top of the brake rod? A.—It could be done.

Q.—The expense would not be great, I suppose? A.—Not materially.

Q.—Would there be any difficulty or objection to it in any other respect? A.—The only difficulty that would occur—and that would not apply if the railing were not carried higher than the brake rod—is that in some localities the men on deck of such a car—is that the railing may be too high; but if it did not come above the brake rod that would not apply, as I have said. I cannot see any special objection.

Q.—Would it be possible for the railway companies to come to an understanding among themselves by which freight cars, that is box cars, would be built of a uniform height? A.—Yes; I think most roads now are building their cars of a uniform height, that is, all ordinary freight cars are practically of the same height. There are special cars, however, refrigerator cars and cars built for a certain class of merchandise, which must of necessity be higher than the ordinary cars.

Q.—Can you tell us what is the average width of the running boards on the freight cars of the Canadian Pacific Railway? A.—About twenty inches.

Q.—Do you think that width sufficient to secure the safety of the men? A.—I think so.

Q.—Do you think it is possible to introduce a coupler for freight cars which will prove safer than the couplers now in use? A.—I hope very much that such a thing will be done. I don't think at the present time it is practicable, for there is not a coupler that meets the requirements of the roads that will accomplish that end at the present time; but all railway men are giving very serious consideration to the introduction of a safety coupler. At the present time the Master Carmen's Association have an expert examining the various couplers that have been devised for the purpose of determining, if possible, on one that will meet the requirements of the road and accomplish that end.

Q.—Do you think that coupler, if one can be fixed upon, will be introduced as soon as the best one is found? A.—I am satisfied it will be.

Q.—Will it be to the interest of the Companies, apart from accidents, to introduce such a coupler? A.—It would be to the interest of the Companies to introduce anything that would insure the safety of their men.

Q.—Do you keep statistics of the accidents connected with the coupling and uncoupling of cars? A.—We keep statistics showing all accidents that occur on the line and giving in detail the causes that led to the accidents.

Q.—Are you able to tell us why the majority of accidents connected with the coupling or uncoupling of cars occurred when the men were coupling or uncoupling them? A.—I am not able to answer that definitely without referring to the records.

Q.—Are the trucks on the freight cars of uniform height? A.—They are on our line.

Q.—Are they on other lines the same height as yours? A.—I think they are about the same height. I don't think there is much difference in the height of trucks for a recently built car, unless it was connected with some coal lines, when they use special cars.

Q.—We have been told by a former witness in some place that one of the difficulties of the introduction of some coupler, was that the trucks were of an unequal height, and consequently the couplers did not meet, and therefore, most of those automatic couplers did not apply, because they would not meet? A.—Yes.

Q.—Would not the railway Companies be able to build cars of a uniform height so that an automatic coupler could be applied? A.—It would be possible; but the fact remains that there are hundreds of thousands of cars that were built ten or twelve years ago, that differ materially from the cars being built now; they have different kinds of springs introduced, and the body of the car sits up on the truck higher or lower than the cars being built at present.

Q.—Still those improvements could be introduced with a view to affording this protection at some future time, if the changes cannot be made at once? A.—I think so.

Q.—Is there any reason why the Miller coupler should not be applied to freight cars, other than its expense? A.—The Miller coupler, taking into consideration the difference of the heights of freight cars, would be harder of application than other couplers, for it has not play enough to allow for the difference in the height of cars.

Q.—Is there any coupler in which that objection could be removed? A.—There is another coupler, which is now being placed on the market, and which, in the matter of the hook, is superior to the Miller coupling, and it prevents the trouble complained of, to a large extent, by allowing more play in the jaws.

Q.—Is it possible to apply an air brake to freight cars? A.—I presume it is possible to do so, but it is hardly practicable at the present time.

Q.—Would there be any objection to it on freight cars, other than the expense of applying it? A.—No objection occurs to me if all the cars were equipped with air brakes, but it would be practically useless for one road to attempt to apply air brakes to its freight cars.

Q.—But are there not gatherings of railway managers, at which agreements in regard to operating railways are arrived at? A.—Yes.

Q.—Could not such a system be agreed upon at one of those conferences of railway companies? A.—It would be very difficult, I am afraid, to bring anything of that kind about. They have been holding conferences in regard to a safety coupler for a long term of years, and they have never succeeded in making much progress in regard to it.

Q.—Can you tell any reason for that? A.—Railway men are like all others, when such a matter is brought up for discussion, each man has his own theory in regard to it. The result is that you cannot get them to settle down on any particular appliance. I have no doubt that freight cars would have been applied with safety couplers, if the companies could have agreed upon a certain coupler.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You would all have agreed upon a coupler if there had only been one? A.—Yes; if there had only been one.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What would be the average day's work of a crew on a freight train, taking one day with another? A.—I would prefer you would ask our superintendent, Mr. McKinnon, on that subject.

Q.—Will he appear before us? A.—Yes; if you will name the day, I will ask him to come.

Q.—As to those improvements; is not the question of expense one very seriously considered by the Company? A.—I don't think so. I can certainly say that would not be the case so far as our Company is concerned.

Q.—Do you think that if the best device could be agreed upon, regardless of any reasonable expense, it would be adopted? A.—Yes; I am satisfied it would be.

Q.—Are the men entering the employment of the Canadian Pacific Railway, required to sign an agreement, and relinquish or abandon any claim that may arise on their part against the Company, in case of accident? A.—I think not; not certainly to my knowledge. I am satisfied they are not.

Q.—You would be pretty certain to know it, if such was the case? A.—Yes; unless it was something that had been in vogue on some of the sections of the line, taken over by the Company, that had not been discontinued; but I don't think there is any such rule.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—In case the Company establishes a benefit fund, would it be compulsory on the part of the employees to join it, as is the case on the Grand Trunk Railway? A.—It is something on which we would like to get the views of the employees. It was the intention of the Company to bear a large percentage of the cost of injured men, and probably it would be made an obligation on the part of the men entering the service of the Company.

Q.—Then it would be like the Grand Trunk system? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any recollection of the difficulty that occurred with the employees, particularly the engineers, in the North-west a few years ago—a strike? A.—I only know of it incidentally; I did not occupy my present position then, and I had nothing to do with it personally.

Q.—Do you know the cause of the strike on that occasion? A.—I hardly think I am sufficiently well informed to discuss it.

Q.—By whom are the accounts of accidents gathered? A.—The division superintendent reports to his chief, the general superintendent, in detail, anything in connection with the accident, and that in turn is reported to the management.

Q.—He takes the information from other officials? A.—No; the superintendent of the division is supposed to have the information himself. He is supposed to go to the site of the accident.

Q.—Is the information given to the superintendent by others; are the parties supplying the information, sworn? A.—No.

Q.—You just get an ordinary account of it? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Just as a private individual would do in a similar case? A.—Yes; just as if an employee in a man's store, broke a pane of glass. He would probably make a statement about it in the ordinary way without doing so under oath.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are the wages paid to railway men, based upon the fact that the service is somewhat dangerous? A.—I presume that is one of the important factors in determining the wages paid railway men. They are paid as a rule higher for the same class of service than men in other occupations receive.

Q.—You think the question of hazard enters into the question of fixing the rate of wages? A.—I think so, to some extent.

Q.—Are those men the train men, for example, who are exposed to danger, higher paid in proportion for the service they render, than the wages of men not exposed to such danger? A.—Yes; their wages are higher.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How often are the employees paid on the western branch? A.—Once a month.

Q.—Are they paid regularly every month? A.—Yes.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Have you any system of fines in your company? A.—Yes; we have on the eastern section of the line.

Q.—Under what conditions are they imposed? A.—By the general superintendent. It is something that came to us, really, from the lines we have acquired in Ontario. It had always been the custom there, and it was continued on this eastern section of the line. I don't think any fines are imposed on other sections; although I consider myself, that it is a good thing.

Q.—Under what conditions are those imposed; or what must a man do in order to become liable to be fined? A.—There are a great number of conditions. A man who is guilty of negligence, which results, for instance, in baggage or freight being sent to a wrong place, is fined for it. Men who leave switches open and allow the truck of a freight car to get off the track, instead of being dismissed or suspended may be fined for it. It is determined, to a large extent, by the culpability of the individual.

Q.—And by the gravity of the offence? A.—Yes; of course, there are many offences for which a man is not fined, but dismissed arbitrary.

Q.—Take the case you mentioned. Can you give us some idea as to the amount a man will be fined for such negligence as leaving a switch open? A.—Our fine list is printed once a month and sent round. I will forward you one of those lists, and it will show you how it is done.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—How is it that fines are enforced only on the eastern division? A.—As I explained that system is in force only on the eastern section. It was in force on the Credit Valley and on the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, and when we took over those lines and took over the superintendents of the lines with them, the system was continued in force. I don't think there has ever been a system of fining on the western division unless it has been within a short time. Mr. Whyte has established a system of fining there I believe.

Q.—What Division is that? A.—On the line from Port Arthur to Donald, East and West of Winnipeg, and from Port Arthur we have the Eastern Section.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—What becomes of the money received from fines? A.—The money is deducted from the wages of the men, and goes into the hands of the Company, and remains there, unless it is remitted afterwards.

Q.—Is the remitting of fines of frequent occurrence? A.—I cannot say as to that.

Q.—Are the bridges on the road sufficiently high to admit of brakemen standing on the deck of trains when they are passing under them? A.—We have not a bridge on the line, unless it may be one or two on the Quebec Division, and possibly one on the Prescott branch, old bridges built many years ago, which have not been changed, which will not allow that. All our bridges and tunnels are high enough, with those exceptions.

Q.—Have you ever heard of an accident occurring to a brakeman from a bridge being so low that he was struck as the train was passing under it? A.—Yes; I have heard of such a thing.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—On your line? A.—There was one such accident on the Prescott branch of which I have spoken.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—If a man was discharged, or if it came to your knowledge that a man had

committed any offence, and you deemed it advisable to discharge him right where he was, would you give him a pass back to his home? A.—It depends on the circumstances. There are cases where I would not give him a pass.

Q.—Have you known of a case at North Bay? A.—I have heard of a case up in that vicinity.

Q.—Would you have any objection to stating the facts? A.—I don't think I can tell you the details. It came to my notice, and I approved of the action of the Superintendent in the matter.

Q.—Did the man ask for a pass through some official, or personally from yourself? A.—I don't think he appealed to me. The case came before me as a report from the General Superintendent as to what he had done. If a man is guilty of gross, and inexcusable neglect, that destroys a large amount of property, or causes the death of some employee, he should be discharged, and I would feel under no obligation to furnish transportation to him.

Q.—Is an account kept of the nature of the offence for which the men were discharged, for the use of other Companies, when men go and apply to other Companies for work? A.—No; we keep a record as between the Divisions of our own Company.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you give a man a recommendation when you discharge him for any offence? A.—If a man is discharged for any offence, he is not given a letter of recommendation.

Q.—Suppose a man might have been intoxicated on one or two occasions, and he afterwards proved to be a sober man, would you give him a recommendation under such circumstances? A.—Do you mean if he was not in the employ of the Company?

Q.—Even if he had been discharged, and it came to your ears afterwards that he had become a good, sober man, would you give him a recommendation? A.—No; I would hesitate in doing so, if a man was discharged for intoxication.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You think that a man who has been in the habit of becoming intoxicated at some time would be likely to endanger life and property at other times, and for that reason you would refuse him a recommendation? A.—Yes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—But if you were convinced that a change had occurred in the habits of the man in that respect? A.—I would not hesitate about saying that he was discharged for being intoxicated, but that I understood he had now become a sober man; I would probably say that.

Q.—Are many of your men garnisheed for debt? A.—Quite a number,

Q.—Do you not think if your men were paid fortnightly or weekly there would be a decrease in the garnisheeing business? A.—It would be difficult to pay so frequently on a railway; I don't see very well how it could be done. I don't think, moreover, it would have much effect. In the majority of cases the men who were garnisheed would probably be garnisheed no matter how often they received their pay.

Q.—On general principles, what do you think; do you discharge a man if he is garnisheed more than once? A.—No; we have no rule about it. We would be very much pleased to know that the garnishee system had been abolished, as it is most troublesome and annoying.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are you aware that in Ontario a man cannot be garnisheed for a sum less

than \$25.00? A.—I didn't know that. I am not familiar with the law on the subject. Our lawyers look after the garnishees.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Are there many street crossings made by the Canadian Pacific Railway in Montreal? A.—We have some crossings at Mile End. I don't think we have any crossings in the City, except one in the yard, which is used to some extent, but is not really a street crossing.

Q.—Do any accidents happen at those crossings? A.—I think we have had one or two accidents at Mile End.

Q.—Is there a man constantly employed at that crossing? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many hours does he work before he is changed? A.—I cannot tell you as to that.

Q.—Do you not think it requires more than one man to undertake that service? A.—I think not.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Is it not fatiguing work? A.—No.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—How much do these men at the crossings, receive per week. A.—I could not tell you.

CAPTAIN JOHN BARCLAY, Marine Superintendent of the Allan Line Steamship Co., Montreal, called and sworn :

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Will you please tell the Commission about the manner in which the cattle are loaded on steamers in this port, when they are put on board steamers, and whether they are put on board at the proper hour or not? A.—At the hour appointed you mean?

Q.—Are they put on board a day or so before the ship is ready to leave the harbor? A.—No; they are put on board when the ship is loaded and ready to go to sea.

Q.—Are they never put on board until the steamer is ready to leave the port? A.—Sometimes, to oblige a customer, we have taken some cattle on board a day before the ship was ready to leave port.

Q.—Can you give us an idea about the space of the cattle stalls on board ship, and the amount of ventilation provided? A.—The space is thirty inches wide by eight feet long and the ventilation is through the hatches, and by proper ventilators sufficient for the purpose.

Q.—Can you give us the largest number of cattle that has been carried on any of the steamers of the Allan line last season? A.—Almost 1,000, within 15 or 20.

Q.—Have you any objection to telling us the mortality among the cattle during the voyage, and until the arrival of the steamer on the other side? A.—I cannot give you that at the moment. It was scarcely anything.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—On an average, what is the mortality of the cattle that are sent over, what per centage per 100 cattle for the whole season? A.—It is a great deal less than one per cent. I don't think it reaches, on our line, one-fourth of one per cent.

Q.—Do you find that 30 inches is space enough for a beast? A.—Quite sufficient.

Q.—Is there any special reason why it should be so narrow? A.—No; we find that is about the most suitable space for the cattle.

Q.—Can they lie down? A.—I have never been to see that they could, so I cannot tell you. They are placed in stalls ten feet wide, four together. At the same time I have seen them lie down at the harbour, two lying and two standing. That is the usual size of stalls on steamers sailing from all American ports.

Q.—When the cattle are put on board is it any duty of yours to know that they are in a healthy condition before they are placed on board? A.—No; there is a person appointed by the insurance companies for that particular purpose, and there is also a Government inspector.

Q.—To see that the cattle are healthy? A.—Yes; and in proper condition to go.

Q.—After the cattle are placed on board would they remain here for a day or two if it was hot or rainy weather? A.—The stalls are properly protected and roofed in.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Are you aware that 30 cattle were lost on one ship from here to Sorel, a distance of 35 miles? A.—Yes.

Q.—You believe it? A.—Yes; I have heard it.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Is such a thing a usual occurrence? A.—No. It depends on the quality of the cattle and the heat of the weather.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you superintend other parts of loading as well as cattle loading? A.—I am General Superintendent.

Q.—What is the usual way you take of loading your vessels? What kind of persons do you generally employ in connection with the loading of your vessels? A.—Laborers in gangs of 20 in charge of a competent stevedore.

Q.—A Company as large as the one you represent are supposed to have competent men about their place; are all the stevedores connected with your line competent men to take charge of the loading or unloading of vessels? A.—I consider them to be such or they would not be there. Most of them are trained by ourselves now.

Q.—Is there any arrangement by which relays of men can be put on board a vessel, or are the same men continued at the work from the beginning to the end of loading; or what time are they supposed to work? A.—We have sufficient men to change the men after they have worked a certain time if necessary—relays of men.

Q.—What time do you consider possible for a man to work under all circumstances so as to be capable of performing his work in the manner in which it should be done? A.—He can work from seven in the morning to twelve at night. A day and a half. He can do that every night.

Q.—They do that every night? A.—Almost every night.

Q.—Do you find that the men complain in regard to the length of time they are employed at one time? A.—They are quite capable of working a day and a half.

Q.—Did you ever know that accidents occurred from the men being overworked or incapable of working? A.—No, they can leave when they please. They are not compelled to work. But I find all the men are very anxious to get in the extra half day.

Q.—Do your men frequently work at night? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the pay given to your men by the day? A.—20 cents per hour.

Q.—Are they paid anything extra for night work? A.—No; they are paid 20 cents per hour night and day.

Q.—For all kinds of work? A.—That is the standard wages, 22½ and 25 cents.

Q.—What is the longest time within your recollection that you have known the

men to be working for your Company without cessation or rest of any kind ; I suppose they are always supplied with meals on board ?

A.—They get their meals regularly, but we provide them with meals on board ship at night.

Q.—How are the meals served ? A.—From the usual place in the ship, the meals are taken to the men ready prepared and they eat them where they are.

Q.—Ordinary food ? A.—Good, wholesome food, such as anybody could eat, beef, potatoes, bread and butter, and coffee.

Q.—Please state the longest time you are aware that men have been at work without cessation and under what circumstances ? A.—I could not tell you exactly. I know they think nothing of 36 hours, if necessary, in the fall of the year or about the close of navigation. It is absolutely necessary to work for that length of time then. The men are quite willing to do it ; there is no compulsion.

Q.—Do you consider that those men who work 36 hours at a stretch are as competent to do their work as other men would be who are put in their place ? A.—They cannot be very fresh at the close. They are fit for the work or I would not have them there.

Q.—The men never complain ? A.—Never.

Q.—Are there men under any circumstances working for you besides those engaged as day laborers ? A.—There are subordinate stevedores getting \$20.00 a week, and there are stevedores who get \$25 and \$30 a week.

Q.—Have you not a certain class of men who engage by the year or by the season ? A.—In the sheds. That class does not come under my department, I know the men are there.

Q.—Have you anything to do with the loading or overloading of vessels ? A.—We never overload.

Q.—Is there a regular rule by which you are governed, that is to say, have you Plimsoll's mark on your vessels ? A.—Yes.

Q.—In all cases you consider you are liable to go by that mark ? A.—That is carefully looked after.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—In the loading of grain how many hours are the men required to remain in the hold ? A.—We rarely have more than 20,000 bushels in one hold, and the elevator will put grain in at the rate of from 3,000 to 5,000 bushels an hour, so it is easy to get at it.

Q.—Are any precautions taken to do away with the dust consequent on the work ? A.—It cannot be done away with.

Q.—Have the men ever complained on the length of time they have been compelled to remain below deck ? A.—We have had no complaints ; they can come up when they please.

Q.—If a man refuses to go below on account of this dust would you place him at some other work ? A.—Decidedly. Some men are constitutionally unable to trim grain. As a rule we select the strongest and hardiest.

Q.—Have men been discharged for refusing to go below to trim grain ? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Have you ever known a case where a man has been refused the bonus which the Company had promised ? A.—No.

Q.—You never heard any disputes about that promise not being fulfilled ? A.—There have been some claims made by men not entitled to it.

Q.—Have those men whom the Company consider are not entitled to the bonus, ever taken any steps with a view to recover it ? A.—I believe they have entered an action against the Company. Speaking of grain trimming, I may say, that the grain trimmers get five cents per hour more than the ordinary laborers.

Q.—Have all your men to sign a contract before being set to work by the Company ? A.—Not all of them ; only a few.

Q.—Are men engaged permanently who do not sign the contract. A.—No.

Q.—They are just occasional laborers that you take on? A.—There are four or five gangs of men who sign, the others we take on as we want them.

Q.—Have the men made representations to you dissenting from the terms of the contract? A.—Not that I am aware of.

Q.—Have exporters of cattle ever made complaints about the manner their cattle were handled in Montreal? A.—In what way?

Q.—In regard to the loading of them, in regard to the general handling of their cattle? A.—No. We have the best appliances in the City. Gentlemen, as a rule, are very well satisfied with our handling of their property.

Q.—Have shippers of cattle ever made any recommendations to the company in the direction of providing a better place for the loading of cattle? A.—Not that I am aware of. They would not make such recommendation to me but to the head office.

Q.—Is it within your knowledge that cattle have been injured in consequence of the handling they received? A.—Not from us.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—In all cases where cattle are shipped on board before the appointed hour, is the shipper consulted? A.—Of course it is at his request, otherwise we don't do it.

Q.—Is he consulted in all cases? A.—Decidedly.

Q.—Is it within your knowledge that the company have placed cattle on the vessels before the appointed hour without the knowledge of the shipper? A.—No; not that I am aware of.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Tell us about how many men are engaged altogether by the Allan Company in summer? A.—Probably from 300 to 400 men; sometimes much more than that number.

Q.—Will the average be about 350? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEARNS :—

Q.—In regard to the Sunday labor question; is that work done on any other vessels except the Glasgow Line? A.—That depends upon circumstances. Late in the fall we are obliged to work on Sunday.

Q.—Is it the rule that work is done on Sunday on the Glasgow Line? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you remember an accident which happened on board of one of your ships last summer? A.—What accident?

Q.—A carpenter was killed on board of one of your vessels? A.—We have nothing to do with the carpenters.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Was he killed on one of your steamers? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Was there a coroner's inquest in regard to the cause of his death? A.—I believe so.

Q.—What was the verdict? A.—We were not consulted in the matter nor were witnesses asked from us. I don't know the verdict.

Q.—Are you acquainted with the details of the accident? A.—I know the man was proceeding into one of the holds to repair the lining and he fell down the ladder.

Q.—How was it he fell? A.—I understand the man had a piece of wood in which was a candle in his mouth, and a saw in one of his hands, and he lost his hold in some way and fell. Of course, I didn't see it. That is the report that was given to me.

Q.—Do you know if this ladder was in good order? A.—The one off which he fell?

Q.—Yes. A.—There was one rung out of it. This rung was not necessary to his safety; it was above the place where he would stand.

Q.—Do you think if this step had been in its place the man would have fallen? A.—I don't know. I say the step was not necessary to his safety. I have often gone up and down the same ladder myself.

Q.—Was that man long in your service? A.—I hear he was about twelve or thirteen years, and he knew the ship as well as I do.

Q.—He was then a sober man? A.—I could not tell you that. He was one of the contractor's men, not one of our men; we give out a contract for doing that work. He did not belong to us.

Q.—Was the ladder supplied by the contractor, or did it belong to the Line? A.—The ladder belonged to the ship; it was a permanent ladder.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that when a man is employed in a gang, he is not allowed to quit work? A.—For what purpose?

Q.—If a man has worked for thirty hours, and he refuses to work any longer, does the foreman threaten to dismiss him? A.—No; I don't think so. Even if he did, he could not dismiss him without my authority.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that men have been compelled to work longer than their time? A.—There is no compulsion.

Q.—Can you tell, by your pay list, the number of hours a man has worked on one consecutive stretch last season? A.—I could by examining the pay list, not from recollection, of course.

Q.—Will you please make such an examination, and submit the result to the Commission? A.—Some person else can do it; it is not my duty to do it.

JOSEPH YOUNG, Bookkeeper, at the Canada Sugar Refinery, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. Walsh:—

Q.—Whom do you represent? A.—The Canada Sugar Refining Company at St. Gabriel Locks.

Q.—What number of hands do the Company employ? A.—Between 450 and 500, directly and indirectly.

Q.—How many do you employ directly in your place? A.—We employ more in the summer than in the winter, on an average 400.

Q.—How many do you employ directly in the business of sugar refining. A.—In the Refinery, I think about 200.

Q.—In the work of those men, are they not subject many times, to very great heat? A.—Not very great.

Q.—To what temperature are they subjected? A.—That I cannot state exactly.

Q.—Is it considered necessary for the temperature to be kept up for the kind of work they are at? A.—No.

Q.—Are there not some of those men employed in positions of danger, with regard to the matter they use in sugar refining? A.—No; I think not.

Q.—Has there been an accident at your concern some time lately? A.—Not from that cause.

Q.—What was the cause; what accident occurred? A.—I really do not know the facts of the case.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What was the result? A.—Injury to a limb.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—There was no life lost? A.—No.

Q.—You consider, then, the temperature kept up in which those men are compelled to work, is not higher than it is necessary to maintain for the business? A.—I believe not.

Q.—What wages are those men paid? A.—The average wages for unskilled labor is \$1.30 for ten hours.

Q.—What wages do you pay the men in the condition I spoke of? A.—They average about that.

Q.—Are they considered unskilled laborers? A.—They are.

Q.—What proportion of your men do you consider skilled laborers? A.—I cannot tell, exactly, what proportion would be considered skilled.

Q.—What is the highest wages you pay to any of those men who are placed under the head of skilled laborers? A.—That I don't know exactly.

Q.—What length of time, during the year, do those men work; do they work regularly? A.—Yes.

Q.—The whole year? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you shut down at any time for repairs? A.—Yes; occasionally for repairs.

Q.—How many men are thrown out of work at that time; or are the hands kept on steadily? A.—The greater portion are kept on.

Q.—How long will your works be shut down? A.—That will depend on circumstances.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What is the general thing? A.—A couple or three weeks.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—At what season of the year is that? A.—Generally when the water is out of the canal, in the spring of the year.

Q.—Are all necessary precautions taken with regard to saving the men from cold or draughts—I refer to the men who are exposed to the great heat? A.—I believe so.

Q.—Are all the sanitary arrangements of your factory good? A.—They are.

Q.—Are they ever inspected by anybody? A.—Yes; by the City Inspector.

Q.—Have you never had any complaints in regard to them? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What hours are the men engaged at the works? A.—Ten hours constitute a day's work

Q.—Do they work day and night, or are there two sets of men? A.—Both.

Q.—Do the men employed at night work, earn more than the men on day work? A.—They do.

Q.—What will be the difference in wages for the two classes of men? A.—The difference in the number of hours; ten hours is considered a day's pay.

Q.—How many hours a night's pay? A.—Twelve hours.

Q.—Why is it necessary to work the men twelve hours at night, when the men on day work are only employed ten hours? A.—I don't know that there is any necessity for it.

Q.—Will you tell us if there is any organization among your men? A.—I don't know to what you have reference.

Q.—Have they an organization for their protection or mutual benefit? A.—
Yes. They have a sick benefit society.

Q.—Does the Sugar Refining Company contribute anything to the funds of the
society? A.—Not unless the funds run down to a very low ebb.

Q.—Does the Sugar Refining Company provide any means of relief for men who
have been hurt in their employ? A.—The benefit society does that.

Q.—Is there an organization among the sugar refiners? A.—That I know
nothing about.

JAMES URQUHART, Paymaster, in the employ of H. & A. Allan, Montreal, called
and sworn:—

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Will you tell us how often the men are paid in your concern? A.—They
are paid on the day following the departure of the ship from Montreal. We generally
have about three pays a week.

Q.—Do you say they get paid the day after the steamer leaves the port? A.—
Yes; they are paid off. That is, our laborers.

Q.—Some gangs would work at that steamer just so long, I suppose, as the
work lasted? A.—The men working on the steamer might work 30 or 40 hours;
then they might be taken away to another steamer; or they might work right through
60 or 70 hours.

Q.—You have no idea of the longest number of hours any one man has been em-
ployed? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are you the proper person to sign a contract with the men for service and
pay? A.—Yes; I sign them after being requested by the Company and by direction
of the Company.

Q.—Do the men sign these contracts voluntarily? A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—No means have ever been taken to compel men to sign the contract? A.—
Never.

Q.—You have not been sent to the houses of the men for that purpose? A.—No;
never.

Q.—On pay day, at what hour is the wicket closed where you pay the men?
A.—About seven o'clock at night.

Q.—Is it never closed at five o'clock, and the men have to wait around till seven
o'clock for their pay? A.—No; never.

Q.—You say you have never known that to happen? A.—No; never.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—If it did happen, how would it occur? A.—I never knew a case in which it
did happen. We are only too glad to get them squared off and have them paid.

Q.—Your instructions are to be there? A.—Yes; and I am there.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Will you give us an idea of the average amount of wages paid per week in
summer by your firm? A.—If you will take my opinion, I should say it would be
about \$13.00 per man.

Q.—I mean the total amount for all the men working on the ships? A.—From
\$2500 to \$3000 per week.

Q.—You consider that would be the average for the seven months? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is it compulsory for all the employees on your dock to be insured? A.—Those working on the vessels.

Q.—It is compulsory? A.—Yes; it is compulsory. The amount is deducted from their day.

Q.—Does the Allan Company contribute anything towards this insurance fund? A.—I believe they do, although I don't know personally.

Q.—Is that one per cent repaid to the men at the end of the season? A.—No; it is paid to the Insurance Company about the first of every month.

Q.—If a man is discharged, is the amount paid in premiums, returned to him? A.—No; it is paid to the Insurance Company.

Q.—Are not the men competent to insure themselves? A.—I don't know of any complaint in regard to that matter. I understand they were spoken to in regard to it, and they were all agreeable, and I have never heard anyone say anything against it.

Q.—When they are discharged or they leave the Company's employ, they cannot collect the amount paid in? A.—No. They cannot collect it when it has been paid into the Insurance Company for insuring them against accident.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—The insurance is for every month, I suppose. How often is it paid the Insurance Company? A.—Every month.

Q.—Is the amount deducted from their wages every month? A.—No; every pay; and the amount is set apart and paid to the Company about every month. The agent of the Company might get it every week, but he comes for it every month.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Tell us why the Allan Company insists on their men being insured? A.—I don't know that.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Do you not think it is a good thing for the men to be insured? A.—I think so.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Is that one per cent. on the amount insured? A.—No; one per cent. on their wages.

Q.—So the men are unequally insured? A.—If a man earns \$10.00 and another man earns \$15.00, the latter pays fifteen cents and the former ten cents.

Q.—In case of accident do the men receive an equal amount of insurance money? A.—Yes; provided they have been a certain length of time in the service of the company.

Q.—The insurance does not begin as soon as they commence work? A.—Yes it begins. For instance: if a new man comes on and commences working with us, and an accident befalls him, say during the first three or four weeks, he would only get three dollars per week. After he had been there one month he is placed on the same footing as the rest, and in case of accident would receive five dollars per week.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Tell us the agreement between the Allan Company and the Insurance Company? A.—There is none that I know of.

Q.—Have the men ever objected to this insurance scheme? A.—Never to my knowledge.

Q.—Are they permitted to object to it? A.—I suppose so; this is a free country.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—If a man is not satisfied he can go away? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Are the men bound to report every morning for work? A.—I do not know as to that, because, perhaps, there may not be work for them in the morning. They often have to wait until the grain or the stuff comes along; they cannot get started just at the hour they are ready, seven o'clock, it may be eight, nine, or even ten o'clock.

Q.—If a man has worked for, say, thirty hours, and there is work to go on with, is he bound to continue at it? A.—There are stevedores there, and he goes into their gangs.

Q.—Is he bound to go after he has been thirty hours at work? A.—I don't know—no.

Q.—Have you ever known cases of men being discharged for refusing to go to work after they had already been working thirty hours? A.—No; never in the Allan Company's employ.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Suppose a steamer comes from Quebec, and the men are sent for and told to be on the wharf at a certain time, and the vessel is say one, two or three or four hours behind time, do the men lose the time they have been on duty? A.—I am simply paymaster; I have nothing to do with the wharf. I am not posted in regard to all these matters, although I have a general idea in regard to them. If I gave an opinion, it might be quite wrong.

Q.—Can you tell us if the Company is interested in the Citizens' Insurance Company? A.—I could not answer that question; I know that some of the Company—Mr. Allan, is a shareholder, but I don't know anything more about it.

Q.—Is he not a Director in the Citizens' Insurance Company? A.—I think so.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—When you speak about thirty hours, you do not mean a man working thirty hours consecutively without rest, I suppose? A.—I don't know exactly how they do for that, but I know that is the system; I have heard it spoken of by the head of the departments.

EDMUND TART, Longshoreman, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—How long have you been working as a longshoreman? A.—Two years.

Q.—What is the number of hours during which you usually work per day? A.—Sometimes we do not work at all, other days we work ten or fifteen hours. It is a common thing to work thirty hours on a stretch. I have worked thirty hours twice in one week. That is a common thing.

Q.—How much per hour do you receive for that service? A.—20 cents.

Q.—Day or night? A.—Yes.

Q.—How often do you get paid? A.—Sometimes two or three times a week. We usually get paid the day after a boat sails; that is in the Allan Company.

Q.—Do you prefer that kind of pay to any other? A.—No; we prefer weekly payments.

Q.—Why would you prefer weekly payments? A.—Because it would be more convenient to us to get the money weekly than to have to go for it two or three times.

Q.—Do you ever have much trouble in receiving your wages when you work for contractors or stevedores outside of the regular lines? A.—Yes.

Q.—Has that occurred often—does it occur often? A.—It has often occurred until last year, and this last summer it did not occur nearly so frequently.

Q.—What means do you take to try and recover the money in a case of that kind? A.—We find the address of the contractor for whom we have worked.

Q.—And you prosecute him in the Courts? A.—Yes, if necessary; but very seldom we have to do that.

Q.—Of what does your work usually consist—what kind of work is it, general cargo? A.—General cargo, coal and grain.

Q.—In working at a general cargo, have many accidents occurred through defective machinery, or bad gear, or incompetent men standing over the hatch, or men working a longer number of hours, and not being fit to hold their positions? A.—Yes; there have been quite a number of accidents, not as many around Allan's as at other Companies' wharves.

Q.—Are the longshoremen of Montreal organized? A.—They are organized secretly.

Q.—Are there any young boys employed at the longshoremen business? A.—Not at Allan's, outside there are.

Q.—Can you tell us about how many men are employed in the longshore business around Montreal, take the average number? A.—During the summer?

Q.—Yes. A.—To give a rough guess I should say from 1,700 to 2,500.

Q.—About how many dollars would a longshoreman make here in the summer season? I am speaking of longshoremen outside of the regular lines. A.—That I could hardly answer.

Q.—Can you answer for yourself? A.—Yes; in regard to the regular lines; I am working at Allan's. I would say from \$200 to \$250. There are from 100 to 120 men engaged by special contract for the season. They get preference in the work, and those men may earn from \$300 to \$350.

Q.—Do you know anything about the insurance scheme among longshoremen? A.—That is at Allan's?

Q.—Yes. A.—I know that one cent on the dollar is deducted from every man's wages and never is paid, it is kept from them and never returned.

Q.—Did the men consent to this reduction? A.—No.

Q.—Have they ever objected to it? A.—I believe they have objected to it. It was last fall, that is in the fall of 1886.

Q.—When you are insured in that compulsory arrangement, does it hold good all through the winter. A.—No.

Q.—You are only insured for the summer months? A.—Only for the summer months.

Q.—If you left the employ of the Allan Company, and were away for six months, and came back to work again, is then insurance good for the first three weeks? A.—I think it would not be good.

Q.—Does this insurance scheme give satisfaction to the men? A.—No.

Q.—If the men were permitted would they rather work without being insured? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can any man get employment in the Allan Company unless he consents to this insurance scheme? A.—No.

Q.—Does the system of giving bonuses in the Allan Company give satisfaction to the men? A.—No; it does not.

Q.—Do you know if those bonuses have always been paid? A.—They have been paid in all cases. The bonuses were only given once, that was during the past season.

Q.—Do you know any reason why the bonuses were not paid? A.—The reason given by the Company is that those parties who did not receive their bonuses, had not been working for the Company till that year; that they had not signed till that year. There are five signed gangs constituting one hundred men. They have signed for years past. Those men who did not receive the bonus did not sign till last year, and they signed last year.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—They got the bonus after they signed the contract? A.—This past summer, no.

Q.—Those who signed were not paid what was promised them; is that what you mean? A.—I will explain myself clearly; there are say 100 men signed; during the past summer there were 120 men signed. The men who had signed before the past summer —

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—We were speaking of last summer. Were the men promised a bonus last summer? Were they paid the bonus promised or not? A.—Some of them were not.

Q.—Why were they not? A.—I am giving the reason that Messrs. Allan gave.

Q.—I am asking you why they were not? You have said that a number of men to whom the bonus was promised by the Messrs. Allan were not paid that bonus. Tell us the reason why?

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Yes; tell us the reason Messrs. Allan gave for not paying the men the bonus? A.—That is what I want to give. There have been a number of men employed there during the last four or five years who have signed—100 men. There were 120 men signed. Some of the 120 men had not signed the previous season. Those who had not signed in the previous season were not given the bonus, and that is the reason the Messrs. Allan gave for not giving it to them, because they did not sign in the previous season.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Then I understand that the men who had not signed the contract in 1886 and had signed the contract in 1887 were refused the bonus that was paid to those who had signed in 1886? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—As a matter of fact was the bonus part of the contract? A.—It was not inserted in the contract I believe.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is it inserted in any of the contracts? A.—No. The understanding was verbal I believe.

Q.—Have the men taken any steps to recover the bonus that was promised them? A.—Some of them have.

Q.—Do you know if those have been successful up to the present time? A.—They have not.

Q.—Can you tell us the reason why those steps have not been successful? A.—Some of the steps I refer to when I say they have not been successful are these: Personal applications were made, by the parties interested, to Mr. Smith, Messrs. Allans' manager, to pay the money to them. He refused to do so. But other steps have been taken with the case to the court in order to recover the bonus, and it has not come on for trial yet.

Q.—So the question is still in doubt? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are the men satisfied with the action of the Company in retaining a portion of the wages during the season? A.—No.

Q.—Is it a part of the contract that the Company shall retain a part of the wages? A.—I believe it is.

Q.—And the men understand, when they sign the contract, that the company has a right to do that? A.—To retain part of their wages to the Fall—yes.

Q.—Is that portion of the earnings of the men retained by the company, always paid to the men? A.—It is, in cases where the men apply for it, I believe.

Q.—Have you ever known a case of a man leaving the employ of the company who was unable to recover the amount retained by the company? A.—No.

Q.—About this Sunday labor, how much of it is worked on the Glasgow line of boats? Q.—By far the greater part of it.

Q.—Throughout the whole season? A.—Throughout the whole season.

Q.—What proportion of the Sunday work is done on the mail boats? A.—Very little.

Q.—Why is the work done on the Glasgow line of steamers, and not done on the mail boats. A.—Because the mail boats, as a rule, stay in port ten or eleven days, and they have more time to have their cargoes worked.

Q.—Do you know any reason why Sunday work should be performed on the Glasgow line more than the mail line? A.—The only reason is that the boats, as a rule, have not such a length of time to stay in port.

Q.—Do you think it is possible to avoid it? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you tell us in what way? A.—By the company timing their ships to depart later than they time them now.

Q.—Is sufficient care taken of the mens' lives in handling freight? A.—Not always.

Q.—Is the neglect in regard to having defective gearing, or in hiring proper men? A.—Not so much in regard to defective gearing, but sometimes there are incompetent men placed in important positions, careless men.

Q.—Have you ever known of men being discharged for refusing to load grain in the hold? A.—Yes, I have. They have not been discharged permanently, but the foreman at the time has discharged them. They have lost so many hours, probably fifty or sixty hours.

Q.—Is there any system of fines in connection with the Allan Steamship Company? A.—No.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—What is your age? A.—My age is twenty-two.

Q.—What have been your earnings a week, take last summer, on an average? A.—From seven to eight dollars per week. I didn't work all the time I could have worked.

Q.—What did you receive for a full week's work? A.—From \$9 to \$10, that is the average for the whole season.

Q.—Will you tell us in regard to the insurance, for what length of time did you pay the insurance? Suppose you paid for four days, how many days would the insurance run? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—If your insurance was paid for only four days, how would your insurance be paid during the winter when you were not at work? On what length of time did you pay your insurance? A.—Every time we were paid we had one cent on the dollar deducted for insurance, and that was all the information given us.

Q.—If you worked six days there would be six day's insurance deducted? A.—I cannot give evidence on that point.

Q.—You say that each time you were paid, one cent on the dollar was deducted for insurance? A.—Yes.

Q.—If you worked for six days, one cent on the dollar for those six days would be deducted? A.—Yes.

Q.—Was anything more deducted? A.—No.

Q.—Supposing you worked from Monday morning to Saturday night, you paid for six days' insurance and no more. A.—I suppose that is the usual way with Insurance Companies.

Q.—If you began work on Monday morning, and worked to Saturday night, which would be seven days, they deducted one cent on the dollar for that time, and no more—or did they deduct more? A.—That is all they deducted.

Q.—And no more? Then, if you did not work on the next Monday, and an accident befell you, do you consider the Insurance Company should pay you? A.—I consider they should pay me.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Is there any definite time for the Company to insure you? A.—No; there is no definite time; that is what I have been trying to tell you. They insure us for no definite time.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—They keep you insured while you work, and while you do not work, then, you are not insured? A.—If we are not working, we get no insurance.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—And, of course, there is no insurance deducted from any amount you earn? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—You are supposed to be insured from the commencement to the close of the season? A.—Yes; if an accident happens to you while in the Messrs. Allans' employ.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—And no longer than the season, under any circumstances? A.—No longer than the season.

Q.—You do not expect that you are insured for the winter? A.—We do not expect that, because we would not get it if we did.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—Do you know any one instance where men who have been injured, have not been paid? A.—Yes.

Q.—They were working for the Company, and met with an accident, and were paid. Is that what you mean? A.—They received their insurance.

Q.—You are insured for a certain amount? A.—Yes.

Q.—When you go to work, you know the amount for which you are insured? A.—Yes.

Q.—And if an accident happens to you, when you are working, you are insured, and will receive so much per week? A.—Yes.

Q.—When an accident happens you are paid that amount? A.—Some, I think, have been paid that amount.

Q.—Do you know some to have been refused? A.—I think I know some have been refused.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Give us the name of one man who has been refused? A.—I cannot give you the name of one man.

Q.—Not even one man? A.—No.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—You have said the men generally object to being insured? A.—Yes.

Q.—Why is it that the men object to being insured? A.—They believe they can form a benefit society themselves that will insure them better, and they will get their insurance in a more satisfactory way than they get it from the Messrs. Allan. That is the reason why the men object to being insured.

Q.—Is there among the workmen such a benefit society in permanent and constant operation? A.—There is a secret society.

Q.—And if an accident happens to men who do not belong to that society, they would not get anything from the secret society, of course? A.—They would not.

Q.—Is that the reason why Messrs. Allan insure their men so as to have them all protected? A.—The Messrs. Allan have their own reason; I cannot give that reason.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—From your age and your experience you can, no doubt, tell us how those men engaged by Messrs. Allen are incompetent? A.—The men placed over the hatch have not had, sometimes, the requisite amount of experience.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—In regard to the insurance matter, I have always been under the impression that the men, generally speaking, would be very glad to be insured, and I thought, as a member of this Commission, that it would be our duty to recommend that a provision of that character be inserted in the law in the interest of the men. That is the reason why I have asked you the question. I desire to find out why the men belonging to your trade do not want to be insured, and you have explained to me that if there was a benefit society in operation the men who do not belong to your society would not have any protection? A.—Not from the society.

Q.—What proportion of the men belong to the society, that is, the men who work on the steamships? A.—I do not desire to answer that question.

Mr. HEAKES :—

That is a secret society and we have no right to inquire into its workings.

To Witness :—You need not answer any question connected with the secret society.

Mr. COTÉ :—

To Witness :—I want to ask you, for the information of the Commission, what, in your opinion, is the proportion of men not belonging to your society who are working in connection with the steamship companies? A.—I object to answer that question.

Q.—Could you answer it if you were willing to do so?

Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

I think when the gentleman objects that should settle it.

The CHAIRMAN :—

I am not going to check Mr. Coté on that ground.

Mr. COTÉ :—

To Witness :—If you were willing to give the figures could you give them? A.—I could give them if I was willing. If I am permitted to volunteer a little evidence, I would say, in regard to why the workmen do not desire to be insured by their employers, that they find a little difficulty in getting their insurance when it is

called for, and if they insist strongly they may be deprived of employment by their employer for the future.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Supposing you earn \$15 a week do you pay 15 cents a week for insurance?
A.—Yes.

Q.—After you leave the company the insurance ceases the following day? A.—
Yes.

Q.—And suppose you got a leg or an arm broken would you receive any indemnity? A.—No.

Q.—Would you get any proportion of your money back? A.—No.

Q.—In regard to the society; is it simply a 'Trades' Union with that kind of name or is it an actual *bona fide* secret society? A.—It is a secret trades organization.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Are accidents frequent in the loading and unloading of vessels? A.—Not very frequent, but more frequent in Montreal than in other ports.

Q.—Have you had experience in regard to the loading and unloading of vessels in other ports? A.—Yes; in one outside of Montreal.

Q.—What port was that? A.—Portland.

Q.—You say accidents are more frequent in Montreal than they are in Portland? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do the laws in Portland give better protection to Longshoremen than the laws of the Province of Quebec do? A.—Not being very well acquainted with law, I cannot say, but I believe they do.

Q.—This insurance of which you have spoken; does that cover you now during the winter season? A.—No.

Q.—Does it extend to sickness or only to accident? A.—I never knew of its being paid in cases of sickness, it may be paid but I never knew of it being paid in sickness.

Q.—Do you know the terms of the policy? A.—No information is given to us on that subject.

PATRICK J. DALTON, Longshoreman, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—What is your occupation? A.—I am a Longshoreman.

Q.—Are you employed on the dock in Montreal? A.—Yes; in summer.

Q.—Can you give us a general idea of the work you perform on the wharves and on the vessels at this port? A.—I can.

Q.—Will you give that information to us briefly? A.—In what respect do you want the information.

Q.—As to the general working of the ship's cargoes, the hours you work, and how long you work in succession? A.—I can only state directly and faithfully of the Allan Company. I have been directly engaged in the loading and unloading of vessels for eighteen years, ever since I was a boy of eighteen. The hours which I have worked on a consecutive stretch on Allan's, and many others have worked the same, have been thirty-five hours, that is at a stretch without a rest.

Q.—Have you ever felt very exhausted at the end of your work? A.—I have felt very exhausted; I have not been able to drag myself home, or scarcely able.

Q.—Are you frequently called upon to work that length of time? A.—Occasionally we are twice a week, usually once a week.

Q.—After a man has worked thirty hours is he ever required to go on to work again without rest? A.—You are, very often.

Q.—For what length of time would you be kept on at work after you had been working thirty hours previously? A.—Very often for five hours more, that is a day and night and night and day and the next night till twelve o'clock, thirty-five hours. I have known gangs work forty hours.

Q.—Supposing a man did not wish to go because he had already been at work for thirty hours, have you ever heard any objection made? A.—I have often by the foreman, which was to the effect, that if he could not come back his services were not required any longer there—if he was not man enough to come back after working thirty hours.

Q.—Do the longshoremen work in gangs? A.—They do, twenty in a gang at Allan's.

Q.—How many gangs do they employ? A.—They employ on an average about ten gangs.

Q.—I suppose each man gets his turn at the work? A.—No; there is a preference given to gangs.

Q.—What would cause preference to be given to certain gangs? A.—I cannot make it out any more than it is in accordance with the old doctrine, there is favor on the dock and there is favor in Heaven.

Q.—Have you ever worked at grain trimming? A.—I have often worked at it.

Q.—Will you tell us from your knowledge of grain trimming what effect it has on a man engaged in the work? A.—It has a very injurious effect upon a man engaged in the work. After a man has been grain trimming five, six or seven hours there is a feeling akin to fever comes on, which is very depressing and injurious to the constitution, and this is more so from wearing a sponge to cover the mouth and nose while you are at work.

Q.—How frequently are you permitted to come from below docks when you are grain trimming? A.—The least possible number of times the better for yourself, or you will get into trouble.

Q.—Is there any objection to your coming on deck to breath the air? A.—There is. You are supposed to stop at work.

Q.—Does the Company have special gangs for grain trimming? A.—There is no special gang for grain trimming.

Q.—You all have a chance at the work? A.—Yes; some get too much of a chance, more so than other gangs.

Q.—Are the men generally desirous of getting that class of work? A.—No; they detest that work for different reasons; it is injurious to health and they do not get enough pay for it.

Q.—What wages do they receive? A.—Twenty-five cents per hour day or night.

Q.—Do they receive nothing extra for night work? A.—They receive no extra pay.

Q.—When men are engaged at working at a long stretch together, how do they manage to keep themselves awake? A.—Very often by artificial means.

Q.—What do you mean by artificial means? A.—That is by running to the tap and sprinkling water on the face and eyes, and what is more injurious, to the grog shop for liquor to keep themselves awake as a stimulant, which, I say, has a very injurious effect on the system.

Q.—Do the men frequently resort to those expedients? A.—They do often; I have done it myself and I have seen others do it often on our terms.

Q.—Is there anything that might be called an iron-clad document in connection with your labor? A.—There is one specially used by the Allan Company.

Q.—Will you please to tell us what that is? A.—What I consider to be an iron-clad document is that one referred to which is all on the employer's side, that is to benefit them.

Q.—In what way? A.—The clause is so specified, that is the clause respecting keeping off a percentage of your money, as to deter you from leaving and you have to stop to finish the seasons' work. Another clause is that if you proceed to Quebec to work at a vessel you receive no pay while you are going to that vessel. There are several different clauses that I cannot enumerate for the reason that it is impossible to get a copy of the agreement.

Q.—Are the men obliged to sign this contract before they go to work? A.—They are to a certain extent obliged, it is not to say compulsory, but it is arranged that way, that if you do not accept it you can seek work elsewhere.

Q.—Will you tell us about this insurance scheme? A.—I can tell you about it.

Q.—Do the men consider it a just and fair scheme? A.—I would not like to speak for all the men, I can speak for a great majority of them, but I will speak for myself particularly. I do not approve of it, not in the sense the scheme is carried on.

Q.—What objection particularly have you to the scheme? A.—My chief objection is in regard to the fines or premiums you have to pay into it. You or your fellows do not derive any benefit from the accumulation of those funds. The money goes to a company outside as a speculative scheme, and I understand on good authority, if writing will satisfy you, that the employers, that is the Allans, have a chief interest in it. The interest goes to them equally as well as it goes to the men—that is to say the interest in the insurance. If the insurance was so arranged that the premiums could be paid into it, should they be great or small, and if the surplus and the proceeds and everything belonging to the matter went directly to the men, I would approve of it; but they do not. It is a speculative scheme.

Q.—Will you tell us what benefit the men derive from that insurance? A.—I can tell you. If you are directly injured in the employers' service you receive five dollars a week while you are disabled. I believe you receive \$500 at death if you are killed outright, fair and square, and no fooling about it. But I cannot enumerate all the clauses that are in it, because I do not suppose any of the men ever received a copy of the prospectus or agreement, simply for the reason that they think that it will do injury, and that you have no business with it.

Q.—Do the men derive any benefit from that insurance in case of sickness? A.—None whatever; merely in case of accident while you are in the employers' service.

Q.—Do you think that the men could ensure themselves as cheaply or more cheaply by any other means than they do by this system? A.—I think they could, because the premiums paid in are very exorbitant, and are not regulated on any standard scale. If a man earns, for instance, \$12.00 per week there is one per cent. kept off his wages, which is equal to twelve cents a week or forty-eight cents a month. I consider that a very high premium for the profit you derive from it.

Q.—Do you think for the same amount of money the men could insure themselves against accident, death and sickness? A.—I know where such a scheme is carried out in a benefit society belonging to and worked by Longshoremen, where the fee is thirty cents a month, and it covers accident, sickness, death and burial—the fee is only thirty cents a month, and that covers the expenses of working the society, and all the expenses connected with it, and it is run profitably.

Q.—What amount does the Longshoremen's Society pay in case of the death of one of its members? A.—\$50.00,

Q.—What amount does it pay in case of sickness? A.—\$5.00 a week.

Q.—What amount does it pay in case of accident? A.—\$5 a week.

Q.—And what amount does it pay for burial? A.—\$5. In some cases the amounts are higher, but I am giving the average of the Longshoremen's Societies; in some places the amount is \$100.

Q.—Do the agents of that insurance society pay promptly all the demands made on the society? A.—Invariably they do.

Q.—Have you ever known cases where agents of this society have interfered in the payment of benefits? A.—I have.

Q.—Could you give us an instance? A.—I will give you my own personal case, as I will try to keep my statements as personal as possible, although I have known a great many similar circumstances. I had unfortunately an accident this summer and I was laid up; and after I had been for a certain amount of time on the sick list the insurance agent found fault with me for being so long on, and wished to cut me off, saying I had been long enough on it. He produced a paper for me to sign to clear myself from the insurance; I would not sign clear until I was cured. He said I had been on it long enough, that the Company were not getting enough profits, enough percentage, that there were too many accidents and my case had been long enough before them.

Q.—Is there any limit mentioned by the Company or in the insurance to a man remaining on the benefit list? A.—I do not know of any; I have never seen the prospectus or agreement.

Q.—Have you ever known a medical man connected with the insurance society to examine a person who has been disabled, with a view to having his allowance discontinued? A.—No; I cannot say he has done it personally, but by telephone—at least not the doctor, but the agent has conversed and spoken about the advisability of cutting the payments off, and compromising the matter with a man, and that man was myself.

Q.—How did they offer to compromise with you? A.—That I was to take a certain benefit and cry quits.

Q.—A certain sum of money? A.—Yes.

Q.—How do the men feel in regard to this scheme? A.—With rare exceptions, with none I may say, the men do not approve of it.

Q.—Have they ever made any representations to that effect? A.—They have never made any representations direct to the Company themselves for the obvious reason that they are assured they would not be entertained—their advice is not asked on such matters, it is very rare for them to sign and do it.

Q.—Will you tell us on what line of boats the Sunday labor takes place? A.—It takes place invariably, that is with very rare exceptions, on the Glasgow boats.

Q.—Can you give us any reason why this Sunday work should be carried on, on the Glasgow boats? A.—I can only give my supposition. These are not mail boats, they are not tied to time with the mails. It is to the Company's interest to dispatch them as quickly as possible. That is the only reason I can give for it—to make money out of it.

Q.—Supposing a man objected to work on Sunday what would take place? A.—It is quite optional with him, but his services would be required by the Company no longer unless they could not possibly get men and then, of course, they would have to keep him.

Q.—Do the men approve of these contracts they sign with the Allan Company? A.—Invariably all the men I have approached are opposed to them.

Q.—Why do they submit to the contracts? A.—Simply for the reason that they are not in a position or properly organized to reject them. By rejecting them without being properly organized, they would be put adrift, and at the same time their representations would not be entertained. The men would not get work if they did not accept all the stipulations, agreements and exactions put on them.

Q.—Is there any undue influence used to make the men work those long hours you have spoken of? A.—I can state this positively, that towards men who have worked exceedingly long hours, language had been used to the effect of threatening them that if they did not come back there was no more use for them there, language to that effect was used to induce them to come back.

Q.—Have you any knowledge of the difference in the wages between those paid in Montreal and other ports? A.—I have.

Q.—Do you know the difference in wages as between Montreal and Portland? A.—I do, well, and I have worked in both places. The wages in Montreal are twenty cents per hour—I only speak directly in regard to the Allan's. I have

worked for no stevedore, shipper or line of boats outside of Allan's since I have been in Montreal. The standard wages paid are twenty cents, night and day. On Sunday you receive a time and a half, although in this iron-clad contract it is not specified so. It is specified that you shall receive only twenty cents; it is optional with them to give you a time and a half; but when you are called out on Sunday night to work you get no extra pay from twelve o'clock on Sunday night. In Portland there is a standard rate of wages recognized on the dock from one end to the other, an exact standard which, to the best of my knowledge, is thirty cents per hour for day work, and thirty-five cents per hour for night work, thirty-five cents for grain-trimming, and a time and a half for Sunday work.

Q.—What are the wages paid in Boston—do you know what they are? A.—I do. The average wages are thirty cents on day work and thirty-five cents on night work.

Q.—What are the wages in New York? A.—There are different standards of wages that have come under my observation, having been there, and from reading the papers from there; but in regard to my own observation I will speak. There are some large companies who pay their men weekly wages, that is \$15 a week for ten hours a day, that is sixty hours a week, and I suppose you can reckon that on a scale of twenty-five cents per hour. Those wages of \$15 a week are paid for ten hours a day, from seven till six; but the men invariably work probably fifteen or eighteen hours. Their wages will run \$20 or \$24 some weeks. The standard outside of those companies that, as I say, pay \$15 a week for ten hours a day, is invariably forty cents an hour for day work and sixty cents an hour for night work.

Q.—Do you know what the wages are in Quebec? A.—On an average \$4 a day, or \$3 or \$3.50. There are as many get \$4 as \$3 or \$3.50.

Q.—Have you ever worked there? A.—No; but I have worked in ships lying in the harbor and on the steamers where those men were at work. I have worked alongside these men who were working on the steamers, but I was not receiving the same pay as they were.

Q.—Do you know any reason why the wages are higher there than in Montreal? A.—I do.

Q.—What is the reason? A.—The only reason I judge is that the men here are not properly organized, and they have not that manly spirit in them here to stand up for better wages. In other ports they do so and are better organized and they attend the unions.

Q.—We had a witness here this afternoon, who stated something to us about the Company not carrying out their agreement with their men. Do you know anything about that matter? A.—I do; I am personally interested in it, and I am one of the aggrieved parties.

Q.—Can you give any reason why the contract was not carried out to your satisfaction? A.—After mature consideration, and desiring to give a faithful account of it, I can only infer that the only reason of the Company is that they want to beat us out of it.

Q.—Had you any understanding, when you signed the contract, that you were to receive the bonuses? A.—We did; I myself did. Twenty of us had an understanding, not direct with the Messrs. Allan, but from the Messrs. Allan's representative, stating, emphatically, that we would receive a bonus of \$28.00 each at the end of the season by so signing. We submitted, and signed, and at the end of the season when we approached them to receive this premium, which their representative had stated to us would be given, we did not get it. The reason for not giving it to us was that we had been mistaken, or that it was not inserted in the terms of the agreement and that we were, therefore, not entitled to it—and we could do the best we could about it.

Q.—Have you made any attempt to settle the matter amicably with the Company? A.—I did; I have called upon the firm at various times to try to get a satisfactory settlement, or induce them, if they would not settle with us according to the

terms of their representative, to make enquiries from the representative that promised it to us, and have a kind of an arbitration, and come to an understanding, so as to settle the matter. They would not do so. The final answer and decision was: do the best you can about it, or do what you like about it.

Q.—Are the men generally willing to submit those matters to arbitration?
A.—The men would be only too willing, but unfortunately the capitalists of great power and strength do not care about yielding in those matters; they would rather, and do, invariably, prefer to let the matter go through a course of law.

Q.—Are you always supplied with proper gear and appliances for the loading and unloading of vessels? A.—At Allan's the appliances for loading and unloading vessels are generally and usually of a very good quality, with the exception of the chains. The chains—it may not be the direct fault of the Allan's, but it is due to the neglect of the men who should look after those chains—are invariably not looked after. When raising bars of iron, twenty or thirty hundred weight, the chain would break, and the weight would fall, and sometimes do serious injury to the men below. I myself know the case of a man who had his leg broken through the chain sling breaking. That came under my own personal observation, but many of the other accidents that have occurred did not come under my own sight.

Q.—Are there many accidents from deficient gear? A.—Not many. They are chiefly from the chains not being properly looked after. In the day time, the hatchman, who is supposed to look after the chains, will see if there is any fault; but at night, unless the chains have been properly overhauled, and tested, there is no way of coming to a satisfactory conclusion as to whether they are sound or not.

Q.—When you speak of chains, do you mean slings? A.—Yes; chain slings.

Q.—You do not mean any portion of the running gear. A.—No; just the chain slings.

Q.—Do you know of any material you could substitute for the chains? A.—Not for the work for which they are used. Rope of course might be used, but it would wear out after a time and there would be even more accidents with it. Chains are the best.

Q.—Are not the chains always tested before they are used? A.—I do not know whether they are or not; they may and may not, I do not know.

Q.—We have heard something about the system of paying Longshoremen; in your opinion is the present system satisfactory or not? A.—I can give you my opinion about it. In most cases the payments at Allan's are very promptly made, but the system they have of paying, does not meet with the satisfaction of the men, for the simple reason that you are paid probably twice or three times a week. The men have their money in their pockets two or three times a week, and it is a temptation to spend it instead of taking it home to their families; whereas, if the men got it once a week it would have a better effect on them, and they would not be under the same temptation to spend it, and would not leave so much of it in the grog shops, but would take it to their families.

Q.—Have the men ever made any effort to obtain a change of the system of pay? A.—No; the men according to my knowledge, and what I overheard at Allan's, have not done so for the simple reason that, in regard to making complaints or grievances, they seem to be afraid to do so.

Q.—Have they no organization of any kind through which they could make those representations? A.—They have, but unfortunately it is not patronized to the extent it ought to be.

Q.—Can you give us any reason why the men do not take advantage of this organization? A.—Yes; I can give different reasons, but I think the most accurate reason why they do not is that they are not sufficiently educated and intelligent in regard to labor questions to help themselves; and I think that the restrictions, and standard of qualification necessary to get into the organization, are too exacting on the men.

Q.—Can you tell us whether there are any undue means used by any persons

employed by the Company to get the men to sign those contracts? A.—None that came under my personal observation; I can give cases on good authority.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Let us have no mere "on authority."

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Let us have what you know yourself; do you know that such is the case yourself? A.—I have never been approached myself directly, but I have witnesses here who have.

Q.—I think you told us that if a man refused to work after he had worked thirty hours what would be the result? A.—The result very often is dismissal. If it is not dismissal, it is because they cannot get men to take their places.

Q.—When a man is discharged from the employ of the Allan Company, is there any reason why that man should not be taken on again? A.—I cannot answer that.

Q.—There is no blacklisting? A.—I cannot answer that truthfully.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you think it is a bad system on the part of the Messrs. Allan to pay a man when he has finished his work? A.—I think it is honest enough for the Allans to do so.

Q.—You say it is a bad system? A.—Yes; for the men.

Q.—As you know all about insurance companies— A.—No; I do not know all about insurance companies.

Q.—Do you know something about them? A.—Yes; a little.

Q.—Can you tell us what the yearly premium would be for an accident insurance company to pay a policy of \$500.00 at the death of a person? A.—I do not know.

Q.—My question applies to the premium to be paid for a policy of \$500.00, apart from any benefit during sickness? A.—I do not understand about other insurance companies.

Q.—Do you think it is right for an insurance company, which insures against accident, and which pays \$5.00 or a certain sum to a sick man every week, to receive anything in the way of a premium?—A.—Am I to infer from that, they are to give you a benefit without you paying a premium?

Q.—Yes; do you think they ought to do so? A.—No; I do not.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you think the organization among the Longshoremen of Montreal will be productive of other benefits than that of an increase of wages? A.—Yes; the chief end of labor organizations is not to increase wages, but to better the condition of the men, socially and morally. By them, they work better, and they treat each other in a more friendly spirit, not only in their own work, but as regards the country.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you know that if the gear you use in loading ships is frequently inspected? A.—It is invariably inspected by the party who is supposed to be in charge of it, while the gear is working, but it is not inspected by any regularly appointed inspector with that authority.

Q.—Have you been a witness of any accident on the Allan Line? A.—I have.

Q.—Recently. A.—Yes; last summer.

Q.—Will you describe the accident you witnessed? A.—I can do so.

Q.—Do so. A.—It is relating to myself personally. Through not having an inspector of the gear, sometimes the wirefalls have become badly chafed, and so injure your hands if you take hold of them. We are obliged to take hold of them in order to steady the cargo going up from the hold; if we did not, valuable property

might be injured and we would get ourselves into trouble, and the Company into responsibility. In this way I have got several wounds myself. No later than last summer a portion was taken off my finger from that cause.

Q.—If the gear had been properly inspected would that accident have happened?
A.—No. I think if a proper inspector was nominated to look after the gear he would condemn a great part of that which is used. If he had that authority, if he did not condemn it he would order it to be repaired.

Q.—How are the orders given to the engineer of the donkey engine to raise the cargo? A.—From the man in charge over the hatch. It is at Allan's I am speaking of.

Q.—Is that order given in such a manner as not to endanger the lives of the men down below? A.—No; the order invariably given is: "Take it up as quick as you can."

Q.—Do you mean to say the order is sometimes given while the men are fixing the load down below? A.—There is very little consideration given to the men, and if they were standing under ten tons, the order is given: "Whip it up—never mind the men—get the stuff out."

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that accidents have happened as a result of the way in which the order is given? A.—I cannot give direct evidence to support that. I am not exactly prepared with evidence to support that, so I will waive my answer.

Q.—Does not the man who prepares the load below, give the order to haul up?
A.—Yes; the man down below gives the pass word in a great many cases where the hatch man could not see him.

Q.—Is the order sometimes given to raise the load without the man down below having given the pass word? A.—Well, it is.

By Mr. Court:—

Q.—Is that the customary way of doing the work? A.—That depends. Sometimes you cannot see the load for it is under the combings of the hatch, and it gets out of your sight so that you have to wait for orders sometimes. If it is under your own personal observation you can tell the men to stand from under.

Q.—Whose order have you to wait for? A.—For the order of the man down below, that is, sometimes.

Q.—Does not the man down below give the order to take it up? A.—If he does not the foreman will probably give the order, and sometimes before it is half loaded he will say: "Whip it up."

Q.—If the order is given to pull up the load before it is ready, would not this be likely to damage property of the Company? A.—Sometimes it would, sometimes it would not.

Q.—Are you obliged to arrive every morning on the dock at seven o'clock? A.—Yes; you are, invariably.

Q.—When there is no work for you, are you kept on the wharf? A.—Yes; you are kept there, you have to stop there, but you are not paid for the time.

Q.—How many hours are you obliged to remain there? A.—You are not obliged to remain there at all; but it is necessary for you to remain there, or you would lose your work for one, two, three or four hours.

(Translation.)

PETER SAMUEL ZEPHIRIN LANCTOT, merchant clerk, sworn.

By Mr. Helbronner:—

Q.—You are employed in a retail dry goods store? A.—Not at present, but I was so last summer, and will be again the next spring.

Q.—You were employed in the dry goods business for many years? A.—Yes; for thirty years.

Q.—How long were you employed at Montreal in such shops? A.—Thirty years.

Q.—Could you tell us, in a general way, what the salaries are that are paid in such stores? A.—The salaries are pretty well according to the ability of the clerks and their merit. When one serves his time, and begins business at the beginning, the pages receive one dollar and a half to two dollars a week.

By THE CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—At what age? A.—There are some who begin at 12 years.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—The price you mention is for apprentices? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the time of apprenticeship in a store? How many years must an apprentice serve? A.—There is no time laid down. It all depends on how a young man pushes himself.

Q.—The apprentices are not engaged by contract? A.—No; sir.

Q.—What is the lowest salary of a clerk coming out of his apprenticeship; let us say, a youth of twenty? A.—Some of them can make from eight to nine dollars a week; others, only five and six dollars; others, ten or twelve dollars a week, but the general wages are six or seven dollars a week.

Q.—What is, to your knowledge, the highest salary paid to a dry goods clerk in Montreal? A.—There are some who have fifteen dollars a week, but the number of these is very small.

Q.—Outside of regular salaries have not some clerks business on commissions? A.—In some stores they have what is called a "spiff" or a "tinge", which means a percentage on a line of goods that is not saleable, as, for example, on a bad remnant, or a piece of goods which has long been lying on the shelves. The employer will perhaps put on five cents or ten cents to the clerk who manages to sell it.

Q.—What are the real hours at present, in Montreal? At what hour, as a rule, must the clerk reach the store? A.—Some must get there at seven, in the morning, and others at eight o'clock.

Q.—Is that the rule in the same stores or in different stores? A.—There are different rules in different stores. There are merchants to day, whom I know, opening their stores at half past five in the morning.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—On what streets? A.—On St. Joseph street.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is there any reason why these stores should be opened at half past five? A.—They give as a reason that it is to make up the entrance and furnish it with specimens of goods.

Q.—Would there be a railway train at that hour making such opening necessary? A.—There are trains coming in at that hour, but it is not the hour to do business in.

Q.—At what hour do the stores close generally? A.—At present the stores on St. Catharine and St. Lawrence Main streets close at seven o'clock.

Q.—On the other streets? A.—In Notre Dame east, I believe, they likewise close at seven o'clock. In Notre Dame west, there are stores that close at ten o'clock and even eleven o'clock, but this happens only a month or two in the year.

Q.—In the other months what are the hours of closing? A.—On St. Catharine street the hour is eight o'clock, on St. Lawrence Main it was at nine o'clock and ten o'clock last summer, as also on St. Joseph street. St. Joseph street is the street where the stores close the latest.

Q.—Is selling brisk in the evening? A.—No, sir; except on Saturdays and the eves of festival days.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—The old custom is kept up of having the stores open late? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—According to you, this closing at nine, ten and eleven o'clock in the evening is not necessary to the business of the merchants? A.—No, sir. It is not necessary.

Q.—In your opinion, are the costs incurred by keeping the stores open, at night, recouped by the possible profits of sales made during these evenings? A.—No, sir.

Q.—What do you think is the effect of this late closing on the clerks? A.—This late closing leads many young men especially, and even several married men, into taverns and other resorts, instead of their going home. I do not say that all act thus, but many are tempted to do it.

Q.—Do you remember the time when the stores almost regularly closed at eight o'clock in the evening at Montreal? A.—I do, sir.

Q.—Was it not a matter of notice among the merchants that the work done during the day was much more serious and followed up, than when they closed late? A.—Yes, sir, that is so.

Q.—Why was this early closing movement not maintained as a definite system? A.—On account of a number of headstrong merchants.

Q.—The refusal of these several merchants led to the reopening of the stores, eh? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you not aware that even those who opened again declared that they would have preferred to see the early closing continued? A.—There are merchants on St. Catharine street who were called on to stop the early closing, who put the men out who came on that mission. They put them out, but added that, if the others opened they would, of course, have to open also.

Q.—Are you not aware that the principal retail merchants, and the most important firms in all the parts of the city, are in favor of early closing? A.—Yes; and furthermore, I may state that I was employed, for fifteen years, in a firm where we were in the habit of closing at eleven o'clock at night; then we came to closing at nine o'clock, and, later, came down to eight o'clock, and now that house shuts up at seven o'clock, twelve months in the year, and the owner has not noticed that his business has lessened. To the best of my knowledge, I think it has improved.

Q.—Is it not the merchants who encouraged the clerks in the early closing movement? A.—There are several merchants who encouraged early closing; the majority of the merchants promised their support to their clerks for closing at an early hour.

Q.—Are there many young girls and young women employed in these retail stores? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are they obliged to stay in the store as long as the men? A.—In some stores they are obliged to stay, but in others they are not. It all depends on the terms of their engagement.

Q.—Were you ever employed in a store closing late, and obliging its female clerks to stop in till the closing of the shop? A.—I was employed in a store of the kind, but it is several years ago.

Q.—Do you remember what effect such long hours had on the health of those women? A.—Several among them were almost always ill, always indisposed.

Q.—The young fellows, called cashboys, do they also stop till the closing of the store? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are they not even obliged to stay after the closing of the store to sweep the store? A.—No; in some stores the sweeping is done at night, and in others it is done in the morning on coming to the store.

Q.—Do you know of stores closing late where these young people are obliged to sweep in the evening? A.—No; not particularly.

Q.—What is the average age, and which is the youngest child, employed as a cash-boy, to your knowledge? A.—I could not lay down a general rule, but I have seen very young ones; I have seen them of eleven years of age generally they are twelve or thirteen years of age, or thirteen to fifteen.

Q.—Have you seen children, from twelve to fifteen years of age, working in retail stores, from seven o'clock in the morning to eleven o'clock at night? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you aware that this is done even to-day? A.—That is still done in certain stores.

Q.—In the store where you lately worked, say last year, it is allowed the young ladies employed in the store, to sit down? A.—In the store where I was last year, there were no young ladies, but it is no more allowed for a young lady to sit down in the store, than it is for the men, unless she be a seamstress and is busy sewing.

Q.—This is the almost general rule? A.—It is the general rule.

Q.—In general, how do the merchants treat their people in the retail shops? A.—As for myself I have no complaint to make against my employers on the manner of their treatment, because I was always well treated.

Q.—You never saw any brutality on the part of the employers? A.—No, sir; never.

Q.—Have you any suggestions to make in regard to early closing? Also, on the best way of arriving at the settlement of this question? A.—An attempt might be made to open the stores at eight o'clock in the morning and close them at eight o'clock in the evening. This could very easily be done, except on Saturday nights and the evos of the great festivals.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—At what hour would you have them close on those days? A.—On those days the employers have always been allowed till midnight.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you think that if the working people were paid on Friday evenings it would put an end to the closing at midnight on Saturday? A.—Yes; because most people are paid only on Saturday night, very late, and then they do not wish to lose time in making their purchases. If they did not buy on Saturday night they would have to wait until Monday night, or sometimes Tuesday, for they can go to buy only at night. But if they were paid on Friday, or during the day of Saturday, they could do their shopping as well on the Saturday. If I may be allowed to make an observation on this point, I should say that the firm, of which I spoke, where I was employed for fifteen years, kept the store late at night to allow people working during the day as, for instance, domestic servants, to make their purchases at night; but when the employer began closing earlier we saw always the same customers, and when he closed at seven o'clock, we still had the visit of the same lot of customers.

Q.—Is it not true that it is chiefly at night that the employers make a profit by selling to their clients, goods that have lost their freshness? A.—Yes, sir; that happens very often.

Q.—So that early closing would prove a boon to everybody; to the employers, the customers and the clerks? A.—It would be an advantage to everyone according to my experience.

Q.—Could you tell us whether there is a special law affecting the seizure of wages of employees in business? A.—The law that exists is the seizure of the whole wages.

Q.—In that case there is no law? A.—No, sir.

Q.—According to you, what is the general feeling among business clerks on the question of the seizure of wages? A.—We should like to be placed on about the same footing as the mechanic, which means, that only half of the wages would be subject to seizure.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Would you prefer that they should not be seized at all? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is there a demand for a difference between the working man and the clerk, in this respect? A.—Yes, sir; there is.

Q.—Are you aware that the whole salary of an employee has been seized? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Was he a married man? A.—He was, Sir.

Q.—Their salaries were seized and the men were forced to run into debt to make a living? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—The clerk can leave his berth, can he not? A.—The clerk can leave, but if he goes to another place his wages are again seized.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you know that clerks thus seized and sued have left the country? A.—That is a question which I am not prepared to answer.

Q.—What is the position of a clerk to whom the employer owes a salary, when the employer fails in business? A.—I found myself in that predicament two years ago. I had an engagement for one year, and I lost two hundred and fifteen dollars in that bankruptcy, because the assignees told me there was no law to protect me, that is, that I had no right to draw a salary in advance, and that they could allow only the salary that had been earned.

Q.—Did you get the salary owing to you? A.—Yes. I got the salary which was due to me.

Q.—How long after it was due to you? A.—At the end of about two weeks.

Q.—The engagements of the men are generally made in the month of May? A.—They are made usually after stock-taking, in the course of the month of January, to take effect in the ensuing April.

Q.—Is it an easy matter for an employee whose engagement is broken, by the failure of his patron, to get a new place in the course of the same year? A.—No, sir; it is quite a chance if he finds another engagement. And then, beside that, he is very often obliged to give his services at low rates. I could name to you men who are very able in their business, and who, to-day, are forced to give themselves away for two dollars and a half a week.

Q.—It follows that the merchant's failure prevents the clerk from getting employment before the month of May? A.—Well, rather to the first of April.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the retail stores in Montreal? A.—It is a very bad one.

Q.—As a general rule, you mean? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In what respect? A.—There is not enough fresh air in the stores. The atmosphere is tainted by the smell of the dry goods as well as by the breath of the customers, because we are closed in without ventilation. I know a store, where I was employed, in which, on opening in the morning, I was obliged to leave the door open, for a minute or two, on account of the vitiated air which had gathered in the store during the night. The bad smell almost drove me back.

Q.—In what part of the store are the privies generally located? A.—Many of them are placed in the basement, and others are in the yard.

Q.—Is it the custom in stores, where they employ persons of both sexes, to have separate closets? A.—In the greater number of large stores there are privies for the one sex, and privies for the other.

Q.—Are there many establishments where this rule is not held? A.—Yes, sir; there are.

Q.—Are these privies generally in good order? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—You spoke of the seizure of wages, just now,—do you know of persons whose salaries were seized in sums of five or six dollars, or seven or eight dollars, and who had to pay heavy costs, and often saw their household goods sold at auction, by authority of justice, to pay the fees of lawyers, courts and others? A.—I remember that the wages of a clerk were seized for the sum of four dollars and this amount went up to fifteen dollars, including a number of costs.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Are you aware of the fact that a certain number of young lawyers go into groceries, butchers' shops and dry-goods stores asking for accounts that are in arrears, in order to sue the debtors? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you know that there are a large number of lawyers who ply that trade? A.—Yes; and collectors also.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Are the clerks held to give a week's notice before leaving the establishment? A.—There are certain houses where this is required, but I think that they are very scarce here, in Montreal. I think there are no more than two or three of our firms exacting that.

Q.—Do employers give their clerks notice before dismissing them? A.—Generally, they do not. Sometimes a merchant will be kind enough to say to his employee: "You may look for a situation for yourself within the space of a week."

Q.—Are clerks generally as well paid as capable mechanics in Montreal? A.—No; sir, they are not.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Much less? A.—Yes, sir, much less.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have not clerks heavier expenses, in the way of clothing and maintenance, than artisans? A.—Yes. They have a much greater outlay than artisans and their salary is not as high, and their hours are longer than the hours of mechanics.

Q.—Are the clerks fined for coming late in the morning, or for any other cause? A.—I was employed in a store where there were fines, but the fines were retained on what I called, a moment ago, "Spiff."

Q.—Are the fines graduated according to the amount of wages received, or the commission given on the sale of goods? A.—In the house where I was employed, there was a rule something like this. We had ten minutes grace after hours, and if we arrived eleven minutes late, the patron would charge us for the eleven minutes, and then he charged us fifteen cents, and that was retained from our wages. But the fines imposed for things done in the shop, as spitting on the floor, or taking down a wrong address, amounted to twenty-five and thirty cents, and that was retained on the premiums.

Q.—Could you suggest any measure that would tend to better the condition of clerks? A.—That would be very difficult, at present, because things have got spoiled in the trade. Something like that prevailed some years ago, when I was serving my time. We were then held to serve four years. The first year, we had four dollars a

month and so on up to eight dollars for the last year. But if you spent only forty seven months in a place, to serve your time, and if you went elsewhere in search of a situation, you had to begin your whole time again. This happened to myself, after thirty months' service. I went elsewhere, in quest of a situation, and I was asked how long I had served. I replied that I had served thirty months. I was then told that, if I could begin my apprenticeship all over again, I should get an engagement. In default of this, I was to return to my former employers, and return with a certificate vouching that I had served four years.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Could not the clerks unite in a combination like the other workingmen? Could they not make a strike? A.—A strike; there is no chance of making one, and that is exactly the bane of us. To-day, a young man is taken from school and transformed into a clerk on the spot.

Q.—But, presuming that these people came to an understanding, could they not get up a strike? Why should you work at the cheaper rates when everybody is clamoring for higher wages? A.—It is very hard for us, because there are certain men who look to what kind of work they can do, but a clerk, who has been engaged in a store a portion of his life, does not care to do anything else, and he is forced to take the price which his employer offers him.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are you aware that married men, employed in stores that close late, are almost strangers to their families? A.—Yes, sir, I myself. I was several years without seeing my family except on Sundays. I started off on Monday morning and returned on the following Sunday.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—You said, a while ago, that it would be to the advantage of the merchant to close earlier. Why is it, then, if it is their interest, do shopkeepers persist in closing late. They would not do so, if it were truly their interest to close early? A.—The case stands thus: The patrons would have much more advantage if they consented to close their establishments early, for several reasons: one reason is that the clerks would be less wearied, and could do better work on the next day. Then they do not close early, because of the neighbour's ambition to keep open late. Of course, if one neighbour refuses to close his store early, the other will also refuse, but if he closed early, the other will follow suit.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—But is it not a fact that there are stores in Montreal that close at seven o'clock, while their neighbours, both on the right hand and left hand, keep theirs open, and is it not true that these stores do a better business than those which close late? A.—Yes, sir.

(Translation.)

PAUL CHARTRAND, Carriage-maker, of Montreal, sworn:

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are the superintendent of the Heney & Lacroix factory of Montreal? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you the superintendent of the store or of the workshops? A.—I am the superintendent only of the carriage factory.

Q.—Are you the superintendent of the factory which Messrs. Heney & Lacroix have at the Reformatory school? A.—Yes, sir. I am superintendent for what regards the manufacture of carriages only.

Q.—Do you know what the contract is which Messrs. Heney & Lacroix have made with the Reformatory? A.—No, sir; I do not.

Q.—Do you sometimes go to the Reformatory during working hours? A.—I am there every day.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You are employed there all the time? A.—Yes, sir; all the time.

By MR. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How many of the pupils of the Reformatory are employed in your shops? A.—I have twenty-four under my guidance.

Q.—Are these twenty-four youths the only hands employed by Messrs. Heney & Lacroix? A.—No.

Q.—You are speaking only for the department of woodwork, are you not? A.—No, sir; I am speaking only for the making of carriages.

Q.—Are there mechanics working in the same shop as these boys? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What is the character of the work done by these boys? A.—At the beginning they only help. There are very few of them leaving the shops of whom it may be said that they are skilled workmen. The only thing is that it gives them a good start to make their living later.

Q.—When you take these children under your charge, do you engage yourself toward the managers of the Reformatory that you will teach them their trade? A.—Yes; as far as that can be done. We do all in our power to show them the trade. Some of them serve only three or four months, or the few months left to them to fulfil their punishment, and naturally they are not mechanics. But I have some who have done their time, and who have made six or seven dollars a week after leaving the factory.

Q.—The goods manufactured by these boys are sent to the warehouse of Messrs. Heney & Lacroix and mixed with other goods bought in other stores? A.—They do not complete their work. They help only. They screw vices, for instance, and help the men. It takes a mechanic three or four years before he can put a piece of work together.

Q.—Do you not know that these boys turn out a quantity of work which is sold to the general public? A.—They do not produce this work of themselves; it is we that do it. They work with others.

Q.—They work at things that go into general consumption just like the other workmen of the Reformatory? A.—They only contribute to those works.

Q.—Do you know how much these boys are paid? A.—I do not know precisely. I have heard the sums mentioned, but do not know personally.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you know that they are paid at all? A.—Yes, sir; I think that they do get something.

By MR. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—I ask whether you pay so much a head for those children? A.—I have heard it said, but I have not kept any account of it myself.

Q.—You evidently work in the buildings which form a part of the Reformatory School? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is there a portion of the tools or the plant, used for manufacturing purposes, that is furnished by the Reformatory? A.—No, sir; there is not.

Q.—You are given the four bare walls? A.—That is all.

Q.—How long is it since Messrs. Heney & Lacroix employ the work of the Reformatory boys? A.—It was I opened the works for Messrs. Heney & Lacroix; it will be four years the next coming May day.

Q.—Do you teach these little fellows designs of carriages, plans and the like? A.—Yes; plans and the like, the best way we can. The reason why I have so many hands, is that every man has a boy with him, which helps the young men to learn. I am positive that, when a boy is clever, we can turn out a better workman than any other shop can.

Q.—Have you other works beside those at the Reformatory? A.—No; I have no others that I oversee.

Q.—I ask you whether the firm of Heney & Lacroix have other workshops than those at the Reformatory? A.—Not that I know of. I know of no other for carriages.

Q.—Have you been long as foreman and workman in carriage making? A.—Yes, sir. I kept a shop of my own for sixteen years in the United States, and for the past four years I have been managing affairs here for Messrs. Heney & Lacroix.

Q.—What are the wages that would be paid to workmen in the city doing the same work as those in the Reformatory now do? A.—If it were as in the time that I served my articles, I would willingly tell you.

Q.—Say thereabouts. How much would you pay if you had apprentices to take in from to-day? A.—At present the price is, I believe, three or four dollars a month and board.

Q.—Do you not throw in bed and lodging at the same time? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—I am speaking of apprentices in the city. You say that the prices are four to five dollars a month, with board. Do you mean to include sleeping and lodging in the house of the patron? A.—Yes; I naturally include their sleeping and lodging. The apprentices, as is usual, always board with the patron.

Q.—Do you know what the working hours of these lads are? A.—About seven hours and a-quarter a day. They begin at half-past eight in the forenoon and knock off at twenty minutes to noon. At half-past one they begin to work again and leave off at twenty minutes to six.

Q.—Have they any class hours? A.—Yes; in the forenoon.

Q.—How many hours a day? A.—I could not say. All I know is what I hear from the wardens. I know nothing whatever about it of myself.

Q.—Could you tell us how many, out of the four and twenty boys under your charge at present, can read and write? A.—All of them, I think.

Q.—The hands who work with these lads, have they orders to teach them the trade? A.—These are my own orders to teach them their trade and make them do their work as it should be done.

Q.—Do the men go to the trouble of teaching them their trade? A.—Yes, sir, they do.

Q.—Are they qualified? Have the workmen the ability to show the boys their trade? A.—Yes, sir; they are mechanics earning good wages, from fourteen dollars a week to seven and a-half at the lowest.

Q.—Can you tell what is the mean time that the boys spend in the Reformatory school? What is the length of their sentence? A.—There are some of them confined for four years; some for three years, and some for only two years. I do not think there are any for less than two years. There are some for five years. I think that, on an average, they spend two years there.

Q.—How do you pay your men? A.—Every Thursday.

Q.—You do not yourself pay the boys? A.—No; I pay only the men. I have nothing to do with the boys.

Q.—Do you use machinery in your factory? A.—Yes; we have a few small machines.

Q.—Are you aware that any of the lads were ever hurt by your machinery?
A.—No, sir.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—What part of the work do you make the boys do? A.—They work at the forge, in wood, in painting, in trimming—in fact in all that goes to the making of a carriage.

Q.—Does the same workman learn all these branches? A.—No, sir, each department has its branch.

Q.—Do some work in the paint shop? A.—Yes; I have a dozen working in the paint shop.

By Mr. COTÉ:—

Q.—In that case, you mean that working in wood is an apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir, I do.

Q.—And working in the smithy another apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And working in paint is still another apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir; it is a trade quite different from the others.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How old are the children working at these trades? A.—There are none younger than 12 years.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are you allowed to chide these lads? A.—Not we; no, sir. If a boy does wrong, we warn the warden. We tell him what he has done wrong, and if he deserves to be punished, the warden does this himself, but never before us.

Q.—Are you not even expressly forbidden to touch a child? A.—Yes, sir; we are forbidden. We ourselves may not touch a boy, and none of the journeymen would lay a finger on one.

Q.—At what age do you put the boys in the forge? A.—That depends on their size and their degree of stoutness. Some are old enough, but not strong. Usually we take the oldest and the strongest at the ages of fifteen, sixteen and seventeen years.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are there other manufactories at the Reformatory besides yours? A.—Yes, sir, several.

Q.—Which are they? A.—There is a harness factory.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is your factory still under the control of Messrs. Heney & Lacroix? A.—Yes, sir. There is also Mr. Sauvageau, who keeps a tinsmith shop. There is, too, Mr. Parent, who has a boot and shoe factory.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Is that all? A.—No, sir; there is also a printing establishment.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is there not, also, a joiner's shop? A.—Yes; but the Brothers manage that themselves.

Q.—Is the shop for their own private work or for public sale? A.—It is for their own work.

Q.—Who has the printing contract? A.—I think it is Mr. Globensky.

R. A. SMITH, of the Allan Steamship Company, re-called:—

I wish to submit two statements showing that during the season of 1886, the Allan Line of Steamers carried 19,747 oxen, with a mortality of 0.167 per cent.; in 1887, 17,351, with a mortality of 0.276 per cent. (Statements filed.)

ALLAN LINE.

Statement of Live Stock Shipments from the St. Lawrence during the season of navigation 1887.

STEAMERS.	No. of Trips.	Oxen.	Sheep.	MORTALITY.	
				Oxen.	Sheep.
Norwegian	5	2742	4	..
Nestorian	5	1430	926	1	14
Carthaginian	6	3740	60	4	0
Buenos Ayrean	6	1896	2	..
Corean	3	1373	487	4	8
Siberian	5	2532	0	..
Grecian	5	1990	145	32	3
Lucerne	3	532	129	0	4
Canadian	1	232	148	0	0
Pomeranian	2	415	552	0	3
Prussian	1	268	0	..
Assyrian	1	201	367	1	3
		17351	2794	48	35

Mortality percentage, Cattle 0.276 p. c., Sheep 1.25 p. c.

Montreal, 8th December, 1887.

ALLAN LINE.

Statement of Live Stock Shipments from the St. Lawrence during the season of Navigation 1886.

STEAMERS.	No. of Trips.	Oxen.	Sheep.	MORTALITY.	
				Oxen.	Sheep.
Norwegian	6	3069	588	2	7
Circassian	2	529	18	1	0
Sarmatian	1	160	...	0	..
Nestorian	5	1271	3082	1	152
Carthaginian	5	1979	...	7	..
Hibernian	4	1478	1038	2	11
Lucerne	3	314	591	2	4
Corean	5	2296	488	5	0
Buenos Ayrean	5	2792	943	2	1
Phenecian	4	1276	1741	8	75
Manitoban	1	375	...	0	..
Grecian	4	1193	4347	1	32
Siberian	3	2090	...	1	..
Scandinavian	2	925	53	1	0
		19747	12889	33	282

Mortality percentage. Cattle 0.167 p. c. Sheep 2.18 p. c.

Montreal,

I declare this (document filed) is a copy of our labor contract and with the explanations conveyed in that letter recorded:—

ALLAN LINES OF ROYAL MAIL STEAMSHIPS.

HUGH & ANDREW ALLAN, AGENTS.

MONTREAL, 10th February, 1888.

SIR,—In accordance with your request, I have the honor to transmit herewith, the form of labor contract to which reference was made in my evidence before the Commission this afternoon.

In respect to this I should, perhaps, repeat here what I said in evidence, that we paid our laborers under this contract an additional sum of 5 cents per hour when working on grain and an advance of 50 per cent. (or 35 cents to 37½ cents per hour) for any time they were required to work between midnight on Saturdays and midnight on Sundays; and that we also paid a bonus of \$1.00 per week to the contract laborers of 1887 who were also under contract with us during the season of 1886, —although such extra allowances were not stipulated for in the contract itself.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

R. A. SMITH.

To the Hon. JUSTICE ARMSTRONG,

&c., &c., &c.,

Chairman, Royal Commission on Labor.

In consideration of the wages hereinafter agreed to be paid to me by Messrs. H. & A. ALLAN of the City of Montreal, Agents of the "Allan" Line of Steamships, I hereby hire and engage to and with them, from the opening to the end and close of the season of navigation of the Saint Lawrence for the ensuing year of 18 , as a ship and wharf laborer, to work on, in, and about their ships, or ships consigned to them at the Port of Montreal, and on and about their wharves in the said Port of Montreal, or at any place on the River Saint Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec, as the exigencies of their service may require, for and at the rate of Twenty Cents (20 c.) per hour for each and every hour that I shall actually work, hereby agreeing and undertaking, during the whole of the term of this Agreement, to work at night as well as by day, or both, on working days, Sundays and holidays, if required so to do; said wages, less ten per cent. thereof, to be paid me once a week, the said ten per cent. so to be retained, to be paid to me on the faithful completion of this Contract, and to be subject to the penalties and forfeitures hereinafter mentioned.

It is distinctly agreed that I shall only have a right to demand pay for the time I shall actually work and be employed; and that if I should refuse to work when required, or if I absent myself without permission, and prevent the proper working of any gang on a ship or steamship to which I shall have been assigned, I shall forfeit my place in such gang, and the said Messrs. H. & A. ALLAN shall be at liberty, should they see fit, to terminate this agreement *instantly*, and on such being done I shall thereby forfeit all right to any amount retained from out of my wages by them as hereinbefore provided for.

I hereby further agree, and it is an essential condition of this agreement, that the penalties and forfeitures hereinbefore provided for, shall be held as additional penalties to all the legal and penal responsibilities imposed upon servants, labourers and journeymen by By-Law XXI of the City of Montreal, and nothing herein shall be held to be a renunciation of the penalties existing under the said By-Law, the penalties and forfeitures hereinbefore mentioned, to be held as cumulative with the penalties under the said By-Law.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed these presents at the City of
 Montreal, this _____ day of _____
 A.D. 18 _____

WITNESS :

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—There is no contract in book form? A.—That is extracted from the book.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do the men sign the contract in the book? A.—Yes; the contracts are bound in book form. I wish also to state that I find three actions are pending against us by contract laborers of last season. As I explained yesterday we paid a bonus of \$1 per month to the contract men who had been contract laborers with us during 1886. Three men who were not under contract during 1886 claimed the bonus, which has been refused, and actions have been taken by them in the Courts.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—I see that 1887, 48 cattle were lost of which 32 were lost on one ship. What were the exceptional circumstances which caused such a mortality on that vessel? A.—They were North-West ranch cattle, and the vessel experienced exceedingly severe weather.

Q.—Was it exceedingly hot weather? A.—No; exceedingly boisterous weather.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Was there anything in the contract signed by any of the men last year stating that they would receive a bonus? A.—Nothing expressed in the agreement.

Q.—It was a verbal agreement? A.—It was a verbal agreement, a promise that they would receive that at our good pleasure at the end of the season.

Q.—Do you remember anything said to any of the men that would lead them to think they would receive a bonus? A.—No authority was given by us to anyone to give such a promise, and I have the assurance of Capt. Barclay and Mr. Urquhart that they did not make such a promise, and they alone outside of members of the firm would have any authority to deal with the men.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Apart from the other two gentlemen mentioned, was there anyone who had authority to make any such statement? A.—No; decidedly not.

CAPTAIN BARCLAY, of the Allan Steamship Company, re-called.

I desire to make a statement with respect to our gear, which has been stated is not good. Our gear is the very best that can be procured in Canada, in this city, or anywhere else. The chain is proved chain when we purchase it. We have a competent store keeper who examines all this gear every day. If anything defective is discovered it is laid aside and the blacksmith comes and repairs it. The men themselves are instructed when they see a defective article connected with the working gear to lay it aside.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Are your steamers examined here by the Inspectors of Hulls or in England ?
A.—They are not examined here but in England.

Q.—Where the law is very strict ? A.—Yes.

By MR. FREED :—

Q.—Can you state how many accidents took place last year in consequence of chains or other tackle connected with the hauling appliances ? A.—I cannot.

By MR. WALSH :—

Q.—Do you know of any ? A.—I don't know of any.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—When men are discharging a vessel is there not a man in the lower part and one at the top who has charge of the work ? Is not the order to raise the goods given by the man in charge at the bottom, and who superintends the making up of the packages ? A.—Yes.

Q.—It is the invariable rule, I suppose, that the engine is not to be started before the man at the bottom gives the word ? A.—Yes. They say "go ahead," and they put in the quantity they think proper.

Q.—And they give the word to the man on deck that he can start the engine and haul up ? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Is that the rule or the practice ? A.—It is the practice always. In fact, the men have those matters all in their own hands—that is to say the laborers.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—Then a man before he gives the word can see that he is out of the way ?
A.—It is his place to see that everything is right before he gives the word. Another statement I have to make, is this: when our men are sent down the river to Quebec, or between Quebec and Montreal to work on ships, they are paid full time when they are working, and half time when they are going and returning, that is when they are idle.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Why should not the men be paid for the full time, for they are prevented from working at home, having been taken away ? A.—I don't know. They all seem very anxious to go, and we have to reject half of those who apply for the job of that kind.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Can they sleep going and returning ? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Does that often happen during the season ? A.—Very rarely; it is three or four years since we have had anything of the kind. I can get an abundance of men to go by simply paying their wages while working. Of course, they are well fed during the time they are away.

Q.—They are paid in addition to receiving their usual pay ? A.—Yes.

PETER FERNS, Stevedore, Montreal, called and sworn:—

I desire to make a statement to the Commission. With respect to the rates of wages paid 'Longshoremen in the Port of Montreal in the past season, I may say, that it was $17\frac{1}{2}$, 20 and $22\frac{1}{2}$ cents per hour on all the regular lines of steamships. The rates of wages paid by the stevedores who handle the coal steamers, and other accidental work by contract, were, during the past season, 20 and 30 cents per hour. The stevedores paid the highest wages to Longshoremen in the Port of Montreal. It is impossible for the ship owner or stevedore to do business in Montreal and not pay the 'Longshoremen their wages. 'Longshoremen's wages have increased fifty per cent during the past seven years.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that a stevedore has not paid the prices which he agreed to pay? A.—My information in regard to that is hearsay. I have no knowledge of it.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that any of the stevedores have only paid five and ten cents per hour to their men? A.—No; I have no knowledge of that.

Q.—Have you known of that having occurred on one occasion? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—You have stated that no stevedore can do business in Montreal unless he pays his men. Will you give us your reasons for making that statement? A.—Because the men would not work for him, and, as a matter of course, he could do no business. I think something worse than that would happen to him.

Q.—Have any of the stevedores ever attempted to do business who would not pay their men? A.—Yes; but they had to take a quick departure. During the period of the last 20 years there have been three stevedores, to my knowledge, who have left the city and not paid their men.

By Mr. KEEWIN:—

Q.—Are there many stevedores in the Port of Montreal? A.—Not many, taking into consideration the amount of work to be done by stevedores here.

Q.—Is there much competition among the stevedores for vessels? A.—At present there is not much competition.

Q.—I am talking about the competition among stevedores last summer? A.—There was not much competition last summer. The merchants and ship owners are more conservative of late with regard to competition.

Q.—Have you ever taken a ship at a low scale and made the men work a great deal harder than is usually the case, so that money might be made? A.—That, in my opinion, is a very silly assertion of the fact that all stevedores try to get all the work they can out of their men, and this, of course, is the case elsewhere.

Q.—You think it is the case everywhere? A.—It is the case everywhere in the world; it is human nature.

Q.—If a stevedore happens to take a ship a great deal lower than the prevailing rate of wages, will not the men have to work harder in order that something may be made out of the contract? A.—It is a question.

Q.—I know it is a question; but I am asking you for an answer to it? A.—I will give you a detailed account in reply. Some men can take ships cheaper than others. Sometimes, also some men, are able to make more money, as is the case in other businesses, by care, good management and so on.

Q.—Do you not think the 'Longshoremen of Montreal would be just as well off without any stevedores in the Port? A.—No; I don't think so.

Q.—Why do you not think so? A.—Because stevedores have a great deal of experience with regard to shipping, and their guiding influence makes the men work

to some purpose. Besides, the stevedores have a competent knowledge that is required to do this discharging and loading of ships, both steam and sail.

Q.—Is it not very often the case that among the men you employ there are men quite as clever in stevedoring as you are, but who have not got so much financial abilities? A.—I grant that.

Q.—Is not that the class of men you look for? A.—I take exception to that remark in this way; there are men in all walks of life who are very poor and who possess a great deal of knowledge. There are such men among the stevedoring men of course.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Who employ the stevedores, who give them the contracts? A.—Sometimes it is the owner of the ship, sometimes it is the agent of the Company, sometimes the Company directly. There is a little rivalry with regard to who has the authority. Sometimes it is the merchant who signs in the matter, and he sells his interest to the stevedore.

Q.—Do you not think the 'Longshoremens could do this work on the co-operative plan, and divide the money that goes to the stevedores, and thus do away with the middlemen? Do you think that is an impossible thing? A.—I have always understood that there is nothing a man can speak of as impossible; but at the same time in regard to this matter I say it is very improbable. I might give you many reasons why it is improbable, but I would rather write a treatise on it than talk about it.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Do you not think the system of doing this work by the ton is altogether wrong? A.—No; I don't think so. It is the manner in which the business is conducted from which the wrongs come. It is quite legitimate for me or any other man to propose to you to discharge your load at a good price; but there is wrong doing everywhere. The contract business, generally speaking, creates a great deal of rivalry. I may see where I can make \$200 at a certain job, and pay the current rate of wages, and you may see an opportunity to make even more, and you may probably offer the man who has power to give you the work a bonus of \$50. That is where the evil comes; that is about the only evil I see attached to it.

Q.—Who is to blame for it; is it the merchant? A.—It is human nature.

Q.—In a case where a stevedore should receive a contract at an exorbitant figure—I suppose it occurs very often—and he completed the job, who would get the credit for making the money; would it be the stevedore or the laborers? A.—All concerned in proportion to their privileges. I suppose that is the way with everything in the commercial world as things run on that principle. I have known myself of a case where a stevedore took a contract for the loading of ships, and the men made \$15 each and the stevedore \$800. I have known instances where ships have been discharged and the men would each receive from \$15 to \$20 and the stevedore was about \$200 out of pocket. It is on the principle of never venture never win.

Q.—Do you not think that this contract and lump business should be abolished altogether? A.—I have got a selfish motive to get over to endeavor to answer that question, as I am a contractor myself.

Q.—I ask you your opinion as I know you are a contractor for I know what a laborer would say? A.—Sinking my own interests in this matter I answer you by saying, yes, if all things were equal. If all the world was run on the co-operative principle so far as commerce is concerned that should be done. It is like free trade. If one country has free trade and all the other countries have protected tariffs.....

By THE CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—We don't want anything like politics introduced.

By Mr. HELBRONNER;—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that stevedores have promised 20 cents per hour and have only paid 17½ cents per hour wages ?

A.—It is not so far as my knowledge goes at the present time that the stevedores have any discretion in that matter at all. The men make the demand and procure the wages they demand.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—The question is are they paid ? A.—Of course they are paid.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you know of any men not being paid this year by stevedores. A.—Yes; there was one party. I don't want to be personal, but there was one party who took a contract. He tried to pay his men, but he could not succeed in paying them to their satisfaction. How much less he paid them I don't know, but I know they were not satisfied, that is from what I hear.

Q.—You have stated in your evidence that the men are always paid according to the demands they make ? A.—If the amount is agreed upon. You may make a demand and I might object to it.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You have explained that in a certain case the men were not paid ? A.—Yes ; that is the only case I know of.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that men occupied on the wharves in Montreal have been unable to find the stevedore so as to receive their pay ? A.—No ; I have no knowledge of such a thing taking place, because they would search him up pretty quickly.

Q.—They may have sought him but not found him ? A.—I have no knowledge of that.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You think they would find him next week ? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Is it the stevedore or the Companies that supply the necessary gear and material for unloading and loading ships ? A.—As a rule the stevedore. There is one Company I believe in the port of Montreal who do not find their gear, and that is the Beaver Line. Beyond that I know of no other.

Q.—As a general rule of what quality is the gear employed ? A.—These who have the work to do select the gear suitable for the work and the pieces of the gear they can get.

Q.—Is that gear inspected ? A.—It is in a superficial way. I judge you are referring to accidents to workmen. I take it, it is this way : accidents that take place in connection with the working of ships, are largely due to the neglect of the men themselves. I don't think there is a greater number of accidents in Montreal than in a similar port on the continent.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that during last summer, a man in this port was killed from the fall of machinery employed ? A.—I don't know of such a case. I believe there was one man killed, but I didn't make any special enquiries in regard to it.

By Mr. COTÉ :—

Q.—Was it through defective machinery? A.—I could not tell you because I made no special enquiries; but I know that many accidents take place on the ships, during some seasons of the year, by too much hurry, and too much confusion. It is not for want of knowledge; there is sufficient knowledge of that dock to conduct things rightly.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Did you work in Montreal last year? A.—I have worked in Montreal for the past twenty-one years.

Q.—Have you ever known of an accident that happened to a man named Bergeron? A.—No; I don't know; I only heard of it.

Q.—Have you known of an accident which happened to a man through the fall of a tub of coal? A.—I know that a case of that kind occurred some ten or eleven years ago.

Q.—Did you know such a case occurred last year? A.—No; not last year.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Is it the duty of the stevedore to see as to the proper loading and unloading of a vessel? A.—His duty is, of course, to see that the ship is discharged and loaded according to the laws of the Board of Trade, and the custom of the port.

Q.—In doing that work one man is not as good as another; the stevedore is a better man than the general run, and he should know more than the men, does he? A.—He ought to do so. Of course, a stevedore is supposed to know his business.

Q.—You think the captain of a ship also should know more than a man who has just been put on board a vessel? A.—Yes. I have been master of a ship myself, and for that reason can give you the information.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—What is the average number of consecutive hours, during which men employed on the wharves, have to work without rest? A.—I have known them to work forty hours, but those are exceptional cases. It is the rule, at the coal business, to work for thirty or forty hours without rest, barring their meal hours.

Q.—Is it your knowledge that men have worked fifty hours without rest? A.—Not specially, although I have no doubt they have done it, but I have no knowledge of it.

Q.—Would it not be possible to limit the number of hours of work during which the men are employed on wharves, as is done in other trades? A.—It would be. There is no obstruction to the introduction of a regular system on our wharves; the disconnected interests of different parties cause the whole of the little wrongs that take place in connection with the work.

Q.—Do you say that the work on board of ship can go on in the same quiet way as it does in a house; is there no hurry in sending off vessels? A.—That is true. In ship work there is always a hurry, there is so much uncertainty that it can not be proceeded with in the same way as you could work in a local factory, such as an iron foundry.

Q.—Notwithstanding this hurry that exists in loading and unloading ships, could not different relays of men be employed to do the work? A.—The men who work in the day time are, as a rule, looked upon to work during the night time.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Could not a system of relays be carried out? A.—It could, but it would not be effectual.

Q.—How? A.—The reason is that shipping work is very uncertain; it varies almost like the wind. It is also found that the men who work on a ship all day are

better adapted for working on the ship at night, certainly more so than a fresh gang of men that might be brought on. They know the circumstances connected with the work much better than those who may be brought on at night.

By Mr. Coré:—

Q.—Could not the same class of men be brought on? A.—Well, even so, and accidents might occur. It takes some time before the men get the run of the work, and it is found better to leave the men who are working all day to work all night. Longshoremen can work twenty hours without difficulty, and we can renew the men the following morning without obstructing the business or injuring the men.

Q.—Are the men paid higher wages for night work than for day work? A.—As a rule, no.

Q.—Was there a time in the history of the port of Montreal, when men received higher wages for night work than for day work? A.—Not during the period of twenty-one years that I have been here. Wages are higher now than they were many years ago.

Q.—Do you know the custom in other ports with respect to night work, and Sunday work? A.—Night work, is work that is never calculated to be done in this country. It has to be done, in connection with the shipping, because of the uncertainty of the business. A mail steamer may be delayed through freight or passengers a few hours, and other causes, and in order to prevent her from being compelled to lay over past her time, it becomes necessary to work on Sunday; but, as a rule, Sunday work is not ever adopted.

Q.—Are you aware if, in American ports, night is paid better than day work? A.—Yes; they pay, as a rule, a time and a half for night work.

Q.—Do you know if in those ports night is as frequent as it is in the port of Montreal? A.—It is more frequent in Montreal, which is due to our short season, and other circumstances connected with it.

Q.—Do you believe that if the rates for night work in Montreal were placed as high as in American ports, as much night work would not be done? A.—Of course not—if there is any economy to be effected.

Q.—Are you aware, if in American ports, relays of men work for thirty or forty consecutive hours? A.—I cannot say, positively, the number of hours they work in other ports.

Q.—When a stevedore asks his men to turn out at seven o'clock in the evening for duty, and he keeps them there two or three hours before putting them to work, are they paid for that time? A.—Not as a rule.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that certain stevedores are paid for those hours? A.—I have compromised with men when I have deprived them of the privilege of working, and I suppose others have done the same thing. I would allow them one hour, or two hours, or half time while they were waiting. A merchant will probably get us down at seven o'clock to receive or deliver cargo, and he will not be in a position to either receive or deliver, and we will have to put up with the consequences. We might give the men half an hour, or an hour, that, of course, being left to our discretion. We have no particular rule as to paying them for time, although they made the demand on me last year for it.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that in the port of Montreal, during the busy season, that stevedores are in the habit of putting two different hoists on one hatchway? A.—No; as rule, we work with one.

Q.—I don't want the rule; do you know it has been done? A.—That is the rule and not the exception. Anything contrary to one gang of men working on one hatch is an exception.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you know that such exceptions take place in Montreal? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you believe that mode of carrying on the work endangers the lives of the men employed? A.—No; it is the mode of doing the work that is the element of danger.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you known 'Longshoremen to be paid by I. O. U's? A.—They are always paid in cash.

Q.—Have you known that to take place? A.—No; never in my life.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—I understand you to say that Sunday work was not calculated upon in this country? A.—No; we consider we are breaking the laws of the day if we are doing it.

Q.—Are you speaking only of Montreal when you speak of this country? A.—In this country.

Q.—Are you aware that in Quebec, for certain months of the year, there is always a steamer working on Sunday, belonging to some of the steamship lines? A.—No; I am not.

Q.—That is the case? A.—It should not be the case then.

Q.—Supposing a steamship came in from sea on Sunday with a dozen passengers on board would you have them remain on board during the twenty-four hours, whereas if they were landed they would be able to reach Toronto by Monday morning? A.—The passengers should use their own discretion.

Q.—But they have no discretion in the matter whatever? A.—I would kick against anything of that kind. We are in a free country, and we have a perfect right to every privilege to which a civilized man is entitled.

Q.—If the Company did not land you on Sunday what would you do? A.—I would make a fuss about it, and get some little canoe to take me ashore if I possibly could.

MRS. SARAH HARDY, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—You are the mother, I believe, of children employed by Mr. Fortier? A.—I have three working there, two daughters and one son.

Q.—Have you a knowledge of the working of the factory? A.—Yes; two of my children have finished their apprenticeship, and have remained there to work.

Q.—They are good, nice, respectable children? A.—I have never known them to be anything else.

Q.—Did you ever hear of any immorality at the factory? A.—I never heard of such a thing until I saw a report in the papers.

Q.—Would you have known of it? A.—Yes; because I know several of the hands employed there, who reside in our neighborhood.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You watch strictly over your children? A.—Yes; very strictly indeed; I was left widow with ten, and they have all done very well.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How old are the children working in the factory? A.—The girls are 15 and 17, and the boy 18.

Q.—You consider they are in a respectable place, in such a place as you are

willing to allow respectable children to remain? A.—Yes, and I tried to put another boy there only last year.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Have you ever worked in that factory? A.—No.

Q.—Have you a knowledge of the internal working of the factory? A.—I have been there repeatedly. When my children have gone to a Sunday school picnic or anything of that kind I have gone to the office on Saturday to get their pay. I have been there many times.

Q.—Are you intimately acquainted with the working of the factory? A.—Yes; I hear all the children tell me.

Q.—But from your own personal knowledge, what you have seen yourself? A.—Yes; I have never seen anything wrong at all.

Q.—In the factory? A.—Yes; or in connection with any of the girls belonging to it.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You know nothing in connection with the working of the factory except what people tell you? A.—No.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG —

Q.—How often have you visited the factory? A.—Twenty or thirty times.

Q.—During what length of time? A.—During the five years my children have been there.

Q.—You have only been there thirty times in five years? A.—I may have been quite that number.

Miss LYDIA WEIR, Montreal, called and sworn :—

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—How old are you? A.—17 years.

Q.—Do you work at Mr. Fortier's? A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you worked there? A.—Five years, on and off. I served two years of my apprenticeship there.

Q.—Have you ever known of any immorality in the factory? A.—I never saw anything of the sort?

Q.—Are the girls and young ladies who work there properly conducted? A.—Yes; so far as I know. I never saw anything else.

Q.—You never saw any immorality? A.—No; never.

Miss LIZZIE BELL, Forewoman at Mr. Fortier's Cigar Factory, Montreal, called and sworn :—

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You are forewoman at Mr. Fortier's cigar factory, I understand? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you seen anything immoral take place there? A.—I have been steadily working there for six years—I spent eight years there altogether—and I have never seen anything immoral taking place in the factory—never. I have had a good opportunity of seeing what is taking place, because I have 35 girls working with me and over 60 under my charge. I would not, of course, work in the factory

if there were any such practices going on, nor would I allow them to take place in any department under my charge.

By Mr. WALSH:—

- Q.—Are they all females where you are engaged? A.—Yes.
 Q.—There are no boys in the department? A.—No.
 Q.—Are the girls entirely to themselves? A.—Yes.
 Q.—Then you are cognizant of nothing at all taking place that would be injurious to the morals of the girls? A.—No.
 Q.—Such matters could hardly take place, I suppose, without your knowledge?
 A.—I don't think it, not in my own department; if they did take place I would be sure to hear of them. I am around the place all time, and I would be sure to know of it.
 Q.—Are there other places besides where you are working where there are young ladies employed? A.—Yes.
 Q.—You have no supintendence over that place. A.—No.

MISS LIZZIE FITZGERALD, called and sworn.

By Mr. WALSH:—

- Q.—In what establishment are you engaged? A.—I am employed at Mr. Fortier's factory.
 Q.—How long have you been there? A.—For six years; I have not been there regularly the whole of the six years, I have been off and on during that time.
 Q.—Do you work in the same department as the witness that preceded you? Yes; she is my forewoman.
 Q.—Have you a knowledge of the other part of the building where the ladies work? A.—We all worked together until comparatively recently for the factory was smaller then—the apprentice boys and most of the girls and the strippers. The strippers and bunch makers and apprentice boys would all work together most of the time; but since we got the new factory we have got a room to ourselves. The new factory has not been built very long, only since last fall.
 Q.—From your knowledge has anything of an immoral nature taken place in the factory? A.—No; I never saw anything that would insult me any more than if I was at my own home and at my own house.
 Q.—Could anything take place without your knowledge in that particular department of the business? A.—No more than here.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

- Q.—What position do you occupy? A.—I am in the stripping department.
 Q.—Are you forelady of the stripping department? A.—No; the young lady over there is.
 Q.—You are a stripper? A.—Yes.
 Q.—You are a deputation coming here before the Commission? A.—I don't know.

MRS. LEVOISE, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. WALSH:—

- Q.—Are you employed in Mr. Fortier's factory? A.—Yes.
 Q.—How long have you worked there? A.—Going on three years.

Q.—Do you work in the same department of the building as the lady who preceded you? A.—I work under the first witness.

Q.—Are there any ladies in any part of the building besides the one you occupy? A.—I worked among the apprentices and the bunch makers at one time when the shop was small. At the present I am in the large building.

Q.—Are there in the large building females in any other portion of the building except where you are? A.—There are.

Q.—You do not know anything of what goes on there? A.—I have been from the cellar to the top doing work.

Q.—During the time you have been employed there have you seen anything of an immoral tendency taking place? A.—I am the mother of a family and if I had seen anything improper I would not have stayed there. I have my girl working there.

CHARLES J. DOHERTY, Advocate, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Will you explain to the Commission the law in regard to the seizure of wages? A.—I might sum up the law as follows :—The wages of any person other than a public employee or a school teacher, and who is not a laborer working and paid by the day, week or month, are seizeable upon judgment rendered against them to the full extent of the amount that may be due at the time the seizure is made. With respect to laborers working and paid by the day, week or month, such a person being called in the statute an *operarius*, 50 per cent. of the wages are seizeable. This seizure does not attach to wages not yet due at the time the writ of seizure was served, but it attaches to wages due at the time of seizure; so that if the amount then seized was not sufficient to satisfy the debt and costs, the operation would have to be again gone through in the next week or at the next time of payment.

Q.—Will you furnish to the Commission the amount of the cost of a seizure; for instance, with regard to a working man earning say \$7.00 per week and owing a debt of that amount? A.—In regard to a working man earning say seven dollars a week and owing a debt of \$7.00 if the creditor takes judgment against him the costs of obtaining judgment would amount to \$5.25. It might be a little more or perhaps a trifle less, but that sum is certainly below the average, and is a very fair average at any rate. After judgment had been obtained and it was sought to execute it by means of the seizure of the wages; the cost of the seizure, in order to enable the creditors to receive from the employee the seizeable portion of the employee's wages, would amount to the sum of \$4.55. So that the result of such a seizure would be this: if the employee was receiving seven dollars per week, and \$3.50 of that amount was seizeable, after the seizure had been carried out the employee would have lost half of that week's wages, with the result of adding \$1.05 to the amount of the debt and costs against him. If this process were renewed every week, as it might be under the law, the employee while being deprived of one-half of his salary in each week would be steadily adding \$1.05 per week to the amount of his indebtedness.

Q.—So that the workingman earning seven dollars a week, and having his wages seized for a debt of seven dollars would instead of seeing his debt reduced each week would find his indebtedness increased to the extent of \$1.05 each week? A.—Of course that would be the strict operation of the law. Perhaps it is an exceptional case where a member of our profession would not do everything in his power to avoid such a result as that.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—If a man was to do such a thing as that what would the judge say? A.—I don't see under the law the judge could interfere with him; I don't know of any discretion the judge has under the law.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Would not the judge be able to interfere in such a proceeding? A.—Not unless there should arise a contestation as to the right to seize. I understand we are dealing with a case where the wages would be seizable and a judgment would be regularly obtained.

Q.—And you think if there was no technical defect the judge could not interfere? A.—No.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Could he not interfere as regards the costs? A.—I am taking a case where the employee would not make any contestation, and so the matter would not come before the judge except on judgment declaring that the defendant should pay \$3.50 per week out of his wages.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Would the judgment creditor be obliged to pay the difference between the amount seized and the amount of the costs? A.—If he paid his lawyer's costs it would cost him that sum; he would have judgment against the defendant for it.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Has there ever been any attempt to revise or alter that law? A.—Not to my knowledge. It is only within a comparatively recent period that the law was moderated by making only one-half of the wages seizable. Of course, in some cases that moderation of the law, as in the case we are talking of, the law works rather worse for the employee than if the whole amount of his wages, seven dollars, had been seized, because then he would have made some progress towards getting rid of his indebtedness by means of the seizure.

Q.—When bailiffs are engaged in connection with warrants of dstraint is there a regular mode of taxing the costs in those matters? A.—Yes; the bailiff's costs are taxed.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—There is a regular tariff? A.—Yes.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Does it vary according to the amount of the seizure, or is it the same on small sums as on large sums? A.—I believe the tariff varies with the amount involved. I am not very familiar with bailiff's tariffs as I have never had occasion to examine them very closely.

Q.—We have had some complaints before us of the sale of furniture for rent and the small amount it brought. The man in question not only found himself getting deeper into debt, but he lost all his household furniture besides. Now is there a legal time given and a legal notice given of those auction sales? A.—There is a fixed day for the execution of a judgment. A man's effects can be seized 15 days after obtaining judgment. Then a bailiff is bound to give a notice of sale, and there must be eight clear days between the day of publication of notice and the day the sale takes place.

Q.—Does it take place at a public place or at the house? A.—Ordinarily at the house of the defendant.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Take for instance the case of a working man who should owe \$40.00, and the half of which would be seized. If that man should desire to go to the Maritime Provinces or the United States what would happen to him? A.—A person owing

over \$40.00 and leaving the limits of the old Province of Canada, Ontario and Quebec, would be liable to be capiased, that is arrested. It is of course to be considered that in order to obtain that writ of capias the creditor would have to make an affidavit that the departure of his debtor was with intent to defraud him of his debt, and in each case it is a question for the Court to decide whether the debtor's departure is really with intent to defraud or not, before maintaining the capias.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that capias have been taken out against working men in such a case as this one? A.—I don't call to my mind any case coming to my knowledge personally.

BY MR. WALSH:—

Q.—But there might be such a case? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the limit at which a capias can be taken out? A.—It must be something over \$40.00, \$40.05 would do, if I recollect rightly.

Q.—Is the law the same yet with respect to capiases, because I heard or read some report lately that the jurisdiction was not the same as formerly—that is the jurisdiction now was more limited? A.—A man may be capiased for other reasons or other causes than that he is about to depart with the intention to defraud his creditor. A man may be capiased because he is secreting or making away with his effects with intent to defraud.

Q.—So if a man goes into Ontario he could not be capiased? A.—No; not from here.

Q.—Then if he went into the Maritime Provinces he could not be under the law I suppose? A.—I could not tell you what the law is in the Maritime Provinces. He might be capiased here if leaving for the Maritime Provinces with intent to defraud.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Will you state to the Commission the position occupied by working men as apprentices with regard to the application of the law relating to the masters and apprentices? A.—I understand your question to refer to the by-law of the city of Montreal. Of course the by-law is before the Commission, and can be seen for itself. I have had some practical experience in the working of it as counsel for working men, who have been arrested under its operations. The result of the observation I have made of the practical working of the by-law, would lead me to the conclusion, that it certainly could not at its origin have been intended to govern the relations between the employers and employees as we ordinarily find them at the present day. Under its operation, the employee finds himself liable to a sentence of imprisonment for absenting himself without permission, or for refusing or neglecting to perform his just duties, or to obey the lawful commands of his master or mistress. The by-law does not on its face provide for any exemption from this penalty in consequence of what might be considered legitimate excuses. To give an instance. In one case in which I was concerned where the employee was prosecuted for having left the service of the employer, and where the foreman, that is the employer, tendered evidence to establish that he ceased to work because his master refused to pay him the rate of wages agreed upon, and insisted on deducting a certain amount for materials the employee had spoiled, and where the employee in addition tendered evidence to establish that he was not responsible for the spoiling of the work and had not spoiled it, it was held that under the by-law that such facts, even if established beyond a doubt, would constitute no defence and no justification of the employee's action, and that he would notwithstanding such evidence being made and the fact being established, that he was without blame with reference to the matter in dispute between him and his master, that nevertheless he would be liable to imprisonment, and that the only recourse he would have would be by civil action at the end of his term, that is when his wages became due.

Q.—Has not the court decided that when an apprentice was employed for a year his wages payable weekly, he was obliged to work the whole year round whether he

was paid weekly or not, and at the end of that time he could come before the court, and sue for his pay? A.—The decision in its practical effect would actually amount to that, but provided the master alleged any reason for the refusal of the pay; inasmuch as the court in that case refused to interfere in the question who was right or who was wrong as regards the payment of the wages, and holding that the employee should be imprisoned for refusing to work, leaving him as his recourse as to the payment of his wages before the civil courts. He might sue each week if he choose.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—In the case of the journeyman there was a plea of spoiling materials you say; that in itself might constitute a plea, but in the case of the apprentice there was no plea of that kind brought against him I understand? A.—The case I spoke of was not the case of an apprentice. The by-law is called "An Act with respect to masters and apprentices," but it covers very much more than apprentices, and it has been held to cover the case of every employee working under a contract with his employer.

Q.—Does that by-law exist as law to-day? A.—Yes; it is a by-law of the City of Montreal.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Does it apply to workmen working under verbal contracts? A.—Yes; if they are engaged before one or more witnesses.

Q.—For what length of time? A.—For one month or for a longer or shorter period.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Supposing an employer should refuse to pay an employee, and the employee should take out an action, would it not be possible under Section One for the employer to prevent his employee from suing him in Court? A.—I don't see there could be any protection for the employee from such a provision. The provision being simply that if an employee absents himself, without permission, by day or by night, he will be liable to the penalty, which is a fine not exceeding \$20.00, and imprisonment not exceeding thirty days—no option being given to the court as regards both punishments.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that employees have been sentenced to fine and imprisonment for not having furnished a certificate of a doctor, for absence in case of sickness? A.—No; that is not to my personal knowledge.

Q.—Will Section 1 of this by-law not have the effect of preventing an employee from executing all his civil duties, and his duties toward his family in case of sickness or death? A.—The letter of the by-law, I think, certainly would do so. I don't know of any case where it has been interpreted in view of facts of that nature; but the letter of the by-law makes the absenting of the employee dependent on the permission of the employer—there is not anything said about cause or reason of his absence. I think, for instance, under that by-law, a man wishing to absent himself on voting day could not do so without permission.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—That would entirely depend on the master? A.—That certainly is the reading of the by-law.

Q.—So he could prevent that man from executing one of the rights belonging to all freemen? A.—Yes; I don't see there is any protection for employees in a case of that kind.

Q.—That expression, "by day or by night," is very broad; it does not specify any length of time. You might work a man for a week, with cessation under that by-law, I suppose, as there is no definite period mentioned in it? A.—No; there is

nothing stated in regard to any limiting period. I presume the court would hold that a man was entitled to his customary rest. Of course, all effected by custom.

By THE CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—And by the decision of the judges? A.—Yes; I think the wording of the by-law should be different for the protection of working men and employees.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Is not an employee, who leaves his master's employ without giving fifteen days' notice, liable to both fine and imprisonment? A.—Yes.

Q.—And when an employer discharges an employee, is not the employer liable to fine and imprisonment? A.—I don't see it stated in the by-law that he shall be liable to fine or imprisonment for the discharge of his employee.

Q.—Look at Section 2? A.—Section 2 says that he should give him the notice. The only section providing a penalty to be inflicted on the master is Section 5.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—What is the penalty in that case? A.—It is fine or imprisonment, at the option of the magistrate. The wording is this: "Having any just cause of complaint against his or her master or mistress or employer, for any nuisance, defect, insufficiency of wholesome provisions or food, or for cruelty or ill-treatment of any kind." I don't see anything about his being fined for discharging an employee.

By MR. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Section 2 provides only for the payment of fifteen days salary? A.—Yes; it would appear to me that if a master discharged an employee without justifiable cause, the employee would be left to his action for damages.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—That would indicate that the section is drawn so as to cover the old indenture system by which the apprentices were living in the house of their master? A.—Yes; it would give one that impression.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Is it not to your knowledge that the Act relating to masters and apprentices is so old and its phraseology is such that the bench and the bar have been unable to come to an understanding as to the real meaning of the word *compagnon*? A.—I don't know how far the bill has been considered by the bench. I know there has been considerable discussion before the Courts as to what was the meaning of the word journeyman. Of course, the Courts have to decide those questions.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Is the word *compagnon* always understood to be journeyman by the Courts? A.—Yes; I think the Courts translate *compagnon* as journeyman.

Q.—The exact equivalent of the English word journeyman? A.—They apply it to any working man. You see the working of the by-laws reads: "All apprentices and servants of either sex or journeymen bound by Act of Indenture or written contract or agreement and all servants of either sex and journeymen verbally engaged before one or more witnesses for one month or for any longer or shorter period." I would like to see that portion of the by-law abolished. The wording of that clause has been held to apply to any person who serves under hire. That I think is practically the result of judicial precedents. I would not like, however, to say that positively, but in my opinion, it is a fair statement of the practical results of the decisions that have been given.

Q.—Will you tell us the position in which a man is placed who does not pay his rent to the landlord? A.—If he does not pay his rent he is liable to be ejected from the premises, and inasmuch as the ejection in consequence of non-payment of his rent would be attributable to his default to carry out his contract, his landlord although he had ejected him might still proceed to recover a sum for damages he sustained by his house being left idle. Proceedings in ejection cases are summary.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Suppose a man hired a house for a year and he left it before the year had expired, and after that the house was vacant for a year, would the man who left the house be liable for any time longer than his own contract? A.—No; unless he had been required to give a notice to the landlord to terminate his lease. If you take the case as you have stated it, his liability would terminate with his contract.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—In a case where it is mentioned in the lease that payment was to be made in advance in what position would a tenant be who could not pay his rent on the first or third of each month? A.—He might be ejected, and, of course, the landlord would obtain judgment for the amount due at the time of the ejection. I don't know how far the tenant would be further liable if the landlord desired to retain the house, but from the bare fact of it being agreed to pay the rent in advance the landlord would be entitled to judgment.

Q.—Those judgments I think you say are summary in all cases? A.—Yes; they are summary proceedings.

Q.—Before the Recorder's Court? A.—Not beyond limited amounts. I think there the amount is under \$25 it can be taken before the Recorder's Court.

Q.—So that a case might occur where a tenant would be ejected on the 6th of the month, and see all his furniture sold without having the privilege of occupying the house during that month? A.—I don't see if a tenant stayed on the premises to the last moment and required all proceedings to be gone through he could be got out by the 6th., if the proceedings were not instituted till after the first. He is entitled to one clear day's notice between the service of the writ and the return of the writ. If the judgment was obtained on that day he is entitled to three days notice after the service of the judgment before the writ of possession could be taken out.

Q.—How long would the proceedings take? A.—If it was carried through as rapidly as possible I think it would take eight or ten days. Perhaps it may have been done more quickly. I am, of course, giving these statements principally as a matter of opinion, for it is not possible for anyone to come here and be able to give the particulars of all the law. I don't know how far it is testimony to tell you how the law is, for I don't pretend to know it all.

Q.—So that according to your judgment a tenant under such circumstances could be ejected 15 or more days before the month expired? A.—Yes; I think the landlord would be entitled to the month due after he agreed to pay the rent in advance.

Q.—What is the situation of the tenant towards the landlord in cases where the landlord does not place the house in proper condition? A.—The tenant, would be upon any default of the landlord to make such repairs as the latter was bound, entitled to take action against him to compel him to make the repairs which he was bound by law or had agreed to make, which action would be summary as is an action of ejection and subject to the same delays as an action of ejection; by the judgment in that action the tenant might be authorized to make the repairs at the landlord's expense, or have his lease cancelled after the landlord's refusal to make them, and in that event he might be entitled to such action for damages as he might suffer in consequence.

Q.—Are the proceedings summary in this case! A.—Yes, under the same law.

Q.—Has he not the right to claim damages for the time which he lost in going to court? A.—No; no party to a suit is paid for time spent in looking after his suit.

Q.—You have said, I believe, that a tenant is compelled to serve a protest on the landlord to compel him to place his house in proper condition? A.—He would be bound to put his landlord in default to do what he was obliged to do, and notify him; and the legal rule is that if the lease was in writing the notification would have to be in writing.

Q.—What is the average cost of such a protest? A.—A Notary can tell you that better than I can. I don't think \$4.00 would be an excessive price. I think the Court would exercise discretion, and if it were shown that the landlord was notified other than by a protest it might count it sufficient.

Q.—In a case where a protest was served and the landlord immediately repaired the house who would pay for the protest? A.—I don't think the tenant would have any recourse against the proprietor for the cost of the protest, because the proprietor is entitled to be notified and to be put in default under the law.

Q.—The tenant would be obliged to pay? A.—Yes. I don't sit here as a sort of court to give decisions on hypothetical questions. I simply give my opinion for what it is worth.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—In a case where there was a written contract and the party takes the house, and they were satisfied with it when they went into it, and immediately afterwards they found that certain repairs were necessary, would the landlord be bound to meet any fair requirements thereafter, there being not a written contract but a verbal agreement—in fact would he be obliged to put the house into proper order and do necessary repairs? A.—There is an article in the Civil Code specifying what are landlord's repairs and what are tenant's repairs.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is there in the Province of Quebec a lien law? A.—Yes. We have the Law of Privileges. I don't understand whether you want me to tell you all the law on the subject of privileges.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What privilege has a laborer for his wages? A.—A man employed in a factory or workshop is privileged on what is contained in that workshop for arrears of wages during a certain period.

Q.—Under three months? A.—There is an article in the Civil Code which specifies it.

Q.—And he comes in as a common creditor for the balance? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—In regard to workmen employed on buildings, what claim have they? A.—The builder may have a lien on the building by registration. There is quite a process to be gone through; and it is quite a complex process for me to explain. There is an article which lays it down.

Q.—But the men employed by him would have no privilege? A.—I don't know of any privilege they would have on the building itself.

Q.—Would you have any objection to telling us what according to your judgment is the moral effect of the law with regard to seizure of wages? A.—That is a very large question. Lawyers are not supposee to be very good judges of the moral effects of anything. I think it would naturally produce—I cannot say this as a matter of fact—an inclination on the part of people getting into debt to adopt such means as are possible to keep their assets out of the grasp of their creditors.

Q.—Do you not believe that the experience we have had in Montreal with

regard to the treatment of apprentices is due to this by-law relating to masters and apprentices? A.—I think the by-law is calculated to constitute to a very great extent, the masters as judges between themselves and their employees, and naturally it would produce very unfair results. As to attributing the facts that have been brought before the Commission here to the operation of that by-law, that is something I have not considered. It seems to me that the by-law in itself cannot be properly considered, such as should govern the present relations between employers and employees. I don't think that is a matter which a municipal council should have power to regulate, particularly in such a shape as it is in this by-law.

Q.—Does there exist, in the Province of Quebec, a law authorizing employers to correct their employees? I think an apprentice, who is a minor, might be reasonably corrected. I could not give you any text of law saying so in so many words. If you wish my opinion, I will give you my opinion. If you want anything in support of it, I might look the authorities up. I don't know of any specified law saying in so many words that a master shall have that power.

Q.—Will you state the reforms which you consider necessary to be made with regard to the seizure of wages, and with regard to wages contracted by employees? A.—I think with respect to the class of people, fifty per cent of whose wages are now liable for seizure, it seems to me the only way to reform that law, permitting seizure of their wages, would be to reform it out of existence. I don't think they gain anything by the credit given to them on the strength of their creditors being able to seize one-half of their wages, and it produces naturally a great deal of misery. Short of doing that, there should be some system under which a debtor can be examined as to his resources and income, the weekly amount of his wages, the amount of his debts, and the means he has of meeting them, and the court should fix some equitable amount payable in instalments. That might possibly be done, but if you want my own opinion, it is that the law making such wages seizable should be abolished.

Q.—Would you include public officers? A.—As I understand it, under our law, public officers are exempt, except with regard to employees of the Provincial Government of Quebec; there are proportions of their salary which are seizable.

Q.—Would you exempt them too? A.—No; I am talking now of the working people.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—The law applies to all class of people? A.—Yes; but it works harder on the men earning seven dollars a week, a day laborer, than a man with a large salary, and who is able to pay his debts. I think under a system where a judge would fix the instalment, which should be paid, the position of the family, and the proportion of wages paid, and all those matters should be considered in determining the amount of instalment.

Q.—You would leave it to the judge to make the men pay what he could pay? A.—My opinion with respect to the class of people for whom the Act was made, limiting the seizure of their wages to one-half the amount then due, that this right to seize should be entirely abolished in their case. If you maintain the seizure, there should be some scheme by which the courts would have discretion to fix the amount a man could afford to pay, which would be more fair to the debtor and the creditor, than the present system of making seizures, and accumulating costs.

Q.—You think that seizures under \$25.00 should be abolished? A.—Yes; that would depend on the wages of the man, not on the amount of the debt. If you take an employee, with a salary of \$100.00 a month, I don't think you should say that he should not be liable for a debt of \$25.00 dollars; but if you take a man earning \$7.00 a week, the seizable portion of whose would be \$3.50, and the costs of seizing per week, would be 4.50, I don't see that any one is gaining anything by permitting a system of that kind to exist. Of course, it may bring practical results, because a creditor and a debtor may come to an understanding in regard to the payment. If

not the employee goes and hires himself to another employer, or ultimately goes away to some distant part to get away from his creditors.

JAMES F. D. BLACK, City Treasurer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—I have requested you to furnish certain documents with regard to houses being Nos. 31 to 33 De Salaberry Street from 1882 to 1887 inclusive. A.—They are here. I caused them to be prepared.

Street Number.	Street.	Proprietor.	Cadastral Valuation			One per cent on value.	City School Tax 20 cts. per \$100.	Total.	Occupant.	Occupation.	Rental.			Yearly Water Rates.
			Number.	Sub-division.	Exempt.						Assessed.	Dwelling.	Shop.	
1882	DeSalaberry...	Cyprien Lafreniere	145			9000	18	.108	Pat. Kennedy	Laborer	70		8 00	
33									Wm. Stonehouse	Book-keeper	60		7 25	
33									Widow D. McDonald	C. McCaughlin	70		8 00	
35									Cyprien Lafreniere	Merchant	120		11 75	
Rear									John Bine	Laborer	40		5 75	
do									Ephrem Chalifoux	Shoemaker	40		5 75	
do									Widow L. Thomas	O. Dufrene	40		5 75	
do									Wilfred Demers	Carpenter	40		5 75	
do									Widow C. Lavend	Marie Borley	40		5 75	
do									J. B. Desmarceau	Painter	40		5 75	
do									Arène Demers	Carpenter	40		5 75	
do									Louis Labbé	Laborer	40		5 75	
do									Widow Knox	Laborer	24		5 00	
do									Onesime Gauthier	Moulder	24		5 00	
1883	DeSalaberry...	Cyprien Lafreniere	145			9000	18	.108	Pat. Kennedy	Laborer	80		8 75	
33									Wm. Stonehouse	Book-keeper	70		8 00	
33									Widow D. McDonald	C. McCaughlin	70		8 00	
35									Cyprien Lafreniere	Merchant	120		11 75	
Rear									Jos. Laren	Carpenter	40		5 75	
do									Paschal Frauchetta	Laborer	40		5 75	
do									Louis Labbé	do	40		5 75	
do									Wilfred Demers	Carpenter	40		5 75	
do									George Bine	do	40		5 75	
do									Edward Groleau	Laborer	50		6 50	
do									Jos. Labbé	do	50		6 50	
do									Widow Thos. Knox	Charlotte Laing	60		6 50	
do									Onesime Gauthier	Moulder	50		6 50	

Street Number.	Street.	Proprietor.	Cadastral.		Valuation		One per cent. on Value.	City School Tax 20 cts. per \$100.	Total.	Occupant.	Occupation.	Rental..		Yearly Water Rates.
			Number.	Sub-division.	Exempt.	Assessed						Dwelling	Shop.	
1884	DeSalaberry...	Cyprien Lefreniere	145			9000	90	18	108	Pat. Kennedy	Laborer	80		8 75
33										Wm. Stonehouse	Book Keeper	70		8 00
31 1/2										James Brown	Tobacconist.	70		8 00
33 1/2										Cyp. Lafreniere	Merchant.	120		11 75
35										Eugene Guyot	Carriage Maker.	40		5 75
Rear				St. Mary's Ward.						Theophile Lessard.	Painter	40		5 75
do										Louis Labbe	Laborer	40		5 75
do										Wilfred Demers	Carpenter	40		5 75
do										do	do	40		5 75
do										Jos. Morin	Laborer	40		5 75
do										Onezime Bolduc	Laborer	40		5 75
do										Jos. Deguire	Carpenter	50		6 50
do										Nap. Dechantal	do	50		6 50
do										Widow Thos. Knox	Charlotte Laing	50		6 50
do										Hornid Malherbe	Clerk	50		6 50
do														
1885	DeSalaberry...	Cyprien Lefreniere	145			9000	90	18	108	Jos. M. Lapierre	Foreman	80		8 75
33										Wm. Stonehouse	Book Keeper	70		8 00
31 1/2										Jas. Brown	Tobacconist.	70		8 00
33 1/2										Cyp. Lafreniere	Merchant.	120		11 75
35										Alex. Verdon	Cutter	40		5 75
Rear				St. Mary's Ward.						Narcisse Mercier	Laborer	40		5 75
do										Louis Labbe	do	40		5 75
do										Wilfred Demers	Carpenter	40		5 75
do										David Carey	Laborer	40		5 75
do										Frb. X. Monette	Driver	40		5 75
do										Ferd. Filteau	Tanner	60		7 25
do										Ulric Larose	Engineer	60		7 25
do										E.A. Trudel	Gentleman	60		7 25
do										Wm. Higgins	Foreman	60		7 25
do												60		7 25

Street Number.	Street.	Proprietor.	Cadastral		Valuation		One per cent. on value.	City School Tax, 20 cts. per \$100.	Total.	Occupant.	Occupation.	Rental.			Yearly Water Rates.
			Number.	Sub-division.	Exempt.	Assessed.						Dwelling.	Shop.	Hotel.	
1886	DeSalaberry ...	Cyprien Lafrenière	145			9000	90	18	108	Pierre Gravel.....	Laborer.....	80			8 75
	33								Etienne Quintal....	Cabinet Maker.	70			8 00
	a 314								James Brown.....	Tobacconist....	70			8 00
	a 334								Cyp. Lafrenière....	Gentleman.....	120			11 75
	35								John McAfee.....	Laborer.....	40			5 75
	Rear 1								Léandre Gauthier..	Tinsmith.....	40			5 75
	do 2								Louis Labbé.....	Laborer.....	40			5 75
	do 3								Wilfred Demers....	Carpenter.....	40			5 75
	do 4								David Carey.....	Laborer.....	40			5 75
	do 5								Michael Bone.....	do	50			6 50
	do 6								Jos. Simard.....	Roofer.....	60			7 25
	do 7								Ulric Larose.....	Stoker.....	60			7 25
	do 8								Frs. Gobeil.....	Blacksmith.....	60			7 25
	do 9								Wm. Higgins.....	Laborer.....	60			7 25
1887	DeSalaberry ...	Cyprien Lafrenière	145			9000	90	18	108	James Beattie.....	Laborer.....	80			8 75
	33								Paul E. Quintal....	Cabinet Maker.	70			8 00
	a 314								Ed. Collette.....	Tailor.....	70			8 00
	a 334								Cyp. Lafrenière....	Gentleman.....	120			11 75
	35								Mac. Martineau....	Laborer.....	50			6 50
	Rear 1								Jos. Bertrand.....	Painter.....	50			6 50
	do 2								Louis Labbé.....	Laborer.....	50			6 50
	do 3								Wilfred Demers....	Carpenter.....	50			6 50
	do 4								Camil. Roberge....	Machinist.....	50			5 75
	do 5								David Carey.....	Laborer.....	40			5 75
	do 6								Michael Bowen.....	do	40			7
	do 7								Jos. Simard.....	Roofer.....	60			7 25
	do 8								Arthur Gagnon....	Laborer.....	60			7 25
	do 9								Prudent Petit....	do	60			7 25
	do 9								Thos. Greatvieux..	do	60			7 25

Q.—Will you please tell us the method employed by the Corporation against persons who do not pay their water rates? A.—The water rates are due by law on the 15th. of August. One month after that day, the 15th. September, the parties are notified that if they do not pay them within a given time, the water will be shut off, and later on the employees of the department are sent to cut off the supply from those in default, giving them a little notice in advance that process will be adopted in the course of a few days unless they meet their engagements.

Q.—After the 15th. of September the water can be shut off from those who have not paid? A.—Yes.

Q.—If after the water has been shut off the water rates are not paid, what action does the corporation take? A.—They generally serve a notice on those parties, and endeavor to collect the amount, if possible, by process. Those are details connected with the management of the water supply, in regard to which I would like you to call Mr. Lapierre. They are nominally carried out under my direction, but in reality by him as head of that particular branch of the office.

T. A. MACKINNON, General Superintendent of the Ontario and Atlantic Division of the C. P. R. Railroad, called and sworn:—

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What would be considered an ordinary day's work for an engine driver on a passenger train on the C. P. R.? A.—It is regulated by the runs figured on the basis of about 125 miles or 130 miles.

Q.—And those runs under ordinary circumstances would occupy how many hours? A.—On passenger trains about four or four and a half hours, sometimes a little less on express trains.

Q.—Are you able to tell what would be the longest regular run for an engine driver on a passenger train? A.—The longest regular run continuously do you mean?

Q.—Yes; a continuous run. A.—The longest continuous run in my division will be from 5.50 a.m. to 10.55, say five hours less five minutes.

Q.—Is that considered to constitute a day's pay? A.—They get more than a day's pay for it, a little more.

Q.—When a man comes off this run, how soon is he required to go to work again? A.—I think a man on that run does not go to work until the next day, or if he doubles, he is off the next day.

Q.—If he doubles that he lies off? A.—They leave Owen Sound at 5.50 a.m. and arrive at Toronto at 10.55; they leave Toronto at 4.50 in the afternoon, so they rest from 10.50 to 4.50, about six hours, exclusive of the time required to get the engine in and out.

Q.—In that case do they receive two days' pay? A.—They receive a little more than two days' pay, based on a run of 100 miles.

Q.—And, as to the time and the pay, there being a difference in the rates, this answer applies to the firemen, conductors and brakemen? A.—Yes; practically.

Q.—What would be about the longest time that would constitute a day's work for a driver on a locomotive on a freight train, taking an average run? A.—About an average on our freight trains would be seven hours or seven and a half hours, perhaps up to eight hours.

Q.—And as to the time and the pay that would apply to the conductors, brakemen and firemen on all freight trains? A.—Yes.

Q.—How much rest may those men get in making a day's run? A.—We always try to give our men not less than eight hours rest.

Q.—Is it to the interest of the Company to call them to duty before they have obtained their proper rest? A.—No; we never allow them to be called out if they have not had proper rest.

Q.—Do the men seek to make more than their regular runs? A.—Sometimes; it depends on circumstances. If they have had a continuous easy run they occasionally like to put in one day or half a day additional.

Q.—If the men have been detained by accident or by storm, or any other cause for a long number of hours on the road, what rest may they obtain before being again called to duty? A.—We consider they are entitled to eight hours rest; we always allow them that and more when they call for it.

Q.—If they are detained a longer number of hours, do they get extra pay for the time beyond the allowance for the one run? A.—Yes; if there is a long detention.

Q.—In case of an accident or storm by which a train is side-tracked or detained a long number of hours on the track, may the men sleep on the train? A.—The engineer and fireman could not sleep on the train.

Q.—They would be required to keep steam up, I suppose? A.—One of them would at all events.

JAMES R. DICK, Superintendent of the Boys' Home, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What number of boys have you, at the present time, in the Boys' Home?
A.—During the past year there have been 250 boys in the Home.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are those boys there under any sentence, or are they simply there as being helped through the charitable Associations? A.—Neither. Those boys in the Home are in situations, and not having any other place to sleep in, sleep at the Home.

Q.—On whose authority do they go there? A.—Their need is their authority; it is a voluntary association.

Q.—And to whom do they apply for admission? A.—To me as Superintendent.

Q.—You act on your own opinion in regard to the advisability of admitting them or not? A.—Yes.

Q.—You judge whether they are in need of shelter or not, and as to whether they should be admitted? A.—Yes; I am on the safe side by giving a chance to some who I think don't deserve it.

Q.—What is the average length of their stay in the Home? A.—Some stop for six months, others for a year, and others for two years. As soon as they receive wages enough to allow them to go to a lodging house outside, I let them go.

Q.—At what age are they admitted to the Home? A.—From 12 up to 18 or 19.

Q.—You admit none under 12? A.—We have one or two, but those are exceptional cases. In the event of there being a mother—who cannot procure her own living with her boy we take the boy.

Q.—When they once enter the Home, are they at liberty to go when they please?
A.—Yes.

Q.—In any employment found for them? A.—Employment is found for all.

Q.—What do they work at? A.—They all work in the city, no work is done at the Home. I procure situations for them at the different trades, and at different kinds of work, and put them in a position to earn their own living. We help them to help themselves—that is the principal we work on.

Q.—You simply provide them with board and lodging in the Home? A.—Yes; and exercise a parental care over them.

Q.—Do you teach them anything in the Home? A.—We have classes in the winter evenings. Some who want to study advanced subjects go to the Y. M. C. A., two or three go to the Art School, boys who are learning trades.

Q.—What do you teach them at the Home? A.—Reading and writing, that is about all.

- Q.—Do you teach them arithmetic? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Do you teach them grammar? A.—No. Of course it is only in the evening we can do anything in that line with them.
- Q.—Do they at all times pay for their board or any part of it? A.—They all pay for their board as far as they are able to do so.
- Q.—How do you regulate the amount which they pay for their board? A.—According to the wages they receive.
- Q.—You do not take the whole of their wages towards their board? A.—Oh! no.
- Q.—You judge yourself of the necessity they have for obtaining clothing and so on? A.—Yes; if a boy gets two dollars a week there is generally put aside for his board and washing, \$1.50. The balance is put aside for the boy's clothes, and it is sufficient in many cases to furnish them. We have a Savings' Bank on Saturday night and the money is put into it.
- Q.—Do you permit the boys to buy any clothing themselves? A.—Yes; but I sometimes give an order on a clothing establishment, and subsequently get the money from the boys. Sometimes I have to buy the clothing for them and charge them and charge them with it.
- Q.—In case you give an order on a clothier, do they get as good value for it as if the payment was in cash? A.—Yes; the clothes are sold to me, not to the boys.
- Q.—Practically, it is cash to the dealer? A.—Yes; because I pay him every month.
- Q.—Do the boys frequently leave the Home before they become absolutely self supporting? A.—Yes.
- Q.—You exercise no restraint upon them in that respect? A.—I use a little moral restraint, and try to advise them how wrong it is to leave the Home until they are properly able to do so; but they do not believe it. The consequence is that some of them go away for a while, and the find out the truth that they cannot keep themselves, and they come back again.
- Q.—You re-admit them? A.—They come back pleading to be re-admitted, and what can I do but take them in?
- Q.—What religious training do the boys get in the Home? A.—We have family worship every evening, and each boy is expected to attend his own church every Sunday, and also Sunday-school.
- Q.—Does anybody conduct them, or go with them to church? A.—Either I or my wife, or an assistant. In the evening we have family worship, singing hymns, and reading the scriptures and prayer.
- Q.—At what hour do the boys retire? A.—The hour which they have to be in now is nine o'clock for prayers, when the roll is called.
- Q.—And the lights are out at what hour? A.—I put the gas out at ten o'clock.
- Q.—Do you require all the boys to rise at a certain hour in the morning? A.—Yes; the bell rings at a quarter to six, and a quarter past six is breakfast.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—We have heard a little about waifs and stowaways arriving by the steamers in this city. What can you tell us about that subject? A.—The number of boys arriving here, who are not willing to help themselves, has been very considerable this year. During the year from 1885 to 1886, I had seventeen who left the Home without giving notice; that means, that they went away without saying anything, owing for board and perhaps for clothing. This last year, the number has been very much more; forty-four have left of their own accord, and eighteen have been expelled,—old country lads who came over here as stowaways, largely. They are left in the city with nobody to help them, and if no one does help them, they get into jail. I had a good many more of them on my hands last year than usual, and the consequence has been that we have had to agitate the matter in the newspapers, and we held a meeting a few days ago with a view to endeavoring to ascertain if something could be done to prevent this influx of stowaways and unde-

sirable class of immigrants coming to the city, and becoming a burden on the charitable institutions here.

By Mr. FREED :

Q.—Have you had any boys sent from the old country by charitable organizations ? A.—Not to me. I know they have come out but we don't receive any boys sent out, we are not a receiving home for the old country.

Q.—Have these boys who have been sent out to this country come to you afterwards of their own accord ? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have they come to you in considerable numbers ? A.—Yes ; in large numbers.

Q.—Have they told you they were sent out by charitable organizations in the old country ? A.—Yes.

Q.—You have found it out in no other way ? A.—I found that some have come even from Reformatories.

Q.—Do you mean they have come from Reformatories in the old country ? A.—Yes.

Q.—And sent out by charitable associations to Canada ? A.—Sent out by the Reformatories.

Q.—How have you obtained that information ? A.—I know it from the boys. I don't know it when they come to the Home, but I have found it out later on. There is one Reformatory, if you desire it I can give you the name, in the old country that regularly sends boys out.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You had better give us the name ? A.—I understand that this Reformatory sends out about 100 boys a year.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—What is the name of it ? A.—The Redhouse Reformatory School, Surrey, England.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Who has charge of that Reformatory ? A.—I suppose it is a Government Reformatory. The names of the parties through whom those boys have come here are : Mr. Gould, of Melbourne, Richmond, and Rev T. W. Fyles of Quebec.

Q.—What is the character of the boys to whom you are now referring ? A.—Very bad.

Q.—Have they any habits of industry ? A.—Very little.

Q.—What is their moral character ? A.—Bad.

Q.—Are they truthful ? A.—No.

Q.—Are they willing to work ? A.—No. I will give you one instance. A boy came from that Institution with his passage paid to this country. I don't know whether he had a ticket to Montreal, but he had a ticket to Quebec at all events. He was set loose at Bonaventure Station here. One of the men sent him to me as he was helpless and friendless. He told me at the time he came from that Institution. I had that boy in seven situations in four weeks, and latterly I could not do any more with him. He was not only a bad boy himself, but he was gradually getting the other boys into his own bad habits, and endeavoring to persuade them not to go to work. He was subsequently arrested at the depot for sleeping in the waiting room. He was brought before the Recorder and I was asked to go down and give a character to the boy. The Recorder sent him to Sherbrooke Reformatory for three years.

Q.—You have spoken of a Savings Bank ; under whose Superintendence is that Savings Bank ? A.—It was started under the superintendence of the Boys' Home

for boys in the Home at first, as the Montreal Penny Savings Bank. When we found we could open it to the public we did so, and it has been now four years in existence. From February 1885 to February 1886 the total number of deposits were 3,795 amounting to \$2,002.47, withdrawals \$764.62, leaving a balance on hand at the end of the year of \$1,217.85. Here is a statement showing the number of deposits made by the boys; the total amount deposited by 74 boys during the year was \$481.69. Notice, that this is not all the money the boys saved but the money they put away. They spent money on collars, ties, shirts and so on; but the amount I have given you, gives an average of \$6.50 per boy. The highest amount deposited by any one boy was \$50.50 and the lowest two cents. We take from two cents to \$50.00 in the bank.

Q.—Do the boys as a rule draw the money from the bank when they leave the home? A.—No; they deposit afterwards. I will read a statement for the year following, which is as follows:—Balance brought forward, \$1275.00; total number of deposits 3896, amounting to \$2963.91. Total amount deposited by 83 boys, \$664.00, or an average per boy of \$8.01. That, you will observe, is an increase. The highest amount deposited by any one boy is \$95.75, and the lowest 2 cents. I have a statement for the year ending December, which shows the total amount on deposit in this bank of \$3502.00, or an increase during last year of \$10.30. I have not got the figures of how much the boys have deposited last year, for the account is not yet made up.

Q.—Will it show an increase or a decrease? A.—There is sure to be an increase, because there is an increase in the number of boys in the Home. There has been a steady increase during the four years, not only there but in the growth of the bank outside. This bank was the first one of the kind opened four years ago. Now there are eight or nine in existence throughout the city. The Sunday schools have taken the matter up, and savings banks are now established in connection with them. There are branches at Cote St. Antoine, Point St. Charles, Hochelaga, St. Patrick's Church, and eight or nine different branches that have been established during the last four years, and all are doing well.

Q.—Under what law are those savings banks established? A.—I could not tell you that.

Q.—What security is given that the money will be carefully kept? A.—The names of four gentlemen in the city who are well known and who are men of money.

Q.—Have you newsboys in your Home? A.—None who go around the streets with newspapers.

Q.—Any who have routes? A.—No. I can always find better places for the boys than running with papers. Besides, the surroundings of a boy who is on the street are bad.

Q.—The Home, of course, is not self-supporting? A.—It is self-supporting as regards all the working expenses, except the property and Superintendent's salary.

Q.—By whom is the property maintained and the additional amount required made up? A.—I get it made up by collections throughout the city.

Q.—From charitable people? A.—Yes.

Q.—Does the city or any constituted authority give you anything? A.—No.

Q.—Are you an incorporated body? A.—Yes.

Q.—Under the laws of the Province of Quebec? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know anything about the House of Refuge? A.—The Superintendent is here and he will be able to give you full particulars. The object of our coming here was that something might be done towards stopping this influx of stowaways and this class of undesirable emigrants who are coming here. As regards the stowaways, I know there is collusion between the sailors or firemen and the boys, and I want to say that the owners of steamships will help us in this matter, because boys are an expense in being brought out here, and if there was proper supervision on the other side, it would be impossible that a dozen or eighteen young men and boys should be able to come across as stowaways, without it being known to the officers. Those boys

come here and are put down on the wharf, and away they go—they are a bad class. On several occasions, when on the wharf, I have taken up three or four of these boys and taken them to the Home, clothed them and placed them in good situations, and the percentage that has turned out well has been very very small indeed.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do they go back to England and often take others with them? A.—Yes; and they sometimes take back with them other boys who are doing very well here.

Q.—Do they stow themselves away on board of vessels? A.—They cannot stow themselves away so well on this side as they can on the other side. They go back very often in charge of cattle. And I know three or four instances in which they did stow themselves away by the help of a fireman. They are a great abuse to us on this side.

By MR. HEAKES;—

Q.—Do you know if there is any other class of emigrants arriving here, except those boys, which is not desirable? A.—There are others from 17 to 19, I suppose you will call them men, and I have a good deal of experience with that class too.

Q.—Are they sent out by charitable institutions? A.—No; I don't think it; not as a whole, some may have been. They are several institutions in London which send out these young men. There is one there that has had more to do in this way than others, and that is the Self-Help Emigration Society of London, which sends them out on their paying a little towards their passage and promising to pay the balance when they get out here, and get settled; but those sent out have been a bad lot.

By MR. CLARKE:—

Q.—What would you suggest in order to prevent them coming out? A.—I would suggest that a law similar to the United-States Immigration law be put in force here. I have a copy here of the Castle Garden Emigration law, which provides that when a ship comes to the wharf, the Inspector shall go on board and ascertain the class of emigrants on board. Those who are cripples, sick, or ex-convicts or an undesirable class, who have no money and no friends to receive them, are sent back; the ship being made responsible for them, and their maintainance has to be paid for, by the owners. Those people are re-shipped and sent back again at the expense of the ship.

Q.—Are there not great abuses perpetrated there by that board? A.—I know nothing about that matter. I see here that in one year there were returned 997 emigrants. Of that number 70 were insane, 20 were idiotic, one was blind, eight were convicts, 18 were cripples; 355 were suffering from a disease which prevented them from earning a livelihood, and 437 were without means of support. On account of this law going into effect in the United-States, I know that people of this class are coming this way now.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Is that the way you account for the increased number of bad young men arriving here last year? A.—Not altogether.

Q.—In part? A.—Yes, in part. The trouble with those from 17 to 20 years of age is, that they have never learned any trade, and have no business—they are jack of all trades and master of none, and they are continually moving from one place to another. The truth is they don't want to work. They come here under a false impression that they are going to have an easy time and plenty of money. They are taking up positions, in many instances, that honest men should occupy.

By MR. HEAKES:—

Q.—What is the largest number of this class of boys you have had coming to your Home in any one year? A.—You mean the latter ones?

Q.—I mean boys coming from the old country, without a thing, who have passed through your Home? A.—This last year we have had 51 Canadians, 106 English, 14 Scotch, 20 Irish, 4 Americans and 4 Nationalities.

Q.—Was that the total number in the Institution last year? A.—Yes.

Q.—What proportion of that number of boys would you consider to be a undesirable class. A.—30 per cent. of the English boys.

Q.—Were the whole of the boys who came from England sent here by one of the Societies you have mentioned? A.—No; they have come here from an immense number of Institutions.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you know if those parties, came from false statements made by parties in regard to the condition of the country? A.—I think that is mostly done by the steamboat runners.

Q.—You mean by the steamboat agents? A.—I think so. The Government does not assist anybody to come by assisted passages, that is, either the Canadian Government or the English Government, but a steamboat runner when he gets a man to go and pay three pounds, gets a percentage for himself.

Q.—The agent does? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think the whole of the passage money is paid by the charitable institutions in the old country? A.—In the case of the Self-Help Emmigrant Society, the emigrant pays what he is able and, promises to pay the rest when he is settled here.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you know anything about the work done by Dr. Barnardo, or Miss Rye? A.—Yes; I know about them. There is no trouble with their boys. I sometimes get one or two who have belonged to those institutions, and have come to the city, but they are very few. The children are sent to the Homes and are cared for. They are put out to farmers, and visited and looked after. But there are other institutions in the old country that send boys out here.

Q.—What is your impression as to the chances of a boy doing well in this country if he behaves himself? A.—There is every chance of his doing well in this country.

Q.—If he chooses to work? A.—Yes.

Q.—I think you have said you go about looking for situations for those boys? A.—Yes; I look for situations for them, and I get employment for all the boys.

Q.—Have you had boys who have remained in situations for some time? A.—Yes; I receive applications for my boys, and I have situations offered for every boy I can place in them.

Q.—Then you find no difficulty in placing good boys? A.—No.

Q.—To their advantage and to the advantage of their employer. A.—Yes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Are they generally placed in the rural districts or in the city? A.—They are placed in the city. They come home at night and live in the Home.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—They do well, I suppose? A.—The large proportion of them do well. I have instances of boys doing very well. One boy had been in the Home for three years, and went to his present employer, and after being with him two years and a half, has gone on the road as commercial traveller.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Tell us the trades to which the boys are indentured? A.—They are in

dentured to printers, bookbinders, plumbers, carpenters, and confectioners, and so forth.

Q.—Are those positions really vacant or do the boys take situations from other boys by accepting lower wages? A.—No; I never do that. My boys are as good as any boys.

Q.—Have you ever known an instance of that kind? A.—No.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You never seek to turn away a boy who is already in a situation so as to get a place for one of your boys? A.—No; I would not do so. I never let my boys go for less money than others, because they are better than the regular run of boys. They are watched and well cared for.

Q.—Do you think an honest good workman can find employment, generally, here? A.—Yes.

Q.—And make a good, respectable living? A.—Yes.

Q.—And you have had some experience in the matter? A.—Yes; and I know it for a fact.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Do any of the steamboat companies impose fines on the sailors in case of a stowaway is found on the vessel? A.—They do not do anything of the kind. I should like if something of that kind were done; it would make them more careful.

Q.—You don't know of steamship companies that do that? A.—No.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—With regard to the boys that have paid a portion of their passage money; is it to your knowledge that the majority pay the balance of their passage money to the association afterwards? A.—No; I guess not. They get here and are not content even after they have arrived. I will give you an instance: four boys were sent to me by a gentleman in the city who had four pounds sent to him to use for their benefit. They were seventeen years old. From the day they came into the home they tried every device to get matters so arranged that they could drop off on the afternoon on which they got their pay. When I last heard of them they had beaten their way to Denver—they had never walked, but had picked and beaten their way—and, as they could not get any further west, they will be obliged to stay down there.

Q.—What proportion do you think would be the balance of the amount due to the association that sent them out? A.—I don't know.

JOSEPH RICHARDS, Merchant Tailor, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—I understand you have a statement to make to the Commission? A.—I come here as representing the St. George's Society, and I wish first of all to make a remark, as a member of the Board of Management of the Boys' Home, in corroboration of what Mr. Dick has said. I think he has under-stated the facts. I think there have been some forty stowaways this year who have come to the Home, and only one of the forty has been any good, I believe. Somewhere nearly 90, I think, English boys including the stowaways have been no good. I just desire to corroborate Mr. Dick's statements in general; and, now I desire to speak as to the working of the charitable societies of the city, at all events of St. George's Society, an incorporated body which exists for the purpose of assisting newly arrived emigrants. I am ready to

answer any questions the Commissioners may see fit to ask me respecting the different matters connected with my work. I may say that we are very much troubled with an undesirable class of emigrants coming here, principally from the east end of London, who are helped out by charitable organizations, of whom I cannot give you their full histories; but they are, as a rule, landed here without a penny in their pockets, and are thrown upon the charity of the city, and become a public burden. I think if it were possible, there ought to be a law passed to prevent any steamship company bringing emigrants between October and March. There is nothing for them to do when they arrive here. If they do get anything to do, it is just a little work for which they get under-paid, and on account of which they put an honest man out, and then they squander the money in drink. They are in our charitable institutions by hundreds.

Q.—Would you prevent any respectable emigrant coming to this country?

A.—Not by any means. I would not prevent any emigrant coming here either if he had no means to exist or if he was a man willing to work; but it is no use for common labourers to come here in November, December, January or February, because if they are willing to work there is nothing for them to do, and they become a burden on the charities of the city.

Q.—Will you tell us what proportion of that total number of emigrants who remain in Montreal, each season, are of that class? A.—I cannot tell you the total number that arrive. The gentleman who is here representing the House of Industry and Refuge has now in that institution, nightly, about 200 men who go there for shelter. Of that number perhaps 125 arrived from England during the past season. They have no means of subsistence, and they are simply paupers on the charity of the public.

Q.—Is this condition attributable to the impossibility of getting work or to the improvident habits of the people themselves? A.—I think it is very attributable to both very largely. We have cases in our Home at the present time, that is in St. George's Home. At our Home we give shelter to newly arrived emigrants who instead of remaining on the wharves or going to poor lodging houses can come to our Home and spend a night or two nights there before they go west to Toronto or Manitoba. We find no difficulty whatever with such people, but it is different with those whose passages have been paid out by charitably disposed people and who arrive here and who are not disposed to work. During the past week I got employment for a man who has a wife and two children in our Home, one child four years old and another two years old, the family having come out last April. The man went to work on the railway near Sherbrooke. He went to Boston in the fall. Either he could not find work there or he did not care to do it, but the family got into the poor house there and the authorities in Boston paid the fare of the man, his wife and children back to Montreal. They arrived at the Home saying they were half starved. I gave an order for their admission. I have got several positions for the man and I gave him work to clear the snow in front of my dwelling. At the last severe snow-fall I expected him to be there and clear the snow on Sunday morning. He did not come, and I spoke to him on Monday morning about it, when he said: "You would not have me work on Sunday," to which I replied that the snow has to be cleared on Sunday in this country. I got another situation for him at which he worked two days, and on the third day he over-slept himself. It was the result of his leaving the store, for they told him that if he could not get to the place in time he was not wanted. My impression is that he thinks the Home is a nice warm place for himself and his family, and although we don't profess to keep people there the length of time they have been there, what can we do? If I say anything to the man he might go away and leave his wife and two children at the Home for us to look after. It is in regard to this class of emigrants that I think something should be done in order to stop their arrival here.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you thought of any scheme by which that class of people could be

prevented from leaving the old country and coming here? A.—There is no scheme by which they could be prevented from leaving the old country, but if the Canadian Government had a central place for the landing of emigrants, either in Montreal or Quebec, a sort of Castle Garden, where a thorough inspection would be made by Government officers, as to whether they were desirable or not, and if they were undesirable, they should be sent back at the steamship Company's expense, I think the plan would be a good one, and I am persuaded in my own mind that this undesirable class should be kept on the other side. I think their coming here is due, not so much to the Government agents, who are very often blamed in this matter, and I think they deserve it a little, but they are not the principal ones to blame, for the principal parties really to be blamed are the steamboat runners, who get a percentage on the three pounds passage money paid by every emigrant.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—What amount of relief did your society distribute during the past year?
A.—About \$4,000 in round numbers.

Q.—Did it ever occur to you that you were giving relief to people who did not deserve it, or need it? A.—I have come across a good many men who did deserve it; as to those who did not need it I am not aware.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—From your knowledge of the subject, what class of emigrants are most desirable for this country? A.—Tradesmen, any man with a trade can do well. In regard to clerks, or common laborers, I don't think we need them; but any man with a trade at his fingers' end, I don't care what it is, can do well if he is willing to work.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you think there is a scarcity of mechanics in Montreal? A.—I don't think so. There may be a scarcity during a few of the summer months when everything is pushed rapidly, but there are sufficient mechanics in Montreal to do everything that is required in the winter at all events.

Q.—At what season of the year would it be best for tradesmen to come out here? A.—If they came in the spring they would be all right, and would get work, but men ought to be prevented from landing here in November.

Q.—You mean men unprovided for? A.—Yes. They cannot weather the first winter even if they have a little means to start with; those means are very soon gone, and they become a burden on the charitable.

Q.—Are not agricultural laborers a worthy class of emigrants? A.—Our experience is that if we find one willing to go to a farm he is very soon back again; as a rule they will not go on the farms.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—You have said there was no room in Montreal for Mechanics at the present time, and that there is a sufficient number of mechanics here to do the work? A.—That is my opinion.

Q.—Suppose a large number of mechanics came here in the spring what would become of the mechanics working here now; would there be work enough for the new arrivals as well as for those working here? A.—There are so many more building operations and out-door work going on in the summer time than in the winter.

Q.—Would they be able to earn enough to keep them during the next winter?
A.—They would have to feel a pinch the first winter; I think they all have to do so. If I had anything to say on the subject I would never be in favor of any emigrants stopping in the sea-port town in which they land. I would like them to go to Toronto, Winnipeg and far back into the country.

Q.—Have you any knowledge of the wages paid carpenters and bricklayers in Montreal? A.—No.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you not think that an influx of mechanics into Montreal would have a tendency to lower the wages of mechanics already here? A.—I should not think so. I think we are growing fast enough to absorb all the mechanics that are likely to come here from the old country.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—All foreign emigration? A.—Yes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG ;—

Q.—Are you aware that statistics obtained by the Labor Organizations state that there is a surplus of mechanics in this country? A.—I am not aware. My trade is that of a merchant tailor, and I have been an employer of labor for twenty years in Montreal, and I may say there has never been an extra hand to be had, and a good tailor can always find employment at any part of the year.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Are other people in your trade in the same position as yourself? A.—I don't know. We have a Mercantile Association of which I am President, and as a rule, we never find there is any too much help.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Have you ever thought by what means you could prevent a British subject from landing in a British colony, any more than a citizen of London would have a right to prevent a citizen of York from going to the Metropolis? A.—I don't know. Take the case of a small parish in England. A man who is a bad character and will not work, and the charitably disposed people of the place think it would be a good thing if he got to a new country, and so subscribe money to send him out here. That man comes out here, and becomes a burden on the charitable institutions of this city, and on the charitably disposed people of the country. If there is not a law to prevent his arrival I think there should be a law passed to prevent such a man coming here.

Q.—Are any emigrants sent back from here? A.—Not that I am aware of.

F. E. GRAFTON, Bookseller, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—I understand that you have a statement to make to the Commission? A.—A.—I have taken a great interest in temperance and other societies in Montreal for the last forty years, and I have been for some years a member of the Executive Committee of the Quebec Branch of the Dominion Alliance. This has brought me in contact with intemperance and that which leads to intemperance. For the past year I have been associated with the chaplain of the prison, and have worked constantly, visiting the prison both on Sunday and week days, and have thus been brought into contact with a great number of individuals who are affected by the liquor traffic. I have in my hand a map which has been prepared by the Women's Christian Temperance Union. Every red mark on it indicates a licensed place. It was prepared a year ago and the number of licenses were only 900, now the number is considerably more. I was surprised to hear the statement of the Inspector just now, because the

applications for licenses on the last occasion were between 1200 and 1300. These marks, therefore, do not indicate the total number of licensed places in Montreal. You will find the red marks are in circles and crosses; the circles represent the drinking places, whether hotels, restaurants or saloons, and the crosses represent the groceries. These marks indicate a state of things as it was a year ago. If you follow Notre Dame Street, Bonaventure Street, Craig Street, and St. Lawrence Main Street up north, down near the railway stations, St. Catherine Street, Commissioner Street, in the neighborhood of the wharves—in fact, if you will follow all the principal thoroughfares, you will find them regularly studded with saloons, a great deal worse than the smallpox scare that we had two years ago.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you think that low wages and long hours have a tendency to create intemperance? A.—No; just the reverse.

Q.—Do you not think that intemperance is the offspring of poverty to a great extent? A.—No; it leads to poverty. The street on which I reside is a respectable street now, of course because I am living there—it is St. Famille Street, a street on which a great many merchants and business men live; and yet one morning at my table we called up twelve drunkards who were respectable business men who have been seen coming home the worse of liquor. My daughter said, "If so many are known how many must there be who are not known." And that I say is a respectable street. Such is the condition of one of the best streets in that part of the City, and on other streets, of course, the condition is somewhat similar. Therefore poverty has not much to do with intemperance. Intemperance is rather the result of the moral degradation of the poor.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Then intemperance is not confined to working people? A.—No; by no means, it is a very serious evil among working men in the City, in fact both men and women. Very few respectable men and women are arrested for drunkenness, yet out of 60,000 incarcerations in Montreal, I am told by the chaplain of the prison, that 50,000 were directly attributable to drink. The prison books show it, he says.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you had any occasion to visit the homes of the poorer class? A.—Occasionally, but not sufficiently frequent to get any information; the information I have is only from hearsay, from my contact with workmen and workingwomen in the prisons during the past three years.

Q.—Can you give us any reason why respectable and healthy drunkards do not get into jail as well as drunken workmen? A.—They generally take a sleigh or a cab and ride home—they get home quietly; whereas the workingman never or seldom take a sleigh and on the road home he perhaps gets into a little fuss with some one and the police arrest him. Whenever a drunken woman is seen she is most likely immediately taken to the lock up.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Do they ever take drunkards to an inebriate asylum? A.—No; we have not an opportunity of doing so here. There ought to be one established here. I think a great many of the people who are sent to jail should be sent to an inebriate asylum. A prison is not the place to send drunkards, for it does not reform them or care them. I can give the Commission information in regard to an inebriate asylum in New-York, if the information is desired. A great many sent from this city have recovered there. I have taken one down there myself, and others have been sent there.

By MR. CARSON:—

Q.—Do you think if the number of licenses in Montreal was reduced it would have a tendency to reduce drunkenness? A.—I think there would be far less if the number of licenses was fewer.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Has that result followed in other places where it has been tried? A.—Yes; fewer the number of drinking places the fewer the temptations to drink.

Q.—Do you know that that result has attended the reduction of licenses in other places? A.—It has; in some places in the old country, some places in the United States, in fact a great number of places in the United States. I am informed that outside the Grand Trunk works there are five or six drinking places, and every day they take in a lot of money. I asked whether they give tick, and my informer said they give credit and on pay day the men pay up.

By M. GIBSON:—

Q.—Do the men ever fail to pay? A.—I cannot say. In fact, going around collecting for the Alliance among the employers of labor, they have said they wished something could be done to repress this drunkenness, for it was a great loss to them. They did not like to say this publicly—they did not like to say that their men drank; some may do so, but I understand they do not like to say it publicly as a rule, but they told me their loss was very great on that account.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You think no law could be rigorous enough to prevent drunkenness? A.—I go for entire prohibition of the liquor traffic. The state should protect itself and help the people.

Q.—You think the state should put down rum as well as wine drinking? A.—I would put the whole traffic down for the sake of the community. There is a great increase of drinking, especially among women. I look upon the grocery licenses as being a great deal worse than the saloons. The groceries are situated all over the city, at the corner of every street almost, especially where there is a large population; in such cases there will be a grocery or two at three or four corners of streets, and the temptation to go in there and get a drink is very great. People who would not go into saloons would go there, especially women and young people. A gentleman informed me that he had had occasion to be in a grocery one day for half an hour, and he was astonished to see the large quantities of liquor that appeared in the grocery bill. He found that when the amount was reckoned up that a larger proportion of the bill in every case was for liquors. Another grocer states that seventy-five per cent of his customers buy liquors. A young man who was employed in one of the large grocery establishments, states that the bulk of their business was in liquor. Another grocer of St. Lawrence Main Street, the vicinity of which is occupied by mechanics and laboring people, states that out of 150 customers there are very few who do not buy liquor. Another grocer, when urged by his minister to give up the sale of strong drink, said there were more than half his customers who had bought liquor. Then, many grocers sell by the glass. I only heard on Saturday last, of a woman who said when she was going along St. Lawrence Main Street, that she must go and get some drink.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Do you know these things as facts, or are they only hearsay? A.—I am not personally cognisant of them, but I can bring witnesses to prove them.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that drink causes a great deal of injury to people?

A.—I am certain of it. I can bring up men and women who have been brought to poverty through their drinking habit. I have met with them in the prisons and have tried to save them, but when they go out again, they fall back into their drinking ways.

Q.—Do you find that the Society for prosecuting unlicensed people is aided by the people of the city generally, or are those unlicensed people assisted to get out of their troubles when they are prosecuted; in other words, have the unlicensed people, when they are prosecuted, the sympathy of the people at large? A.—The sympathy of the temperance people is with law and order. We have a branch of our Alliance called the Law and Order League, which devotes itself to preventing an increase of licenses, and sees to the enforcement of the License Laws.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you know the average number of arrests for drunkenness in Montreal per week? A.—No; I could not give that. I have not made enquiries, but one Monday there were thirty persons sent down to jail, most of them for drunkenness. That was an extreme case, and most of them were newly arrived emigrants.

Q.—Do you consider that would be a large proportion in a city of 230,000? A.—It was very much larger than the average.

Q.—Do you think that is a very large percentage, thirty out of 230,000? A.—I should think so. Those are men who are picked up in the yards and streets quite drunk, so drunk that they could not take care of themselves, and the police picked them up and took them to the station house, and on Monday they were sent down by the Recorder for eight days.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are you the Mr. Grafton who is acquainted with Mrs. Rout; will you explain to the Commission under what circumstances the wages of Mr. Rout were seized? A.—Mrs. Rout told me, after her husband's death, that a grocer in the neighbourhood had supplied them with groceries, and they had run up a bill of about \$11.00. They told him they were a little pressed, for it was winter time, and they had a great deal extra to pay, and they could not pay the bill in full, they would pay him as quickly as they were able; and they had paid over \$7.00, leaving \$4.00 still due. In what way it was done, or why it was done, I don't know, but Mr. Rout's wages were seized for the amount, and I am informed that the bill covering the debt, \$4.00 and costs, amounted to \$15.00. Something was garnisheed in the firm of Garth & Co., and this weighed so much on the poor man's mind that he took his life. I know the man had been in a weak state of mind for some time, but the circumstances I have stated, led to his taking his life.

Q.—How many children had Mrs. Rout? A.—There are, I think five children.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that when Rout's wages were garnished, Mrs. Rout had been sick at the time? A.—Just about that time, Mrs. Rout was confined.

By the Chairman:—

Q.—Are you aware of any undesirable emigrants coming here, who have been sent back again to the old country? A.—A considerable number of women and children have been sent back from time to time, as being unsuitable to this country; some from physical disability, but most of them on moral grounds.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—By what authority have they been sent back? A.—Women out of jail, for instance, with whom benevolent individuals could do nothing, have been sent out to this country to get rid of them. I have seen them myself in the Female Prison. When they got out, they would be back again in about a couple of weeks. Situations have been obtained for them, but the first money they got, they spent in drink, and

became a burden on the community, and benevolent individuals have collected money and paid their passage back to their friends in England, Ireland, or wherever they might come from. There is an institution in the city, on Mansfield Street, for Women emigrants, household servants, and so forth. That institution has had to send home a number of such characters as I have mentioned. During one year, I think, they reported they had sent home about twenty-eight of such women, most of them on account of moral unfitness—they could do nothing with them. They raised money and sent them home.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you know personally anything of the children sent out by Dr. Barnardo and Miss McPherson? A.—I know personally of the children sent out by Miss McPherson and Mr. Quarrier, of Glasgow. I have met Miss Rye, and I know something of that work. All that work is healthy and good. A number of the children, both boys and girls, have been sent back by those who brought them out. I know every year Miss McPherson takes home several, sometimes as many as seven, whom she has found to be unsuitable to the country. They seek in that work to get rid of the unhealthy and otherwise unfit children, so they take them home at their own expense.

Q.—Do you know what has become of the children who have remained here; have they got on in the world? A.—Yes. The children who have been brought out are especially looked after, and the homes are visited as a rule, and I am informed that the percentage of failures is only five per cent. I think Miss McPherson has brought out about 4,000 children. I had something to do with them, looking after them. Some girls and boys were left in this city, and the majority of them have done well. Some who are here now are doing very well.

(Translation.)

13th February 1888.

PHILORUM LAMONTAGNE, joint collector of the Provincial Revenue, for the District of Montreal, sworn :

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What is the number of licenses in this city? A.—The number is 1069, comprising restaurants, hotels, wholesale and retail dealers. There are 201 hotels, 305 restaurants, 18 wholesale and 545 retail dealers. The total is 1069. Parcellled off into wards they stand thus : East ward 40 hotels; West 6; Centre 9; St. Anne's 27; St. Antoine 28; St. Jean-Baptiste 10; St. Lawrence 11; St. Louis 12; St. James 22; St. Mary's 22; Hochelaga 14. As for the restaurants, they are divided as follows :—East ward 21; West 26; Centre 21; St. Anne's 45; St. Antoine 49; St. Jean-Baptiste 5; St. Lawrence 36; St. Louis 35; St. James 40; St. Mary's 25; Hochelaga 2. There are 12 wholesale spirit and liquor dealers in the West, and 6 in the Centre wards. The retail dealers are thus divided : in the East ward 25; West ward 10; Centre ward 8; St. Anne's 88; St. Antoine 76; St. Jean-Baptiste 27; St. Lawrence 39; St. Louis 80; St. James 94; St. Mary's 83; and Hochelaga 15.

Q.—What has been the total of applications from the beginning of May 1887? A.—I can not give the number, as these applications are made before the Commissioners of Licenses, and it is Mr. Edmund McMahon who is their deputy, and who could give you the information?

Q.—Do you know Mountain Street, between St. Joseph and St. James Streets? A.—Yes, sir, I do.

Q.—What distance is there between the two latter streets, along Lamontagne street? A.—Three or four acres.

Q.—How many taverns are there along those two or three acres? A.—I do not know of any taverns between St. Joseph and St. James streets, but there are liquor dealers there. I have a plan here pointing out pretty well the places where taverns are situated in the city, and other liquor dealers. The red spots on the plan show the retail dealers of spirits. The blue spots show the restaurants, and the yellow points the hotels.

Q.—Commissioner street, from Barracks street to St. Peter street, contains a great number of hotels, liquor houses and restaurants, does it not? A.—Yes.

Q.—Was that plan drawn up last year? A.—No; it was drawn up two or three years ago.

Q.—Are there more taverns and groceries to day than before? A.—Yes; sir, a little more.

Q.—According to the plan, the largest number of licenses is found in what is known as the workman's quarter? A.—Yes; except the East ward.

Q.—The East ward is the part where are found the working men of the port, the working men who labour on the wharves? A.—Yes; a great part of the shipping labourers, but these are found in front of the Bonsecours market, or St. Paul street, where there are more of them. If you take St. James ward, you will find that too, is pretty well filled up.

Q.—Is it not a fact that along all the streets, which laboring men frequent on their way from home to their work, and from their shops to their dwellings, are found the greatest number of tavern and restaurant licenses? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is it not true that measures were taken, a few years ago, to reduce the number of licenses first, and then to increase them by opposing parties? A.—In one thousand eight hundred and eighty-four, the Federal law was passed. By this law the number of licenses was considerably lessened in the City of Montreal. Furthermore, the Council had passed a resolution still further reducing the number, although the Federal law had already reduced them. The City Council found the number still to great. To this effect an effort was made on the part of the City Council, and I had received instruction to visit a great number of restaurants and to make a report on their manner of carrying on. I did indeed visit a considerable number of these places and wherever I found what I thought was not exactly according to the requirements of law, I made a report, and the total of these haunts was considerably diminished.

Q.—What happened then? A.—Well, public opinion shifted again after that, and licenses were given as before. The Commissioners granted licenses as in the past.

Q.—In your opinion, is the number of licenses granted in Montreal too large for the population? A.—Yes, sir; too large, certainly, for the public morals.

Q.—Do you not think that it would be well to reduce the number of licenses on the thoroughfares of Montreal? A.—I think it were well to reduce them every where and in everything.

Q.—Are there not places where licensed houses are found almost side by side? A.—Yes; several places.

Q.—According to what you know, have licenses been issued which were not up to the requirements of the law? A.—If you could dispense me from replying to that question I should prefer it.

STATEMENT A.—Referred to in the deposition of Philorum LaMontagne Deputy Collector of Provincial Revenue for the Revenue District of Montreal.

MEMORANDUM.—Number of Hotel, Restaurant, Wholesale and Retail Liquor Shop Licenses issued for the City of Montreal, between 1st of May, 1887, and 13th February, 1888.

Ward.	Hotel.	Restaurant.	Wholesale Liquor Shops.	Retail Liquor Shops.	Total.
East.....	40	21	25	86
West.....	6	26	12	10	54
Centre.....	9	21	6	8	44
St. Ann.....	27	45	88	160
St. Antoine.....	28	49	76	153
St. Jean Baptiste.....	10	5	27	42
St. Lawrence.....	11	36	39	86
St. Louis.....	12	35	80	127
St. James.....	22	40	94	156
St. Mary.....	22	25	83	130
Hochelaga.....	14	2	15	31
Total.....	201	305	18	545	1,069

P. LAMONTAGNE,

Deputy Collector of Pr. Rev., R. District of Montreal.

Montreal, 13th February, 1888.

(Translation.)

ANTOINE HAMILTON, Chairman of the Board of Assessors of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are Chairman of the Board of Assessors of the City? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—For how many years? A.—Since One Thousand Eight Hundred and Eighty-six., which makes two years.

Q.—Who were the assessors in St. Mary's Ward last year? A.—Messrs. Morin and Thomas.

(Translation.)

15 February, 1888.

SAMUEL LARRY, apprentice tobacconist of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How old are you? A.—Ten years old.

Q.—How long since you have been working? A.—Six or seven months.

Q.—How much do you get a week? A.—One dollar and twenty-five cents.

Q.—At what hour do you go to work? A.—At a quarter to seven o'clock in the forenoon.

Q.—At what hour do you leave the factory in the evening? A.—At quarter to six.

Q.—At what time do you take your dinner? A.—At ten minutes to twelve o'clock.

Q.—At what hour do you return to work after dinner? A.—At one o'clock.

Q.—On Saturdays, at what time do you leave the factory? A.—We leave off at four o'clock.

Q.—Have you ever been beaten in the factory? A.—No sir.

Q.—Did you ever pay fines? A.—No sir.

Q.—Do you live with your parents? A.—Yes sir.

(Translation.)

ALFRED PATRIE, leather cutter, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are a leather cutter? A.—Yes; sir.

Q.—What are the wages paid generally to the leather cutters in Montreal? A.—The average wages in Montreal, are from seven dollars and a half to eight dollars a week. There are some factories where more are made, and some where less are made. In the factory where I work, there are twelve who make ten dollars a week and the others yet less.

Q.—Have the wages increased in the past few years, or have they stopped at a stand still? A.—I have been seventeen years in the trade and the wages have remained pretty much the same as to day.

Q.—Is there more work now than there was formerly? A.—There is an increase in numbers among the leather cutters. We can count about fifty more leather cutters at the present than when I began.

Q.—Are you employed the whole year. I mean all the leather cutters? A.—No. The cutters in general lose about two months in the year, but as for me, in the factory where I am employed, the work is continual.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Will you explain to the Commission what you mean by a leather cutter? A.—The cutting of leather for boots and shoes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is there a large number of apprentices in your trade? A.—Yes. There are many, and more than are wanted at present. There are factories where, for three cutters, eight apprentices are employed.

Q.—Is it long since the number of apprentices increased in that proportion? A.—When I went into the trade, we were about twelve cutters and about six apprentices.

Q.—How much time is required for an apprentice to learn his trade well? A.—One must give about three years of apprenticeship, but there is no apprenticeship in the trade; and we do not want apprenticeship. I went into the trade at ten years and came out of it at nineteen years, when I got a journeyman's wages.

Q.—Can you give us an idea of the wages paid in the United States and of the wages paid in Canada? A.—I never worked in the United States.

Q.—How are apprentices treated, as a rule, in boot and shoe factories? A.—Pretty well.

Q.—Are they ever fined? A.—Never.

Q.—At what age do they begin? A.—There are factories where apprentices are taken on at eleven.

Q.—It is a hard trade leather cutting; is it not? A.—It is a trade trying on the legs.

Q.—What do apprentices work at generally? Are they required to do hard tasks? A.—No, they are generally put to begin cutting the trimmings of boots and shoes.

Q.—Are there women employed in the leather-cutting trade? A.—There are three in Montreal, to my knowledge.

Q.—Do you think that it is a suitable trade for women? A.—No. The three women that I know do not do work that is suitable to women. There is a girl working in a manufactory here, who does the heaviest work that can be done in the trade. She cuts the ticking.

Q.—Do you know that woman? A.—Yes, I know her.

Q.—Does she enjoy good health? A.—Since I knew her, she has begun to fail.

Q.—How old might she be? A.—She is twenty-seven or twenty-eight years of age.

Q.—How long has she been working at that trade? A.—For the last 11 or 12 years.

Q.—Has not the School of Arts and Manufactures opened a class for leather-cutters? A.—No; for the cutting-out of patterns only.

Q.—Do you know at whose instance this class was opened, and whether it was at the demand of the patrons or that of the working people? A.—I have never heard anything about it.

Q.—Do you know whether a great number of apprentices or artisans follow this class? A.—There are about twenty-four following it.

Q.—Do you know whether there are several applications for admittance to this course? A.—There are about sixty applications already made.

Q.—Is there a great desire among workmen and apprentices to follow the classes which are called "technical"? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are all the pupils actually following that class according to your knowledge, at least, also actually employed in your trade? A.—No. There are boot and shoe makers, and others employed in other branches of the boot and shoe trade, who follow the class.

Q.—Did not the mechanics working in leather, in different degrees, demand that the School of Arts and Manufactures open classes relating to the manufacture of leather? A.—No, never; at least not to my knowledge.

Q.—Do you know that such is their desire? A.—Yes, sir. Such is their desire.

Q.—How many hours a day do you work? A.—We work ten and a-half hours a day, and on Saturdays, we knock off at noon.

Q.—The half hours of every day go to make up for the Saturday afternoon? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—At what hour do you close at night? A.—At six o'clock.

Q.—At six o'clock precisely? A.—Yes, at six o'clock precisely. That is the rule in almost all factories.

Q.—Do you not, at times, close at a quarter past six o'clock or at half-past six? A.—There are certain manufactories where this is done, but I did not work in them myself. Perhaps other witnesses will be able to give you the information.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the factory in which you work? A.—The factory where I work is in a perfect condition. But I have worked in some factories where we were obliged to cover ourselves with our aprons on our way to the privies. There were about eight or ten inches of shavings on the floor to staunch the water flowing along the floor.

Q.—How do the doors of the factory where you work open? A.—Always on the inside, and that is general in almost all the the factories.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Does not your employer know that this is against the law? A.—He knows it well enough, but the factory was so built when he took it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Are the doors closed during the day? A.—They are closed by a spring, but are easily opened.

Q.—They are not locked? A.—No, never.

Q.—In the factory where you work is there a salvage apparatus in case of fire? A.—No, there is none, so far as I know. There are a couple of manufactures here in Montreal, where they have this apparatus, and there are about 38 factories in the city.

Q.—How many men are there in the factory where you work? A.—For our department of trade, we are about 34 or 35 in our room, but, in all, I think that there are about 200 people.

Q.—How many floors are there in the factory? A.—Four floors.

Q.—How many stairways? A.—Three stairways in the front and three in the rear.

Q.—This makes six pairs of stairs from below to the top? A.—No, there are three stairways in front and three in the rear.

Q.—Is the stairway straight up? A.—No, the three stairways are built one above the other. But the first stairway turns like a corkscrew.

Q.—Have you three stairways leading from above to below, or a single stair from below to the flats above? A.—There are three stairways in the rear from floor to floor, but in front there are only two, because the one in front is spiral.

Q.—In case of fire, with the doors opening from the inside, do you think the men could make their escape? A.—We should always find it difficult in any case, because the stairway in the rear, to go to the rear door, leads over a considerable distance.

Q.—Your shops are heated during the winter are they? A.—They are always well heated in the factory where I work.

Q.—Are the shops well ventilated in summer? A.—They are well ventilated where I work, but I have worked in factories where the men were forced to work with their overcoats on.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—The cutting of which you have just spoken, which was made by the woman whom you mentioned, is it done by hand or by machinery? A.—By hand. Never machinery. It is done with a knife, by hand.

Q.—Are there any tanneries in the city? A.—There are many, but I cannot tell you how many there are.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Are there many factories which refuse to employ men who belong to Trades' Unions? A.—I know an employer who dismissed two men from his factory, because they belonged to labor unions, and who incurred a libel for sending letters to other factories requesting that these men be not employed.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Were those two able, afterward, to find work in the city? A.—Yes; they found work, I was one of them myself.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Was not all this an exceptional case? A.—Yes; if the same thing happens often, I know nothing about it. To my knowledge it is a solitary case.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have the leather cutters ever struck? A.—Never.

Q.—They have never had trouble with their bosses? A.—Never.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do leather cutter's do any work at home? A.—Never.

Q.—Are there other workmen in the boot and shoe trade who work at their homes? A.—Yes; there are many who do work on their own account.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you know any of these men personally? A.—Yes; I know men who do work at their homes.

Q.—Is that kind of thing done on a large scale at Montreal? A.—Yes; generally speaking, work in reversed hides is done at home.

Q.—Were you out of work for a long time after being dismissed by your employer for belonging to the union? A.—I went to work myself the following morning, but I went to work in a factory where the owner did not belong to the employers' union.

Q.—Do you know of any men who were sent away, by any employer, because they belonged to the Workingmen's Union. A.—No; not to my knowledge.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Do you know whether there are any women employed in the tanneries? A.—Not to my knowledge.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You have just spoken about boot and shoe work done at home; is this work done by men, or by women? A.—By men.

Q.—Are children employed in this work? A.—Sometimes.

Q.—Young children? A.—Children of any age can help, when the work is done at home.

Q.—Do you know whether those men, who work at home, keep a great number of hands in small rooms, or in an ordinary room, in a house? A.—Usually, private houses have rooms about thirteen feet by fourteen, and, in those rooms, eight or ten hands are sometimes employed, and sometimes more than that.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Are boots and shoe manufactured at the Reformatory, and the houses of Detention, of Montreal? A.—Yes; there is a factory at the Reformatory, where boots and shoes are made.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Is the leather-cutting done there, also? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know whether the work is done by the men, or the children of the Reformatory? A.—The cutting is done by both. There are apprentices among the children of the Reformatory.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you know whether this work is done by the authorities managing the Reformatory, or if it is done by the contractor, who hires from the Reformatory? A.—It is done by the contractor, who has the management there.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you know how many children are employed at this work? A.—No; I do not know.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Are you aware that women, or men, repair to the factories, with small vans, and take a load of boots and shoes, all cut, which they take back with them to finish? A.—Yes; lots of men and women.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How are you paid in the factory where you work? A.—We are paid every week; every Saturday.

JOHN F. O'ROURKE, Shoe Cutter, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are a shoe cutter, I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—You have heard the evidence given with respect to your trade; have you any statements to make contrary to that evidence? A.—I cannot say anything contrary to it, but I corroborate the statements already made.

Q.—Have you worked in the United States? A.—Yes; for a number of years.

Q.—Can you tell us the rate of wages paid in the United States in your trade as compared with those paid in Canada? A.—They are more than double, so far as my experience goes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Where have you worked? A.—I worked for eleven years in New York, Philadelphia, Rochester, Baltimore and other cities in the States.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do the manufacturers in the United States pay double the wages at the present time as compared with the manufacturers here? A.—In some shops their regular pay is \$24.00 a week, but the wages run up for trimming cutters from \$12.00 to \$24.00 per week, and some are paid a great deal more than that. Trimming cutters here get \$1.50 a day, but they get \$3.00, \$4.00, \$5.00 or \$6.00 for the same work in New York; they get \$15.00 a week, and they used to get \$18.00.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What is the average time such men are employed during the year in the United States? A.—They lose about two months in the year; between two and three months they are idle.

Q.—Are they idle for about the same time here? A.—Something similar.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Did you ever work in Massachusetts? A.—Yes; for a short time.

Q.—Where was that? A.—In Sharon, a few miles outside of Boston.

Q.—How do the wages there compare with the wages in Montreal? A.—The wages in the country towns are very poor. They are pretty much all farmers who go there, and very few city men go there to work.

Q.—How do the wages compare with Montreal? A.—They are better there than in Montreal.

Q.—How long is it since you worked there? A.—It is about ten years since I worked there.

Q.—Were the wages higher or lower at that time than they are now? A.—At that place I cannot say.

Q.—Have you worked in several factories in Montreal? A.—Yes; I have worked in several factories.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the factories in which you have worked in this city? A.—Some of them were first-class, but some of them were in the very worst condition—in fact, they were not fit to live in.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Was there a sanitary inspector at that time? A.—I have worked two years here now, and I have never known one to come into a factory up to this time.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are there in those factories separate water-closets for men and women? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know of any factory where there are not separate water-closets? A.—No. I know where the partition was very slight between the two, and the females had to pass the closets where the men were, and very often something very queer took place on account of that. I have known of a man being arrested on account of the closets.

Q.—Was the factory in which you worked properly heated in winter? A.—It was just about so warm that I had to wear an overcoat and mitts, and had to go home very often to get warmed up. That was about the heat there was there.

Q.—Was there a stove there? A.—They had a stove, but the boss thought it would be too injurious to the health of the workmen—that too much heat was injurious.

Q.—Is the work in your trade sufficiently hard that you can do it without a stove? A.—It is very quiet work.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—So a man would not gain much by not keeping you warm? A.—He would not gain much. We can go to the shop and put in our time without doing much.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is the ventilation in summer in your factory good or bad? A.—It is of the very worst kind. The ventilation we have in summer is by opening one of the lights. A young man had twelve weeks sickness on account of the draft he got—sore eyes on account of it. There is practically no ventilation in summer, but there is a great deal in winter. If we want any ventilation we have to take out one of the side lights.

Q.—How do the doors open in the factory where you are employed? A.—They all open on the inside.

Q.—Are there any fire-escapes provided in case of fire? A.—No; not in case of fire. I have never seen one.

Q.—Of how many storeys does the factory building consist? A.—Of three, I think.

Q.—And how many stair cases are there? A.—There is only one that I have seen. We all come in and go out at the same place.

Q.—How many people are employed in the factory? A.—I should say about 100 or 200, to the best of my judgment.

Q.—In case of fire, could the persons employed in the factory, that is, in the upper stories, escape easily? A.—Not very well, unless they went out of the windows; that is the only means of escape.

Q.—How many hours do you work per day? A.—We work ten and a half hours a day.

Q.—At what hour do you finish at your factory? A.—We commence at seven o'clock in the morning, and quit at twelve for dinner; we commence at a quarter to one, and

work till a quarter after six, and till a quarter after three on Saturdays. The half hour we work extra during the five days, makes up for the earlier time we leave on Saturday. We work sixty hours per week.

Q.—You stop work, I suppose, when the engine stops? A.—Yes; according as the engine starts, or stops, we work half an hour over in the day—as the engine stops we stop.

Q.—Do you do so of your own free will? A.—No; we kick against it, but it is no use. The boss says that it is the time, and you have to go by it. We do not want to create any disturbance in the shop by leaving on account of it.

Q.—Have you any suggestions to make relative to your trade? A.—Nothing special.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Will you tell us some of the principal reasons why men are discharged from these shoe factories? A.—In many cases on account of nationality and creed.

Q.—Will you also tell us the ages of the youngest children that work in the houses where they are employed on the work obtained from the factories? A.—To my personal knowledge, they work from the age of six years up.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Do you know anything about the prices paid at other branches of your trade? A.—I could not tell you any prices outside of shoe cutting.

Q.—You do not know anything about lasting? A.—No; only that that they are dissatisfied with the prices given them.

Q.—Do you know the prices that are given them? A.—There are many in the trade who will be prepared to give you the rates, if you think it necessary to have them.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you know the difference in the prices paid between Montreal and Toronto in your trade? A.—I should say there between \$3.00, \$4.00, or \$5.00 a week difference.

Q.—That difference is in favor of which place? A.—The difference is in favor of Toronto; in fact, all Upper Canada.

Q.—How do you explain the difference to exist? A.—I really cannot say, as to that; it is a great deal the fault of the men themselves. If one man asks a rise of wages, ten will not do so; so he has to stay at what he is. This is due to lack of unity.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do I understand you to say that there were some men arrested in those water closets? A.—Yes.

Q.—What for? A.—For indecent conduct, on account of the close proximity of the closets.

Q.—Did anything come of the arrest? A.—Yes; the man was sent to prison.

Q.—Then there must have been something culpable in his actions? A.—The case was made out squarely against him. I was not working in the shop at that time but I knew the man personally, and I had worked with him seven years in another factory.

Q.—Had anything of the kind occurred when he was working before? A.—He tried it but was prevented. Nothing came of it for the reason that the other party was too respectable to make anything of it, and we kept the thing quiet.

Q.—Do you know any other matters of this kind that have occurred in the factory except this special case? A.—No. About the question asked by the gentleman at the lower end of the table (Mr. Kerwin) I may say that I have had to leave Montreal twice on account of being boycotted. I tried to get employment in every shop in Montreal and I could not get a job as soon as my name was known.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—On what account was that? A.—Because I had been rather prominent in trade organization matters. I consider there were lots of men in trouble on account of the same thing, but the trouble is over now. The bosses have a combination here—they are bound to put an end to us if they possibly can.

Q.—Is there an understanding between the employers not to engage men who belong to organized labor in the shoe trade, in the cutting department? A.—Yes; I am positive of it.

Q.—Do you know that for a fact? A.—I am positive of it.

Translation.

AUGUSTE COAILLIER, Joiner, of Montreal, sworn:—

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What is your trade at present? A.—A joiner. I was employed at the oil cloth factory, on Parthenais Street, before that.

Q.—Where did you lose your arm? A.—At the oilcloth factory, through a thong.

Q.—How long is that ago? A.—That was on the eighth of March, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six.

Q.—Will you tell us how you came to lose your arm? A.—I have here a plan, showing the spot where the accident took place. There was a ladder leaning against the shaft, and we were about undoing a strap, to replace it by a stronger one. My chum, whose name was Johnny Duclos, was standing on a ladder, which is shown on the plan, at the other end of the wall.

Q.—But how came you to have your arm torn off? A.—I was caught in the machine by a strap.

Q.—Had the machine not been stopped to unfasten the strap? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Were you in the habit of changing these straps? Was that your business? A.—No; I was engaged as a joiner.

Q.—Did you receive orders to go and change the strap? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you give the matter no thought? A.—The only thought I had was that my chum had ordered me to go with him and do that work. He is known in the factory as the foreman, and I had to obey his commands. It was he who engaged me.

Q.—Was he, himself, in the habit of changing the straps? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you always in the employ of the Company? A.—No; it is about a year now that I am out of work. I am not even cured yet. I am, at the present moment, under the doctor's care.

Q.—Did the Company allow you any damages? A.—No; no damages.

Q.—Did it pay your bill of sickness? A.—Not at all; I was even upbraided for the scrap of cotton on which I had rested after the accident, and which was stained with my blood. I may here remark that in the factory there was an electric clock that did not work. I fell within three or four feet of the electric alarm, and if there had been an electric alarm, such as there is in the factory to-day, I am positive that I should not have got off with only a broken arm.

Q.—You are a married man, and have a family? A.—I have five children.

Q.—Can you work at present? A.—The doctors have told me that I am in for it for a year more, at least. I had my arm torn out up to the extremity of the back.

Q.—Did you make a demand on the Company? A.—I made a demand to the Court, and the suit will come up next Thursday.

(Translation.)

VINCENT BELANGER, plasterer, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

- Q.—You are a plasterer, are you not? A.—Yes; sir.
- Q.—What are the wages paid in your trade? A.—The wages are 25 cents an hour.
- Q.—What is the average of working hours? A.—In summer we go ten hours a day. At the present time we work eight and nine hours a day.
- Q.—How many months of the year do you work? A.—About nine months of every year. In spring we have always a slack time, in April, May and June.
- Q.—How are the relations between the plasterers and their employers? Are they on good terms? A.—They are on good terms.
- Q.—Have you had a rise in your wages lately? A.—Not this year; but the past two years we had a rise of 25 cents a day each year. That is to say in 1886 (one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six) and in 1887 (one thousand eight hundred and eight-seven.)
- Q.—This is an arrangement which you entered upon with your employers two years ago? A.—We have a society, and every year towards the month of December or the month of January we demand a rise of wages, or else our bosses ask us if we are willing to go on at the same rates. This year they asked us if he would go on at the same wages, and we consented, only we demanded for hours of extra work, thirty-five cents the hour. Sometimes we are forced to work by night in places where we cannot work during the day, as in stores and shops and other similar buildings. For that class of work we demanded 35 cents an hour.
- Q.—Are all the plasterers of Montreal now kept busy? A.—Yes. They are kept busy.
- Q.—There is a great demand for plasterers, is there not? A.—Yes sir, in this season, of the year there are not men enough to do the work that is to be done.
- Q.—Is there a large number of apprentices in your trade? A.—Not more than three to each boss. Our Society has entered into an agreement with our employer that he may not take more than two apprentices, only, when the first is rounding off his last year we allow him to choose a third.
- Q.—Do you mean to say that each employer has the right to take two or three apprentices, as you state, no matter what is the number of the men? A.—Yes; no matter what the number is of the men.
- Q.—Thus an employer who has one hand under him can take three apprentices while an employer who has ten hands could not take more than three apprentices? A.—Not all the same thing, because there are certain times of the year when an employer is obliged to take on eight or ten men, or twelve or fifteen men, and when the work is over the men go off and engage with another boss.
- Q.—Have you worked in other places beside Montreal? A.—No; only here in Montreal.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

- Q.—You are always satisfied with the city? A.—I am satisfied.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

- Q.—In Montreal do the plasterers set the laths, or is this a separate trade? A.—No; we have special men for that.
- Q.—Do you know the price paid for setting laths? A.—I think that it is \$1.18 or \$1.25 the hundred laths. I could not be very sure; but I think that this is about right.
- Q.—Do plasterers make use of stoves during the winter? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Who pays for the cost of those stoves? A.—Why! the bosses.

Q.—Has the plasterers organization taken measures that have resulted in an increase of wages? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What are the wages paid for the *manœuvres* of plasterers? A.—The employer for whom I work pays \$1.25 a day and in summer he pays up to \$1.60.

Q.—Are your wages and those of your labourers reduced in winter? A.—Yes. They are reduced because the boss pay the labourers \$1.60 in summer and in winter \$1.25.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—But your own wages, have they been reduced? A.—Our wages are reduced because we work by the hour and not otherwise.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Is there a society existing among the labourers? A.—No, sir. They have not got that far yet. They have been talking about it for these two or three years past; but they have not yet succeeded in organizing.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you anything else to lay before the Commission beside what you have already said? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Are you satisfied with your wages and your relations with your employer? A.—Yes.

GEORGE KNOTT, Plasterer. Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have heard the evidence of the last witness in regard to your trade; have you anything to say different from what has already been said? A.—I do not think I can add anything to what has been already said. I think the statements made are correct and I corroborate them.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are the various trades in the building business federated? A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—You know what I mean? A.—They are not amalgamated.

Q.—I mean a federation between carpenters, painters, bricklayers and so on, throughout the whole building trade; is there a federation of that kind in Montreal? A.—No.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you do any piece work in plastering? No.

Q.—You are not paid by the yard for any work you do? A.—No.

Q.—You do not do cornice work by the yard? A.—No.

Q.—Nor centre pieces? A.—No.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you not think piece work in plastering trade is injurious to journeymen? A.—Yes; it is.

Q.—And that piece work causes a great amount of jealousy and ill feeling to exist? A.—Yes. Since we have got our society we do not allow that to be done.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you worked anywhere outside of Montreal? A.—Yes; in New York.

Q.—How do the wages in New York compare with those paid in Montreal?
 A.—In New York a man gets \$4.00 while here he gets \$2.50 a day. Taking everything into consideration, I think a man is as well off here, at that rate, as in New York.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do I understand you to say, that a man who does very little work receives as much pay as one who does half as much more work? A.—That is just what they do. Every man is paid the same.

Q.—Whether he is a good workman, or bad workman? A.—Yes.

Q.—Or whether he works hard, or easy? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—When you admit a plasterer into your Union, do you first take the precaution to find out whether he is a good workman or not? A.—We are not so particular as regards that, so long as the plasterer has served his four years' apprenticeship—that is what is called for. There are some men who never would make good plasterers, it matters not how long they served at the trade; but there are other men who, after having served two years, are good plasterers.

Q.—Do you compel men to give a proof of their having served an apprenticeship, before you admit them into your Union? A.—Yes; anyone, who has served his time in the city, has to bring a note from the boss that he served his time.

Q.—And how is it in regard to parties who have not worked in the city? A.—We have then to take their word for it.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Do plasterers here do any brick work? A.—No; not as a rule.

Q.—Do any of them do it? A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—Do you say they do no other work but plastering? A.—They only do plastering.

Q.—Have you a strong body of plasterers here? A.—About 150 in the city.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Do you know if the master plasterers have an association? A.—I cannot say. I believe they have a Society—that is, the carpenters, and masons, and those branches, together, but I do not think the separate branches have; they are altogether, I think. Two years ago the boss plasterers had a Society, but I think they have broken it up.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Do you, as plasterers, do any white-washing, or anything of that kind? A.—Yes; it is part of our business.

Q.—In cleaning out in the spring, do you do white-washing, kalsomining, and plastering, and everything of that kind? A.—Yes.

Translation.

EDOUARD PELLETIER, shoemaker, of Montreal, sworn :—

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You have worked at the Reformatory? A.—I work there at present.

Q.—How many young people in the Reformatory are employed at the boot and shoe trade? A.—I could not say exactly how many there are; but I know that we

have as many as seventy-five and seventy-six. To-day there are about forty, to the best of my knowledge.

Q.—How many men are there? A.—There may be about twenty men.

Q.—Do you know how much the children are paid? A.—I think it is 15 cents a day. That is what I have been told.

Q.—What do these young folks do? A.—They work at the boot and shoe trade, like ourselves.

Q.—Do they learn their trade? A.—They cannot learn the whole of their trade, because there are too many machines. They are taught only a part of the trade.

Q.—Taken altogether, does a lad who has worked at the boot and shoe trade, at the Reformatory, turn out a good workman when he leaves? A.—No.

Q.—Is he able to go to work in a shop in town? A.—There are several lines in the trade, and he might go to work with others who would teach him.

Q.—In your opinion, is the employment of children in the boot and shoe trade, at the Reformatory, hurtful to the workmen of Montreal? A.—No.

Q.—How much are boys paid, in other factories, who do the same work as those employed at the Reformatory? A.—As to that I know nothing about it.

Q.—You worked in other shops before going to the Reformatory? A.—No; I worked for myself before going to the Reformatory; that is to say, I did work for other manufacturers at my own house.

(Translation.)

ELI MASSY, Cigar-maker, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are a cigar-maker? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What is the average of wages for the men? A.—The average of salaries is \$7.00 a week. I may tell you, first, this question has received a great deal of consideration, and the conclusion come to was, the average \$7.00 a week.

Q.—Seven dollars a week, for the whole year? A.—For the whole year.

Q.—You make more by the week, but you have days when you knock off, and you thus calculate that you made \$7.00 a week, the whole year round, Sundays thrown in? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you ever studied the question of workingmen's expenses in your trade, striking an average? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What average did you strike—say a married man, with how many children? A.—A married man, with a family of two or three children, we found, gave us this result. For schooling, the cost is about fifty cents a week. Then, as to rental, we calculated an average, about one dollar and a half a week, but I see that the rentals are still rising.

Q.—Speak for the present moment? A.—For the present moment, we have set down \$1.50 per week for the rental.

Q.—That makes \$78.00 a year. A.—Yes; that is the average.

Q.—How much do you calculate for bread? A.—First, we calculated on fuel, and we put down eighty cents a week for fuel.

Q.—And how much did you put down for bread? A.—We assigned the whole balance for food, the average being for that item, between \$4.00 and \$5.00 a week.

Q.—If you put down \$5.00 a week for food, you go beyond \$7.00. you get up as far as \$7.80. In determining \$4.00 for food, you came down to \$6.80, which leaves you twenty cents for clothing, and the balance? A.—For living, we did not calculate; I speak from my own experience for all the expenses which I have mentioned.

Q.—How many children have you got? A.—I have two children.

Q.—Can you live on \$7.00 a week? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Then, you run into debt? A.—Yes; we run into debt. When health gives way, we must, necessarily, contract debts.

Q.—But, in ordinary times, without sickness, could you make a living with your \$7.00 a week? A.—Certainly; we could always live. I am of opinion that I could live with \$7.00 a week, in ordinary circumstances, without sickness, with my children.

February 14th, 1888.

CHARLES ALEXANDER, Confectioner, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You are here, I understand, as the President of the House of Industry and Refuge. Will you please proceed in any statement you have to make? A.—I came to speak about the over-crowding of our institution. We have over 200 men there who can find no employment, seemingly, in the city. Last Monday morning I was appointed to lay the matter before the Commission, and I am therefore here. We represented to the Government some years ago the kind of emmigration that is coming to this country, and at the meeting we held we expressed the strong conviction not in the least to object to healthy emigrants, but rather fostered it in every possible way. The expression of our Board was that if we could get intelligent mechanics and intelligent farmers, who are not paupers, to come to our shores, we would hail them with delight; but the kind of men who come now, form really a burden upon our charitable institutions. Some of these have come late in the season, sent out by unthinking people who were ignorant as to our climate here; the consequence is that these poor fellows are unable to get employment late in the Fall, and they fall upon our charitable institution. I can only say that this is to us a very great hardship. Our institution is supported by charitable contributions and we have to bear the brunt of all these helpless fellows. We think this is a very great hardship to us, and if the Government could remedy it in any possible way, it would not only be a blessing to us as an institution, but to all other charitable institutions in the city. There is another phase of our work which the Commission should know about and that is out-door relief, which has no connection with the House of Industry proper, but is an organization of the different societies. We relieve weekly, and this is a very important item I think, about 160 or 170 families, giving them wood, provisions, and clothing, when we get it. Now the fact about these families is this: A large majority of them are English and they are very respectable but they are very poor. They come out late in the Fall and cannot get employment and the result is that they are thrown upon the charities of the people. We have some sixty English families out of that class of 160 or 170 families. This is a very serious question and what we would like to know is, if it can be remedied in any way. We have had suggestions made in regard to it and the Government of Ottawa have been written to about it. I have written myself about it, and we have received answers, but so far there has been no result of any kind. If we could only have the Government exercise, what we think is desirable, a little more restriction on the other side of the ocean in sending emigrants here, that is in regard to the kind of emigrants sent out, it would be a blessing.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Have any of these inmates of the House of Refuge been in the country for more than one year to your knowledge? A.—Yes; some have.

Q.—Any considerable number? A.—A considerable number of them.

Q.—Then they do not adapt themselves to the circumstances of the country and become self-supporting? A.—It seems so. Some who come out and go even as far as British Columbia find their way down here.

Q.—Now as to those who are receiving out-door relief through the House of Refuge. Have any of them been in the country for more than a year? A.—I think about sixty families are recent emigrants. The others are resident here, but people who cannot get employment, do what they may in the country.

Q.—Have you any knowledge of the circumstances under which those people were induced to come to Canada? A.—No; we have our surmises but no data to enable us to know this.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—What is your idea of fostering emigration of mechanics and working men as you have mentioned. Is there a demand for them here? A.—We had a meeting about this pauper emigration and the strong conviction expressed was this, that as a people, we were not opposed to healthy emigration, that is to intelligent mechanics and intelligent farmers coming to this country with some little means. We did not consider that a kind of emigration to which we should deny ourselves.

Q.—Did your institution ever encourage the emigration of mechanics to Montreal? A.—No; we have enough to do without doing that.

Q.—Has the number of families in connection with your institution been increasing or decreasing within the last twelve months? A.—The number is about the same. There are about 170 families, but a large number of these come out with the emigration in the fall of the year.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—What proportion of those families are emigrants who have come out to this city within the last twelve months? A.—I think about sixty families, so far as I can judge.

Q.—Are the others old residents? A.—Yes; and invariably we cannot get them out of the rut.

Q.—Do you find more applicants from residents of this country than from people who have emigrated recently? A.—There are some regular pensioners on the out door relief every year.

Q.—Do you find many of the same people applying for relief year after year, as compared with those who come out as emigrants? A.—Well no, not many. Some of them get on after a little while with the help of others and they get positions in summer and some go out into the country districts.

Q.—Then the principle out door relief is given to those who have resided in the country for some time and have been born here? A.—Yes; largely so.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you believe intelligent mechanics and good workmen have any difficulty in finding work here if they come here in spring? A.—I should think not; they can get work if they try pretty hard, and are not too particular. I know I could.

Q.—How long have you been in the country? A.—I have been in this country since 1840.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that many men have come to this city as poor men, and have done very well? A.—Yes; very well.

Q.—Are you aware that many of the children of those who came out as poor men in 1840, are doing well in this city now? A.—Yes.

Q.—And that some are leading men? A.—Yes.

Q.—So you are not altogether opposed to emigrants? A.—No.

Q.—Not even to the emigration of mechanics? A.—No.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Do you ever hire out the labor of this institution? A.—Yes, we do.

Q.—Please tell us what kind of labor you hire out? A.—It is not very satis-

factory to them or to us either. It is in this way. In regard to those poor fellows who come into the night refuge, there is no knowing what to give them to do. We have a little industry in our house, called the kindling wood business. We employ some of them at that for their board; we have them employed in making kindling wood and tying it up in little bundles. Some of the people in the large houses occasionally want somebody to look after their furnaces in the morning and to take away the snow from their dwellings. We like to encourage some of the steady lads and get them this work, but there are comparatively few of them to do it.

Q.—Who derives the revenue obtained from this labor? A.—In regard to the revenue, they get part of it, and the house gets the balance.

Q.—Have you any objection to tell us what the proportion is obtained by the house and what is given to the men? A.—I think the house gets two thirds and one third is given to the men, but we keep them all the time.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What part of the expense of keeping them will this two thirds of their labor be? A.—Very little.

Q.—Will this two thirds pay the expense of their keep? A.—I think not.

HENRY HOGAN, Hotel-keeper, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—I understand you have been a witness at some of the trials made with this apparatus for coupling cars, the Pierson coupler? A.—Yes.

Q.—The same we had on exhibition here yesterday? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you have the kindness to state to us what was the result of the investigation that came under your knowledge? A.—I had the model for about six months in my private house, and I showed it to most of the prominent men in this country and the United States, in railway matters; and they very strongly approved of it as a means of preventing accidents in the coupling of cars.

Q.—Those prominent men of whom you speak have had large experience in railway matters, I suppose? A.—Yes; such men as Walter Shanley, Mr. Pottinger, who is connected with the International Road, and Mr. Witney, Mechanical Superintendent of the International.

Q.—Were those gentlemen satisfied with it? A.—They were very well satisfied with it.

Q.—Did they consider it would be an advantage if the coupler was introduced on all the railways? A.—They said so. But the great difficulty was in regard to their being so many couplings and such large interests involved. In their opinion there was not a coupler equal to it for safety to life.

Q.—Did they express any desire that it should be introduced into use on the railways of this country? A.—Yes; they said it would be a great boon if it was introduced.

Q.—Have you ever heard any practical man express an opinion against it? A.—I have had several practical men try to pick holes in it, but when I brought them before Mr. Pierson and he showed them the way in which the apparatus worked they were satisfied. Some one would say that they heard so much of this and that coupler that it was difficult to say whether a coupler was worth anything or not, but after Mr. Pierson had showed them the way it acted on the different levels and the simplicity of its action they allowed it would be a great advantage. A great number of men from the United States to whom I have shown it said it was invaluable. Those were railway men who staid at my house—most of them stay

with me always when they come to the city—and I took the opportunity of showing it to them to forward Mr. Pierson's interests.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Did anyone express the opinion that the danger of uncoupling cars during the running of a train was greater than with the ordinary link and pin? A.—No. They said that it was a great advantage that in case of a break loose the engine could run back and pick up the cars with this coupler, while with the ordinary link and pin a man would have to go between the cars and couple them.

Q.—They did not consider that the danger of disconnecting was greater than with the link and pin? A.—No; and in case of a break loose the engine could immediately go back and hitch on the train again.

H. R. IVES, Iron Founder, and Hardware Manufacturer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—You are an iron founder, I believe? A.—I am a founder, and a hardware manufacturer.

Q.—Have you a large establishment? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are there many foundries in Montreal? A.—There are a number.

Q.—Can you give us an idea of about the number there are here? A.—Perhaps there may be fifteen, or twenty—not many large establishments.

Q.—Have you a general idea as to the number of men employed in the foundries in Montreal? A.—You should distinguish between a foundry and a manufactory, for I am more of a manufacturer, than merely of a founder. There are a good number of foundries which simply make castings, and there are others who manufacture, and finish the products of these foundries.

Q.—About what would be the wages ordinarily received by moulders in Montreal? A.—Principally, in the neighbourhood of \$2.00 a day.

Q.—How many hours constitutes a day's work? A.—Ten hours.

Q.—During how large a portion of the year are the men employed? A.—I think the whole time. I am now speaking of my own establishment.

Q.—Take those who are founders only, do they not shut down during a portion of the year? A.—They shut down during a very small portion.

Q.—Will that small portion be equal to a month? A.—That will be according to circumstances; there is no general rule. There is no occasion for it, except from slackness of work.

Q.—What do unskilled hands in the factories receive? A.—An average of \$1.00 a day; some more than that.

Q.—Do they work ten hours also? A.—They work ten hours.

Q.—Is there any surplus of labor in your business, or is there a scarcity? A.—There is a scarcity, rather than a surplus.

Q.—Do you find any difficulty in getting as many hands as you wish? A.—We find difficulty in getting skilled labor, and steady labor, men who are willing to work six days in the week.

Q.—For what reason are they not willing to work six days in the week? A.—Because they have a bad headache on Monday, and are ill, or something of that kind after pay day—that is, a number of them are.

Q.—When is pay day in your establishment? A.—Pay day is every two weeks.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—On what day is pay day? A.—On Saturday.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you consider ten hours too long for men to work at such hard work as that in your establishment? A.—No; I should say not.

Q.—Are they not very fatigued at the close of a day's work? A.—Very seldom; not at day work.

Q.—Are they not in a great state of perspiration when they go out of the foundry? A.—Not necessarily.

Q.—Is not moulding very hot work? A.—Moulding is not.

Q.—Is casting? A.—Sometimes, the pouring off is likely to be.

Q.—Are there facilities in the factory for men washing, and dressing themselves, after casting? A.—Not specially.

Q.—Are the foundries pretty well protected from the weather? A.—Yes; fairly well.

Q.—Are they very cold? A.—No.

Q.—Can the moulders work during the day without their overcoats in the winter time? A.—They do.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How is the ventilation in the foundries of Montreal, good or bad? A.—I cannot answer generally on that point. My foundry is very high between the floors and I think there is sufficient ventilation. At times during extremely cold weather the moisture tends to make it rather thick, but I think generally, the ventilation is very good. My foundry, as I say, is particularly high between the floor and the ceiling.

Q.—You consider then that the ventilation of your factory is good? A.—At most times it is good. I think at times it might be improved. I have been considering a plan to put in artificial ventilation and have ordered for two places in my works, ventilating wheels which will undoubtedly be an improvement in these places, and if it should prove necessary, I expect to put them in other places.

Q.—How is the ventilation of your mill room? A.—I do not think it is very good; it is for that place that I have ordered the wheels with a view of improving it. They will be put in as soon as the work can be done.

Q.—Is there not a good deal of smoke in your factory that could be got rid of? A.—There is sometimes smoke. It is unnecessary. When the ordinary fires are put out the men will sometimes make up a small fire from few bits of wood to dry the ladle of lead when it might be done in some other place, but it is more convenient for the men to do it just there and they do not consult the convenience of others; that does not make very much smoke.

Q.—In what condition are the water closets in your establishment; are they open? A.—They are open.

Q.—Are they near where the men do the casting? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you ever heard of the men complaining about the smell from the water closets while they were doing casting? A.—I have not.

Q.—How near is the drinking water to the closets? A.—Not very far off.

Q.—Is there not a tap nailed on the boards of the water closet? A.—Very near.

Q.—Of course the foreman will know much better about that matter than you do? A.—I do not think he does.

Q.—You have never heard any of the men complaining about the smell from the water closets while they were casting? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What proportion of the moulders are skilled and unskilled? A.—Nearly the whole number profess to be skilled moulders. I have very few apprentices. The apprentice system is very nearly out of vogue now; I have no bound apprentices.

Q.—Is it the custom to keep handy men in a foundry to work on a certain class

of goods, such as smoothing-irons and small castings of that description? A.—Handy men can do it. Men usually call themselves moulders when they do it.

Q.—Is it customary to get handy men to take the place of moulders at that class of work? A.—It is hard to define what is a moulder nowadays as a man does not serve an apprenticeship.

Q.—We were speaking of men who have served an apprenticeship and can make stove plates or take patterns and make any class of machinery. Is it the practice to get unskilled men to work on certain classes of goods to the exclusion of those skilled men? A.—Not to the exclusion of them.

Q.—Do those unskilled men who work on this special class of castings receive the same wages as will machinery moulders? A.—They receive the same wages as machinery and stove moulders would, if they were employed at that work.

Q.—They do not receive the same wages as a skilled moulder receives? A.—They receive what they earn.

Q.—Is it possible, by an arrangement of ventilating flues and fans to prevent the dust from the milling room from entering the foundry? A.—That is what I am experimenting in order to find out—at the present time it does not enter the foundry.

Q.—Have you ever seen a system of that kind in operation? A.—Not practically.

Q.—You are not aware of an apparatus being so arranged as to carry off every particle of dust? A.—I am endeavoring to do so now. I have given orders to make improvements in that respect.

Q.—In making certain classes of castings, large castings, is not the smoke driven from the shop by means of fans? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can the smoke from those castings be carried out of the shop without doing injury to the premises? A.—It can.

Q.—Is it the custom at the present time when heavy work, is being done to carry the smoke out of the shop? A.—It is.

Q.—Is the attempt successful? A.—Yes; fairly so. In my factory a ventilator is opened above where this work is being done—a sash is taken off for a ventilator.

Q.—Are accidents frequent in the foundries in Montreal? A.—Very seldom, I think.

Q.—I suppose you have met with such instances in your shop? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is the cause very frequently the carelessness of the men or the indifference of those who have charge of them? A.—That is really a difficult question to answer. You might particularise a case I think.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you any objection to employing men who belong to labor organizations? A.—Not at all, I never did have any objection.

Q.—What is your system of apprenticeship—are your boys indentured? A.—We have no apprentices now, that system is broken up altogether.

Q.—Was there an accident lately in your own establishment? A.—There was one.

Q.—Will you please state the nature of it and the cause of the accident—did death result? A.—A fatal accident occurred.

Q.—Please state the nature of it, how it occurred? A.—A man was fatally injured. The case was before the coroner's jury, but I have no personal knowledge of it. I probably know nothing more about it than you do—I know nothing beyond what was published in the evidence and I cannot really tell you anything about it.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—What kind of work do you turn out on your factory especially? A.—In the foundry it is very general work, general castings.

Q.—Are there any factories in Montreal that turn out edge tools? A.—I do not think so at present.

Q.—You do nothing of that kind of work? A.—No.

Q.—You only turn out such goods as machinery and stoves and everything of that kind? A.—We do not manufacture stoves in Montreal. We have a factory in Longueuil, which turns out stoves and builder's and house furnishing hardware.

Q.—How many men do you employ in your factory in Montreal? A.—We employ something over 200.

Q.—How many men do you employ in your factory in Longueuil? A.—We employ over 100.

Q.—Do the men in Longueuil, in all cases, make the same wages as a similar class of men do in Montreal? A.—It is all piece work we do in Longueuil, with the exception of the laborers and general men.

Q.—Do the men at piece work there, earn the same amount as similar men would working here? A.—About the same; some can earn, of course, a great deal more than others. It depends on the disposition of the man, and his skill and efficiency, and the number of days he works.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—I understood you to say that the men complained, after pay day, of having a headache? From what cause would that originate; gas from the castings, or the intemperate habits of the men? A.—I think you can tell that, if you have had any experience of Montreal workmen, as well as I can. I do not think it necessary that I am required, as an employer of labor, to go into that subject.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Has your business increased during the past five years? A.—Generally, yes.

Q.—Have you put on many extra men during that time? A.—Yes; I have added some new lines, and more men, and the business is increasing.

Q.—Have you any idea of the number of men you have taken on? A.—I may say, that within the past six years, I have added the establishment at Longueuil, which is practically an increase of the number of men there employed.

Q.—I suppose wages have increased also? A.—Wages have increased.

Q.—How much a day have wages increased? A.—It will be very difficult to state that, as a matter of percentage, but considerably.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you known of factories where, on pay day, the men have had to remain waiting around outside of the shop in a state of perspiration? Did you ever hear any complaints in connection with the foundries of Montreal in that respect? A.—No; I never heard complaints of that sort. As we pay our men in the afternoon, the men can wait and get cool before they come for their pay; that is their privilege.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you pay your men out of doors? A.—At the office door, usually. They are not obliged to remain there; they can remain in the workshop. We pay every Saturday at half past four, and the hour and a half is a gift, so far as I am concerned.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—If they remain at the office door, would not that be outside? A.—Yes.

Q.—On the street? A.—Yes. They are not obliged to remain there; there are other places where they can remain.

Q.—Are they paid for the hour and a half given by you? A.—Yes.

Q.—How about those on piece work? A.—That, of course, would not apply to those on piece work, for it has nothing to do with them. There are, however, comparatively few in our town works who are paid by the piece.

Q.—Did you ever give a thought to the desirability of paying the men by envelope while they are at work? A.—They are all paid by envelope now.

Q.—But while they are at work, so that a man would not have to leave his work and wait out in the cold to get paid? A.—It does not take five minutes to pay the men when they are ready.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Would you consider it your duty to do anything for the health of the men, if they complained? A.—Yes.

Q.—You consider it your duty to do so? A.—Yes; and I am very glad to have any suggestion that either they, or anyone else, can make. There are some difficulties I should be very glad to overcome.

GEORGE E. MUIR, Assessor of the City of Montreal, called and sworn:—

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are an assessor of the City of Montreal A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you occupied that position? A.—Since the beginning of 1883.

Q.—Will you tell us the system adopted for assessing property for rents by the Corporation? A.—The law obliges us to assess it on the mercantile value of the property, what we suppose the property will sell for.

Q.—And as to rents? A.—The rents actually paid—that is, for the water-rates and the business tax.

Q.—Do you mean to say that the assessed rent is the rent actually paid by the tenants? A.—Of course we cannot always find it exactly, we come as near to it as we possibly can. We deduct from the rent, if the tenant does not pay the taxes, the amount of the taxes, for example: if, in those small tenements, a party pays \$3.00 a month we put the amount down as \$30.00 for the year, and if he pays \$4.00, we put it down at \$40.00, and so on.

Q.—Is it not a fact that you assess rentals according to what you believe to be just, and not according to what the tenant pays for rent? A.—In these cases we consider we have a certain amount of judgment to exercise. If we think that a man is paying a very exorbitant rent we put him down at the same rental that other persons in similar houses are paying. If his landlord has taken advantage of the fact that, perhaps, he must remain in that place, and to charge a very exorbitant rent, we put the rent at what similar houses rent for.

Q.—When the proprietor assesses his own house how do you assess it? A.—We assess it at what we think it would rent for, if it was rented to another person.

Q.—Do you believe that the value of the houses increases with the increase in the rent? A.—Not always. If it is a permanent increase of rent it is so; but if it is merely a temporary increase of rent we do not consider it so.

Q.—When it is permanent you do? A.—It depends upon the nature of the house. In regard to the rentals, we sometimes find that a very poor class of house will bring in a very large amount of rental, in proportion to the value of the property, because of the nature of the tenant, and the repairs that are required on the house. I may state, in regard to Montreal, that the rentals will vary from three per cent. to fifteen per cent., and even twenty per cent. on the value. Some do not go to three per cent., while others again will exceed fifteen per cent.

Q.—Do you believe a house would have increased in value if the rent therefor had steadily increased during the last six years? A.—It depends very much upon the circumstances. We follow, in regard to rents and values, a different principle altogether. The value is in proportion to the sales that are made on a similar class of houses; we follow, and not precede, the values, and judge by the sales that are made.

Q.—Do you believe that a house which in 1883 produced a rental of \$688 would

have the same value to-day when its rental is \$910? A.—It altogether depends on the house.

Q.—The same house? A.—It altogether depends on the locality of the house, and whether property is rising all around in that neighborhood. We know that property has been rising where there are manufactories established, and railway workshops; the rentals have increased, and, after a time, the values have increased.

Q.—Do you believe that a property which would bring in a rental of \$688.00 would sell for the same price as one bringing in \$910.00 a year? A.—Under ordinary circumstances it would not.

Q.—So that the commercial value of a property is to be judged by its rental? A.—Not always.

Q.—In what case does the mercantile value of the property not depend upon the rental which it brings in? A.—It depends very much, as I have said before, upon the neighbourhood.

Q.—It is not a question of locality, but in this instance my question refers to the same property? A.—Without knowing the circumstances of the case, I may say I suppose it would be increased in value.

Q.—I submit to you copies of the assessment roll fyled yesterday by Mr. Black, City Treasurer, with respect to the property on Cadastre Road, No. 145 St. Mary's Ward. A.—Yes.

Q.—In 1882 this property was put down as of the real estate value of \$9,000.00. A.—It appears so.

Q.—Will you kindly tell us from that statement if from the year 1882 to 1887 inclusive, the real estate value of the property has not changed? A.—It appears not to be changed. I do not know this property myself.

Q.—Do these documents not explain themselves? A.—It appears to be the same value.

Q.—Will you now kindly refer to the assessing of the rent of the same property?

A.—If this property is, as I suppose it is, an incased brick house I do not think it is a proper assessment to put it for 1887 even at \$9,000.00. I do not think ten per cent is too much for that class of tenements.

Q.—What do you mean by ten per cent? A.—I think it is valued at \$9,000.00 and the rental last year was \$910.00.

Q.—Can you explain how it is that the same property valued at the same amount in 1882 and in 1887 brought in during the first named year \$682.00 rental, and in the last named year \$910.00 rental? A.—I cannot explain it because I am not an assessor of the ward, but what I mean to say is that it was valued at \$9000.00, and it only produced a little over ten per cent.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You say that \$9000.00 is not too much or too little because it produced a rental of \$910.00? A.—I consider that tenement houses of that class should bring, at least, ten per cent, and that the proprietor did not obtain a very large amount.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Let the proprietor alone, we have nothing to do with him. Do you believe that when the rental of a tenement increases, the rental of the other houses should increase in the same proportion? Do you believe if there is a building containing nine tenements that only one should increase in value so far as rentals are concerned? A.—I do not know, rentals vary very much.

Q.—I am not now referring to facts, but I am asking you on a general principle, as to whether it would be possible? A.—As a general principle, I would say that if the rentals increased permanently the value is increased too. Sometimes the rental will increase on one tenement and not on another—I have it in some of my own houses. If an old tenant is occupying the house you do not perhaps increase

the rent, while if a new tenant comes in you will do so. Again, you will give a house for less rent to a good tenant than you will to a poor tenant.

Q.—So then it is not really the value of the rental you assess but the standing of the tenant? A.—No; I do not think so, it is generally what the house rents for.

Q.—You say you assess the property for what it brings in as rental? A.—You mean assess the rental? As a general rule, we do, taking off in these small tenements the proportion of taxes on the house.

Q.—Will you kindly refer to the copy now before you and tell us how it is that property being number nine and occupied by the same person during the years 1882 and 1883 was raised in rental from \$25 to \$45? A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Do you believe that an increase of 110 per cent. on the rental would not increase the commercial value of the property? A.—Of course, assessors make mistakes as well as other people; we sometimes find we have made mistakes and correct them in the following year.

Q.—What means have you at your disposal to correct errors? A.—We are not always told the truth by the people themselves; sometimes we get at the truth afterwards.

Q.—What means does the law place at the disposal of the tenant to obtain a correction of such errors? A.—It gives the tenant an opportunity to come before the assessor of a ward. When he receives an account, if he considers it too much, he can go before the assessor of the ward who has made the assessment and show by his receipts the rent he has actually paid, and if the rental has been assessed too high, it is reduced.

Q.—Is it not to your knowledge that the law contains no such provision? A.—That is the practice of the assessors. The public are invited to attend. Of course, in the water rates the discount is allowed to the 15th of August, and an immense number of tenants, come and claim they have been over assessed, and if we find we have made a mistake we reduce the amount.

Q.—Is it not a fact that you invite the tenants to come to pay their water rates and not to have errors in their assessments corrected? A.—We do not issue the advertisement, it issues from the treasurer's office.

Q.—Please refer on this list to number 35, occupied by Cyprien Lafrenière, who it appears is proprietor of the block? A.—He appears to be the proprietor.

Q.—And can you tell us how it is that the portion of the house occupied by the proprietor has never changed in its rental value while the house number 9 has increased from 1882 to 1887 from \$24 to \$60? A.—Of course I do not know those houses. I am not assessor. I see Mr. Lafrenière is always down for the same amount.

Q.—Is it not a fact that the assessors change round every year or every two years? A.—No, it is not a fact, because I have been in the same wards ever since I have been appointed assessor, St. Antoine, St. Mary's and Centre Wards and East Ward.

Q.—So you cannot explain how it is that in six years time the rental value of the house occupied by the proprietor at \$120 did not increase, while the rental value of the other houses occupied by tenants increased in the same period from \$24 to \$60? A.—I do not know. I think \$24 must have been a mistake; that is only \$2 a month. My impression is that there is a mistake about that; of course, I cannot say because I am not assessor, but I notice that it is put down the very next year at \$50, then \$60. I am not assessor of the ward and I do not know whether Mr. Lafrenière always remained at the same amount.

Q.—Can you tell us how it is that the houses in that block from number 1 to number 4 inclusive, did not increase in value during those six years, and that the houses from number 5 to number 9 increased in value from \$40 to \$60 and from \$24 to \$60 during those six years? A.—I see from number 1 to number 4 inclusive increased from \$40 to \$50.

Q.—Now speaking from 1882 to 1886? A.—Yes; I see in 1887 it was increased.

Q.—In 1883 the house being number 1 was assessed for \$40.00 and in 1886 the same house was assessed for \$40.00? A.—Yes.

Q.—In 1883 the house being No. 5 was assessed at \$50.00 and in 1886 the same house was assessed at \$50.00? A.—Yes.

Q.—In 1882 the house being Nos. 6 and 7 were assessed at \$40.00; in 1882 and 1883 they were raised to \$50.00, and in 1884 and 1885 to \$60.00? A.—Yes.

Q.—In 1882 the houses being Nos. 8 and 9 were assessed at \$24.00; in 1883 and 1884 at \$50.00; in 1885, 1886 and 1887 at \$60.00. Can you explain the reason of these changes? A.—As I have said before I do not know the reason. In 1883 the houses eight and nine were assessed at \$24.00 and in 1883 at \$50.00. There must have been a mistake in the first named amount.

Q.—There is no mistake? A.—That is my impression. I speak according to my impression; I do not know what are the facts of the case are.

Q.—Do you believe that when a building is erected on property, the property is thereby increased in value? A.—Yes. Now I mean by a building a regular building, and not a mere shed.

Q.—Do you believe that when a proprietor enlarges his house by one apartment that the property is thereby increased in value? A.—Sometimes it is.

Q.—Do you think it would have the effect of diminishing its value? A.—Not generally, I should think.

Q.—Do you believe that when a party has one more tenement in his house the property is thereby increased in value? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you please turn up to the assessment of 1886 and 1887? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you see in 1887 there is on that property one tenement more than in 1886? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you explain how the property remained assessed at the same real estate value although there was one tenement more? A.—I do not know. The house may be the same exteriorly and yet have one more tenement and more tenants.

Q.—Do you not believe that when one more apartment is laid out of a house some of the tenants should pay less rent? A.—That altogether depends on the circumstances, if they do pay it as they sometimes do.

Q.—You have stated that when rentals were apparently excessive you reduced them for the purpose of assessment? A.—For water rates.

Q.—Yes. A.—Those are exceptional cases when we reduce them in that way.

Q.—You do not believe that when a tenant occupies one apartment instead of two his rent should be reduced? A.—Generally, yes.

Q.—How can it be possible that No. 3 in the list submitted, should be assessed at \$40.00 in 1886, and \$100.00 in 1887, the same No. 3 having been divided into two tenements in 1887? A.—There is no person at \$100.00. I see that there are five at \$50.00.

Q.—Will you refer to No. 3 of 1886? A.—There are \$40.00 here.

Q.—Will you now refer to No. 3 of 1887? A.—I see there are two tenements here charged at \$50.00.

Q.—Do you not believe that unless the house has been enlarged these two apartments must have been taken off from the apartment of 1886? A.—Of course, I cannot say, I have not been there, I cannot possibly say.

Q.—How can you explain that number three, assessed, in 1886, at \$40.00, should have been assessed at \$100.00 in 1887? A.—I have an idea that each of those parties paid \$5.00 a month, and the assessor put them down. That is my idea; I cannot say further in regard to the matter.

Q.—I am now questioning you as to the general principle on which assessments are made, and not with regard to this particular case? A.—In all such cases as this, as I have said, we generally take the rentals they pay, deducting the amount of the taxes. I cannot explain this case, because I do not know about it.

Q.—Do you not believe that this case, in which the tenant assessed a tenement, in 1886, at \$40.00, and in 1887 at \$100.00, was not one of those cases in which the

assessor should have granted a reduction? A.—If these parties applied for it, yes. I suppose the parties never applied for it.

Q.—Do you believe that a working man who has to work the whole day for the maintenance of himself and family can afford to lose a day to go down to the Corporation officers to have the tax reduced? A.—They never do it; it is generally the women who come down with their receipts.

Q.—Some working men are widowers, and have no women to send? A.—If mistakes are made, it is the only way they can be corrected.

Q.—Do you not believe that the system adopted has been to increase, the matter rates, during the last six or seven years? A.—I say, decidedly, no, unless the parties have paid more rental. There has been no such principle in operation. The assessors are perfectly independent of any other body, and they rather favor the working classes, and are disposed to be lenient with them, rather than otherwise.

Q.—Is it not a fact that the water rates, in a large number of cases, have increased, while the real estate value has not increased? A.—It may have been sometimes.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that the workingmen of Montreal demanded an enquiry into the matter, and that it was refused them? A.—Not by assessors. The assessors are quite willing to explain all their proceedings, because they feel they are disposed to do perfect justice to all classes of the community, and especially the working classes.

Q.—Is it not to your knowledge that during 1886 and 1887, a large number of complaints were made to the assessors, as well as to the Corporation, as to the manner in which the water rates are imposed? A.—There were fewer complaints, during those years, than the previous years. We always, every year, have a number of complaints. There are an immense number of cases gone over, and mistakes are made, and, every year, there are always a large number of complaints to which we are always willing to listen, and do justice to the parties.

Q.—Will you tell us how much tax has been paid on the property in question, from 1882 to 1887, for each of those years, inclusive? A.—The amount is \$108.00 a year.

Q.—From 1882 till 1887? A.—The assessment on \$9,000.00 is one percent for the Corporation, and one-fifth of one percent for the school tax, which makes \$108.00. Calculate the number of years, and you will get the amount.

Q.—Now, tell us the amount of water rates paid by the tenants of that house, from 1882 to 1887, inclusive? A.—I could not, without going into it carefully. The assessors have nothing to do with the accounts. All they have to do is to put down the rentals; the accounts are made out in the treasurer's office, and we have nothing to do with them. I see by this statement—I do not know whether it is correct or not—that there have been paid for water in 1882, \$91.00; in 1883, \$91.25; in 1884, \$97.00; in 1885, \$100.00; in 1886, \$100.75; in 1887, \$109.50. I do not know whether this document, handed to me, is correct or not. I may say, that I suppose that amount is not all paid, because there are a large number of parties who have never paid at all.

Q.—Did the proprietor of this building not pay \$109.00 during those six years? A.—Yes; per year.

Q.—Did not the water rates rise from \$91.00 to \$109.50 during those six years, or equal to an increase of twenty per cent? A.—Yes; from \$91.25 to \$109.50 for water tax, if this statement is correct.

Q.—Is not a fact, that out of fifteen tenements, situated on this property, the water rates were increased in fourteen cases and not increased in two tenements, one of which was occupied by the proprietor himself? A.—The proprietor does not seem to have been increased here.

Q.—But the tenants were? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you explain how that is? A.—No; I do not know.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Is the amount of water rates based on the assessed value of the rental? A.—There is nothing less than \$5.00 for \$30.00 rental—that is the lowest—and there is seventy-five cents additional for every \$10.00, up to any amount, of rental. In regard to the valuation of property, I may say this: we had an unfortunate boom in property in 1873, 1874, 1875, which sent property to a tremendous high price, and which resulted, afterwards, most disastrously to most speculators, because in 1877, 1878, 1879, property went down just as much as it had gone up. Rents commenced to fall before property declined. When the crisis came, after the boom business became bad and rents began to fall, property did not begin to fall as quickly as rents did, and we reduced rentals long before we reduced values. The rentals and the values of property remained low for several years. Railways and other schemes were carried out; then the rentals advanced, and values of property began to rise, and we commenced to advance the assessment too.

Q.—Are the water rates higher on valuable property, in proportion to the assessed value of the property, than on the low priced property in which the working people generally live? A.—On high priced property the rents are not so high, in proportion, according to the value of the property. As I have said, there are properties that do not yield three per cent, or two and a half per cent, on their value.

Q.—The more expensive house a man lives in, the less he pays relatively? A.—Yes; in proportion to the water used and paid for by the rich man, the poor man gets much less.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Would you be astonished to hear that an officer of the Corporation says that he uses more water in his bath, in one morning, than a working man does in a whole week? A.—I saw it mentioned in the paper that a certain high official of the Corporation had said so.

Q.—Is there a special charge made for a bath? A.—No; there is for the water closet.

Q.—So then you cannot state that the occupant of a small tenement consumes more water than he pays for? A.—I mean to say that those persons assessed at \$5.00 could not obtain water except from the water works for less than \$10.00. It does not amount to a cent and a half a day, and it would not be possible to get the water in as cheap a way if there were no water works.

Q.—Is it not to your knowledge that a person who pays \$5.00 a year for water contributes his share towards watering the streets and supplying water on the wharves and in other public places? A.—They pay in proportion to their rentals.

Q.—They pay the same as others? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you tell us what amount of tax a proprietor pays for a house which is unoccupied, towards its protection from fire? A.—If the house is unoccupied, it is not assessed for water rates.

Q.—So that when the fire brigade uses water to extinguish the fire which breaks out in an unoccupied house, the proprietor receives the benefit of that water for nothing? A.—Of course he does not pay anything.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you looked into the question of how much each party pays for water considering the quantity used? A.—I have always thought that the lower assessed persons used more water in proportion to what they paid for, than those who pay higher rentals.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Is the water rate based on the quantity of water supplied or on the quantity of water supplied plus the interest on the investment, plus the charge for street

water, plus the charge for water used as a fire protection and plus the protection which it gives? A.—Not independent of the water used.

Q.—There is no separate amount? A.—There is just one tax.

Q.—It is based on the whole? A.—Yes. A store pays less in proportion than a dwelling house does and of course a store uses less water.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG—

Q.—Can you give us the amount of real estate exempt from taxation in Montreal? A.—I have not the book before me. I have it in the office. I forget the exact amount—but those properties pay the water rate now.

(Translation.)

CHARLES LAPIERRE, accountant of the Water Department of Montreal, being sworn, deposes as follows:—

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are accountant, Mr. Lapière, in the Water Department? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Will you tell us how the Corporation deals with tenants who do not pay their water rates? A.—We shut off the water where it is possible to do so.

Q.—And then what do you do? A.—Then we take action through the Recorder's Court, for the seizure of the effects of those who do not pay.

Q.—Thus a man may see his effects sold for water which he has not used? A.—Yes; if the party is taxed as tenant of a dwelling or of a business place where water conduits are introduced.

Q.—In such cases you begin by cutting off the water, you deprive the tenant of water for a certain number of months, and then you sell his goods for water which he did not use? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Can you tell us, on an average, what is the number of seizures made in one year? A.—Beyond a thousand.

Q.—Can you tell us the average number of houses where the water is shut off? A.—I think I made a list last Fall, by which I ascertained that there were about 400 families who had been deprived of water, I am not quite positive, but I think the figures are in the neighbourhood of 400 families.

Q.—Were these 400 families all included in indebtedness for water? A.—No. Because in many places it is impossible to stop the supply of water, owing to the fact that there are pipes furnishing water to families who have paid their rates.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have been specially busy with the collection of the water tax? Would you tell us what, in your opinion, is the best method to employ, both in the interest of the tenant and the interest of the city? A.—Well, I believe that it would be in the interest of the tenants that the water rates should be levied on the property. This would ease, in a great measure, the payment of the rates, inasmuch as by that method the tenants could pay the tax with their rent, either by the week or by the month.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What was the amount of arrears last year? A.—I could not give you the amount of arrears, but the average of loss for the last ten years by the Corporation

on this water tax has been about \$250.00 a year. The yearly income from water is \$540,000.

Q.—Almost the total of this loss is due to poverty, is it not? A.—Almost the whole of this loss is to be traced to the poverty of the parties.

Q.—By the city by-laws the water rates should be paid in advance, should they not? A.—That varies very much. In certain cities of the United States the mode of collecting the water tax is not at all like ours. In the cities of the United States the water tax is levied along with the other municipal taxes.

Q.—But I ask you if the payment must be made in advance? A.—The payment in advance is made in almost all the cities in the United States, because in all these cities the water tax is not a compulsory tax, but optional, inasmuch as parties may take water or let it alone.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—When there is no water in a house is the tenant bound to pay all the same? A.—If the pipe is laid on the property where the building stands the tenant is bound to pay, except where the landlords refuse or neglect to lay pipes on their ground; as in this case the landlord is responsible, and he is made to pay.

Q.—Vacant lots do not pay the water rates, do they? A.—No.

Q.—Do you not believe that a vacant lot should pay a water rate equal at least to the capital invested in the laying of the pipes passing in front of the lot? A.—It seems to me that the passage of a water pipe on any street is of great advantage to the owner of a lot even unoccupied, since he can build and enjoy at once the use of an article of prime necessity, which he can hand over to his tenant. This he could not do if there were no pipes there.

Q.—It is a fact well known in Montreal that wherever the corporation lays down water pipes the property increases in value? A.—Yes; that is my opinion, so far as I may know about it.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—There is no special tax for the laying of pipes, is there? A.—No. Pipe laying is at the expense of the city.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is there a special tax for sewers? A.—Yes; for the sewers; and, I believe, the interested parties pay one half of the cost.

Q.—Whether the lot is vacant or not? A.—I could not say. That is not in my department.

Q.—Was the water cut off from all those who had not paid their rates, where it was possible to cut it off? A.—Yes, sir; wherever it is possible to do so. We make no distinctions.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How do you manage when the water closets are exempt, do you cut off the water? A.—There is a proviso to that effect in the by-law. We cut off the water all the same.

(Translation.)

14th February, 1888.

ALPHONSE GOSSELIN, Assistant City Clerk, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Mr. Gosselin you are Assistant City Clerk? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you tell us whether towards the month of September, 1886, the Central

Council of Trades and Labor sent in a petition to the Corporation? A.—On the 18th August, 1886, according to the Minutes of the Corporation, the Central Council of Trades and Labour sent in a petition requesting an inquiry into the manner in which the water rates were distributed.

Q.—Was not this petition sent to the Finance Committee? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Would you tell us what action the the Finance Committee took thereupon?

A.—I have here the Minutes of the Finance Committee, and I find nothing bearing on the point.

Q.—According to the books of the Corporation the petition sent by the Central Council of Trades and Labour to the Finance Committee never reached that Committee—at least do not your books show this? A.—No, sir; it did not reach; but I am not the Secretary of the Finance Committee.

Q.—Have you got with you the Minutes of the Committee of Inquiry which was held in 1887? A.—No, sir; it is the clerk who has them. There was a report from inquiry submitted to the Council.

(Translation.)

JOSEPH GALABNEAU, Apprentice Cigar Maker, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—How old are you? A.—Thirteen years of age.

Q.—How long have you been working at that trade? A.—One year and a-half.

(Translation.)

ADOLPHE DION, Apprentice Cigar Maker of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—How old are you? A.—Thirteen years of age.

Q.—How long have you been working as an apprentice cigar maker? A.—It is now two years and one month.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Have you ever been beaten by your employers?

The Chairman takes exception to the question being put, as it was understood that the case of cigar makers was closed for all matters with the exception of that of immorality.

(Translation.)

ALFRED THERREAU, Cigar Maker apprentice, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—How old are you? A.—Past 14 years.

Q.—How long have you been an apprentice? A.—I think it makes about one year and three months.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you always been well treated?

The question was ruled out by the Chairman on the ground that it was understood by the Commission that no other question other than those relating to immorality should be asked of cigar men.

JOHN BRENNAN, re-called.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are you of the opinion that all Stevedores employed in the Port of Montreal are competent men? A.—I have answered that question before, no.

Q.—Do you believe it would be advisable to require from every stevedore a certificate of capacity? A.—Yes; provided they were thoroughly examined.

Q.—Who do you believe should examine them? A.—Competent men in the trade.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Please tell us some of the competent men you would name to examine them? A.—It is not necessary; that is outside my jurisdiction.

Q.—You as a stevedore should know the competent men who should examine them? A.—Perhaps if it came to a nicety, and an opinion was asked from me in the interests of the public, I might do so.

Q.—It is in the interests of the public that we should get that information now? A.—I am not prepared to give it; I am not a judge.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What would you consider the qualification for a competent stevedore? A.—A man who thoroughly understands his business.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have heard the evidence given before this Commission with regard to wages paid at other ports? A.—Yes.

Q.—Would you now or at some other time furnish us with reliable statistics concerning the wages paid in other ports? A.—Yes; if I had time to communicate with New York, Philadelphia, Boston and Portland. I might do so if that would be taken as testimony.

Q.—Do you consider the wages paid in the Port of Montreal form a sufficient remuneration for the work required from the men? A.—No.

Q.—Having spoken of the ill-treatment cattle are subjected to on being placed on board of vessels, have you any suggestion to make in regard to the manner in which that ill-treatment might be avoided? A.—I might suggest, although my suggestion might be considered of very little worth, that no cattle should be placed on board of any ship before that ship had received its full cargo and everything clear for the cattle. Then, in my judgment, it would be natural and proper to put cattle on board.

Q.—How are they now placed on board ship? A.—In a great many cases the cattle are now placed on board ship before the ship is loaded and there is a great inconvenience to the business of a stevedore, and also in my mind, a great injury done to the cattle.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Give us some instances in which cattle have been placed on board before the ship was ready? A.—I could state a thousand if necessary.

Q.—Give us one and leave the nine hundred and ninety nine to some other night. A.—There is hardly a ship that leaves the Port of Montreal—

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—That is not the question. Tell us some lines which are in the habit of doing this? A.—Every line you can mention to my knowledge.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Am I to understand that all the cattle, loaded in the port of Montreal, are loaded before the ship is ready for sea, or to take them on board? A.—In the majority of cases it is so.

Q.—You said, a moment ago, in all cases it was so? A.—I say in the majority of cases—that will cover the question.

Q.—Did you ever load any cattle yourself? A.—I have nothing to do with the loading of cattle.

Q.—Do you know who gives instructions to have the cattle placed on board, the owner of the cattle, or the steamship owner? A.—It is a question that I do not care to answer directly; but, in many cases, it is the steamship agent that gives the order.

Q.—Does he give the order without receiving instructions from the owner of the cattle, or does he give the order on his own responsibility? A.—That is outside my business. If you will ask me anything about the treatment of stevedores, and so on, I will answer to the best of my ability.

Q.—You do not think you know much about the cattle business? A.—I have seen a good deal of it.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Do you know of anything else wrong, in this cattle business, besides the placing them on board too early, and the treatment they receive? A.—In my opinion, if these cattle had one day's rest, at least, before they were put on board the ship, for shipment, it would be a great benefit to the cattle.

Q.—Are they put on board immediately after a long journey? A.—As a general rule, they go from the cars to the ship.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do they not sometimes run through the streets of Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—And put on board? A.—Yes.

Q.—And sometimes they die shortly after leaving port? A.—Before they leave port.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Do you say some of them die before they leave port? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are any parties responsible for those cattle, while on board, before they put out to sea—who are responsible for taking care of them, and watching them, and so on? A.—I should judge the owners of the cattle are.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Do you know if anyone else attends to the cattle except the owners? A.—Their agents, or employees, I suppose, are the parties responsible.

Q.—I suppose you know the owner of a lot of cattle places certain parties on board to feed, and water them on the way across, and that the cattle are not put on board until those individuals are ready to look after them? A.—If I answered that directly, I would say no.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What is the greatest number of cattle you have known to die on board a vessel before she has left port? A.—There was one special summer—it might be considered a liberty on my part to mention it—in which as many as fifteen died in one shipment.

Q.—Before the vessel left port? A.—Yes.

Q.—How long would that be? A.—I think, two years last summer.

Q.—Do you know any special reason why there was any great mortality among cattle on that occasion? A.—Want of sufficient ventilation, and heated condition, as I should judge it to be, of the cattle after being taken from the care to the ship, without the necessary rest.

Q.—Do you think sufficient care is exercised in handling cattle when they are being loaded on vessels? A.—When they are loaded the trouble is over.

Q.—In loading them? A.—They are handled pretty roughly some times. It is some times necessary to act pretty roughly with them to get them to embark.

Q.—In your opinion are there proper conveniences provided for loading cattle in the Port of Montreal? A.—The system might be improved considerably.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—In what manner? A.—For instance, by providing larger gangways.

Q.—Do you think the present kind of gangways is too narrow? A.—They are. Sometimes they are found too narrow when they burst apart.

Q.—Have you ever known of cattle dropping into the water on account of the gang way being too narrow? A.—I have seen one or two cases of the kind.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Are there not guards to those gangways? A.—There are temporary ones, not extraordinarily strong.

Q.—What width do you think the gang ways should be? A.—There are generally two or three oxen try to get up together.

Q.—In what space? A.—The space of the gangway, five feet six or five feet eight.

Q.—Do you not think it would be an easy matter to have cattle put on board one at a time? A.—It is possible to do so, but it is not so easy or quick a way as when two or three rush together.

Q.—In case of cattle going on board one at a time how should the gangway be? A.—The present style is wide enough for that.

Q.—Is it the intention of the steamship companies that the cattle should go on board one after another? A.—I do not know what the intention of the steamship people is.

Q.—You do not know anything about the intention of the cattle owners either? A.—No.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—If the gangway was a little wider would it have the tendency to preventing the cattle from falling into the water? A.—Most decidedly. The broader road a man had to walk on the less danger there would be of his falling off, and I take it that with oxen it is the same, the broader road to walk on the less danger of falling off.

Q.—Would not more oxen in proportion try to get on the wider gangway than on the narrower one? A.—It is possible there might be more.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Are there not guards and supports to the gangways so that it is almost impossible for cattle to fall into the dock? A.—Not when the side breaks away.

Q.—How often does the side break away? A.—It has happened more than once to my knowledge.

Q.—How many cattle were lost in that case? A.—No cattle were lost because they were fished out.

Q.—How many cattle fell over board from that gangway to your knowledge? A.—In two instances, I think one at each time.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you anything further to add with respect to the shipping of cattle? A.—Yes. If my suggestion would be considered worth anything I would say, that if there was a large space into which those cattle could be turned adrift for say twenty-four hours so as to give them a good run and a good rest and the use of their limbs or rather their legs and also to give them refreshment, I think it would be a great benefit.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you mean to give them a chance to go to grass? A.—To grass, if you like; but you might feed them in some other way. In this way a great improvement might be made, even as regards the cattle themselves.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you any suggestions to offer with respect to ameliorating the condition of the workmen employed on the wharves? A.—Yes; if the hours of labor were diminished, I think it would tend a great deal towards the health of the men.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—How many hours would you consider a proper time for the men to work? A.—There are some places in which men work more, but I consider that a man after having done ten hours' work has done sufficient for a day's labor.

Q.—To what description of work do you particularly refer? A.—There are so many kinds of employment in connection with this business. I might describe some, such as carrying coal, carrying pig iron, carrying bags, and different kinds of employment in which ten hours are quite sufficient for any man.

Q.—I suppose you are aware that there are some kinds of work that must be pushed forward rapidly, in order to get the vessels sent to sea as speedily as possible? A.—Of course, it is a natural consideration that when a vessel comes in she has got to be worked.

Q.—If a vessel comes in, perhaps the people in the harbor are waiting for things on board, and the people are all here and want to get the vessel unloaded? A.—That is in the case of a great rush.

Q.—What is the cause of the great rush? A.—Competition in the shipping business, as well as in all other branches of commerce, has brought matters to such a fine point that the fewer days or hours the vessel remains alongside the wharf the better for the owner.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—In regard to cattle going on board under the present system, do the cattle have to climb over merchandise and boxes, and so on, sometimes to get on board? A.—Most decidedly.

Q.—You consider this injurious to cattle, I suppose? A.—When a beast hurts its flesh, it is no benefit to it.

Q.—Do you think it would be an improvement if a special dock was provided, at which a vessel would call, after it had taken on its regular cargo, to ship cattle? A.—It would be a great benefit to the trade, in my opinion.

Q.—Do you think it would be an improvement to the trade? A.—I think it would tend to improve it.

Q.—And it would raise the price of the cattle going to Europe? A.—It would increase their value to a certain extent.

Q.—In regard to the men employed on the wharves: if there was an extra amount paid to the men in wages for night work, would that increase the amount of day work done? A.—If there was an extra charge for night work, it would tend to decrease the number of hours night work is performed.

Q.—And in that way, perhaps, night work would be done away with to a great extent? A.—Yes, to a great extent.

(Translation.)

_____, Machinist, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You are employed at the Hochelaga Cotton Factory? Yes, sir.

Q.—At what mills? A.—At the Hudson Factory, at the great Hochelaga mill.

Q.—Do you know how many hands are engaged in that mill? A.—There are about eleven hundred hands.

Q.—To the best of your knowledge how many men are there? A.—About 400 or 500.

Q.—How many women are there? A.—500 or 600, I should say.

Q.—Do you know how many women and girls above fifteen years of age are at work in that factory? A.—There are about 500.

Q.—How many children are there? A.—There are a couple of hundreds of children.

Q.—So far as you know, how old is the youngest of these children? A.—There are children of ten years old working there; perhaps some even younger; but I know of several ten years old.

Q.—Of those whom you know to be ten years old, have they worked a long time in the factory? A.—They have been working a couple of years.

Q.—What are the average wages of these children? A.—Twenty-five or thirty cents a day.

Q.—What are the average wages of the girls? A.—The girls earn about 75 cents to 80 cents a day.

Q.—Do they work by the piece? A.—There are some who work by the day, but the majority do piece work. In my department, which is the department of weaving, women there all work by the piece.

Q.—Have they been long working by the piece? A.—Ever since the beginning of the factory.

Q.—What are the average wages of the men? A.—From eighty cents to one dollar a day. There are several who make much less and there are men having families who earn sixty cents a day.

Q.—Are there times when you work longer than others? A.—Yes; often we are pressed with work and we are obliged to work extra.

Q.—What are the working hours? A.—For a couple of months work we have been working ten hours a day—sixty hours a week.

Q.—Which is the longest day of work that you have had? A.—Thirteen hours.

Q.—Do the children work as long as the men stay in the factory? A.—The same thing. When some work all work. If any one dares not want to work, the next morning he is fined.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Is it true that the children work in the factory barefoot? A.—Yes; several do.

Q.—At the present time? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is it true that the agent of this factory goes into the Saguenay district and brings back whole families to work in that factory? A.—Yes; I know that they go down to the Saguenay to engage hands.

Q.—Are there many of these people brought from down there? A.—Yes; the great part of the employees of the factory down below are people brought from the Saguenay.

Q.—Are you aware whether it is true or not that the majority of these Saguenay people do not know what a bank note is of the denomination of one dollar, and that they do not know the difference between the notes of the several banks? A.—I know that there are some of that sort, but I could not give the names of the parties.

Q.—Do you know whether the pledges given these people have always been redeemed? A.—They have not been redeemed.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you know what promises were made? Were you present when any promises were made? A.—I was not present when the promises were made, but I have seen the people to whom the promises were made.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Is it true that the company guarantees grocers a certain amount of the purchases made by the employees? A.—Not for all. I have known of cases. I am certain that it has stood security with several grocers for several families. They guarantee for the amount of groceries for the board of one boy.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—When are you paid? A.—Every fortnight.

Q.—Do you receive your wages in full? A.—We are always one week in arrears.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—That is to say, that what is due on the 15th you receive on the 23rd? A.—No; we are paid every week, but one week is kept in arrears.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Those people who came from the Saguenay on the strength of the promises made them, when they learnt from the other employees that they did not receive the amount of wages pledged to them, did they demand an increase? A.—Yes; they demanded it.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Did they get this increase? A.—To my knowledge they did not get it. They were told that the company could not do any better:

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—What was the result when they demanded an increase of wages? What did the company do? A.—They said that they could not do any better; that it was all they could afford to pay, and all that they would.

Q.—Do you know whether any of the children employed in this factory were

ever beaten? A.—I have heard that spoken of, but the children are not in my department; they are upstairs. I have heard it said, but I never saw any of them beaten.

Q.—Do you know what fine a lad undergoes who leaves any filth on the floor? A.—Now, that is in my department. I myself am obliged to impose on them a fine by the orders of the foreman. If a weaver woman drops a tube on the floor she is fined twenty-five cents.

Q.—If the girls who are employed in the establishment make use of certain pieces of paper to curl their hair, are they fined for it? A.—Yes. Here is one of these pieces of paper, and if a girl uses it to curl her hair, she incurs a fine of 25 cents. This paper is worth nothing, but the fine is imposed to prevent them using that paper.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—And they have been obliged to pay their fines? A.—Yes; always. Every time they were caught they had to pay the fine.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Supposing a party should use this paper a second time, after having paid the fine a first time, what will be done to her? A.—Generally, she would be discharged.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Are fines imposed for other offences? A.—Yes; a fine is imposed on a party for making too much waste. A weaver woman who makes too much of this waste gets a fine of 25 cents. It is true that weaver women can make a great deal of waste, but often it is no fault of theirs. Often they do bad work because the tubes they receive from upstairs are bad. Those who pay the fines are not those who make the bad work; it is those who are obliged to receive work badly made from upstairs.

Q.—What is a tube worth? A.—It is worth almost nothing. It cannot cost more than a quarter of a cent.

Q.—What you mean to say is, that those on whom the fines are imposed are not those who do the bad work? A.—Yes; it is they who are obliged to employ that. Sometimes there is a piece in the tube which is not used, because it is badly made, and that causes a loss. A weaver woman who makes too much waste incurs a fine of 25 cents; but she makes this waste because the fillings are badly made. The foreman told me, the day before yesterday, that the fines of a single floor—that of the weaving room—amount to at least \$50 a month, for several reasons, such as those I have just stated.

The witness lays on the table four envelopes, which read as follows :—

The first—"Salary of \$12.60—fine \$1, for a girl."

The second—"Salary, \$12.55—fine, 75 cents."

The third—"Salary, \$10.30—fine, 25 cents."

The fourth—"Salary, \$6.30—fine, 40 cents."

These four envelopes contained the salaries of four girls.

Q.—Is that \$6.30 for fifteen days? A.—Yes, sir. Envelopes of this nature I can show you by the hundreds, if you wish them, inasmuch as all the hands have these same envelopes, and there is hardly any hands in the factory who has not some such fine to pay, about the same as these.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the factory? A.—Good enough.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Are the privies separated one from the other, for the women, and the men? A.—No; they are together. There is a partition between the two. The hands go in the one or the other. It is the same place for women, and men.

Q.—Are the women obliged to pass before the door of the men's privies? A.—Yes; if they go into the second one, as there are two doors, one next to the other, and both the one and the other can be used. If the women go into the first, they

need not pass before the door, but if they go into the second, they are obliged to pass before the door.

Q.—Are those privies so situated that other parties in the establishment cannot see those that go in? A.—Everybody going in can be seen. Once inside, they cannot be seen, but they can be seen going in.

Q.—Does the Company set apart a place where the employees can take their meals? A.—No; we take them along with our work as a rule. There is no special place to take meals.

Q.—At what hour in the morning do the children begin their work? A.—At twenty-five minutes past six.

Q.—At what hour do they close their work in the evening? A.—At a quarter past six.

Q.—How long do they have for dinner? A.—Three quarters of an hour.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Have they any other time to rest, besides these twenty-five minutes for dinner? A.—No; the moment they enter the factory, they are there till evening, except the time for dinner, three quarters of an hour.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—When there is much work, you make extra hours do you not? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—At what hour do the children come to work in the morning; at what hour, to your knowledge, have they left the factory on a very busy day? A.—When we work extra time, we work till nine o'clock at night, and the children leave the factory at that hour.

Q.—Do you mean to tell us that children, ten years of age, and under, of whom you have spoken, stop in the shop from twenty minutes past six in the morning, till nine o'clock at night, on those days? A.—Yes.

Q.—Between the dinner, and nine o'clock at night, the time when they leave the factory, have these children a moment of rest? A.—No.

Q.—Do they receive supplementary wages for the hours that they work extra? A.—Yes; I have heard it said that several of those young people were not so paid, but, as for me, every time that I worked I was paid.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Did those children ever fall sick, as a result of the extra work which they were obliged to do? A.—Not to my knowledge.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—When children work 13 hours a day, what time is given them for supper? A.—They do not get any, they work all the time from a quarter to one in the afternoon until nine o'clock at night. Sometimes we are allowed a half hour to get some supper; but generally speaking we work the whole time. On some occasions notice is given in the forenoon that work will be continued till night and then we fetch our supper.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Are the doors of the factory closed to prevent the hands from going out? A.—Yes; and the foremen station themselves at each door to prevent any one from passing.

Q.—In the Hochelaga factory is there any salvage apparatus in the event of fire? A.—Yes.

Q.—In your opinion is this apparatus adequately strong to allow 1,100 people working in the factory to make good their escape? A.—I think that it is.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Do the doors open inwards or outwards? A.—Down below they open inwards.

Q.—Have you heard swearing or other obscene language in the factory? A.—When the machinery is going there is not much hearing of anything, and we do not hear talk.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—No one takes the liberty of swearing in that factory? A.—Perhaps, there may be some who take the liberty even myself I may have whipped out an oath now and again. There is such a clatter that nothing can be heard.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Does this noise heard in the factory have the effect of deafening the children? A.—Perhaps, it may deafen some of them.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you know of no means of stopping this noise in the factory? A.—No.

Q.—You know of no person who has invented a means of putting a stop to this noise? A.—No.

By Mr. McLEAN —

Q.—Are the doors closed with lock and key after you go into work? A.—Yes. After we have passed the yard gate it is locked up; but the door of the establishment is not locked.

Q.—Who keeps the keys of these doors? A.—The guardian.

Q.—Are there several keys? A.—That's more than I can tell you; but I think that the manager has a key of his own, as he often goes out.

Q.—Is the guardian always on the premises to throw open the doors in the event of fire? A.—Yes. He is always about somewhere. In the office or some other place. All that he has to do is to keep watch, although he has some work beside.

Q.—Have any accidents been caused to your knowledge by the machinery in that factory? Q.—In our factory there have been persons who were hurt, but no serious accidents.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Is there anything which protects the children when they are around the machines? A.—No; there's nothing. Each one has his work to do and if he does not protect himself, so much the worse for him.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—What is the condition of the privies at the factory? Are they proper? A.—Yes, sufficiently, they are generally clean.

Q.—Are the floors upon which the children walk with barefeet cold? A.—They cannot be very cold.

Q.—Is the factory very warm? A.—The factory is well heated; there are several children who are employed in the mule room, and who go down stairs, three stories, and in going down are obliged to go through passages which are cold.

Q.—Are the steps of the staircases in wood? A.—Yes.

Q.—Without iron facings? A.—There are no iron facings.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Can these children wear their shoes if they wish? A.—Yes; they have full right to wear them, but generally they do not wear them, because they have

none; many of these children have none at all, and if they have them, have only one pair, and they take care of them.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—How do they go home? A.—They go with what they have—with shoes—but they take care of them because they do not earn enough salary to be able to buy others.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Have these children any opportunity of attending school during the year? A.—No.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Are there any night schools in this locality? A.—Not to my knowledge. There are none.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Can you give us an idea of the number of these children who know how to read and write? A.—There is not a quarter of them.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you know whether the families who have been brought up from the Saguenay to Montreal, have taken the places of the families who formerly worked in the factory? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know of any of the families who have thus been dismissed from the factory and replaced by others from the Saguenay, have emigrated to the United States? A.—Yes.

Q.—Then in your opinion, the fact of bringing families from the Saguenay to Montreal, has had the effect of driving others away to the United States? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are the children who work in the Hochelaga factory under the control of the foremen or forewomen? A.—Yes of the foreman.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—Has the Company had any difficulty in obtaining foremen in this establishment? A.—I do not think so, for to my knowledge there is not a person who can have the place of foreman who is not well qualified to get it. Generally they take people who have worked there the longest.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—What, to your knowledge, is the highest fine which has been paid in one week or in a fortnight? A.—In my department a dollar and seventy-five cents, of anywhere else I have no knowledge.

Q.—Do you know what is the salary which that person earned? A.—I think that she had earned eleven dollars and something.

Q.—It was a girl? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do they sometimes impose fines for other reasons than those which you have mentioned; for instance, for being late in the morning and for absence from work or for other causes? A.—If one is late in a morning it is impossible to enter before nine o'clock and then one loses a quarter of a day. Moreover, people are often fined for doing bad work. If a weaver woman does bad work she is fined for it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—When a worker enters the Hochelaga Factory, he or she is made to sign an engagement? Is not such the case? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Can you give us the nature of such engagement as you speak of? A.—I have one here and I produce it.

THE HOCHELAGA COTTON MANUFACTURING CO.. (Ltd.)

TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT.

All employees intending to leave the service of the Company, shall be held to give two weeks notice of such intention to their Overseers, and upon failure to comply with this stipulation, shall forfeit to the Company, the amount of two weeks wages, which shall be deducted from whatever amount may then remain unpaid in the hands of the Company.

The Company may at any time, without notice, discharge any employee for incompetence, unfaithfulness, immoral or improper conduct, or for any wilful damage done to the property of the Company.

The employees shall work on all holidays, except on Christmas and New Year's, or any other day that the Company may see fit to grant.

A copy of the above Regulations shall be given each employee at the time of registration.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—When you sign the engagement do they make you read it or do they read it to you? A.—They give us a paper like that and we sign it.

Q.—According to this regulation you are obliged to work on holidays. Is it not so? A.—Yes. But it has only been for the last three or four months; we have had new rules for the last three or four months.

Q.—During three months have you worked on holidays? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know whether or not the majority of the work people employed in the cotton factory is opposed to working on holydays? A.—To my opinion I quite think that the majority at the present time does not wish to work on holydays, but we are obliged to do so or lose our places. There have been two or three girls to my knowledge, in my own department, who have been discharged for not having come on holy days.

Q.—Then a workman or workwoman who would not come to work on the day of a *fête d'obligation* would be dismissed from the mill? A.—Yes; certainly.

Q.—In that case do they keep from them fifteen days salary? A.—All the wages that may be due at the time an employee is dismissed are retained. That is said upon the envelopes.

Q.—There is no mistake here is there? A workman who will not work on *fête d'obligation* is dismissed and fifteen days salary, or what happens to be due, is confiscated by the company? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—If the *employee* consented to go to work the day following the *fete* do they confiscate his wages? A.—Generally they do not want them any more. Sometimes they will take them back again seven or eight days after, but generally they give them no more work. Thus one stays away on a holy day, and the next day if one goes back there they tell us "we don't want you any more."

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you know that according to the contract which you have submitted to the Commission you have no right to absent yourself from work any day in the year, even on Sunday? A.—There are two days in the year when one does not work, Christmas and New Year's Day.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you know that by law you are not obliged to work on Sunday?
A.—Yes; we know that however, to my knowledge they have never worked on Sunday.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that work has actually been done on Sunday in the factory? A.—Yes; work is done in the factory on Sunday.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are the general operations of the mill stopped on Sunday? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—They have never spun or weaved on Sunday? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—At what hour do you stop working on Saturday? A.—At noon.

Q.—At what hour are you paid? A.—About one o'clock as soon as we stop, between noon and one o'clock.

Q.—Was there not a difficulty between the directors of the mill and the workmen when they imposed on them work on holy days? A.—Yes; There was a slight difficulty, there were different opinions. Some were willing and others were not willing. Such was the difficulty that occurred; but I do not think that it was very serious. What decided us to work on holy days was, that we formerly were only paid the first Saturday of the month, and they said to us that if we were willing to work on festivals they would pay us every fifteen days. Before that we worked sixty-six hours a week, and now we work sixty hours. We work eleven hours a day, but on Saturdays we finish at noon, and that makes sixty hours per week.

Q.—Do you know of people working in the factory or children having been arrested and taken before the Recorder's Court, for having stopped work? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Do you know whether working women have brought the directors of the mill before the Recorder in order to obtain the moneys that they had kept back from them? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know what was the result? A.—There are some who were paid and others who were not. Some succeeded and others did not succeed.

Q.—Do you know what was the judgment of the Recorder? A.—This is the judgment of the Recorder. He compelled the Company to pay some of them and others were not paid.

Q.—You have no personal knowledge of the matter? A.—Not perfectly.

—

Translation.

GILBERT GARAND, Fireman, of Montreal, sworn:

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have heard the testimony of the last witness, who has just been examined? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you anything to contradict in his testimony? A.—No; only that he was employed in a department where there were only grown persons, while I was foreman where there were children.

Q.—What is the youngest child, to your knowledge, that you have had under your orders? A.—Under my orders, I have had them of eight years.

Q.—How long is that since? A.—It is four years.

Q.—Did the children of eight years come at the same hours as the men, and did they leave the Factory at the same hours? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What is the longest day that you have seen made in the Factory? A.—From half past six in the morning till nine o'clock at night.

Q.—What were the hours for meals which the children had during the day? A.—They had three quarters of an hour for dinner, at noon, and occasionally, in the evening, I myself sent them off to get a bite, but they returned right away.

Q.—Were these children sometimes illtreated? A.—They were not illtreated by me, but I have seen them illtreated.

Q.—What was the sort of illtreatment to which they were made to submit. A.—I saw a foreman go up to a child—a young boy—who was in front of me, and give him a kick in the rear. I then took a stick and knocked that foreman down.

Q.—What was the age of that child? A.—The child could have scarcely been ten years old.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Did the affair come to the knowledge of the Directors of the Factory? Did you make a complaint to the directors? A.—I made no complaint to the Directors, but the first boss came to me, trying to reprimand me, because I had struck the other.

Q.—Did that finish the matter? A.—The matter was finished, because that foreman left the Factory.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Was the foreman obliged to leave the Factory because he had beaten that child? A.—He was obliged to leave, I think, on my account. I placed myself against the door, and I saw him illtreat children, and I would not allow him to touch them.

Q.—Have you seen other children illtreated? A.—Yes; that is to say, I did not see it, but my child, last year, was himself illtreated.

Q.—What was done to him? A.—My child came to me, at noon, and said to me, "Papa, they have given me kicks in the rear." Then I went out and saw the foreman. I met him at his gate, which is right opposite the station, and I said to him: "If you beat my boy again I will knock you down."

Q.—You do not believe that the foreman has the right to correct the children? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you impose fines on these children? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What is the biggest fine you have seen imposed on a child, in a fortnight? A.—At the time I was employed there, they did not work by the fortnight. It was by the month.

Q.—Well then by the month? A.—I have seen as much as two dollars and a-half of fines imposed during a month.

Q.—Upon wages of how much? A.—Twenty-five to thirty cents a day. I have seen more than that. I have seen girls who worked for me; for I had girls and young children at the same time, and I had men also. I have seen young girls fined as much as a dollar in one day.

Q.—What was about their salary per day? A.—Forty to fifty cents per day.

Q.—Do you know whether the managers of this mill approved of the illtreatment of children? A.—I am going to tell you how that was: I saw the former manager of the mill come to me and treat me like a dog. I said to him "I am not a son of a bitch; my mother has been dead a long time—"

Q.—That is not a reply to my question. I asked you if the superintendent of the mill approved or had authorized the ill-treatment of these children? A.—I cannot tell you whether or not he approved the ill treatment of these children, but since he wished to strike me, he would approve of this ill-treatment.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are the workmen who enter the mill obliged to sign an agreement? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—They sign a register. Is that so? A.—At the time that I was there,

they came with a book and put it on the desk, and they did not say to a child or a grown person "Here is an engagement which says so and so." They simply said, "Sign that book." Every evening at five o'clock they came with that book for new employees to sign it.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—What did they do for those who did not know how to sign? A.—They made them touch the pen and they made a cross.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Were there many who did not know how to sign? A.—Certainly.

Q.—And those who signed did not know what they were signing? A.—No. They did not know. They asked of them simply the number and the name of the street in which they lived.

Translation.

16 February, 1887.

ADÈLE LAVOIE, employed in the cotton factory (Ste. Anne), at Hochelaga, nineteen years of age, being sworn deposes as follows:—

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Mademoiselle, you have, it appears, a communication to make to the Commission, will you have the goodness to make it? A.—On Saturday last, about eight o'clock, Mr Théophile Parent came and accused me of having taken a piece of cotton. Mr. Parent is the foreman of the factory.

Q.—What do you call a piece of cotton? A.—It is a piece of cotton such as you buy in the stores, of about 40 to 50 yards. I said to him that it was not so. I said to him that I had taken my piece as a regular way, and I there asked him for my bill in order not to work at a disadvantage.

Q.—To whom did you return the piece of cotton? A.—I do not know to whom I have returned it. I have no knowledge of any piece. I had been as usual to carry it in the evening, and the next morning he came to me to say that. Then, I said to him: "No." I asked him for my bill, and he said to me that he was able to prove that it was I who had taken it. It was because he had found a small piece of cotton which I had left under my feet to give it to Mr. Parent. At this time, I told him to go to our house, and that if he found it I should be guilty. He visited us accompanied by two gentlemen who had no right to make the visit; they searched everywhere and did not find the piece of cotton. They returned to the factory to insult my sister.

Q.—Is your sister employed in the factory? A.—Yes, sir; she works with me there. They asked my sister where I had put the piece of cotton which I had stolen in the morning. He stooped at this time and raising the skirt of my sister's dress, he said that she had it under her skirt.

Q.—Were you paid for that piece of cotton which you had made? A.—Not at all. I ought to have received \$10.16. I only got \$9.91. All the same he admitted that it was I who had made that piece of cotton, and he did not pay me for it.

Q.—You did not receive your salary for the piece of cotton which he said you had stolen? A.—No, sir.

Q.—You have left the factory? A.—Yes.

Q.—How much were you paid by the piece? A.—Only 25 cents the piece.

Q.—How long did you work at the factory? A.—It will be three years next spring.

Q.—Have you paid many fines? A.—Yes, sir; if I had all the fines which I have paid.....

Q.—Do you know how much about you paid in fines during the three years? A.—I cannot say how much; but I believe it is something like about \$12 or \$13, because, every fortnight, I always had 40 to 50 cents to pay.

Q.—Why did they impose these fines, do you remember? A.—Because at times it was bad cotton that they worked. Even that did not prevent our paying for it, even if only two threads broke. Then there were slips, and black stains washed, but not well washed and white streaks in it.

Q.—Are you a weaver or do you run a machine to spin or to weave? A.—

Weaver.
Q.—Is it possible to carry away a piece of cotton of that quantity without the guardian perceiving it? A.—No. We cannot carry off a piece of cotton without it being noticed.

Q.—Did you remark to Mr. Parent that you could not carry off a piece of cotton like that? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What did he say? A.—He would not believe me at all, but he was unable to say that the piece of cotton which was missing was mine. The number of my machine was not worked upon it, because upon each piece they place a ticket.

Q.—Are there children who work in the department where you work? A.—Yes, sir. There are children to carry the thread and the hoses.

Q.—How old are these children? A.—I can hardly say; but the one who is with me is not large.

Q.—Are these children allowed to play during the day? A.—No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You swear that these children never play? A.—I am going to tell you. We are very busy with our work and I do not know.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What hour do you go to the factory? A.—The day ought to begin at half past six o'clock. If one is not there to the minute, he is fined or rather reprimanded.

Q.—At what hour does work finish? A.—When they do not work in the evening we finish at a quarter-past six, and when we work in the evening at a quarter past seven.

Q.—When you work to a quarter past seven have you leisure time to take your tea or to rest? A.—No, sir; and if we do not work till a quarter-past seven we are cleared out, that is discharged from the factory.

Q.—Do you ever work later than a quarter past seven? A.—Occasionally until half-past seven.

Q.—You never work up to nine o'clock? A.—No.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that other young girls have been treated by a foreman in the manner that you and your sister were treated? A.—No. The week before there was a piece missing; and they let it go. They did not wish to speak about it.

Q.—When you finish a piece what do you do with it? Do you send it to the foreman? A.—They place a ticket upon our piece and then they place it on a desk to have it marked. There is a man whose duty it is to mark the pieces.

Q.—They do not give you another piece to begin before the first has been taken away? Is not that so? A.—They take away the first and they give us another.

Q.—Do all the pieces from the same machine bear the same number? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is it you who places the number of the machine upon the cotton? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you neglect to place the number upon that piece of cotton which you were accused of having stolen, or had you neglected to do so? A.—It is very certain

that I took my pencil and wrote the number upon the cotton beside the ticket, because occasionally the ticket is lost, and then one cannot say whether that piece is mine or some one's else, because we are all making about the same cotton. He accused me because I had taken a small piece of cotton to make an apron, but all the girls do the same thing. We are accustomed to take cotton to make our aprons; but they let us do so, they do not prevent us.

(Translation.)

JOSEPH LÉNEILLÉE, Ex-Superintendent of Pilots, Montreal, seventy years of age, being sworn, deposes as follows:

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—When did you cease to act in that function? A.—Since the last of December, 1887.

Q.—To what point does the jurisdiction of the Pilots of the District of Montreal extend? A.—From Montreal to Quebec.

Q.—How many pilots are there in this district? A.—About forty-five.

Q.—What are their special duties? A.—Their duties are to take charge of vessels, when they are requested to do so by the Captain, or rather by the Harbor Commission.

Q.—Were you ever employed as a pilot on steamers? A.—Yes, sir, I was employed during a period of twenty years. I was employed on steamers twenty years in all. That is, on steamers, and on ocean sailing vessels.

Q.—Do you know anything of the digging, and deepening of the channel between Montreal and Quebec? A.—Yes, sir, I was employed by the Harbor Commission on that work for the space of twelve years.

Q.—Did you work by night as by day? A.—Last summer we worked by night as well as by day, at least, so I am told; but I did not see the men at work myself, and I was not employed on board the dredges.

Q.—Do you think that this work can be done by night as well as by day? A.—Not so easily.

Q.—How far down below Quebec do the pilots go to meet the steamers? A.—They never go, but still they are at five or six miles below Quebec. But the Quebec pilots go sixty leagues below.

Q.—What kind of boat do they use? A.—They use sailing schooners.

Q.—From the time that a pilot takes charge of a steamer, at sea, does he not become the master thereof? A.—From the moment that he takes charge, he is the master of the vessel, until she reaches port.

Q.—Are pilots held to undergo an examination? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you aware that any accident has ever happened through the carelessness, or ignorance, of pilots? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What was the nature of those accidents? A.—Last summer, here in this port, through want of attention, a pilot stranded his ship, and it was reported he did not see the second buoy.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you know what are the wages allotted to pilots who do the service on steamers, between Montreal and Quebec? A.—On the mail boats, I believe, they receive \$1,000.00 for the service during the season of navigation.

Q.—How are they paid—outside Montreal and Quebec? A.—The prices vary. In summer they get less than in the fall, but I cannot say how much they get.

Q.—When an accident happens to a steamship, through the carelessness of the

pilot, has the owner of the steamship a recourse in damages against the pilot? A.—If it is done through negligence, he can have a recourse, and get the pilot punished, but, generally, the pilot does everything that is possible to save his pilotage, and, by saving his pilotage, he saves the ship.

Q.—On board these steamships how many hours of work a day, between Montreal and Quebec, have the sailors? A.—There is no set of hours. When the time is come they work the night as well as the day.

Q.—They are usually engaged for the season or at so much per month? A.—Generally it is by the month.

Q.—They are paid by the month, but are they not engaged for the season? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you think that it would not be better for the sailors when they get out at Quebec, coming from Montreal, to be engaged over again before taking the boat to return to Montreal; that is to say, would it not be better to engage for every day or for every trip, rather than engage for the season? A.—It is best to be employed for the season and be paid every month.

Q.—What wages do the sailors earn? A.—I have not kept track of that these past few years; I know that the prices have gone up. I think that they made from \$12 to \$15 a month.

Q.—Do the pilots work night and day? A.—Sometimes they are obliged to spend the night in work, when they are steering their boats; but when they get into port, they do nothing during the day.

Q.—When the boat is moored the pilot has nothing to do? A.—No, sir; when the vessel is in port they have nothing to do.

Q.—Are the pilots on ocean steamers expected to work night and day? A.—On ocean steamers the charge of the vessel is entrusted to the pilot, and when the boat gets into port, then the pilot has nothing to do.

Q.—Supposing that you start from Quebec in the afternoon and that you arrive at Montreal in the afternoon of the next day, is the pilot in charge of the vessel during the whole time, or during the night, or does he go to bed at that time? A.—So long as the steamer does not stop, the pilot stands on the bridge; but, if the steamer stops through stress of weather, such as fogs, then he gets some rest.

Q.—Do you not know that steamers do not run at night between Montreal and Quebec? A.—Yes, sir. Generally they are obliged to stop, unless they start early enough in the morning to have the whole day of fair weather to arrive here in the evening; but often the tide and the low water are in the way and the boats are forced to stop.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—In summer are there not days when they begin at four o'clock in the morning and end at nine o'clock at night? A.—Yes, sir; in the long days of summer.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—During the last season was there more than one accident, to your knowledge, between Montreal and Quebec? A.—There were two or three accidents. I do not remember the names of the steamers. They were steamers outward bound. One of them stranded and the other only touched bottom.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Do you believe that the licensed pilots in the district are sufficiently numerous for the navigation between Montreal and Quebec? A.—Yes; they have been numerous enough up to the present time; but if navigation increases, like everything else, I think that more would be wanted. I think that several young men having their branches ought to be admitted. I have spoken of it to the Harbour Commissioners. The number of pilots ought to be raised to fifty.

Q.—Is it not true that all the pilots are French Canadians?

Objected to this question by the Chairman on the ground that no question of race or nationality should be introduced into the proceedings of this Commission.

Question withdrawn.

Q.—Do you allow young men to make an apprenticeship of the trade of pilot?
A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is that generally done? A.—Yes, sir; that is always done. If a young man wants to become an apprentice he has to file his application, and he must work for four years before getting his branch. Furthermore, he is obliged to make three voyages to Europe on board of a steamer.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—At all events it is the same thing? A.—Yes, sir; except that it may happen that the aspirant made his voyages to Europe before making his application; but it is just as well as it is.

Q.—What is the age of the oldest pilot that you have on the river? A.—From fifty-eight to sixty years.

Q.—Do you not think that this is rather old for that kind of work? A.—I think that he is able to do his work properly. It depends on the infirmities of the parties.

Q.—Are the pilots put on the superannuation list, and at what age does this take place? A.—After the age of fifty-five years every pilot is bound to stand a second examination to show whether he is able or not to receive a second certificate.

Q.—Are the pilots of Montreal incorporated? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Have they ever applied for an act of incorporation? A.—Yes; but it was never granted them.

Q.—Are they obliged to know the two languages? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are the hands employed on steamboats between Montreal and Quebec in any measure or numbers, owners of their own dwellings? A.—There are very few of them in that case.

HOLLIS SHOREY, wholesale clothier, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:

Q.—You employ a large number of people I believe? A.—A good many.

Q.—Are there other houses in the same line of business in Montreal as yourself?
A.—Yes.

Q.—And I suppose they also employ a large number of people? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are those people employed in your establishment or do they take the work to their homes? A.—Both. The largest number of people we employ are employed outside.

Q.—Are they all residents of Montreal? A.—No. Some of them live at St. Jérôme, Ste. Rose and several other centres.

Q.—How far from Montreal is this work sent? A.—Some is sent to St. Jérôme, St. Rose and St. Hyacinthe and other places.

Q.—20 or 30 miles from Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are the same prices paid for the work that is sent out of Montreal as are paid for work done in Montreal? A.—Just the same. The same price is paid for work sent out of Montreal as is paid for the same kind of work done in Montreal outside of our premises.

Q.—Are the prices on your premises the same as are paid for like work done outside of your premises? A.—Part of the hands work by the piece inside and part of them work by the week.

Q.—But if those inside work by the piece do they get the same rates as those who take work to their homes? A.—They get quite as much.

Q.—They are not paid exactly on the same scale then? A.—The largest portion of our work is done outside. We keep a certain number of hands inside, and it is very convenient to have some hands inside because in filling an order for \$2,000 or \$3,000 worth of goods there might be \$50.00 worth short, and they have to be made up quickly, and it takes a shorter time to make them up inside than it would outside, although it may even cost a little more. If we have, say five orders from one little town, we don't like to send one or two orders first, for our customers would complain on the ground that the orders were taken by our traveller on the same day and they desired to get them all at the same time, that is if they were asked for at the same time.

Q.—Then I understand you to say that you pay higher prices for work done inside than you paid for work taken by people to their homes? A.—We pay fully as high; there is not supposed to be much difference. Specialties in any line of business cost a little more to make. More than the ordinary lines.

Q.—What wages can a good sewing woman earn on ready made clothing in Montreal, working about ten hours a day, she having a sewing machine of her own?

A.—That is a question I thought I might possibly be asked, and I therefore requested my bookkeeper to prepare a statement. This statement was prepared by my bookkeeper and cashier who does nothing but keep an account of the work going out and coming in, and pays the work people. He has been with us about eight months. We have had a lady cashier; but with ladies we generally find they get married from our establishment; and we have had other cashiers who have been with us for some years.

Q.—Will you read the statement to us? A.—I asked this young man before this Commission came to Montreal (a few days before it came to this city) to try and let me know how many hands we were employing. Many of our hands are small contractors—one woman will take a number of hands to work for her. Her name alone goes on our list, although they may employ several girls on the work.

Q.—This relates to your own hands only? A.—Yes. It is not taken from the books by myself, but by the man who, I suppose, ought to know more about it than I do.

Q.—I see by this statement that the number of outside hands employed by your firm is 1,450? A.—Yes. Let me explain a little on that point. Just before the Commission came to Montreal I asked that young man to let me know how many outside hands we are employing. He had to do it in this way: When he turned up the index of the ledger to pay a woman who came for payment for her work, he asked her how many hands she employed, and he entered the number given, and when he obtained a return he added the total up. He has not quite got through the list yet, but nearly so, and he gave me this statement.

Q.—And this is substantially the number of people employed? A.—Yes; as near as you can get it.

Q.—How many are employed inside? A.—One hundred and three. Sometimes there will be 150.

Q.—I see there are travellers, clerks and storemen, twenty-four? A.—Yes.

Q.—I see, according to the statement, that girls working on piece work earn from \$4 to \$6 per week? A.—Yes.

Q.—Would that be about the average of what an ordinary sewing woman earns? A.—That is what he says he pays them.

Q.—He has made up the statement from your books? A.—Yes. I don't vouch for the correctness of the statement altogether, because I have not made it up.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—It was made up and given to you as a correct and true statement? A.—

Yes.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are you able to tell us how many hours the hands work on piece work in

order to earn that sum? A.—I cannot tell you how many hours they work outside; they may work ten hours, eight hours, six hours, or even longer than ten hours.

Q.—You have never made enquiry as to the number of hours they work? A.—In regard to the inside hands I say this: we used to open at seven o'clock, and our hands used to be supposed to go to work at that hour, but most of the hands working inside are now as a general thing working by the piece, and they are not allowed to come quite as early. They have to be at work by eight o'clock generally, and I don't think the majority work ten hours inside.

Q.—At what hour do they leave? A.—Six o'clock.

Q.—Have you any night work in your business? A.—Not very often.

Q.—When the hands work at night, are the week hands paid extra? A.—Yes.

Q.—How much time are they allowed for dinner? A.—One hour.

Q.—I see that those who work inside are paid five dollars a week? A.—That is about the sum.

Q.—And another statement is, that a good cutter makes from \$15.00 to \$20.00 a week? A.—A large portion of 103 hands you see mentioned there, are working on piece, but the ones that are hired, who do not work by the piece, make about five dollars, that is, a competent hand.

Q.—And a good cutter gets from \$15.00 to \$20.00? A.—That is what my young man says.

Q.—Are there any earning less than \$15.00? A.—Yes.

Q.—Some who are not as proficient as others? A.—Yes; I question that a little about the earnings of the cutters. I intended, after seeing that statement, to go back to him and see how many there were who were earning less than \$15.00; but I think all the men who are proficient in their business, and who have worked for any length of time, can earn that amount. A man coming into the establishment, however, who is not in the habit of cutting ready made clothing, would not make as much as that. If you, for example, were to come into the business, you would not make that sum, but you might possibly make it in a year or two.

Q.—I think, perhaps the most important question I have to ask you is that relating to the actual earnings of those who for what we call sub-contractors; are you able to tell us how much they can earn? A.—No.

Q.—You never made any inquiry as to what the percentage of these prices remain with the sub-contractor, and what they pay to their hands? A.—No. I have one large sub-contractor, and I suppose I could ascertain the amounts paid, but I am not prepared to give them to-day.

Q.—Would the figures you have given us, relating to your establishment, be about a fair average, as regards other establishments in your line of business in Montreal? A.—I should think so; I don't see how there could be much difference. Ours is like every other business, there is competition, and if we did not pay as much as others we would not get the hands, and so it would be with other firms.

Q.—Where do you find your market mostly? A.—We find our market all over the Dominion.

Q.—West or East, or both? A.—We send to every province in the Dominion. I don't say that we visit every little village in the Dominion, possibly not, but we send to every Province.

Q.—Where do you buy your cloth mostly? A.—In England, as far as English cloth is concerned, and we buy a great many cloths from Canadian mills. We buy a very much larger proportion of Canadian goods now than we did ten or fifteen years ago.

Q.—Are Canadian cloths got up in better style than they were ten or fifteen years ago? A.—Yes; that is the case with Canadian goods.

Q.—Do they compare more favorably with foreign goods now than they did ten or fifteen years ago? A.—I think they do.

Q.—Are they absolutely cheaper, or dearer, than they were at that time? A.—They are absolutely cheaper.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Tell us the price paid per garment? A.—It varies very much; it depends on what the garment is.

Q.—Do you manufacture overalls? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the price per garment, or dozen garments? A.—As I don't attend to the manufacturing now, and as my young son has charge of the factory, he would be able to answer that better than I could.

Q.—Would your son be able to furnish us with the sums paid for all classes of work, distinguishing children's clothing from adults' clothing? A.—Years ago I had charge of the factory myself, but my sons are working into it now, and I look more after some of the departments of the business.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—On what terms may a woman take out work and how small quantities of work may she take out in one lot? A.—Until we are acquainted with her and know something about her we consider it a little risky to give persons anything, for we don't know whether they will ever bring the work back or not. We generally give two garments at a time, and if they are well made we give them a large quantity. In regard to the quantity given out at a time; we give them all they want and all they need. It depends on how many hands they employ and how much work they can do for us.

Q.—What I am getting at is this; if a woman is working for a sub-contractor and prefers to work for herself does she have any difficulty in dealing directly with you? A.—No; they often leave sub-contractors after they have learned to work at the trade and commence doing work for themselves.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you inspectors to examine the work as it is brought in? A.—Yes; two or three of them.

Q.—Supposing the work is not up to the standard what is done with it? A.—He will not receive it till they alter it.

Q.—It has to be altered? A.—If it can be altered.

Q.—In every case? A.—There are some cases where it is too far for the people to take it home, and sometimes they sit down in the waiting room and make slight alterations there, but if it is too far to take it home and there are small alterations to be made we will get the alterations done at so much inside and that amount is deducted off the pay.

Q.—Is it deducted off the party who brings in the work? A.—Yes. There never has been any trouble about that so far as I know. We must do something to have the work kept up to the standard; if not, we would get more bad work than we would good work through incompetent hands. I suppose it is the same in all lines of business.

ROBERT MITCHELL, Brass Finisher and Steam Fitter, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—You are a brass finisher and steam fitter, I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—I suppose a large number of men are employed in that industry in Montreal?

A.—Yes; a much larger number are employed at it now than there were when I commenced business.

Q.—About what wages can a man earn in your line of business, take a journeyman? A.—On an average from \$11 to \$12 a week—that is a steam fitter. Taking

the whole—and our principal branch is brass finishing—the men will run from \$1.50 to \$5.00 a day.

Q.—Do many receive wages up to \$5.00 a day? A.—Only one or two do; some of the others receive from \$2.50 to \$3.00 a day.

Q.—What would a plumber receive? A.—About \$11 or \$12 a week.

Q.—How many hours constitute a day's labor in your establishment? A.—Ten hours constitute a day's work with us.

Q.—Are there many apprentices in your establishment? A.—We have to have apprentices, generally a boy to each man.

Q.—Are they indentured apprentices? A.—No. I used to indenture them at first but it became monotonous. I was formerly in the habit of keeping one dollar off their wages the first year as an inducement for them to stop on during their apprenticeship and give them the amount at the end of the third term, but I found it proved no inducement, and if they wanted to go away they would just step across the line. If they thought they could make more money elsewhere they would go. We now try to induce them to stop with us by giving them fair treatment.

Q.—Do they learn their business with you under those circumstances? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you consider they become as good workmen now as they did when your apprentices were indentured? A.—Yes. Sometimes we have to engage strong young fellows to help the steam fitters—we call them helpers—we get them at \$4, \$5 or \$6 a week, but we don't bind ourselves to keep them; they are only there for the time being. Our regular apprentices we start at \$2, and they go to \$4 and \$5.

Q.—Do many helpers remain in your establishment and learn the trade? A.—No.

Q.—Do many of your apprentices or journeymen attend the night schools that have been established in this city in connection with the different trades? A.—I believe so. I believe a considerable number of the plumbers are attending those schools.

Q.—Have you any knowledge as to whether the training they there receive makes them better workmen or not? A.—The schools have been established too short a time to be able to judge, for they have not been established much more than a month. I think such training has, however, a good tendency.

Q.—Is there a scarcity or a surplus of hands in your business in Montreal? A.—There is no surplus. Every man who is a good workman can get work in our line.

Q.—Do they get employment all the year round? A.—Yes. We scarcely have ever to shut down, and we keep the men on.

Q.—Do many workingmen in your trade come from abroad? A.—No.

Q.—Neither from the United States or from the old country? A.—No.

Q.—Do many workmen from the country districts in your trade come into Montreal, that is workmen from different parts of Canada? A.—No; because they have all to be skilled mechanics to be employed by us.

Q.—How frequently are your hands paid? A.—Our hands are paid every two weeks.

Q.—Are they satisfied with that arrangement? A.—Yes.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Do you do a great deal of brass-work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Of what particular nature? A.—It is divided into three different branches for plumbers goods, for gas-fitters goods, for steam-fitters goods.

Q.—Do you do your own castings? A.—Yes.

Q.—The moulds are all made in your establishment? A.—Yes. We keep in our establishment about 250 hands.

Q.—Where do you get your pipe for heating purposes? A.—It is made here. We have a large factory here just starting to make pipe by a new process, and they will be able to make enough iron pipe for the whole Dominion.

Q.—In what does the new process consist? A.—Of the withdrawal of iron pipe from the furnace at one heat and making it perfect. Before they used to half round it, and they bring it together two or three times, and run it into the furnace two or three times; now they bring it all in one heat and make a splendid pipe. I saw the process yesterday.

Q.—Do you employ your own pattern makers? A.—Yes.

Q.—What are the wages received by a pattern maker? A.—About \$2.00 a day.

Q.—Have you had any labor troubles in your establishment? A.—No; not during the last 12 or 14 years. At that time they tried to introduce the nine hour movement, and my establishment being the largest in our trade, they began with me first. The men were on strike for five or six weeks. I gave away to them with the understanding that if the other shops did not do the same I would have to go back to the old number of hours. The other shops did not follow the nine hour system and I had to go back again to the ten hours.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are plumbing and steam-fitting two distinct trades in Montreal? A.—Yes; although there are plenty of men who can do both.

Q.—Are they Canadians or old countrymen who work at the business? A.—There are both. There are quite a number of Canadians now in the business.

Q.—Who command the most money, plumbers or steam-fitters? A.—The steam-fitters receive a little more than the plumbers.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Is the reason for that because they are employed for a shorter time at steam-fitting? A.—No; I suppose it is because it is a newer business and for that reason they obtain a little higher pay.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Is it not harder work than plumbing? A.—Yes.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—I suppose you lay out the plans that the men go by in steam-fittings? A.—The foreman goes and lays it out and the men follow it.

J. K. WARD, Lumberman, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—You employ a large number of hands, I believe? A.—In the summer time, from sixty to 100.

Q.—During what period of the year would those men be employed? A.—From May to November.

Q.—Do they get any employment during the rest of the year? A.—We employ a good many around our yard in the winter, but not so many as in the summer. We employ a great many in the woods to get out logs; but many of the men, with families, prefer to remain at home, and get employment where they can.

Q.—Could you find employment in the shanties for them? A.—Yes; we could find employment in the shanties, but not at our mills.

Q.—Would they be able to work in the shanties? A.—Yes; but, as men become old, and have families, they do not like to go to the woods.

Q.—Do they get employment at any other work? A.—They do around the city, mostly.

Q.—Working in the city, in the summer time, how many hours a day do they work? A.—Ten hours, from seven to six, with one hour for dinner.

Q.—Are they all men so employed? A.—Yes; they are all men. I think there are three or four boys out of seventy-five or 100 men.

Q.—Do they require very much skill to do the work you give them? A.—Some of them, such as sawyers, who run our saws, and edgers, and butters around the mill. They are all the more capable, after having had some experience in the saw mill. There are, of course, no skilled mechanics.

Q.—How long a time would they require to work in order to acquire that special knowledge, needful? A.—A good man, a smart active fellow, would learn to be a sawyer, if he had been around a mill two or three years.

Q.—What wages do your men earn? A.—We give them \$2.00 a day, that is, the sawyers, who run our saws, earn from \$1.50 to \$2.00.

Q.—And what do you pay the unskilled men? A.—We give them \$1.10 to \$1.25 for ten hours.

Q.—How frequently do you pay your men? A.—We pay our men every Friday night.

Q.—Do you consider Friday the best day in the week for pay day? A.—I do. I have been employer of labour for forty years. Twenty-five years ago, when I was living in Three Rivers, I adopted the plan of paying on Friday night, and I can say without exaggeration, that I have never failed since then to pay all due to my men on Friday evening, simply in order to give them an opportunity of going to Saturday's market with the money.

Q.—Do you find any great difficulty, or any great increase of labor in paying your men once a week? A.—We find no difficulty, so far as we are concerned, and I think it is a great convenience to them. So far as regards myself, in regard to the increased amount of clerical work necessary, we consider nothing of that inconvenience, so long as it is the means of giving such a convenience to the men.

Q.—Do you know of any reason why ordinary manufacturing establishments should not pay their hands every week? A.—No reason at all, except the reason given by those establishments, that it would be a little inconvenience to them, where there is a large amount of clerical work to be done, if the men were paid every week.

Q.—Would that clerical work be trifling in proportion to the benefits derived by the men from the weekly payment? A.—I consider it so. In my opinion it is no great inconvenience to any employer, compared to the great convenience to the men.

Q.—The great advantage to the men much more than overbalances the little inconvenience to the employer? A.—I think so. A man paid every week will be better off at \$1.00 a day than he will be at \$1.10 or \$1.15 if he is paid once a month, for the reason that payment monthly places the poor man in the power of the store-keeper so to speak, who has risks to run and the man has to pay higher for his goods in consequence.

Q.—That is your opinion based on an experience of forty years? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you engaged in any other industry besides lumbering? A.—Yes; I am largely engaged in the Cotton industry, and have been so for 12 or 14 years.

Q.—As a director or as a stockholder? A.—As a stockholder and President of some companies—I have taken a very active part in the management of some companies.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—What Companies are those? A.—The Montreal Cotton Company, the Valleyfield Company, that is the one located at Valleyfield, the Magog Print Works, the Coaticooke Company located at Coaticooke, and the Merchants' Company at St. Henri.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Are you able to give us an idea of the ages of the youngest children employed in the Cotton Mills? A.—I have seen some whose age has not exceeded ten years, if not a little younger. In fact I have seen many not exceeding ten years.

Q.—Do you think those children are old enough to perform the duties required of them in a Cotton Mill? A.—They are to a certain extent. The nature of the work at which they are employed is very light, probably picking up threads which are broken on the ring frames, but at which work they are kept pretty busily engaged if they attend to it properly, and if they do not they are no use. There are other parts of the work at which they are not kept employed so closely.

Q.—Do you think children of ten years of age are able to attend to that work during those hours? A.—If they are looked after some are—they are as a general rule; but I don't think it is advisable to have them there if it is possible to avoid it, as I think they should be at school.

Q.—Do you think they are frequently punished? A.—I have never heard of any punishments being given them in my experience. Of course they have to be looked after in order to see that they keep their work up, and if they don't pick up the threads that break they are reproved. I never heard of any physical punishment being administered.

Q.—Have you heard they have been fined? A.—I never heard of children being fined. It is a very common thing to fine adult weavers, especially where they make defective cloth. I never heard of children being fined for dereliction of duty.

Q.—Do you know of any children who work in those mills in the winter bare-footed? A.—I have seen them occasionally that way, but I think that would be no objection to the child, in fact they prefer it, I suppose, where there are clean floors and warm rooms. The rooms as a general thing are pretty warm.

Q.—Are they not required to go from building to building where the rooms are not connected? A.—Not in our buildings.

Q.—And often out into the snow? A.—No; I don't think it. I do not know any mills with which I am associated or connected that are so connected as to necessitate those children to move from one building to another and have to go out into the weather to do so.

Q.—Do not some of the children go home without any shoes? A.—I have never seen it. It may be so in the summer time, but I have never seen anything of that sort.

Q.—Do you think it is advisable to have children of such tender years at that work at all? A.—I don't think so; but I suppose many are necessitated to do so from the fact that their parents probably earn very little, not sufficient to keep a large family unless the little fellows are sent to work at tender years.

Q.—Do you know of parents living in idleness while their children earn sustenance for the family? A.—No; I do not.

Q.—Have you heard complaints of that kind made in that direction at all? A.—No; I have not.

Q.—Can you give us any idea of the class of immigrants who are coming to this country now? A.—I happen to be on the Board of the Outdoor Relief of the Protestant Board of Industry where I spent this morning. I know the applicants there are largely made up of new comers, people who have been brought out to this country under false pretences, no doubt many times, people who are not suitable to this country and who are not brought out at a suitable time; many of them were induced to come out here by commission agents employed by steamboat companies regardless as to the time they came out so long as the man got his commission and the steamboat owners their fees. They are brought out in the fall when there is nothing whatever for them to do here and a class of people are brought out who are not suitable for this country at any time, that is to say, they are largely composed of unskilled laborers from cities. If they were unskilled farm laborers coming here at the proper season of the year no doubt they would do well enough; but they are

largely unskilled laborers from cities who are not at all suitable for anything we have to do here.

Q.—Have they families as a rule? A.—Several of those who made application this morning have families. One woman had six children and her husband had nothing to do, and could not get anything to do; they came here two or three months ago. There are a great many of that kind of applicants at the House of Industry. Sometimes I have made enquiries from the parties who have come there, and I have been told that the husband had obtained work but owing to the fact of having to wait for his pay for six weeks it necessitated their throwing themselves on the Outdoor Relief for means of support. This seems to be the custom of some concerns in the city. One of the largest concerns in this city keeps two weeks wages back to begin with, and does not pay till the end of the month, making six weeks during which a man will be working before he gets any money with which to buy necessities, and this compels the families in some cases to go to the House of Industry to get Outdoor Relief for their support.

Q.—Do you know of any adults that have been sent to this country or have been encouraged by those steamship companies to come to this country who have been inmates of poor houses in the old country? A.—Yes; we have had some experience of that both at the St. George's Home and in the House of Industry and within the last year we have sent back two or three. We raised money to send them back to the old country.

Q.—Were many of those physically incapable of doing work? A.—That was the reason why they were sent back; we induced them to return, and we raised money to send them, because they were not able to earn their livelihood here.

Q.—Are there many who are physically able to earn their livelihood here, not likely, on account of their bad habits, to become self-supporting? A.—I think, as a general thing, the immigrants who are applying this year, are mostly young people who cannot obtain employment. The older ones who are applying for relief, are people who have not been in this country many years, and many of them are brought there by intemperate habits.

Q.—Have you any knowledge of boys or girls who are sent to this country by charitable organizations? A.—No.

By Mr. WALSH:

Q.—Do you know whether the ventilation and other matters connected with the sanitary arrangements in the cotton factories are perfect, or as nearly perfect as possible? A.—At St. Henri Mill, I know everything is well arranged in that way, and it has a good system of drainage. There are, however, special arrangements made, like what you would see in a well ordered house; but I think, as a general thing, it is in good condition in that respect—well ventilated where necessary—and it has good drainage.

Q.—I suppose there are females working in those factories? A.—Yes; many of them; mostly females.

Q.—Are the the water closets for the different sexes in those factories separate? A.—Yes; those for the women are entirely separated from those for the men.

Q.—Is the conduct of the hands generally good? A.—As good as could be expected, with such a number of young people associated together.

Q.—No complaints? A.—Not that I know of. In large factories lighted by gas the air, after the factory has been lighted up, is not of course the best. It becomes vitiated from the great quantity of gas burnt, and the heat of the rooms becomes uncomfortable sometimes.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Do you consider running wood machines dangerous? A.—In a saw mill, you mean?

Q.—Yes. A.—They are, if not properly arranged and protected.

Q.—Are competent men always employed at this kind of work? A.—Always men of experience.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You speak for yourself? A.—Yes; I have had large experience in sawing for nearly forty years, in some of the largest mills in the country, and since I have been in Montreal, I have not seen an accident of any consequence to occur in our mill for probably twenty years.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Did you ever know instances where a man who lost a hand or an arm received any recompense from his employers? A.—I do not remember that I ever did.

Q.—Do competent men ever get hurt? A.—Very rarely. In my experience, a boy once got his arm pulled off, but it was wholly through his own carelessness.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Have you not known competent men to meet with accidents the same as inexperienced men do? A.—Not in my experience. Of course I know it from reading in the newspapers, as I sometimes do, that a man has got cut in two and a good man at that, and that a man by some mishap has got killed; but in my own experience I have never had any men hurt in that way either competent or incompetent.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Will you tell the Commission the earnings of men employed in lumbering in the shanties? A.—Our people this year are getting from \$18.00 to \$24.00 a month and board; those are the wages paid to our ordinary choppers and teamsters. In the spring of the year when we come to drive, we have a different scale of wages; we then pay \$1.25 and \$1.50 a day for driving, and the experienced, and first-class men will receive \$2.00 a day.

Q.—Do you find any difficulty in getting competent men to go to the shanties? A.—Not generally.

Q.—Are the men generally anxious to go to the shanties? A.—They like to go to the shanties not very far from home in preference to those very far. My lumbering operations are on the River Rouge, and as there is a pretty large population on the lower part of the river there is not much difficulty in getting what we want.

Q.—About how long does the lumbering season last? A.—The men generally go into the shanties in October and remain there till about the 20th of March, and those who do not remain for the drive are home about that time. Those who remain for the drive do not get through till the middle or end of June.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are those men paid weekly wages while they are in the shanties? A.—No. They are hired by the month and paid by the month.

Q.—Do they get any clothing, boots or shees and so on while they are up in the shanties? A.—No; not unless they want them.

Q.—Do any of the men ever ask for them? A.—Not that I know of. They are engaged by the month and expect to be paid by the month. We could not very well pay them any other way when they are so far distant from the office and centres of population. When I said that I paid my men every Friday, I had reference to men employed around the mill where there are means of doing it.

By Mr. CLARKE:—

Q.—Can you tell us anything more in regard to the way you manage the payment of your men in the shanties? A.—When they want a few dollars they can

have them, and in regard to those with families at home we pay their families or wives so much while the husband or heads of the families are away.

Q.—When are they paid in full? A.—When they come out of the shanties.

Q.—Have they to wait any time for their money? A.—No; not with me.

Q.—Are the logs cut by special contract? A.—Yes; mostly, the driving is done by the day. We pay our drivers by the day not by the month.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you not require men of extra skill for driving? A.—Yes. Good drivers receive \$3.00 a day, while common drivers will receive only \$1.00 or \$1.25.

Q.—Are accidents frequent? A.—Occasionally we loose a man from drowning, but not very often. In these cases again it is very often due to the man's own carelessness. We lost one man two years ago while running a rapid. In order to save themselves the trouble of portaging the men undertook to run through the rapid and the boat was swamped and one man was drowned.

Q.—Did you give any recompense to anyone under those circumstances? A.—No.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Where do you carry on your lumbering operations? A.—On the River Rouge, a tributary of the Ottawa, where I have carried on operations for the last twenty year. I have also done lumbering on the St. Maurice, and up the Maskinonge.

By Mr. CLARKE:

Q.—Your lumbering is done on territories purchased from the Government? A.—Lands leased from the Government.

Q.—Where are the logs scaled? A.—On the banks, when they are hauled out of the woods, or on the ice.

Q.—How are the sub-contractors paid, by the scale of the woods'-scaler? A.—Yes.

JAMES O'BRIEN, Wholesale Clothier, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—You are a wholesale clothier, I understand? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you hear the testimony given a short time ago by Mr. Shorey? A.—No.

Q.—Is your work done in your establishment, or outside? A.—Almost all of it is done outside, that is to say, the making up is done outside, and the cutting, and preparing work is done inside.

Q.—Are you able to tell us how much a sewing-woman, who makes this clothing, can earn in a week? A.—I cannot tell you. Most of this work is done by families, the mother and daughters working together, and we pay so much per piece, trousers so much, coat so much, vest so much, and overcoat so much.

Q.—Are you able to tell us what those prices are? A.—Yes; I can give you a pretty good idea of what they are. They vary according to the quality of the work, and the way in which they are made, more being paid for the finer goods than for the coarser goods.

Q.—Take an average overcoat, what do you pay a dozen for them? A.—All the way from sixty cents to \$1.50.

Q.—That would be a heavy woollen overcoat, I suppose? A.—A heavy overcoat.

Q.—For ordinary overcoats, what would you pay? A.—I think from about fifty cents up to \$1.50, according to the quality of the goods, and the work done.

Q.—Take light summer coats, what would you pay for them? A.—Linens and dusters from about twenty cents to forty cents.

Q.—For woolen vests what do you pay? A.—Vests vary from about fifteen cents for the commonest to about forty cents or about fifty cents for the finest.

Q.—For linen vests how much do you pay? A.—From fifteen to twenty-five cents, the prices vary according to the quality.

Q.—For woolen trousers what do you pay? A.—They vary from the commonest ones for lumbering hands as low as twelve and a half up to thirty cents.

Q.—For linen and cotton trousers for summer wear what do you pay? A.—Those will come under what we call overalls. I think they will run about one dollar a dozen. I am not swearing as to the accuracy of these prices, but I am giving them to the best of my recollection.

Q.—Do you make any shirts in your factory? A.—A few.

Q.—What do you pay for shirts? A.—I think from one dollar to two dollars a dozen.

Q.—Does that include the whole of the work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Washing and ironing also? A.—We don't go into fine shirts—not into linen shirts. These prices are for workingmen's shirts—shirts used by shantymen and railway men, and people of that sort.

Q.—Have you heard of shirts being made for fifty cents a dozen in Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is much of your work done by sub-contractors? A.—I don't know what you mean by sub-contractors.

Q.—A man or a woman who takes work out and employs a number of others to work for them? A.—Some work is done in that way; but they are direct contractors with us, and they employ their own hands. There are lots of people of that kind, particularly Jews, and some of them employ ten, twenty or thirty hands, for all I know.

Q.—You have no connection with those hands? A.—We have nothing to do them.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Are there a special class of operatives who make buttonholes? A.—We have a man who makes the buttonholes by machinery.

Q.—Are the prices named by you in addition to the prices you pay for buttonholes; or do they include buttonholes? A.—The buttonholes are extra over and above the prices stated. They are made at so much per hundred.

Q.—Do you supply the thread for the work? A.—All trimmings, thread, buttons, and everything, but the buttonhole maker supplies his own silk and everything else.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Could you give us one or two names of those people who employ their help outside? A.—Yes; I could hand you the names of some of them.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you know how many woolen shirts a woman would make in ten hours? A.—I do not. I can tell you this much, that a good hand will make as many as two ordinary hands. Our work is work all done outside, and it is sent to the villages around Montreal, St. Rose, St. Remi, and all throughout the country districts around here we have hundreds of hands.

Q.—In what part of the Dominion do you find your largest market? A.—We do a business from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Cape Breton and Halifax to British Columbia. While in one part of the country trade may be bad this year it may be good in another part.

Q.—Can you compete with the Western firms, such as the firms in Hamilton?
A.—Yes.

Q.—Take a pair of pants which you sell for \$3.50 under the sub-contract system—
A.—I don't understand what you mean by the sub-contract system.

Q.—A party engaging to work for you and re-letting the work out? A.—We have not that class of people as a rule. The people who make pants for us are women who have their families, and who in addition to their own labor and that of their families employ some girls at so much per week. Sometimes a pair of pants selling for \$3.50 does not cost any more to us than a pair selling for \$1.50, \$2 or \$2.50.

Q.—Do you pay all the hands out of the establishment who make goods for you?
A.—No hand leaves our house any day of the week without being paid—we pay every day in the week. As work is received, the foreman or assistant foreman gives the party a ticket and they go downstairs to the office and get the money due. No hand leaves our house without being paid for the work done.

HENRY MORTON, Stationer, Bookbinder and Printer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How many hands do you employ? A.—41 in the bindery, 14 in the printing office, total 55.

Q.—How many journeymen printers do you employ? A.—Four.

Q.—Do they work by the week or by the piece? A.—By the week.

Q.—How much per week do they receive? A.—From \$11 to \$15.

Q.—Are they constantly employed in your establishment? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many hours constitute a week's work with you? A.—57½ hours constitute a week's work.

Q.—Have you any other people in the printing office other than the hands?
A.—Yes; we have boys.

Q.—How many boys have you? A.—We have nine boys and four men.

Q.—How old is the youngest boy, and how long has he been at the business?
A.—We have one boy as young as 12½. He has been with us four or five months. We did not want to take him and we refused to receive him, but his father came and asked us as a special favor to take him. I took him for that reason. We don't want any boy less than 14½ or 15 years of age, which is our limit.

Q.—How much per week does that boy receive? A.—During his first year he receives \$1.75 a week.

Q.—How many boys have you on piece work? A.—We have none on piece work.

Q.—Are they all on day work? A.—Yes; we have none on piece work.

Q.—Those men to whom you pay \$15, what do they do? A.—They are compositors and pressmen. We have a pressman at \$12, a foreman at \$15 and compositors at \$11 or \$10.

Q.—How many compositors have you working at \$11 or \$10 who work constantly at case? A.—Two at \$11 and one at \$10. I am not quite certain on the point.

Q.—Have you any girls setting type. A.—No.

Q.—Do you not consider the type set by a boy is worth as much to the proprietor as type set by a journeyman? A.—No.

Q.—Are not both types published for public criticism? A.—Our work is entirely job work.

Q.—Is not the type as valuable when proof is read where it as been set by a boy or set by a man, is it not worth as much in the estimation of the proprietor? A.—It takes a longer time and costs more. So far as regards the work when it is finished

it may be as good work, but it costs more to set. A boy works lower than a man of course.

Q.—You consider employing a boy is detrimental to your establishment? A.—Certainly not or we would not employ them.

Q.—You say that it takes longer to correct type set by a boy? A.—Yes; there are more errors in it and it takes a longer time.

Q.—Does a boy correct his own type or is it corrected by a journeyman? A.—A competent foreman examines it, and the boy as a rule makes his own corrections, or sometimes the foreman does it for him. But I may say that I am not a practical printer, I am a bookbinder; my partner is a printer.

Q.—How many journeyman bookbinders have you in your employ? A.—We have nine men.

Q.—What is the rate of wages made by them? A.—From \$7 to \$14 per week.

Q.—What wages would be about a fair average, do you think? A.—The wages would average, I think, about \$11.00.

Q.—Do they work in the office as long as printers? A.—The same hours, and we have the same rule applying to them.

Q.—Do you employ any female bookbinders? A.—We have eleven girls working for us.

Q.—Are they paid by the week? A.—Yes; they are paid by the week.

Q.—What are the average wages paid those girls? A.—They earn from \$1.50 to \$6.00. They get \$1.50 for two months, while they are learning, and after that they earn what they can.

Q.—How many are employed at \$1.50 per week? A.—Three. They get that sum during two months, while they are learning, and afterwards they earn what they can.

Q.—How long are they required to serve at the folding business before they become competent hands? A.—Our business is not bookfolding, but it is entirely blank books, not publications. Our girls are employed at feeding machines, sewing, and folding blank account books.

Q.—How long has a girl to work at the trade, before you consider her a competent hand? A.—Two or three years; some are competent in one year, and others are not in four.

Q.—Do you indenture these young women? A.—No.

Q.—Do you indenture the boys? A.—Yes; all our boys are bound.

Q.—For how long are they indentured to you? A.—For five years, as a rule, some five and a half years. If a boy comes to us at fifteen he stays five, if he comes younger, then he stops till he is twenty years.

Q.—In taking on apprentices to the printing business do you question them in regard to their education? A.—Yes; always.

Q.—And you take that as a proof, whether the boy would be worth taking on or not? A.—We always take a boy on trial, for two or three months, before he is bound.

Q.—Do you believe in the indenturing of apprentices to the printing business? A.—Most decidedly so, both for the sake of the boy, and the master. Boys become better workmen, and are under better control, and the master's interests are better served, as well as the boys' interest—in fact it is to the interest of both parties that boys should be indentured.

Q.—Is it job work that you do in your shop? A.—It is entirely job work, commercial job work altogether.

Q.—Have you any unfair competition in job printing in Montreal? A.—We don't feel it in our business at all.

Q.—Is there not job work done in the Reformatory, and in some of the charitable institutions here? A.—I believe there is, but it does not hurt our business.

Q.—Do you know whether it is a matter of fact? A.—No; only by report.

Q.—Do your journeymen remain long with you? A.—Yes; we have, however, had the printing office only for about eight years; we have had our bindery for ten years.

Q.—Do you do ruling? A.—Yes

Q.—Have you machines? A.—We have five ruling machines in operation, we got one new one last week.

Q.—What would be the average weekly wages paid to a first class ruler? A.—About \$12 a week.

Q.—Is that the standard wages paid to a first class ruler? A.—I cannot speak for other shops. I know that the rate ranges from \$10.00 to \$15.00 per week for a good ruler, they are always scarce.

Q.—Do you know whether there are rulers in Montreal receiving less than \$12 per week wages? A.—I don't know them personally.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you think there are some who are not worth \$12? A.—Yes.

Q.—You would not like to pay \$15 per week to such hands? A.—I would rather not pay \$10 or \$8 in some cases; in fact I would not have them at all.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Then, you pay \$8 for one who is not a first-class hand? A.—No.

Q.—I thought you said you do that? A.—No; we have not got them.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are there females employed on press in Montreal? A.—I don't know, as a matter of fact, but I believe there are.

Q.—Could you tell us what they earn? A.—No; I am not a printer. My partner is a printer.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Have there been any accidents in your shop? A.—We have had a very small accident, such as a man getting part of his finger taken off in a machine.

Q.—No serious accidents? A.—Not since I have been in the business.

Q.—Have you had any accidents connected with any hoist in your establishment? A.—Yes; a stranger, about a month ago, walked down the hoist.

Q.—What happened to him? A.—He fell about eight or nine feet, that is all.

Q.—Did he break any bones? A.—No; he was stunned and taken to the hospital, and we paid all expenses.

Q.—How long did he remain in the hospital? A.—Two days; he had no bones broken at all.

Q.—Were there any guards at the opening to the hoist? A.—There was a guard. We have the hoist for taking customers up to the bindery. This young man had been up to the bindery after dark, and he came back a second time. And let me here say that we always send an employee up the hoist with anyone who goes. The hoist is at the back of the shop. It is built against a back building outside, and you go out the back door into a large porch. It was dark. The young man lifted up the bar, he thought the hoist was there, and stepped down into the cellar. We paid his doctor's bill, for his lost time and his soiled clothes. Since then, we have put an automatic door on the hoist, so that when the hoist is away the door is shut, and when the hoist comes down the door opens.

STEDMAN A. LEBOURVEAU, Advocate, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—What position do you occupy? A.—I am Secretary and Solicitor of the Law and Order League of Montreal.

Q.—Will you please tell us your experience in connection with the League and its action as regards licenses? A.—Although, I have only been connected with the Law and Order League for the past six months, and that body has only been in existence about a year I have had a great deal of experience in connection with licenses during the past six or seven years. Every year I have been actively engaged in the work.

Q.—Has the number of licenses been increased of late years? A.—The number of licenses has increased during the past few years very rapidly in proportion that the population has increased.

Q.—Where are the taverns generally situated or the large proportion of them? A.—We find, on an examination of the city, that they group around the docks where the sailors are, and around the manufacturing establishments and around some of the markets. For instance in the western portion of the city there are very few licensed places. On the other hand, in Griffintown, in the neighborhood of the manufacturing establishments, there are many, as there are also in the neighborhood of the C. P. R. station and the Cotton factories and so on where there are many workmen. I suppose the holders of those licenses are wise business men and they group their establishments where there is most custom.

Q.—What do you consider to be the number of unlicensed places from what you have been able to judge? A.—The number has been estimated from 1,000 to 1,500 unlicensed places in Montreal. The figures have been given by the License Inspector, by the government and by the police authorities. I am not prepared to say exactly which is correct, but the different figures are 1,000, 1,200 and 1,500. We have this difficulty that nearly all licensed places are selling illegally. The grocers who are supposed to sell by the bottle only, sell in nine cases out of ten on an average, by the glass, and are productive of immensely more mischief than the saloons. We, in the course of our work, have successfully prosecuted a large number of these cases, and the Magistrates from the Bench have publicly reprimanded those people and stated that it was an outrage on the saloons and hotels who paid large licenses for the privilege of selling by the glass. Under the law there is an alternative of fine or imprisonment in such cases. The penalties for selling without a license are \$95 fine for the first offence, \$195 fine for an offence committed after the first conviction, and for the third offence, after the second conviction, imprisonment without the option of a fine. The penalty for grocers selling by the glass or allowing liquor to be drunk on the premises, is \$75 fine in every case. The penalty for restaurants and hotel keepers selling after hours or on Sundays is from \$30 to \$75 for the first offence, for the second offence a fine of \$75, and for the third offence a fine of \$200. In all those cases the penalty is a fine, or in default of the payment of the fine, imprisonment, except in the case of the third offence for persons selling without a license, and then it is imprisonment without the option of a fine.

Q.—Are there many hotels who sell on Sunday to people outside who are not regular boarders? A.—I think nearly all the hotels and nearly all the restaurants in Montreal sell right along on Sunday.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—In regard to those people who sell without licenses at the present time, have they ever had licenses or have the licenses been taken from them, or are they people who have been carrying on this illegal trade for some time? A.—The large proportion of them never had any licenses. Those people are composed principally of the keepers of fast houses, and all those little sweet and cigar establishments that are scattered through the city.

Q.—Has their trades existed for any length of time to your knowledge? A.—Certainly.

Q.—It is not new in Montreal? A.—It is not new at all in Montreal, and it is not new anywhere.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you taken out many suits against those unlicensed people? A.—Our action has been more especially with regard to the grocers selling by the glass. We have paid considerable attention to Griffintown, and to the section of the city west of Bleury street; our work so far as has been very little east of Bleury. We proposed to take that section first and after we had gone through it take other sections of the city afterwards. We have had very good success. When we first started our work we went on the voluntary system; that is to say, people came to us and volunteered to give us cases. They would give us the names of unlicensed places, and the names of witnesses, but they refused to go into the box themselves. The Committee tried that plan, but they were compelled to abandon it because in only one case in which we tried to secure a conviction in that way did we succeed. In every other case our witness swore directly against us. The Committee then came to the conclusion that the only way to succeed was to pursue the same course at the Revenue Department and employ men of their own. We engaged detectives who swore out the information, got up the evidence and went into the box themselves.

Q.—Do you find those cases generally contested and all possible impediments thrown in your way by outside influences? A.—Of course people in that position do not like to pay fines, and in order to, if possible, avoid it they employ lawyers to fight us. We have had very hard fights, some cases lasting from eleven o'clock to five in the afternoon, and we have had eight or nine witnesses against us in one case. But notwithstanding that those parties have brought all their influence against us and brought forward many witnesses in order to defeat us, we were successful.

Q.—Have you had cases where witnesses for the unlicensed parties have come forward and sworn directly the contrary to your witnesses? A.—Certainly this has occurred in several cases. In one case they had six or seven witnesses who swore positively against our witnesses, but the trouble was that their witnesses swore too much so that the Magistrate on the Bench said their evidence was not allowable. One of the Magistrates was prejudiced against us at the outset, but after seeing our men in the box so often and hearing them give their evidence he came to the conclusion—as Justice Desnoyers said—that those men will tell the truth and do tell the truth.

Q.—Will you explain the reason why you commenced your work in Griffintown? A.—When we commenced at first with our voluntary evidence the people who gave us work were French. They gave us work against the French. A charge to this effect was then made; you are a Protestant Institution and are making a raid on us as French, while the majority of the people connected with your institution are English and live at the other end of the city. That led us to commence our work west of Bleury, and we naturally got down towards Griffintown, because, in the upper part of the western portion of the city very little of this sort is going on.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What attempts are made to suppress unlicensed places? A.—The only thing that can be done is to bring them up before the Courts, and have them fined as frequently and severely as possible.

Q.—Do your detectives try and get evidence against those places? A.—Yes.

Q.—As well as against the groceries? A.—Yes. We try to work against the three classes of offenders.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Have they succeeded to any extent with regard to the unlicensed places?

A.—Not as much as they have against the others; their principal actions has been against the groceries. We consider they are the greatest evil of all. We consider that the licensed groceries where liquor is sold by the glass are greater evils than the restaurant or an hotel. I may mention here that there is no difference in the law between the restaurant and the saloon—they are the same. Sometimes one term is used and sometimes another. As regards a restaurant when a man goes in there to drink and goes independently and is known—he wants his drink. In the grocery a man will go there as if he was going on legitimate business to buy groceries and under cover of buying groceries he will obtain drink without the knowledge of an outside person. Again it very often happens that the woman of the house will go there and get liquor charged in bills as groceries. Very often a man finds that his grocery bill is exceedingly large, and he cannot understand it. He receives a large bill for legitimate groceries, while as a matter of fact a large portion of it is often for liquor sold to his wife.

By Mr. CLARKE :—

Q.—Where do the funds come from to carry on the work? A.—The principal part of the work is carried on as I have said by voluntary contributions. We get a portion of the fines, a certain portion goes to the Government in every case, and the balance, if action is taken by the License Inspector, goes to him or the informer. If the action is taken by us it goes into the the general fund of our work. We pay our men stated wages and they have no interest whatever in the fines. Thus far it has been necessary to call on the generosity of our friends very heavily; as a matter of fact two of our Committee are out over \$100 for this work.

Q.—You solicit subscriptions? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Are the unlicensed places known to the police? A.—It is very difficult to say, but when the police report that there are about 1,000 unlicensed places in the city they must have some knowledge of them. They gave me a long list of fast houses and nearly all are supposed to sell liquor.

Q.—Are the cigar stores where liquor is sold known to the police? A.—Oh, yes; but it is one thing to know in our own mind that a person is breaking the law, and it is another thing to get the necessary evidence to convict him. Our courts will not go on general knowledge, they must have positive proof, and they are very sharp in this matter.

Q.—Do the detectives employed by your society become known? A.—Yes; they are not getting any cases at present, they are so well known. We shall have to take other means to carry on our work.

Q.—Is drunkenness increasing in Montreal? A.—I think the natural conclusion will be that if the number of places are increasing, the effect of the places must be increasing also. It cannot be any other way, and if the number of licensed places has increased from 600 or 700 a few years ago to 1,000, it indicates that they must make money, and if they do so they sell an increased amount of liquor, and the natural consequence, to my mind, is that drunkenness must increase with it. The records of the police in Montreal for a number of years past show that the number of cases brought before the Recorder's Court has largely increased, probably in the same proportion as the number of places.

Q.—Do you think the actual number of crimes has increased, or the vigilance of the police has increased? A.—I think that crime has increased. We may be mistaken, but there is a general impression around that a large portion of the police do not see it, because they do not wish to see it.

By Mr. CLARKE :—

Q.—What is the percentage of commitments before the Recorder's Court caused by intemperance? A.—I cannot say as to that; but the general impression of the

authorities is that two-thirds or three-fourths of the crime is caused either directly or indirectly by the use of intoxicating liquors.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are you able to give the Commission any information in regard to the number of men absent from their work on Monday or any day immediately following pay day? A.—I cannot speak as to that—some of the manufacturing establishments would be better able to speak in regard to it; but I have heard manufacturers complain that on the Monday after pay day they find it difficult to get their men to work, and some establishments have almost to shut down. The men get their pay on Saturday night; they will take very little of their pay home, and they will be spreeing all day Sunday, and they will take all Monday to get over it, and sometimes longer.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Will you in a few words outline the duties of your society? A.—We take up two lines of work. We act as a central committee for parties interested in opposing licenses, and that is the work we are entering upon just now; the applications for licenses are coming in, and we are opposing certain applications. Then, in addition to that, our general work is to secure convictions for all violations of the license law. We confine our work under that head to groceries selling by the glass, and allowing liquor to be drunk on the premises, and to restaurants, hotels and saloons selling liquor on Sundays and to those selling without license. That is our special work under that head.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What does it cost to procure a license in Montreal? A.—I could not tell you just now. If you wish I will send you a statement of the License Law and the license fee charged.

By Mr. CLARKE:—

Q.—Do you think a higher license would curtail drinking? A.—We have had no experience in regard to that. I know it has been so stated in the papers, but I have no personal knowledge in regard to the subject, and I have not looked into the matter specially.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you think there is food for thought as to whether it is desirable that the Law and Order League should take up such subjects as the mismanagement of private banks, swindling by real estate agents, and the usury practiced by money lenders? A.—I know there are many members of the committee who think that eventually the League will have to branch out into some other lines; as we have just got started it has not yet been possible to do so. Of course, we commenced with small means, depending entirely on voluntary contributions, and we have had our hands full in following our present lines of action. The society cannot take up others at present, I think; but eventually we will branch in other directions.

Q.—Is the membership of the society increasing? A.—In regard to that I may say it is. The Dominion Alliance have a branch in every province, and, while we call our society the Law and Order League, of Montreal, it is simply a committee of the Quebec Branch of the Dominion Alliance. The movement originated in Boston, and about a year ago Mr. Dudley, of Boston, Secretary of the League, came here, and an organization was effected. They organized first as a separate organization, but for fear there might be some jealousy between the two institutions, as the Alliance had been doing part of the work, they amalgamated and became a Committee of the Alliance; and so, while six or seven gentlemen compose the committee, they have the whole body of the Alliance back of them.

Q.—So far it is purely a temperance organization? A.—Yes; but we will probably later on extend our operations.

By Mr. CLARKE :—

Q.—How many objectionable places do you think are licensed in the 1100 mentioned? A.—I think, if the law was carried out in each case, nearly half of them would be wiped out. A large number out of those that are licensed are hotels and small drinking places, and the same applies to restaurants. The intention of the law is not to license a mere drinking place, but to license a place where meals are served, and, having that qualification, the keeper of the establishment is allowed to sell liquor; but in a great many cases there is nothing served in the shape of food, except, perhaps, a mutton pie handed across the counter. In regard to groceries I may say that a very large proportion of them, I do not know but what you may say half, sell liquor with a few groceries put in in to cover the law.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—As to the abuses practiced by private vendors; do you think such abuses are very prevalent in Montreal? A.—I hardly think abuses have been very prevalent, not to such a degree as might be imagined from a case recently brought to light. There has been, however, more or less of it. If people want money very badly there are always those who will take advantage of them and drive as hard a bargain with them as possible. In my estimation one of the greatest benefits that could be conferred on the working classes, would be the removal of this evil use of intoxicating liquor. When a man who receives \$3.00 or \$9.00 a week, takes only a small portion of his money to his family, other evils are small compared with it.

EUGENE HERSEY, General Superintendent of the Mill Street Works of Pillow, Hersey & Co., Nail Manufacturers, etc., Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—How many men do you employ at your works? A.—At the Mill Street Works we employ about 230 men, boys and girls.

Q.—How many boys have you? A.—I suppose perhaps 50 or 40.

Q.—How many girls have you employed? A.—About 20 at present.

Q.—What is the duty of the girls in connection with the Nail Works? A.—Those in connection with our Tack works are running what we call Leather Heading machines, machines to put leather heads on carpet tacks. Others are running what we call capping machines, machines to put fancy heads on nails.

Q.—How many boys do you say you employ? A.—I think there are about 40 or in that neighborhood.

Q.—At what ages do these children enter your service? A.—I don't think we have any less than 12 or 14, and very few of them. They are no use to nailers unless they are about 14—it depends on their size.

Q.—What are the duties of the boys in your factory? A.—They feed tack machines and in the bolt department are nutting bolts and feeding threading machines for threading bolts.

Q.—You have them in connection with your nail works? A.—Yes; and the nut and bolt works are in the same place.

Q.—What hours do the hands generally work there? A.—The hours are from seven to twelve and from one to six, ten hours a day.

Q.—Is there any cessation of work on Saturday or any other day? A.—On Saturdays we close at five in the afternoon and during the summer we generally close at 12 when we can make arrangements to that effect.

Q.—Have you work for your hands all the year round in your factory? A.—Yes. We stop for a short time at Christmas and sometimes shut down two or three weeks for general repairs. In some of the branches of the trade we don't shut down at all, but keep running right along closing only on the holidays.

Q.—Do you find any disagreement between the workmen and employers? A.—Very seldom; occasionally some of the workpeople think they do not get high enough wages for what they do and if we can afford it we give them more and if not we tell them so and of course they can go somewhere else.

Q.—What wages do the men generally get? A.—Laboring men receive from \$1.00 to \$1.65 a day.

Q.—What are the duties of what you call laboring men there? A.—That varies a great deal; the handling and moving of iron and goods from one part of the room to another and from one branch of a department to another branch.

Q.—What constitutes the difference in wages? A.—It is a difference in the kind of work they do. Some work is very particular and requires a rather intelligent laboring man to perform it. There being so many sizes and different kinds of goods an intelligent man is required or he is liable to get them mixed.

Q.—What wages do your workmen get? A.—A skilled workman?

Q.—Yes. A.—A skilled workman receives from \$1.50 to \$6.00 a day.

Q.—How many of your men receive \$6.00 a day? A.—We have six or eight who do that at times. It depends on the class of work they are running on and the number of machines they are running.

Q.—What is the average wages of a boy, say from 14 to 15 years? A.—The wages run from 50 cents to \$1.00 a day.

Q.—Can a boy at 15 years earn \$1.00 a day? A.—Yes.

Q.—About what are the wages of the girls? A.—From 50 cents to \$1.00. We generally hire them, and pay 50 cents a day while they are learning to run the machines. We assume the loss in doing that, so as to get them to learn to do the work as quickly as possible. After that they are placed on piece work.

Q.—How long do they require to learn the business? A.—Some of them learn to be able to run the machines in two days, and others in two or three weeks. They never care to go on piece work until they are able to make more than they are receiving on day work.

Q.—In your factory, have you every regulation necessary for the ventilation and sanitation of your building? A.—As far as possible.

Q.—In the matter of water closets, have you taken care that the sexes are divided as far as possible? A.—They are exclusively divided.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are those boys employed by the firm directly, or by the men? A.—Those who work by the piece are employed by the firm, and some few of them by the men.

Q.—A man who earns \$6.00 a day, does he employ a boy to help him? A.—Yes.

Q.—And he pays the boy from what he earns? A.—Yes; from what he earns.

Q.—What wages will he pay the boy? A.—From 50 cents to \$1.00, according to the size of the boy and his ability.

Q.—Is the firm responsible for those boy's wages in any way? A.—They have never had occasion to be. On one or two occasions we have assumed the responsibility, when the men did not chose to pay—only on one occasion. We paid the boy out of the man's wages, and gave him the balance.

Q.—At what employment are the boys put, when they are hired by the men? A.—Feeding tack machines and shifting the plates.

Q.—Do any feed the nail machines? A.—As soon as they get large enough they strike out and get a job at feeding the nail machines.

Q.—Do any accidents occur to boys employed on those machines? A.—Very seldom. We have had one or two accidents, but they have not been serious.

Q.—Is sufficient care taken to see that the machinery is protected? A.—Yes; on those two occasions, accidents were due to the boys themselves, doing what they had no right to do. In one case, a boy was trying to see how far he could put his fingers into the machine without getting caught. He got caught, and his hand was taken in and the ends of some of his fingers were taken off.

Q.—Are the hoists properly protected in your establishment? A.—They are all enclosed.

Q.—You have never had any accidents with hoists, or with beltings? A.—Yes; we had an accident in connection with the hoist, and we had, also, one to a man while putting on a belt. We generally use a stick to throw the belt on; but in this case, the man piled a couple of boxes, and jumped up to put the strap on. His hand was caught in the belt and he was thrown over the belt, and one of his arms broken.

Q.—How did the accident in connection with the hoist occur? A.—We had an accident a short time ago, in connection with the hoist. A man went to the top flat, and a door closed behind. He opened the door again, never looking where he was, and fell down the hoist. That was due to his own negligence.

Q.—He was killed, of course? A.—No; he broke his arm. On another occasion a man broke his leg. That was caused by the man falling as the hoist was going up, and as the hoist came down it caught him.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Is trade increasing in the nail business? A.—It has been about the same for the last few years.

Q.—Is your output any more? A.—I cannot say it is a great deal more.

Q.—Where do you find your market for those nails and tacks? A.—From the lower Provinces to British Columbia.

Q.—Do you do much in the nut and bolt business? A.—We do considerable, equal to the capacity of our factory.

Q.—Do you do any blacksmithing in connection with your business? A.—We have two blacksmiths in connection with one of the departments.

Q.—Do you do anything except in connection with the bolts and nuts? A.—No.

Q.—You take no contract work in connection with blacksmithing? A.—No.

Q.—What kind of nails do you turn out as a general rule, what are their dimensions? A.—We make them all the way from what we call three-quarter inch to seven inch.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—In your factory do you pay a uniform scale of prices? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it the Pittsburg scale? A.—We pay about the same as they do in the United States.

Q.—Are you paying the same scale as they do in Hamilton? A.—I don't know what they are paying in Hamilton. I think we are paying about the same. If there is any other firm in the country paying any more than we do, we hear of it right away.

Q.—Do your men belong to labor organizations? A.—I cannot say, I think some of them do, I think the majority of them do.

Q.—Have you any objection in that direction? A.—We never made any objection to it, we never question their right to belong to any organization.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you not refuse to employ a non-Union man? A.—No; no one, if he is capable of doing our work, and he is a competent man.

THOMAS MONAGHAN, Moulder, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—At what kind of moulding are you employed? A.—General machinery moulding.

Q.—How long have you worked at the moulding business in Montreal? A.—I have worked at the moulding business here upwards of ten years.

Q.—Is the apprenticeship system a good one here? A.—No.

Q.—Will you explain the reasons why it is not a good one in your business? A.—Because the employer does not bind the apprentice. They have manufactured their apprentices lately.

Q.—How long do you think an apprentice should serve at your trade? A.—To turn out a proper mechanic he should serve seven years.

Q.—Are any apprentices indentured in Montreal? A.—There may be a few at the present time.

Q.—Is piece work a proper system to put men to work at in certain branches of the moulding trade? A.—Not at machinery moulding.

Q.—Is machinery work done by piece work here to any extent? A.—In the majority of cases it is done by piece work.

Q.—What are the sanitary conditions of the shop in which you work? A.—There are some shops in a very bad sanitary condition at present.

Q.—Have any complaints been made to the firm on account of it? A.—To my knowledge in certain firms where I have been employed complaints were made.

Q.—What was the result? A.—They paid no attention to them. They gave the complaints a deaf ear.

Q.—When hands are short is it difficult to get good moulders to come to Montreal? A.—You can procure good moulders in Montreal at any part of the year if they are properly paid.

Q.—That is generally the reason why they are scarce? A.—That is generally the reason—they don't pay the men properly.

Q.—Do you know anything in connection with loam moulding? A.—Yes.

Q.—Would it be a benefit to the boy in going through the trade to obtain a technical knowledge of drawing? A.—Yes; it would be an advantage to him in the different branches of the trade.

Q.—That knowledge would be of great benefit to him in loam moulding, I suppose? A.—Yes; it would be of great benefit to him while going through his apprenticeship.

Q.—Have you known of any moulder, on pay day, to have to wait for his pay and get cold on account of being exposed after a casting? A.—I have known them to wait upwards of one hour, but I have never known any of them to catch cold.

Q.—They could remain inside, I suppose? A.—Yes; they could remain in the foundry, but they prefer fresh air to the smoke and gas there.

Q.—They are not allowed to go into the pay office? A.—I don't think they would be.

Q.—Were they ever ordered outside of it? A.—I never went to the office myself.

Q.—Are the men always paid in full or are any wages retained? A.—Often complaints have been made to me that men were paid short on several occasions—not in the firm where I am employed now.

Q.—Were those cases ever rectified? A.—In several cases it was rectified—several cases that came under my own notice.

Q.—Does emigration affect the moulding trade? A.—Yes; severely.

Q.—Do the immigrants who come here as moulders generally work for less pay than the moulders are receiving in Montreal at the time? A.—They do in some cases; they are willing to accept anything to get work.

Q.—What would be the average wages of a moulder provided his wages were spread over the whole year? A.—Taking one year with another the wages would

amount to about \$1.40 a day ; that is allowing one bad season with another. I think that at the end of five years a man would have earned not more than \$1.40 a day.

Q.—Do you know anything connected with the moulding business at the Grand Trunk shops ? A.—Yes ; I have been there a while.

Q.—How are the men paid, by the day or by the hour ? A.—By the hour.

Q.—How much do they receive per hour ? A.—I have heard they receive from 14 to 25 cents.

Q.—Do you think 18 cents would be about the average ? A.—I have been paid 18 cents myself there.

Q.—How often are the men paid ? A.—Once a month.

Q.—Are they paid in full ? A.—Ten days are kept off.

Q.—Do you know the reason why ten-days' pay is kept back ? A.—I believe it is to give them a chance to make up their pay list.

Q.—Did you belong to the Benevolent Fund when you were connected with the Grand Trunk shops ? A.—I did not stay long enough to join it.

Q.—Have they any apprentices in connection with the Grand Trunk moulding shops ? A.—I could not say at present whether they have or not.

Q.—Under the present system in Montreal does an apprentice learn all the branches of the trade, or has he the privilege of doing so ? A.—He has the privilege of doing so if he is bound by agreement ; they don't, however, teach them all the branches, but they place him at one branch. Very often he comes out not a proper mechanic.

Q.—Is there any dangerous machinery in the shops such as a crane ? A.—I have heard strong complaints of shops in that regard, and I have known of some shops where machinery has come down on several occasions with myself.

Q.—You heard the last witness speak in regard to the water closets, what is your opinion in regard to that matter ? A.—I have heard that complaint also myself.

Q.—Do you think if there were baths and such conveniences constructed in the shops that men would take advantage of them ? A.—I think they would take advantage of them and they would be a great benefit to the moulders of Montreal if we had them.

Q.—Have you ever known a moulder to be blacklisted by the bosses ? A.—I have heard of men being out of employment for several months, upwards of one year and could not get a job, and they have blamed it on that.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How long have you lived in Montreal ? A.—I was born in Montreal.

Q.—Go back in your mind ten years and tell us if at any time there has been a scarcity of moulders in Montreal ? A.—Not to my knowledge ; you can always find plenty and too many sometimes.

Q.—Can you tell us what has been the increase in wages during the past seven or eight years ? A.—The increase has been only the last year, and it has been about ten per cent.

Q.—Then the wages have not materially increased during the past ten years ? A.—No.

Q.—Are the Moulders in the habit of remaining away from work ? A.—A certain class of moulders are, not what we might call moulders.

Q.—We are speaking now of moulders ; are they as a rule steady men at their work ? A.—Yes ; in general I have found them always steady when I had any dealings with them.

Q.—Have you ever noticed anything particular about them on Monday morning ? A.—In some cases I have.

Q.—In what percentage of the men did you notice that ? A.—Very often I have heard the men complain of being short and they have gone off and got a little excited.

Q.—Was the shortness of the pay the cause of what is technically known as a swelled head? A.—In some cases it has caused it.

Q.—You think the men as a rule are pretty steady at their work? A.—Yes; as a rule.

Q.—Can you give any information to the Commission beyond the questions that have been asked you? A.—As a rule in Montreal to-day the bosses take advantage of the moulders and the apprentices. They employ laboring men and put them on certain branches of the business and make what we call manufactured hands, and those men work for under pay, and the result is that the moulding branch is being destroyed at the present time.

Q.—What is the nature of the work on which those men are placed? A.—On plain castings and different classes of work. A man is employed in making one piece for a number of years.

Q.—Do those men take the place of skilled moulders? A.—Very often they do. Skilled men would have to be employed if those men were not there.

Q.—Does the employment of this unskilled labor on this class of plain work have a material effect on the wages? A.—Yes; it has a big effect on the wages.

Q.—Have you ever known unskilled men to take the place of skilled men for less wages? A.—No; it has never come under my notice.

Q.—You are here as a representative of the Moulders' Union, I believe? A.—Yes; I represent that Union at the present time.

Q.—Is the Moulders' Union in favor of an indenturing apprentice system? A.—They are fully in favor of an indenture system.

Q.—Does the Moulders' Union favor the principles of arbitration in settlement of disputes between capital and labor? A.—On certain conditions they do.

Q.—Please give us the conditions? A.—That the employers should have the privilege of appointing one arbitrator and the employes another and the Government a third, or the third to be appointed by the other two arbitrators.

Q.—Do you think arbitration under these circumstances should be compulsory? A.—I think so. Things would go on favorably in that way.

Q.—What is your opinion about the establishing of a Bureau of Labor Statistics for the Dominion? A.—I think it is required at the present time in Canada.

Q.—Do any proprietors of Moulding shops object to employing men belonging to labor organizations? A.—I heard some time ago they did object to moulders belonging to the Moulder's Union. I cannot say for myself as I never was blacklisted. I think some persons can say that.

Q.—Do the moulders here receive as much wages as are paid to moulders in Toronto? A.—Not under the day system.

Q.—Do they on piece work? A.—In some cases they receive more and some cases less.

Q.—Do you know if machinery moulding is done by piece work in Toronto? A.—Not to my knowledge, I understand at the present time it is all day work.

Q.—Have you ever worked on the other side? A.—I worked in Detroit.

Q.—How long ago was it since you worked in Detroit? A.—I think I worked in Detroit in 1882 if I am not mistaken, about that time.

Q.—Is there any difference between the wages paid to a moulder in Detroit as compared with the wages paid to a moulder in Montreal? A.—Yes; there is a difference. Over there all the men are paid alike and every man is paid to do his work and if he is not a competent man he will not be engaged.

Q.—Do moulders working the same number of hours in Detroit, earn more wages than they do here? A.—A moulder gets more wages there—he gets more and generally works day work.

Q.—Taking into consideration the cost of living there for a man and his family would you consider that a moulder is better off in Detroit than he is in Montreal? A.—I was a single man and I was better off in Detroit.

WILLIAM BOYD, Moulder, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—What branch of the moulding trade do you follow? A.—General bench moulding. I can work at the floor, that is, on machinery moulding.

Q.—Will you explain to the Commission the nature of bench moulding? A.—Bench moulding consists in the manufacture of small goods. You generally take the box off, leave the mould open, and put weights on. In regard to the large work, on the floor, it is quite different.

Q.—Is bench work done by the piece? A.—In the majority of shops it is all done by the piece.

Q.—Do you know that the pay of bench moulders is limited in any of the shops? A.—The average pay of a bench moulder is about \$1.50 or \$1.40, all the year round.

Q.—Provided they should make a little more than that, would the price, per piece, be reduced? A.—Yes; in a great many cases it has been so. It has been so with myself on several occasions where I made pretty fair wages. When the job came in again, the price was cut down.

Q.—Have you heard the evidence of the previous witness? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you approve of it? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you anything to add? A.—I have something to say in regard to bringing in laboring men to do moulders' work. I have seen several cases, where laboring men who were brought in turned out very inferior work; in fact they turned out work on which the health of the city now depends—a great deal of sanitary work, such as pipes. I have seen Italians brought in, and as they were not competent to do the work, I have seen them spilling the iron around the floor. One Italian fell with a ladle and, was laid up three months in the General Hospital, on account of being an unskilled workman. I have seen boys obliged to work very hard in some shops, in fact, doing work they were not able to do. They were compelled to help the moulders to cast off their work, and the moulders were working on piece work. Moulders have lost a great deal of work by laboring men being introduced into the foundries to do some kinds of moulding.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is it the general practice in foundries, in Montreal, to put laboring men on plain work? A.—Yes; in most of the shops.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do many of the moulders, in Montreal, own their own houses? A.—Very few—I don't know of any. They hardly get enough money to be able to rent a house, without owning one.

Q.—Have you any other information to give to the Commission? A.—In regard to the apprenticeship system, I have to say that it is very bad in this city. It is bad for the apprentices, because they are kept on one class of work nearly all the time. The fact is, after the boys have served their time, they are not capable of going as first class moulders. I have seen an instance where a boy has got a piece to make, and was not allowed to make it, but it was given to a man. He may never see that piece again, and if he was ever asked to make it, he could not do so.

Q.—Is it a benefit to the apprentice, who is learning his trade, to be placed on piece work? A.—No.

Q.—Tell us the reason? A.—Boys are, as a rule, very greedy in making money, and employers see this, and put them on piece work. I think piece work should be abolished altogether, so far as apprentices are concerned, at all events, and in regard to the men too.

Q.—Do you mean that the object of employers is to turn out rather quantity,

than quality? A.—It is the quantity, and not the quality. They don't ever look to quality, but to quantity.

WILLIAM MARIN, Foreman of a Foundry, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—In what branch of the foundry do you work? A.—In the machinery branch.

Q.—Did you hear the evidence of the last witness? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you approve of what he said? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any suggestion to add to what he said which might be of use to the Commission? A.—The only suggestion I should make is that the founders ought to pay their men every Saturday. This is one of the great things that they ought to do.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How are you paid at present? A.—In the foundry where I work at present, the men are paid every Saturday.

Q.—How do they manage in other factories? A.—There are other factories where they pay every fifteen days, and others, every month.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you any knowledge of a black list at Montreal? A.—Yes; I have a knowledge of it, and perhaps, my name was on it. Four years ago, seventy-five moulders were discharged from a foundry at Montreal, and it was thought that it was because they belonged to a Society of Moulders.

Q.—Do you know whether there is any objection at present to employ men belonging to the Unions? A.—Not in the place where I am employed.

Q.—Is there a system of fines in the foundries against employees who spoil their material or their patterns? A.—No; not to my knowledge. There are, perhaps, some foundries which might do so; but I do not know of it.

Q.—When an apprentice is engaged, is he put in the charge of a man in the trade who is to teach him the trade? A.—At the present moment, I have two apprentices; one is a young man, and I placed him with a moulder to begin learning the trade.

Q.—Does there exist a system of inspection of the foundries of this city on the score of the sanitary condition of those establishments? A.—It may happen sometimes that inspectors come to make a visit.

Q.—How many times have these foundries been visited by the inspectors? A.—To the best of my knowledge, they were inspected twice last year.

Q.—Is it within your knowledge that, at any time, moulders were imported from England or elsewhere to take the place of those who are working in Montreal? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Could you tell us under what circumstances these moulders were brought into the country? A.—About eighteen months ago a number were brought to the Grand Trunk, I think, to replace other moulders who, being on strike, had left their work.

Q.—Were those men brought under contract? A.—They were promised certain wages, and when they got to the shop to undertake work, either they were not satisfied with their work, or the Company would not give them the promised wages. They left the premises.

Q.—Did these men take the place of moulders living in Montreal? A.—I could not say whether any of the moulders were forced to leave the city, and I myself engaged moulders who could not find work elsewhere, because they had been discharged by the Grand Trunk, and I employ some of them to this day.

Q.—Have you any suggestion to make to the Commission in regard to your

trade? A.—No; I am ready to answer such questions as you may ask me, but I have nothing to say of myself.

(Translation.)

PIERRE LALONDE, Moulder, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—For how long have you worked at your trade in Montreal? A.—I have been for sixteen years in the business, but I have been eight years absent from Montreal.

Q.—Are you acquainted with all the shops in Montreal? A.—Almost all.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the shops? A.—In the majority of them one suffers from the smoke and the gas which pervade there.

Q.—How are the privies? A.—In one establishment they are not all good.

Q.—Are the privies badly kept in other establishments to your knowledge?
A.—I have heard speak of another shop.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Speak only of what you yourself know? A.—I have not worked sufficiently long anywhere else to know how they were, but I know that when the doors are closed they smell very badly. In the shop where I work to-day one of my comrades asked for chloride of lime to take away the pest, and he could get none. There are founders who do their moulding in this establishment and the stench is still greater. As for myself I do not feel it much because I work too far away, I work at the other end of the shop. What I mostly feel is the gas and smoke.

Q.—Is the water which you drink in the shop in the neighborhood of the privies? A.—The hydrant is at the door of the privies. One length of the pipe goes to the privies and the other goes to the hydrant.

Q.—Are you aware that some of the men employed in this establishment have refused to drink of that water because of its bad smell? A.—No; I am not aware of it.

Q.—What are the average wages of stove founders? A.—That is not in my line. I am a bridge moulder.

Q.—What are the average wages paid to apprentices in your trade? A.—At the present time I think the men are all at job work. To the best of my knowledge I could not even say whether they are engaged as apprentices or not. They are engaged only to do service. Some work by the day and others by the job.

Q.—Under the present system of apprenticeship, do those who are in service learn their trade? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do the young men who go into your trade as apprentices learn all the branches of the trade? A.—No.

Q.—Is the ventilation good in the foundries? A.—No; not in the foundry where I work.

Q.—Is it hard to find good moulders in Montreal? A.—No.

Q.—In what condition is the machinery, as to the cranes, and the rest? A.—The two cranes which we have in the shop, and which are used for the heavy work, are not safe, because the establishment is very old.

Q.—Have you any knowledge of the moulding system in the workshops of the Grand Trunk? A.—I have not a personal knowledge.

Q.—Have you any knowledge of loam moulding? A.—No.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What are the wages paid to the men of your trade? A.—By the year; taking in a good and a bad year, wages do not come up to \$1.50 a day.

Q.—During what time are you idle, because out of work? A.—We are in the habit of knocking off a fortnight during the holidays. Then, we usually lose all the festival days, and there are always other days, besides these, which a man loses. This year we lost only three days.

Q.—When you are at work, how much do you make a day? A.—There are some who make more than others. There are some who earn not more than fifty or sixty cents a day. There is a labourer, moulding certain works, who does not make more than fifty or sixty cents a day.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—As to yourself, how much do you make? A.—I, sir, work by the piece. When I work a day, I make \$2; but the wages have been cut down 10 per cent.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What would be the average wages of a good hand, working six days a week? A.—At the present rate of wages, I think that \$2 to \$2.25 a day, would be the most that he could earn, working by the job.

Q.—Are there men working by the week in your department? A.—There are only one or two.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How do you account for the fact that the hands do not learn all the branches of the trade? A.—There are some men there—I do not know whether they began as apprentices—who have done nothing else, during the past five or six years, but the same work. They have always worked at making the same piece of moulding.

Q.—Is it usual, in the moulding of stoves, to teach the apprentices the moulding of all the parts of the stove, or of a single piece only? A.—There are stove moulders present who can reply to that question better than I.

Q.—What is the reason of that smoke which there is in the factory? A.—In the first place, there are stoves in the shop which have no pipes; and, in the second place, they have lamps to dry the tanks, and there is only a small ventilator, which is not large enough to allow the smoke to escape.

Q.—Speaking generally, are proper measures taken, in the foundries of Montreal, to prevent accidents? A.—From my personal knowledge, I could not say much outside of where I work. In my department, there is a rolling mill, to separate the ashes from the molten matter, so that there is no dust, and there is a chimney to draw what dust there is. Therefore, I am of opinion that we are not too badly off in our foundry.

Q.—Have you already worked in an establishment where use was made of a suction pump to draw the ashes and smoke? A.—No.

Q.—Are you aware that such pumps are in use in Montreal? A.—I have never heard anything about them. I once saw a kind of fan to drive away the dust, but not at Montreal.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do the bridge moulders work by the piece? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is their pay limited, and if so, what is the limit? A.—Our pay is not limited.

(Translation.)

F. X. THIVIERGE, Moulder, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—In what branch of the business do you work? A.—In stoves or light machinery.

Q.—Do you agree with the evidence of the two last witnesses? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it the custom when the employers have an apprentice to show him the construction of a simple piece of a stove or of the whole stove? A.—There are certain shops where this is done. I have myself been foreman over a certain number of apprentices, and I showed them how to make from the first to the last piece of a stove, also the work in machinery.

Q.—When they do not show an apprentice how to make a complete stove, is it as easy for him to obtain work in an establishment, as if he knew the entire business?

A.—Not here in Montreal.

Q.—Do you know moulders who went to learn the whole business, and who only learned how to make certain pieces or who only learned certain branches of the trade?

A.—I know several, but they did not continue; they became labourers.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Are stove moulders employed the whole year in Montreal? A.—No, sir.

Q.—On an average how many months do you work in the year? A.—At the most, nine months.

Q.—Have you anything else to offer to the Commission that would be in the interest of your trade? A.—I consider that it would be in the interest of the trade to engage apprentices for at least four years by engagement before a Notary; but the trouble to-day is that the employers put the workmen on piece in nearly all the establishments here, in Montreal, except in the one where I work. When I was foreman over apprentices in a large shop in the city, the boss forced us to put them on piece work. I did not wish to do so, and I was obliged to leave because I did not agree with my employer.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—What do the workmen do during the three months when they do not work?

A.—When they do not find work at anything else, they walk the streets and wait till work recommences, and when the bosses see that they are hard up for work, they try to reduce wages and put them as low as possible. There are to-day stoves which I made two or three years ago, for which I had three or four dollars per stove and to-day the price is from one dollar and seventy-five cents to two dollars per stove.

Q.—Do you know if these stoves are sold at a better price? A.—I could not tell specifically; but if they are cheaper it is not much.

Q.—Do the employers take advantage of the necessities of the workingmen to reduce their wages? A.—Being under oath I cannot affirm this; but, to the best of my knowledge, I believe it to be true.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—But you cannot say it on your oath? A.—No.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—When there is a reduction in wages does this reduction extend to all the establishments? A.—Yes. It happens generally at the approach of winter or in autumn, about the month of November.

Q.—Are you aware that employers have met for that purpose? A.—That is more than I can say; but I do know that work was not to be had here, in the city of Montreal, when I was a member of the Moulders' Union.

(Translation.)

PIERRE PLEAU, Machinist, of the city of Montreal, sworn :

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have you been employed in cotton factories? A.—Yes, sir ; for some fifteen or eighteen years.

Q.—At Montreal? A.—In the United States and at Montreal. I have worked in Montreal for four years. I was foreman for four years at the Ste. Anne manufactory.

Q.—Does the Ste. Anne Manufactory belong to the same people as the company which is called the Hochelaga Hudon Factory? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—According to your remembrance how many men were employed by the company when you were there? A.—I cannot speak for the whole factory ; but I can answer for my department. In my department, at the time that I worked there, I had from 60 to 70 men employed under me.

Q.—How many young women and women were there? A.—On an average during the year, there might be from 34 to 36 young women.

Q.—Were there any children in your department? A.—There were little boys and little girls. Among the 34 or 36 persons whom I have just mentioned, there were small young girls from 13 to 14 years of age.

Q.—Which was the youngest child employed in your department? A.—The youngest child who worked under me was about thirteen years old.

Q.—Were there in the Ste. Anne Mills children younger than this, in the other departments? A.—I have seen such ; but they did not work under me.

Q.—What age might they have been? A.—They did not appear to me to be above ten years old.

Q.—At what hour did work begin? A.—In my time, work began at twenty-five minutes past six.

Q.—How long is it since you left the factory? A.—It is now ten months.

Q.—At what hour, in ordinary times, did work cease? A.—Work ceased at a quarter past six.

Q.—At what hour had you your dinner? A.—We had three quarters of an hour for dinner ; but generally speaking the hands were forced to resume work after a half hour. The engine was set in motion after the half hour, and the speed started immediately after the half hour.

Q.—Was there much overtime made? A.—Last winter, that is a year ago last winter, we worked for two months time up to a quarter past seven ; but only in my department.

Q.—Did they give you any time to rest in the afternoon? A.—No ; no rest. When the girls wanted to eat they were not allowed to go out and I sent out a little girl of twelve or thirteen years, who was employed in changing the work, to get a little lunch and thus they eat while working.

Q.—Has it ever happened that you worked later than a quarter past seven in your department? A.—Yes. We have worked up to nine o'clock at night.

Q.—You have worked up to nine o'clock at night for several days in succession? A.—We have already worked up to three nights in succession during the same week.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Were you paid extra for that? A.—For my own part I was paid ; I don't know whether the other employees were paid. I was foreman, but I was never able to touch the books. The superintendent took the book, and his boy marked the time.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Mr. Daniel Cook was the superintendent was he not? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did they allow any time for rest when they made you work up till nine o'clock at night? A.—Not more than when we worked up to a quarter past seven.

Q.—If I understand you properly, then, you worked from a quarter to one in the afternoon, until nine o'clock in the evening, without any rest? A.—Yes; without rest; only he came to me, towards three o'clock in the afternoon, and he said to me: "You will notify your men that they will work to-night till nine o'clock."

Q.—Without stopping? A.—Yes; without stopping. I myself gave them a chance. I gave them the privilege of sending out for something to eat. I said to them: "Send one of your sisters, or one of the little girls, to get food, if you have none." When he asked me in the forenoon to tell the hands that we should work at night, I said to the hands at noon: "Bring some lunch with you, we shall have to work till nine o'clock to-night."

Q.—Why did you have to work till nine o'clock at night? A.—I cannot say. It seems to me that a couple of times I heard the manager, and the other foremen say that they were working also for the other factory—for the Hudon Company who were in arrears with their work, and had not enough filling or warp.

Q.—But you were not given time to eat, you had to eat during your work? A.—We had to eat during our work.

Q.—So that the children of whom you speak, who were only thirteen years old, were forced to work from a quarter to one, in the afternoon, till nine o'clock at night, without stopping, and without taking time to eat? A.—Yes; just the same as grown people.

Q.—Did it happen often that you had to work thus until nine o'clock at night? A.—During the time that I was foreman, that happened, generally, every fall, for seven or eight weeks running. We worked every second night.

Q.—Is it within your knowledge that young girls have wished to leave the establishment, and were prevented from doing so? A.—Yes; I have seen young girls wishing to go, and dressing to go, and the foreman, on hearing of this, send men down stairs to the guard room, and put them at the doors, to prevent the girls going out.

Q.—At what hour did they make ready to go? A.—At a quarter past six.

Q.—You have never worked later than nine o'clock in your department? A.—No, never. When I did work, I worked alone, to repair the machinery; sometimes, while it was stopped, and sometimes, in the morning, I would go to the shop at five o'clock, or half past four to fix the machinery, but I did this of my own accord.

Q.—Were the working-men, the working-women, and the children, paid by the piece, or by the day? A.—There were some by the piece, and others by the day.

Q.—Do you know whether those who were paid by the day were paid more when they worked till nine o'clock at night? A.—I could not tell you.

Q.—In the St. Ann's Mills, have you seen very young children working in other departments? A.—Yes; I have seen them in the mule room, and in the spinning room.

Q.—To the best of your judgment, how old might they be? A.—There were some of them who did not seem to me to be over ten or eleven years of age.

Q.—When there was work going on till nine o'clock at night, did these children work? A.—Yes; they had necessarily to work.

Q.—Were there fines imposed in your department? A.—Yes.

Q.—Was there any rule for these fines? A.—There was no rule. For the least thing they were fined. There were girls fined up to \$5.00 on the same pay.

Q.—For one single time? A.—For one single time, on the same pay.

Q.—It was taken from the pay? A.—Yes; it was taken off four week's pay. On the envelope which they give, containing the money, \$5.00 were docked off for fines.

Q.—Did you, yourself, ever impose fines? A.—No, never. I never kept the books. They tried to impose this task upon me; they put a slate and pencil before me, and said to me: "Peter, go around the room, and, no matter who it is, put it down

on the slate, and I will put it down on the book." I did not tell them that I would not do it; I walked about in my department, but I levied no fine on any one.

Q.—Who is it that levies fines in your department? A.—At the time that I was first foreman, it was Mr. Cook and his son. I name his son because he kept the time, and I saw his father go up stairs, into the other department, with the book in his hand.

Q.—Could you give us some examples of cases where you saw fines imposed? A.—This very evening, I was around among a few neighbours, and I think that I have, on my person, some forty envelopes, in which fines are set down. I could show them to you. I should not wish that the names be known.

Q.—How are wages paid at the present time? A.—At the present time, the wages are paid every fortnight.

Q.—Then, they are the envelopes of the fortnight that you have with you. A.—Yes; these envelopes all belong to the same family. In the last five months, I believe that there have been docked off over \$30.00 for fines. There are fines of \$1 on a single pay. I might have others, if I had more time. There is another parcel of envelopes all belonging to the same family.

Q.—May you produce these envelopes before the Commission? A.—No; I promised to return them to the parties who placed them in my hands; if I had known that you wanted any, I could have brought you lots more.

Q.—Is there any by-law concerning these fines pasted up in the factory? A.—No; not at all. What they do, is this: they will go and talk to the party, and if that party answers coarsely, they will break out swearing and say: "I will fine you 50 cents," and then they go off.

Q.—Who does that? A.—It is the first foreman.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What is the name of the foreman? A.—James Skead.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What is, to your knowledge the highest fine that has been imposed? A.—I believe that it was five dollars.

Q.—All at once? A.—All at once. It was imposed on a boy for having broken a roller.

Q.—Had he broken it voluntarily or maliciously? A.—No; it was an accident.

Q.—How much, to your knowledge did that boy earn per day? A.—That boy, I believe earned fifty or fifty-five cents per day. I cannot say exactly what were his wages.

Q.—In what mill did this happen? Was it at the Ste. Anne's? A.—Yes; at the Ste. Anne's, the boy worked under me. I was second foreman at the time.

Q.—To the best of your knowledge, how long is it since this fine was imposed? A.—It is about a year and a-half—that is between a year and a-half and two years.

Q.—You are certain, you remember it perfectly? A.—Yes; I remember it well, I think that his father spoke to the Superintendent, and he made him take off two dollars, he paid only three dollars.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that a widow, working with her two daughters, paid a large amount of fines during one particular month? A.—Yes; upon the pay of the three they paid out eleven dollars and sixty odd cents for the three upon four week's wages.

Q.—How much did the pay of the four weeks amount to? A.—I cannot exactly say; it was between seventeen and eighteen dollars each.

Q.—Can you tell us why they imposed these fines—in what cases they imposed fines? A.—For anything. For instance, if he wished to make himself feared and insist upon work which no one was obliged to do, it was the custom to impose fines. I have had occasion to interpret for the English and the French people, and they have said to me: "Tell such a person that she has to do so and so." Then I have

gone there and when that person replied that she did not wish to do it. I was accustomed to hunt up the first foreman and say to him: "She does not wish to do it." Then the foreman would say to me—"go and tell her that I am going to impose a fine of a dollar and a-half."

By MR. WALSH:—

Q.—What was the nature of the work which that person refused to do? Was it work which she ought to do? A.—No; she had finished her work and had only to clean up her machine a little. Sometimes one of the girls, who ran another machine alongside of her, wished to go out, and the first foreman desired her neighbour to take charge of her machine.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—The person was not obliged to do the work? A.—If he or she had been willing to undertake the work, it was perfectly competent for them to do so, but it was not their work.

Q.—To the best of your knowledge had all the employees or nearly all the employees fines to pay each pay day? A.—Yes; almost all. There were only five or six out of the whole lot who had not fines to pay.

Q.—Out of the whole lot of seventy employees who were in your department? A.—Yes; between sixty and seventy.

Q.—This rule which I now show you, did it exist at the time when you were employed? A.—Never; they never showed that regulation to anyone. That rule did not exist. All they did where there were new employees was that a clerk, generally the son of Mr. Whitehead, came and asked the foreman if there were any employees who ought to sign. Then he had a large book, and I went after the new employees and they signed their names.

Q.—Did they read anything to them, or show them what there was at the head of the book? A.—No. All that they said to them was that it was for their information, and when the employees did not speak English, he told me to tell them that it was for their information. I made them understand that it was to oblige them to notify the company fifteen days before leaving; but I saw persons give the required notice fifteen days in advance, and I myself interpreted this notice to the first foreman, and when their time had expired they were unwilling to pay them saying that they had not been notified, and they made them put in another fifteen days. The Company, for instance, never gave notice. When they wished to discharge anyone they discharged him. They only gave notice to the foreman. When they wanted to discharge a foreman the Company gave the notice.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that employees were dismissed without notice and without cause—without even having done anything in the factory to be complained about? A.—I have knowledge of a family which left because the son had to pay a fine of a dollar and a-half. I had informed the foreman that he was unwilling to do the work.

Q.—You speak of a young man who paid a dollar and a-half. What was this affair? A.—I am going to explain it. When I mentioned it to the foreman he told me to go and tell him that he would impose a fine of a dollar and a-half. Then the young man said to me: "Ask him to give me my bill, my account and I'll go." He gave him his account, but he kept back a fine of a dollar and a-half. Then the father, who had given his notice, as well as one of the sisters, became excited and vexed and wished to have their accounts also. The foreman was unwilling to give it to them and they put on their clothes and left. This was on the Saturday, and on the Monday the father came back to give his notice, and the foreman would not either take him back or pay him.

Q.—Then he lost his fifteen day's pay? A.—Yes; and his daughter also; but the young man had his pay less a dollar and a-half.

Q.—Have you any objection to give to the Commission the name of that person?
A.—It was Mr. François Demers.

Q.—Do you know whether he is in town, and what business he follows? A.—
He is a labourer, I believe.

Q.—How long ago was this? A.—It was a year last summer.

The witness here fyled a certain number of pay envelopes, of the fifteen days, amounting for three persons to \$376.50 (three hundred and seventy-six dollars and fifty cents), with an amount of fines \$12.30 (twelve dollars and thirty cents), representing 3.29 per cent for fines.

Q.—When an employee was fined, could he appeal to any authority whatever?

A.—There have been those who have tried, but they have lost their case.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Did they appeal to the court? A.—I believe that Mr. Demers pleaded his case, and, I believe, he lost it. People did not care to contend with the Company, they feared to take suit against it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that the factory, in which you worked, sought workmen, or workwomen, or children in the country? A.—In our factory I have no knowledge that they went to seek for them, but I know there were those who came from the other factory, whom they had sent agents to search for. I know that there was a Mr. Gideon Thibaudeau, for whom they searched in the Saguenay, but I cannot exactly say where. They called them "the Saguenay" at the factory.

Q.—Were there many whom they called "the Saguenay" at the factory. A.—
Yes; there were many of them.

Q.—Did these people receive the same wages as those who were engaged in Montreal? A.—No; they had to wait five or six weeks, sometimes two months to be able to get the wages of the others. They had a sort of apprenticeship to put in.

Q.—Among the people, whom you call "the Saguenays," were they many children? A.—They are, generally, all large families.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that among those "Saguenay," there were children who went to Montreal without their family? A.—I knew girls who were sufficiently old, who were sixteen or seventeen years old, and boys, also, of sixteen or seventeen years, who were here without their families.

Q.—These girls, and these boys, of course, boarded with strangers? A.—Yes; occasionally, they had acquaintances, consins, or relatives from "the Saguenay," they all came from the same place.

Q.—When people were brought from the "Saguenay," is it to your knowledge that the factory was always in want of hands? A.—No; they had enough of them.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that, when the hands from "the Saguenay" were qualified to work, the factory discharged the old employees. A.—Yes; that happened more often, even, than otherwise. People from the town held out for their rights, you see, when they required them to do too much, and they turned them out.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that families living in Montreal, and discharged from the factory, to give place to the Saguenay people, were compelled to emigrate to the United States? A.—I knew one family which went to the United States.

Q.—Did you see, during the four years that you passed in the factory, any accidents? A.—There was one—only to my knowledge—on account of their negligence. It happened to me, myself, by their fault. It might have been a serious accident, and I might have been killed. I fell from three upper stories.

Q.—Did you hear the people whom you call the "Saguenays" complain that they did not pay them their promised salaries? A.—I never heard them speak. I never had many of them working for me, it was a few of the young people—the

small boys. The greater number of them worked at the Hudon Cotton Factory below.

Q.—Did you ever see these children badly treated in the factory? A.—Once I saw one of these small boys taken by the arm and cuffed, but most generally their money was taken from them and fines were imposed upon them.

Q.—What was, to your knowledge, the highest fine that a boy had to pay during a month? A.—There were small boys who earned twenty-five cents per day, and during the month of four weeks they sometimes had a dollar or seventy-five cents stopped; this was as they were quiet. There were small girls also who paid fines.

Q.—In speaking of accidents, is it to your knowledge that a young girl had her hand cut in the factory? A.—That happened in the spinning room department. I worked in the guard room where I saw it. I went to her help, because it was my business to pass there.

Q.—When you worked in the Ste. Anne Factory did you work on *Fetes d'obligation* and legal holidays? A.—No; they wished us to work, a year ago, last Spring (in 1886) eighteen hundred and eighty-six, the eve of the twenty-fifth of March, which was a religious holiday. I passed through the factory with the first foreman to speak in French to the girls and to the men, and to those who said that they would not come to work the next day because it was a holiday, he instructed me to say that they were fined a dollar. There were three or four of them who said that they would come, and I saw him mark in his small book a dollar for those who said they would not come to work the next day; but I do not know if he made them pay it. The next day I was at work myself as foreman. I was obliged to go for the machine, and there were only five or six employees. They worked two holidays following, but when they saw that the employees did not come they abandoned it.

Q.—You left the St. Anne Mill of your own free will? A.—Yes; because all their regulations displeased me, and I think that it was on that account that they did not give me the books to keep; for I had more education than he (the foreman) and his son had, but I believe they found me too honest to keep time.

Q.—You have never had to pay a fine? A.—No.

Q.—Had the foreman any fines to pay? A.—No; I have never lost any time, but whenever I have been sick I have been paid.

Q.—In the Ste. Anne factory were the privies for men and women separate? A.—They are in the same apartment; there was only a partition of eight or nine feet in height which separated them. It often happens that young men and young women, when they do not see us near them, throw things at each other, they throw water. There are always some who are dissipated and it is necessary to watch them.

Q.—Men, women and children work in the same department? A.—Yes; in the same room.

Q.—Generally speaking, what was the conduct of the young girls and the young men in the Ste. Anne Factory? A.—Pretty free.

Q.—Did the Superintendent of the Ste. Anne Mills impose fines when he saw a young man conducting himself improperly? A.—No; never.

Q.—Had you children who worked with you in the factory? A.—I had one daughter only who worked there. She left at the same time as I did.

Q.—You did not wish to have her in the factory when you left? A.—No.

Q.—Why? A.—On account of the regulations, and sometimes when one is with the wolves one must howl.

Q.—What was, in your opinion, as the father of a family, the moral condition of the Ste. Anne Factory during the time that you worked there? A.—For myself whilst I was there, I saw several girls or women—and I believe girls—whom the Superintendent should not have allowed to work in the factory, in the condition in which they were, in the presence of other young girls of thirteen and fourteen years and of small boys of from ten to eleven years.

Q.—Did you see any reprehensible acts committed in the Factory? A.—I saw things pretty "tough" as we say.

Q.—Did they occur often? A.—Yes; several times; but, as they were people above me, I had nothing to say.

Q.—Do you mean to say that the Manager and the Superintendent of the Factory did not maintain order in the establishment? A.—No; in this particular, they were a little too free with certain women.

Q.—When you left you took your daughter away with you, as you did not wish to leave her in the Factory? A.—Yes; she left at once—about seven or eight days after.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Can you tell us what was the proportion of children under fifteen years in your department, who knew how to read and write? A.—I did not see one among those who worked for me, because they only touched the pen when they signed their names.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Apropos to the book which the employees had to sign, did they inform them as to what they were signing? A.—Only as I have already said to you. Those who did not speak English and would not make themselves understood with the clerks, they told me to tell that it was to make them give fifteen days notice before leaving the Factory.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Had the Company schools to teach them reading and writing? A.—No; they had not the time to read and to write there in the factory.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Did the children who worked in the Ste. Anne factory begin, like the men and the women, at twenty-five minutes past six in the morning? A.—Yes; at twenty-five minutes past six in the morning.

Q.—And when the men and the girls did not leave off until nine o'clock at night did the children also not leave until nine o'clock at night? A.—Yes.

Q.—And they had only three quarters of an hour for rest at noon? A.—Yes.

Q.—And the three quarters of an hour were reduced? A.—In part. Those who worked by the machine, who started the machine had only a half hour. Those who worked by the job—those small boys—took all their time; they remained at the door and did not return until the bell sounded.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Did all the men, women and children go out together? A.—Yes; all together.

Q.—They did not then let the children out first and afterwards the bigger people? A.—No; not at all. They went out jamming one another at the foot of the stair case.

Q.—Do you know, when the factory commenced operations, if the men did not go out at different hours to the girls,—a quarter of an hour before or after them? A.—No; I just arrived from the United States, when they started the first machine in the factory and at that time all the hands went out together.

Q.—Do you not think that it would be better if the young girls and children went out a quarter of an hour before the men? A.—It would be much better. It would prevent complaints and scandals and bad words which take place in coming down the spiral stairway.

Q.—Do you know if the system of allowing the girls and the children to go out

a quarter of an hour before the men is adopted in one of the Montreal factories?
 A.—I cannot say that.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you know if there are men who have complained in the shop of not being paid for the time that they made? A.—There are some who complained to me, and I told them to arrange matters with the first foreman; that it was not I who kept the books.

Q.—Do you know if the children who worked in your department were paid by the day or by the job? A.—They were paid by the day—those small children.

Q.—Do you know if they received anything more when they did extra work?
 A.—I cannot say; I have never looked into the books. I had the keys of all the desks; but I never had the key of the desk containing the books. It was he who had them.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Are the Saguenay people who worked there, Canadians the same as the others? A.—Yes; they are Canadians.

Q.—Like all the others? A.—Like all the others; they all speak French.

Q.—As father of a family, when you have seen scandals in the factory, have you sought the Curé in order to speak to him about them? A.—No.

Q.—Do you not believe that where things like those which you have reported happen before your eyes, it is your duty as father of a family, to go and communicate to the Curé of your parish? A.—There are mothers who, I believe, have been to complain, and the Curés have spoken to me on the subject.

Q.—Reply to my question; I ask of you, as the father of a family, if you have made it your duty to warn the Curé of the parish that such scandals existed in the parish? A.—I have not been there.

Q.—Last year, was Mr. Thibaudeau at the Saguenay? A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Upon your oath, when did he go there for the last time? A.—I do not clearly recollect.

Q.—Was it last year? A.—I cannot say; it was a year last summer.

Q.—Was that the last time he went? A.—I cannot say for last year.

Q.—In (1887) eighteen hundred and eighty-seven it was not, according to you, but it was in eighteen hundred and eighty-six that this took place? A.—Yes; the Saguenay people who work at the factory told me so.

Q.—I do not ask you what they told you, I ask you what you yourself know. Do you know if Mr. Thibaudeau was at the Saguenay in (1886) eighteen hundred and eighty-six? A.—I did not see him go there, but I understood it from the people of the Saguenay.

T. J. FINN, Foreman, Gazette News Room, Montreal. called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How many years have you occupied the position of foreman? A.—I have been about eighteen years foreman of the news department of the *Gazette*.

Q.—How many hands are employed in the composing room? A.—I think about twenty permanent journeymen.

Q.—How many apprentices have you? A.—I think five apprentices working at the case and two message boys.

Q.—Are the apprentices employed on piece work? A.—Three of them are on piece work, and four of them, that is including the two message boys, are paid by the week.

Q.—How much do the apprentices who are on piece work receive per thousand

ems? A.—The apprentices on piece work receive from 19 cts to 29 cts per thousand ems. They make on an average from \$5.00 to as high as \$8.00 per week.

Q.—Do the journeymen receive the standard scale prevailing in the city? A.—The journeymen receive the highest price paid in the city.

Q.—What is the average amount of wages paid per week during the year to a journeyman printer in Montreal? A.—The average wages per week would be, on the *Gazette*, \$15.00 or \$16.00 for six days work of eleven or twelve hours per day.

Q.—Do the apprentices work during the day time or at night? A.—Exclusively in the day time.

Q.—At what age is the youngest apprentice taken? A.—The youngest apprentice, I think, at present is over fifteen years.

Q.—Are they indentured? A.—No.

Q.—Do you ever get any type set outside of the establishment? A.—No; not outside of the establishment.

Q.—You would consider that kind of thing would be disadvantageous to the compositors employed inside, I suppose? A.—I certainly think it would be. There have been occasions, very rarely, when a large tabular statement has come into the office which has either to be stereotyped or electrotyped or to be set outside and we give it outside as we could not very conveniently do it ourselves in time for publication.

Q.—But it is on very rare occasions that this has happened? A.—No more than once in a year.

Q.—Are the advertisements and tabular work of small size set by the piece hands or by the week hands? A.—Advertisements are set by regular time hands receiving \$16.00 per week, and at times there are a good many advertisements given out on the piece. Sometimes piece hands are put on time to assist in inserting advertisements; but advertisements, as you are aware, cannot be set by piece hands generally, as piece hands, as a rule, are not competent to set advertisements in a competent manner.

Q.—Do you know any office in Canada where advertisements in tabular matter all go to the piece hands? A.—There is no office in Montreal. All the tabular work in the *Gazette* Office, with the exception of one or two tables, goes to the piece hands, pick ups, and all of the fat matter. The piece hands get the fat of the tables that are picked up.

Q.—In every case? A.—Yes. There are only one or two tables in the whole lot that are withheld from the piece hands—small tables.

Q.—The monthly weather table; does that go to the piece hands? A.—The monthly weather table? No.

Q.—How much is paid per hour for time work? A.—Twenty-five cents per hour.

Q.—How many hours of composition do the piece hands receive? A.—The hands on piece work remain in the office, that is, it is necessary for them to remain in the office, for from eleven hours to twelve hours per day. Of course, they are not kept going in copy all the time, that is an impossibility; but we do the best we can and in those eleven or twelve hours the average wages made are from \$15.00 to \$16.00 per week. The men make from \$12.00 as high as \$22.00 a week; that is taking eleven or twelve hours as a days work. I have had men there who have made \$22.00 a week. \$21.00 have been frequently made, also \$20.00, \$18.00 and \$17.00.

Q.—You do not know then how many hours of composition a man receives on an average? A.—No; I could not state positively.

Q.—And the average wages per man, per week, for each man, will amount to what sum? A.—The average wages will run from \$15.00 to \$16.00; that is taking the wages from \$12.00 to \$22.00 per week; the amount of course depending on the ability of the men.

Q.—You say you pay as high wages as any in the city; what is the rate per thousand paid to journeymen? A.—You are asking me the Union rate—32 cents.

Q.—Do you pay that? A.—Yes, I pay that. The journeymen are all Union men I may state.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the establishment in a general way? A.—The sanitary condition of the establishment might be better. Of course the proprietor would no doubt improve the sanitary condition of the office if he was in a position to do so, but the proprietor cannot, at all times, make the changes he desires. If a portion of the building is leased they cannot get the party out unless at great expense, and in order to make alterations the proprietor must await his opportunity; but the proprietor does all he can to make the sanitary condition as fair as possible. I cannot say, however, that the sanitary condition is the best.

Q.—Can you inform us whether the rate per thousand on piece work has been increased from what it was, say twelve years ago? A.—In 1872 the amount paid per thousand for piece work was 33 and one-third cents. The amount paid for composition at that time, that is composition on the paper for a week, was from \$165.00 to \$180.00 per week; at present the amount paid for composition, notwithstanding that the rate is lower, that is 32 cents, as against 33 1-3 cents, runs from \$325.00 to \$359.00 per week. Of course I can account for that by this fact, that there are nearly half as many more men employed in the composing-room, and that the paper has been enlarged; while there were only fourteen or fifteen compositors twelve years ago, there are now twenty men employed, and the class of matter is much better to-day for the men than it was then.

Q.—Has the class of workmanship improved? A.—The class of workmanship is about the same.

Q.—That is so far as composition is concerned; A.—Yes.

Q.—From your experience in Montreal, and having been a resident here and being a practical mechanic, do you think house rent, fuel and taxes have increased during those years? A.—Considerably so. Take 1872, the year I have referred to when, as I have said, men were paid 33 1-3 cents per thousand and compare it with 1888, the present year. I state that the rate of living has increased, as nearly as I can come to it, from twelve to fifteen per cent as compared with 1872. That is giving as fair an estimate as I can prepare. The house rent has gone up considerably in that time.

Q.—Taking all branches of the printing business together, have wages as a whole increased? A.—No; I would state that the condition of the printing business, so far as compositors are concerned generally throughout the city, is in a considerable worse position than it was then—that is taking the trade generally and the way working men are employed throughout the city. The same number of men are not employed at the business to-day as there were then. Then they were exclusively journeymen. There are a great number of women employed now who exclude journeymen to a great extent.

Q.—Do you believe the stereotyped plates are injurious to the printers' interests? A.—When they are brought into the country most decidedly so, or even when they are supplied from one city to another. It takes the bread out of the printers' mouths in my opinion.

Q.—Are you aware of any printing being done in the Reformatory and charitable institutions in this city. A.—I have heard of it being done, I cannot say positively; I have not seen it myself. I have heard it was done and I am pretty certain it is a fact.

Q.—Do you believe that kind of contract is injurious to the employer or employee in the city? A.—I do.

Q.—Do you know establishments in the city where journeymen printers receive less than \$9 per week? A.—I cannot state positively on that point. I have heard of it, but I cannot state whether it is true or not.

Q.—Do you believe in the indenture system as far as regards apprentices? A.—

No; I do not from my own experience. I have had to do with apprentices for about eighteen years and I have never experienced any difficulty with my apprentices. I never had occasion to give one of them a slap during that time nor did I do so. Of the number of apprentices who have passed through my hands during that time I have had two or three who have left without serving their apprenticeship, and I have found out from experience that I have got along with boys much better when they are not indentured. By treating these boys as they should be treated they will remain with you and will learn their business if they are inclined to do so. If a boy was bound you might find that he was not suitable for the business after five, six or seven months, and you would have to keep him, and when he was on your hands he would do no good to himself or anybody else. As a rule, if I find a boy after he has been with me three or four months is not adapted to the business and is not likely to make a good printer, I feel it my duty to inform him so that he can seek some other employment for which he is better adapted.

Q.—From your experience can an apprentice who has served his time in a newspaper office become as competent a journeyman as if he served his time in a book and job office, as regards being an all round printer? A.—My experience in that way is this: there are very few places that I know of to-day, except in country printing offices, where a boy learns his business thoroughly. In cities you are aware newspaper and job offices are entirely distinct. Boys who learn their trade in the newspaper department may know nothing about job printing and if they learn job printing they know nothing of newspaper composition. I know very good job printers who can set up posters and do general job work who are not competent to go and work in a newspaper composing room.

Q.—Have you any objection to employ Union men? A.—Not at all. I have a preference for them, for I have found Union men, as a rule, to be the most competent men.

Q.—From your experience in connection with the business, have you any information to offer that would be of benefit to the Commission in connection with your trade? A.—I cannot think of anything additional at present.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you any non-Union men in your office? A.—There are no non-Union men in my department.

Q.—With regard to those stereotyped plates; do you know there are places in the country which are supplied with newspapers, all those places being able to use stereotyped plates, which otherwise would not have newspapers? A.—I cannot say whether they would have them or not. My opinion is that, that the people in any locality where they require a newspaper, and are prepared to support one, would pay the rate for having that newspaper set up in that locality in preference to importing plates and dead matter from a foreign country.

Q.—Then you think that in some country places where they publish papers with stereotyped plates the proprietors do not know their own interests? A.—I have no doubt they do.

Q.—Do you know of an office where a man from New York, who had some talent about illuminating, or something connected with printing, was engaged to come to Montreal, and the union men in the office would not allow him to work unless the office paid the rest of the men the same wages as he received? A.—I am not aware of that fact—it is not within my knowledge.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG —

Q.—In your opinion does the reading public look upon a newspaper with stereotyped plates as a real live newspaper? A.—No.

Q.—You have complained of printing done at the Reformatory; what would you have the children do? A.—I think that would be for the Government to determine.

Q.—But you object to printing being done there; please tell us what they ought to be taught? A.—I am not prepared to state what is suitable for the people in the Reformatory to be taught.

J. C. WILSON, Paper and Paper Box Manufacturer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—You manufacture paper-bags and paper-boxes, I believe? A.—We manufacture paper-bags principally, and paper-boxes are incidental to our business on account of the manufacture of envelopes.

Q.—Do you do any printing? A.—We do printing also.

Q.—What is the nature of the printing? A.—Advertisements on paper-bags principally.

Q.—Do you do any job work for the public? A.—Only bill-heads, and dodgers and wrappers and so on; the class of work for grocers.

Q.—Have you any girls employed at the printing business? A.—We have I think, one girl feeding a press out of fourteen presses we are running.

Q.—Have you any setting type? A.—No; we have none setting type.

Q.—How many hands have you setting type? A.—Five or six I think; I am not sure however.

Q.—Are they apprentices or journeymen? A.—They are journeymen; that is some of them are and others are half and half, common hands and better hands. We pay from \$7.00 up to \$13.00 and \$14.00.

Q.—Are you a practical printer? A.—No.

Q.—What is the lowest you pay printers? A.—Do you mean compositors?

Q.—Yes. A.—I think 7.00 a week; I think that is the lowest we pay them.

Q.—What is the highest? A.—\$13.00 or \$14.00, I am not sure, but I think it is one or the other.

Q.—Are they ordinary compositors? A.—They are ordinary compositors; they are working every day.

Q.—How many hours do they work per day? A.—We commenced in 1870 and adopted the nine hour system and we have followed it ever since. Our men work nine and a-half hours a day and on Saturday they leave early, and thus the time is made nine hours a day for the week.

Q.—How much do the young girls earn? A.—To which young girls do you refer?

Q.—To those pasting on the bags? A.—We have paper bag machines for making bags principally. There are a great many bags of different kinds still made by hand. At that kind of work they earn from \$2.50 to \$4.50 per week.

Q.—Does it require much skill to become proficient at that kind of work? A.—Not a great deal of skill. An ordinary intelligent girl can become an adept at it in three or four months if she is any way smart with her fingers.

Q.—Where do you find a market for your goods? A.—From one end of the continent to the other, from Victoria to Halifax.

Q.—Do you find keen competition in your trade? A.—We find keen competition in all parts of the Dominion now.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How many of those girls do you employ making paper bags? A.—I think we have from 100 to 120 employed generally, about forty or fifty girls in the different departments.

Q.—What will be the age of those girls? A.—I do not think any are under fourteen. I have positively refused from time to time, during the last seventeen or

eighteen years to employ girls under fourteen. I do not think a girl can be found in our employ who is under that age, for we have positively refused to employ them under it.

Q.—Do the boys and girls and men all work in the same room? A.—No; we have different departments. We have eighteen flats in the building; fifteen are in actual operation and are divided up into different departments as much as possible; but in the same room we may have men, boys and girls.

Q.—Have you separate conveniences provided for them? A.—Yes; the conveniences for the female portion of the hands are on one flat and the convenience for the men are down at the bottom of the building.

Q.—Have you any competition in charitable institutions in making paper bags? A.—We have nothing to complain of in that respect. We have heard of such a thing but we have never complained of it, and we do not know where to put our fingers on those institutions. We know there are some—we have heard of them.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Do the girls who feed the presses give as much satisfaction as the boys employed at the work? A.—We have only one girl and she is employed at a small press called the Gordon Press. Girls seem to do as well as boys.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—How long have you been a resident of Montreal? A.—About forty-six years; I think I came to the country in 1842. Of course I have not been in Montreal ever since.

Q.—Rents have raised in this city? A.—Yes; rents have raised in that time considerably, that is in forty-six years.

Q.—They have been rising every year? A.—They have risen and they have been checked at times.

Q.—Are they higher now than they have ever been? A.—It depends upon the locality, whether they are higher or not. If a man wishes to live in the east end, where property is not so valuable, he can get just as good a house for \$10.00 a month as he can in the west for \$12.00.

Q.—Has the price of living generally increased during the past ten years, apart from rents? A.—I really do not think it has—if we take what the people wear, and what they eat, principally.

Q.—Are not the people more luxurious than they were ten years ago; are what we considered luxuries ten years ago, considered necessaries now? A.—I consider workmen have more luxuries now.

Q.—I am speaking of everybody? A.—What do you term luxuries?

Q.—I ask you whether you consider what were almost considered luxuries ten years ago, are not considered necessaries now? A.—Before I could answer that question you would have to give me a limit.

Q.—That will do. A.—The capitalist, the intermediate man, and the working-man, all come under different heads, entirely. What would be luxuries to one man would not be luxuries to another, and, perhaps, has never been a luxury to him.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you think a man averaging \$9.00 a week, and paying \$10.00 a month for house rent, can afford to have many luxuries over the necessaries of life? A.—I will tell you a rule that I have applied in employing labor of all kinds in my business. After a great deal of experience, and figuring, I came to the conclusion that a man could not afford to pay more than one-fifth of his income for rent. When a man has to pay more than one-fifth, I am satisfied that a man could not live reasonably well.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Does a man at \$1.00 a day, rent a house in Montreal at \$10.00 a month?
A.—No.

HUGH GRAHAM, Proprietor of the *Star* Newspaper, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How many hands do you employ? A.—About 175 including all employees.

Q.—How many journeymen compositors do you think you have? A.—I should think probably about thirty, and then we have journeywomen.

Q.—Do you pay your journeymen compositors the rate of wages the organization calls for in Montreal? A.—We pay a higher rate than they claim.

Q.—Do you pay the prescribed rate of wages to all your compositors? A.—Our wages are graded according to their capacity and merits and the same applies to the women and the girls.

Q.—What is the lowest rate of wages you pay a journeyman? A.—My foreman is here. I cannot tell exactly without referring to the books, but he will be able to do so.

Q.—How many girl compositors have you? I should think about twenty-four or twenty-five or twenty-six or somewhere about that number.

Q.—Do you know the rate of wages per thousand you pay them if they are on piece work? A.—The highest rate we pay is 29cts. per thousand; they are graded according to capacity.

Q.—To how many do you pay 29cts. per thousand? A.—I think five or six as far as I can remember; but in all those matters my foreman can give you definite information.

Q.—You are not a practical printer, I believe? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you find the girls do equal work with the men? A.—I do not think quite as good taking the men all round.

Q.—Do you find them equal to the men as compositors? A.—I think some of the girls are equal to the average man, but there are also reasons why, taking them altogether, they are not worth as much as the best men.

Q.—If a woman can do the same work as a compositor and do it equally well with a man what objection is there to her receiving equal wages? A.—If she can do the work equally well she should have the same wages.

Q.—You think a woman cannot compete successfully with a man? A.—I think there is a little difference. We pay our best men 30cts. and our best women 29cts., that is only a difference of one cent per thousand; but there are reasons obvious to every body, why a woman cannot be depended upon to the same extent as a steady man; besides they are not equally as strong and cannot endure the same amount of fatigue and therefore altogether they are not worth as much.

Q.—Do you employ the women in commercial work or newspaper work? A.—We do nothing but newspaper work.

Q.—Are they employed on the composition for the afternoon work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do they do any night work? A.—No.

Q.—What hours are the women required to work? A.—I believe eight and three quarter hours.

JOHN LOVELL, Printer and Publisher, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG —

Q.—You are a book publisher, I believe? A.—Yes; and do all kinds of printing work.

Q.—Can you tell us how many journeyman printers you have in your employ? A.—I think there are about twenty-five.

Q.—Are those men employed by piece work or by the week? A.—A certain number by the week; there are fourteen on piece work.

Q.—How much per thousand do you pay your hands? A.—Twenty-five cents per thousand.

Q.—What can a man earn per week at twenty-five cents per thousand? A.—I really cannot tell you. I remember when I set type I could make \$20.00 or \$22.00 per week.

Q.—How long is it since you made \$22.00 per week by setting type? A.—In the winter of 1831 and 1832, the winter of 1831.

Q.—How much do you pay per week to a week hand? A.—From \$9.00 to \$10.00.

Q.—Are they good hands at those wages? A.—The \$10.00 men are really good; they are really jobbers. I would not give an ordinary newspaper hand that amount, and in fact I would not give him house room for I could not do it. I have no work for him.

Q.—Is twenty-five cents per thousand to piece hands the prevailing rate of wages in Montreal? A.—No, I believe it is about the lowest, the very lowest; but I have no trouble to get all the hands I want at that price. I never paid more.

Q.—How many women have you setting type for you? A.—I think about seventeen or eighteen.

Q.—Does the woman at the lowest rate set type correctly? A.—Yes; very well.

Q.—Do you not think that type set for you at fifteen cents per thousand is worth to you as much as type set by the journeymen at twenty-five cents? A.—It does not make any difference; I have a profit on them or I could not live.

Q.—The type is as valuable to you after it has been corrected as if it had been set by journeymen? A.—Yes; and as well done.

Q.—Have you any girls working not on piece work? A.—Not in the composing room.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest girl that sets type? A.—I have no idea, thirteen or fourteen or fifteen; I do not believe I have any less than fourteen in the office.

Q.—I understand you to say that the highest rate you pay women compositors is twenty cents per thousand? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many years has a woman who has paid that rate worked in your establishment? A.—I have a woman now in my office who has made regularly her \$12.00 a week and I have known her to make \$22.00 a week setting tables. I have not a man in the building who could set tables with her.

Q.—Shs sets tabular work as piece work? A.—Yes; she works at it nearly all the time.

Q.—Do you give the young women who set tabular work double prices? A.—Yes; forty cents.

Q.—Do those women who receive twenty cents per thousand set plain matter or all fat matter and tabular work? A.—All kinds of matter, not fat generally speaking. We have several publications in the buildings, newspapers and monthlies and they set them up. They do all kinds of work; they do the very worst kind of work, setting 22 ems of long primer, which you know is not very fat.

Q.—Do the men and women work in the same room? A.—In the room where

the women work there is only one old man and he has his two daughters in the same room.

Q.—Do you say there are men and women setting type in the same room? A.—There is not a man picking up type in the room; there is a foreman over the women of course.

Q.—Is it the custom in your office, or have you ever known it to be done, that this tabular work is given to the women in preference to the men on account of the cheapness of their labor? A.—It is given to them because it belongs to the work they are doing in their room. They begin a book and finish it and if they do anything to it they must finish it. We were fortunately favored with the work on a large report from Manitoba. There were a great many tables in it and the whole work was finished by women in the one room. 1,000 page royal octavo.

Q.—Have you known the work given to the men to be culled? A.—No. The men have been working during the last two months steadily, and among other work they have been employed on a book for the Honorable Mr. Justice Taschereau. That was set by the men. They may have been some part of it set upstairs for all I know, but I do not remember any. That is solid work, small pica, long primer and brevier.

Q.—Have you any objection to employing men who belong to labor organizations? A.—No; I never ask a man what he belongs to and I never intend to do so. I take a man for what he is worth if he is sober enough to work.

Q.—How many hours per day do the young women work in your establishment? A.—They are supposed to work ten hours, but I believe they do not average nine hours. They are on piece work and are indulged a good deal. The office hours are ten hours a day except on Saturdays when we stop at one o'clock, and we work half an hour extra on the other days to make up the time; in winter we stop at five.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Can you tell us the wages paid to book-folders in Montreal? A.—Our book-folders' work is entirely piece work; I have no idea of their pay. When I used to pay the hands there were some who made \$8.00 and \$9.00 a week on book folding. I do not know what we pay now—I think they are not so smart now as they used to be.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Young people nowadays are not so good as they were formerly? A.—No; they do not compare with them. I desire to say a few words in regard to the printing being done in the Reformatory. The reason why we object to printing work being done in the Reformatory is, that the people there, are kept there and pay no taxes while we have to pay very heavy taxes. A lawyer came to me sometime ago and wanted a factum printed and I said it would cost \$1.25 a page, for I have never printed one for less. He said he could get it done in the Reformatory for 75 cents a page. I said: "that is the place to take it—and you are a fit subject." He went away. That kind of thing has occurred frequently. I am sure if the lawyers can get a factum of fifty or one hundred pages printed there at 75 cents a page we do not want the work.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—You consider that printing done in those charitable institutions and in the Reformatory is injurious to the employing printers? A.—I must make a distinction between charitable institutions and the Reformatory.

Q.—Well the Reformatory? A.—The Reformatory does a great injury to the printing trade here, generally speaking, so far as I can judge. I give you a strong proof of this. They do work for nearly one-half the rate at which I can do it and live, for a man who prints a factum for \$1.25 a page printed on one side only, does

not make a fortune out of it; but those in charge of the Reformatory pay no rent and no taxes and are able to do it for almost nothing.

Q.—That is in fact taking contracts? A.—There is an immense quantity of printing done in that way. Then the Christian Brothers have an immense establishment. I used to do \$15,000.00 to \$20,000.00 worth of printing work for them a year, but I do nothing now. They have their own printing office. They do not pay taxes either on the building or on anything else. Of course I have no objection to their doing their own work if they are put on the same footing as an ordinary printer.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do they compete with outside printers? A.—I do not know; I believe they confine their work entirely to themselves. The number of books those gentlemen print is something enormous, the demand is so great.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Is it a fact that the Government pays so much per head for the keep of convicts in the Reformatory? A.—I do not know.

Q.—If so it would be a double injury to the employing printers, I suppose? A.—Yes. It is quite certain they are fed, housed and clothed there. If they will allow us to go free of taxes we are willing to enter into a fair competition with them.

FREDERICK STANLEY, Foreman of the *Star* composing room, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How many compositors have you under your control? A.—At present, twenty-one journeymen, six apprentices, and twenty-five girls, at the case.

Q.—Are all those on piece work? A.—Seven men are on piece work, all the girls are on piece, and the apprentices, of course, are on stated salaries.

Q.—How much per thousand do you pay the journeymen? A.—We pay five men at the rate of thirty cents, two at the rate of twenty-nine cents.

Q.—Is that the standard rate of wages paid compositors on newspapers in Montreal? A.—That, I believe, is a little higher than the standard rate for evening papers.

Q.—How much per thousand do you pay your girls? A.—There are three receiving at the rate of twenty-nine cents, eleven at twenty-six cents, one at twenty-five cents, two at twenty-three cents, one at twenty cents, four at seventeen cents, and three at fifteen cents.

Q.—What is the length of time any of your girls have been there? A.—Some of them have been there five or six years.

Q.—Is not a young girl, who is apt at the business, competent to earn journey-men's wages, when she has been there six years? A.—We have five or six girls who are quite as good as men. If anything, I would prefer to give work to them rather than to the men, and they rush the copy up very quickly.

Q.—When they are able to do men's work, why should they not receive men's pay? A.—They get men's pay at the *Star* office if they do men's work.

Q.—Are girl compositors, and male compositors, employed in the same room? A.—They are all in the same room.

Q.—Do you ever show any favoritism to the women in regard to giving them copy? A.—Everything goes on the hook, and they take their turn.

Q.—Did any journeymen in your office ever receive higher wages than at present? A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—Have the wages ever been decreased? A.—Not since I have been foreman.

Q.—Do you not think that type, set up by a young woman, and corrected, is just as valuable to the proprietor as type set up by a journeyman? A.—Just as valuable. Of course, when I speak about being just as valuable, I do not refer to the girls who work exclusively by the week, because they are not quick enough for evening work.

Q.—Do the men remain idle much, on account of waiting for copy? A.—We have, taking it all together, very little idle time.

Q.—Do they receive nothing for their idle time? A.—Nothing.

Q.—Do you know any offices in Canada where they allow the waiting time? A.—I do not know of any.

Q.—Is the matter culled before it goes to the men; that is, is the fat matter taken out and given to the girls who receive less per thousand than the men? A.—No; everything that comes from the editorial room goes on the hook.

Q.—The first out of copy, I presume, obtains the first copy that comes in? A.—We have a blackboard, and when a compositor is out of copy his slug is put down.

Q.—Is it the same with the men and women? A.—Yes; that is, except copy for the weekly, which is never put on the hook. We have a regular department for that work.

Q.—How many hours composition do the men receive in a day? A.—I should think, on an average, six and a-half hours all the year round.

Q.—Have your compositors remained any length of time in your establishment as a rule? A.—We have some men who have been there fifteen or sixteen years.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the establishment? A.—It could not be better. The room is large, well ventilated and well lighted.

Q.—During your time has there been any labor trouble in connection with the establishment? A.—Since I have been foreman there has been no actual trouble, except that five men went out for, perhaps, an imaginary grievance, but I believe myself that the whole cause was to their being the little the worse for liquor.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What is the Union scale for evening papers in Montreal? A.—I do not know whether there is a scale or not, but if there is it is not more than 28 cents.

Q.—And you pay higher than that according to your statement? A.—Yes; we pay 29 cents to some of the women, and 30 cents to the men.

Q.—Are the men employed in the *Star* office members of the Union? A.—Some are members of the Union and some are not. A man is never asked on coming to the *Star* office whether he is a Union man or not.

Q.—Are you a member of the Union? A.—No.

Q.—Does the Union permit female compositors to become members? A.—I am not aware of that. I think they would if they could get them in.

Q.—Do the women set as much type as the men do taking them on an average? A.—I have known a man to make \$17.50 in one week and the same week the highest wages paid to a girl was \$13.80.

Q.—Did she receive the same rate of pay as the man? A.—No; she received 29 cents and the man 30 cents.

Q.—So that if you had a given number of male compositors and an equal number of female compositors, the female compositors would not set up as much type as the male? A.—Not quite.

Q.—Then you are at greater expense for room, heating and inside expenses for the female compositors? A.—I do not know that there is any greater expense for room; and, as regarding heating, we would have the building heated by steam whether we had fifteen girls or twenty men.

Q.—If you have a given quantity of work done by females more frames and room will be required to do the work than if it was done by the men? A.—Exactly so.

Q.—Then female compositors are not quite so satisfactory and advantageous to

you as male compositors? A.—They are not quite so quick and they get tired a little sooner; but I consider they are almost equal to men in the *Star* office, and we have some very smart men in our place.

Q.—At certain times female compositors are compelled to remain at home, I suppose? A.—Yes; through sickness.

Q.—When men are required to wait for copy are they permitted to distribute type? A.—Yes.

Q.—So it is not absolutely necessary for them to remain idle? A.—No. We have always plenty of type and they can distribute when they choose.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—As a practical man, are you not aware that after a man has been setting type for some time, and happens to be idle, that it is not exactly agreeable to his feelings that he should commence to distribute type; would he not rather work at the regular distribution hour? A.—Some of the men would rather, and some would not; but in the middle of the afternoon we never have any waiting time. The men have that between eleven and twelve o'clock. I would like to state here, that our journeymen are paid from \$10.00 to \$20.00 a week, and the time of time hands is nine and a half hours a day, and the average time of the piece hands is eight and three-quarter hours.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How many of your men receive \$20.00 per week? A.—Only one; the pay runs from \$10.00 to \$20.00.

Q.—How many are receiving \$10.00? A.—We have one at \$20.00; one at \$15.00; two at \$14.00; one at \$12.00; three at \$11.00; and five at \$10.00. I may state that I have included one man who is a printer, and who is working in the office,—he gets \$3.00 per week.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Are those men paid according to capacity? A.—Yes.

Q.—You do not believe that a man who receives \$10.00 per week, should receive \$20.00, per week, for he is not worth it? A.—No; if a man is worth \$11.00 or \$12.00 in the *Star* office he gets it.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do those parties who receive \$12.00, and \$13.00 per week set type? A.—They work on the stones.

Q.—They do not set type at the cases? A.—No more than correcting ringers, and anything like that.

Q.—They have what are known as soft sits? A.—To be at the stone is not a very soft sit on an evening paper.

Q.—They are stone men? A.—Yes.

Q.—They are not compositors, and are not on piece work? A.—They are men who get weekly salaries, and are not on piece work.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Is the gentleman who gets \$20.00 a week the foreman? A.—Yes.

JAMES CONNOLLY, Foreman of the Book and Job Department of the *Gazette* office, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:--

Q.—What is the amount of wages paid to book and job hands in Montreal?
A.—\$10.00 is the standard.

Q.—Have your men been receiving more than that? A.—There is one man receiving \$11.00, and one \$12.00, and one \$14.00.

Q.—How many boys have you as apprentices? A.—There are five; two of them are going on with their fourth year.

Q.—How long do they serve with you? A.—They are supposed to serve five years. That is the general rule in the city.

Q.—Do you keep them on as journeymen after they have served their time?
A.—Yes; if they turn out competent enough.

Q.—Have you any men on piece work in the job room? A.—We have three.

Q.—How much per thousand ems do you pay piece hands in the job department?
A.—Twenty-eight cents.

Q.—Have you any young women working in the job department? A.—Not at the case. There are two girls working putting sheets into the press; but they are not under my control.

Q.—What would be the average amount that the press hands receive in the job department per week? A.—I do not know; I could not tell you. I think \$18.00 a week is paid to the foreman, and from \$10.00 to \$12.00 to the men; I would not be positive.

Q.—When the men are working in the job room on a book, for instance, is the work at any time celled? A.—Not unless there are standing tables. If it is a new job, the printers will get the matter as it comes.

Q.—Have you any journeymen who receive less than \$9.00 per week? A.—No.

Q.—Are any of your apprentices indentured? A.—No; there are none.

Q.—A good job man, a married man, with a family of three, living economically, how much could he save at the end of the year with his wages? A.—I think he could not save ten cents. I speak from experience. He would have to live very meanly if he saved anything.

Q.—Will you tell us the number of printers, in Montreal, who own their own houses? A.—I could not.

Q.—Do you think there are many? A.—I am not positive.

Q.—How long have you been living in Montreal? A.—I was born in Montreal.

Q.—Has the cost of living increased during the past five years? A.—In some cases it has.

Q.—Has house rent, to your knowledge, increased? A.—It has; the rent of the house I am living in has been raised twice during the last six years.

Q.—How much per cent has it been raised? A.—It was raised a dollar a month each time.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the job department in the *Gazette* office?
A.—It is in good condition. The only thing the men complain of is the heat.

By Mr. HEAKES:--

Q.—What rent would a man earning from \$7.00 to \$9.00 a week be able to pay?
A.—He would have to take a house not dearer than \$7.00 a month.

Q.—What do you believe would be the average rent paid by the working men of Montreal for a house within one mile of the City Hall? A.—It is hard to say; I could not tell you.

FRANK ROLLAND, Agent Citizens' Insurance Co., called and sworn:—

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What have you to say to the Commission about the question of Insurance?
A.—Some of the laborers, who work for Messrs Allan, came before the Commission, the other day, and stated that the insurance charged to laborers by Messrs Allan was excessive, compared with the price of similar benefits elsewhere. One of the men stated that he was working a whole year, and yet, he was only entitled to insurance during navigation season. The case is not in that position at all. A premium is charged for the time he is at work, and they are only insured for that time. We don't charge him premium for the whole year, and, of course, he has no claim on the Company for the time he is not insured.

Q.—He is insured only for the time he is at work, and not for the balance of the year? A.—Yes; he is only charged on every dollar he earns while he is at work.

Q.—So, if he works thirty days he is only charged insurance for thirty days, and he is only covered for that time? A.—Yes; he is only covered during the thirty days, because his premium is in proportion. In regard to accident insurance, I would like to say that our experience, in Montreal, goes to show that the accident business has proved a severe loss to the Company. This year we have had to cancel our policies with the Dominion Barbed Wire Co., as the rates we charged proved to be too low, which is a proof that the Company charges low rates. Then, as regards the Dominion Bridge Company, we had to do the same thing last year. We had a larger insurance of this character than any Company here, I think, and eight-ninths of the men who insure with us, go into it voluntarily. Only such lines as the Dominion, the Allan and the Beaver, and one or two other companies, in which we get compulsory insurance; but they don't represent more than seven-ninths of the working population insured with us. We cannot look to each of those men separately, as we can in ordinary cases.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you ever cancelled the policy of a stevedore? A.—We have occasionally cancelled the policy of a stevedore. The year before last, we had to reduce the indemnity paid to men on the Dominion Line, because we could not stand it. We furnish a doctor all along during the time of the accident. In case of accident to a laborer on the Allan Line, he receives \$5.00 a week, and \$500.00 is paid in case of death.

Q.—When you reduced the amount of the policy on the Dominion Line, was that done on account of the frequency of accidents on that line? A.—Yes. The men around there are not quite of so good a class as those working for Messrs Allan, and they are not quite as regularly employed, and a large number of them have been laid up for long periods from small accidents.

Q.—Accidents were so frequent you could not afford to continue the policies for some men? A.—We were losing money by it, and had to change the terms of the policy.

Q.—Have you found the same conditions to attach to the men on the Allan Line of Steamers? A.—The pay of the men is rather higher there, and the average is better. The Dominion has a smaller pay-roll, and a smaller average pay; and so, we can charge the same rate to the Allans as the Dominion, but give them more indemnity. In fact, the men on the Allan Line get \$1.00 more than the men on the Dominion Line, for the same amount of premium.

Q.—When does a man commence to be covered by your policy—is it when he enters into the service of the Allan Line? A.—When his name is entered on the list of the Company. We are only paid once a month and a man is insured directly his name is entered on the steamship Company's list, although we are not paid till the end of the month.

Q.—And he has a claim for the insurance from the first day he is in the Company's service? A.—Yes; and for every day he draws pay.

Q.—Suppose an accident happened to a man the day after he entered the Company's service would the policy cover him? A.—It would cover him so long as the man was in the employ of the Allan Company.

Q.—And as soon as he leaves, the policy expires? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Like any other insurance? A.—Yes.

Q.—If the Company insures a man for a year and there is no further premium paid I suppose he is not insured after that year? A.—If a man working for the Allan Company is paid \$1.00 a day he pays one cent a day for insurance. We don't hold him covered for the next day.

Q.—It is on the same principle, I suppose, as every other life insurance? A.—Yes; and we charge a very small premium comparatively.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—You do not furnish sick benefit? A.—No; but we give him the best medical advice, Dr. F. W. Campbell.

Q.—Does he attend the men when they are sick? A.—No; but when they meet with an accident, and sickness relating to the accident would be covered.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You say you charge low terms? A.—Yes; and we are the only Company doing the percentage business.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—If a man met with an accident not connected with his work would he get any indemnity? A.—No. I would not like to say it is on account of the misbehaviour of the men, but there are so many of them who are birds of passage, and who after working a few hours do almost anything, that we could not hold them covered.

Q.—Can you give us any idea of the number of men who received payments from you during last year? A.—It would be pretty hard to say, but I think we have paid to the Allan Company \$800.00 in claims last season. I cannot give that with certainty, but that is about what the amount is.

Q.—Tell us the amount of premium you received from Messrs Allan? A.—I believe a little over \$1,000 I should think; but you must remember that we hold each of those men covered to the extent of \$500 in case of death. If your houses do not burn this year it does not follow that the Company is free of risk because they may burn next. One death would carry away more than the surplus in this case. We pay as I have said a doctor and all the visiting expenses connected with the accident, and we pay ten per cent brokerage to the foreman who collects the insurance amounts and so there is not much left as you will see. We charge this insurance cheaper than any benefit society could charge and besolvent.

Q.—How long is it since a death occurred on that line? A.—I think we paid a claim last year. We have the men connected with almost all the large concerns insured, and many of these insurances are carried out by the Company, because we cannot possibly get at the men. A man works for one hour and then he goes away.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—This insurance is compulsory on the part of the Beaver, Dominion and Allan men? A.—Yes; on the Beaver, Dominion and Allan Lines.

Q.—Would you have as many insured if there was no compulsion about it? A.—No; because we cannot get at the men.

Q.—So a man is insured because he is compelled to do it? A.—Yes; because it is good for them, we believe.

Q.—Do the men on those vessels all pay the same rate? A.—The men on the Beaver Line pay twice the amount of the Allan Line.

Q.—How is it on the Dominion Line? A.—They pay the same, but they get less benefit than the Allan Line, because the Line is smaller and we cannot afford to conduct business with a smaller pay roll.

Q.—You pay the same rate but you do not give an equal benefit? A.—Yes; because the wages paid are less. I don't know the reason except that it is for the fact of the number of men being less and the wages less; and we cannot assume equal liability with a small corporation.

Q.—Did you ever endeavour to force this system on laborers working at Portland? A.—Yes; we tried it with one of the foremen.

Q.—What was the reason it failed; did the authorities stop it? A.—No. There the laborers are handicapped. A man in order to go and work in Portland has to pay an indemnity fee of \$15.00 to be admitted into the league of laborers whether he works for one hour, one day or for a year. Apart from that they have to pay the benevolent societies' fee besides—that is compulsory with the Knights of Labor. The men are handicapped to that extent which is more than we charge for a whole year or two seasons. If a man only works for one hour we charge him insurance for one hour and not for the year. No man in Portland can do work at stevedoring unless he is a member of that Association.

Q.—Did the men who went down from the Allan Company here join that Association when there? A.—A great many of them did.

Q.—When you attempted to force this compulsory insurance in Portland did the authorities step in and forbid you doing it? A.—The Association said ———

Q.—They said you should not do it? A.—No; only the men could not afford to make the payments to that Association and also pay the insurance. A great many of the foremen carried the insurance right through voluntarily—the insurance they had in Montreal.

Q.—When they came back to Montreal did you impose it on the men again? A.—It is compulsory on those Lines from the beginning of the season. We don't do it personally but the heads of the Lines do it.

Q.—When the men came from Portland to Montreal did you force the compulsory insurance on some of the men which you could not do in Portland? A.—I could not tell you. During the winter there are quite a number of men who do work in factories or do city work about the streets, and we cannot follow the men up. Some of the men go to Portland others do other work around.

Q.—You do not know whether it was forced on the same men or not? A.—No; we have laborers who have for six years continued with us, sometimes not receiving any benefit whatever and yet being perfectly satisfied with the protection afforded them, as being much more than adequate for the premium they pay.

Q.—You have stated that the men were compelled to pay \$15 before they could go to work in Portland? A.—I think it was \$15; they were compelled to make some payment.

Q.—You are not positive whether it was \$15 or not? A.—I am not positive. I am inclined to believe that was about the amount.

Q.—You would not swear to it? A.—To the best of belief I would.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—You have no figures to carry out that statement? A.—What statement?

Q.—That a man has to pay \$15 before he can go to work in Portland? A.—I have never been in Portland, but it is only through the agency of the line there, that I have this figure.

Q.—You are a member of the Knights of Labor? A.—No.

Q.—You know nothing about the institution? A.—Nothing. But they are making lots of fuss.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Where did you get your information about the \$15 payment? A.—I know one of the foremen of the Dominion Steamship Company.

DANIEL COOK, Superintendent of St. Anne's Cotton Mill, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you a list with you of the rules and regulations of the St. Anne's Cotton Mill of which you are the Superintendent? A.—I have the old book and the present book of the engagements, and lists subscribed by the employees. The book contains the names, ages, witness' signature, residence, date of commencing work, date of finishing work, and terms of engagement.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How long have you been employed at the factory? A.—Five years.

A.—This book (book produced) was kept during your time? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are those rules posted up in the factory? A.—Yes.

Q.—You employ a large number of French Canadians, I believe? A.—Yes; quite a number; mostly all the hands are French Canadians.

Q.—I see that all those engagements are written in the English language? A.—Yes; all our books are kept in English.

Q.—Are those engagements translated into French for French Canadian employees? A.—Yes; we are very particular about that. When we engage a person we hand over a copy of the engagement. The engagements are both in English and French.

Q.—You have no rules in your factory except those now submitted? A.—Nothing, only some little rules we make ourselves.

Q.—Have you any other printed rules? A.—No.

Q.—What do you mean by those small rules you make yourselves? A.—We fine them and notify them if they break anything and make bad work.

Q.—Who has authority to frame those rules which are not printed? A.—I do it myself.

Q.—So you frame those regulations as you like? A.—Yes.

Q.—Who authorized you to frame those regulations? A.—Nobody particularly.

Q.—Do you mean to state that you impose fines on employees in this factory without the authorization of the directors of the company? A.—Yes.

Q.—You are the only judge of the fines that you impose? A.—Yes; I am the principal judge.

Q.—You are the only judge—you do not consult anyone else? A.—No; I do not consult anyone else.

Q.—You then declare you have taken upon yourself the responsibility of imposing fines on employees of the factory? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the limit? A.—From ten cents to twenty-five cents.

Q.—You never impose a fine above twenty-five cents? A.—Yes; very seldom; for breaking something carelessly.

Q.—Was this fine above twenty-five cents regulated by a printed rule? A.—No; not by a printed rule.

Q.—On what principal did you estimate the damage that caused you to impose this fine? A.—By the bad work they made.

Q.—You have now spoken of imposing fines for carelessness and for breaking machinery? A.—Yes; and for very bad work.

Q.—Do you declare that every time a machine was broken it was through the fault of the employee who had charge of that machine? A.—I do not, There are many machines broken for which we do not make the hands pay.

Q.—Do you declare that every time you impose a fine on an employee for breaking a machine it was through that employee's fault that the machinery was broken? A.—It was done through carelessness.

Q.—Do you declare that every time you imposed a fine on an employee for breaking machinery there was not some fault in that machinery which caused the accident? A.—Yes; I do declare it was not the fault of the machine.

Q.—Can you state a few instances of the fines which you imposed under these circumstances with respect to the breaking of machinery? A.—We have to take some of our machinery from one place to another to repair, and in doing so we take it on trucks. In lifting out rollers and putting them back again if they are not very carefully handled—they have to do it nicely—they may break them by carelessness—by throwing them in or out. If they get the truck running across the floor too fast or something like that they are liable to break it. If they break machinery in that way I fine them. A break of that kind will cost \$5.00 or \$6.00 to repair. Lots of spindles cost us 90 cents to \$1.00, and they break lots of them. If they don't go carefully they will run into the frames with the truck and smash them up.

Q.—What is the most extensive fine you imposed? A.—The largest fine I recollect imposing at one time was on a young man, and it was \$2.50.

Q.—How much did this young man earn in a day? A.—About 90 cents, I think.

Q.—What had he done that caused you to fine him? A.—He broke one of those rollers in two, fooling with some other parties carelessly.

Q.—You were present? A.—I was not.

Q.—Who imposed the fine? A.—The overseer after speaking to me about it and telling me how the accident happened.

Q.—Was he present? A.—Yes; he saw the accident at that particular time I am speaking of.

Q.—Do employees know they have to pay fines for any machinery that is broken? A.—That is what I put up the little notices for—to put them on their guard.

Q.—Are those rules printed? A.—No. They are written in French and English.

Q.—At what height are those posted on the walls? A.—About six or seven feet.

Q.—Are those rules read to the employees? A.—I don't know that they are.

Q.—Are there any of your employees who are unable to read? A.—I dare say there are, I could not say.

Q.—How may boys who are unable to read become acquainted with those rules? A.—They get somebody else in the room to read them.

Q.—Would you not impose a fine on an employee who would leave his work to go and read a copy of those rules to young employees? A.—No; not if half a dozen went.

Q.—Are the employees allowed to leave their work without fines being imposed? A.—Yes; but not to go out of the mill, of course—in the mill certainly.

Q.—Will you tell us whether you impose fines for other offences than breaking machinery? A.—We don't impose fines, only for bad work in the weaving room, making bad cloth. If a girl makes bad cloth, a bad piece, we fine her ten cents to put her on her guard. If we did not do so we could not get along and it would all be bad cloth.

Q.—Are the employees always responsible for the work done? A.—To a certain extent they are.

Q.—Can you state that all the warps you give out to your employees are in good order? A.—No. If they are not, we don't fine the weaver for it.

Q.—How can you ascertain that the warp is not in good order when you hand it over? A.—If it is not good they will take it to the overseer and show it to him, and say it is bad, and they cannot weave it.

Q.—Are you certain that all these threads on the bobbins you hand to your employees are sound? A.—No; I am not certain about all the bobbins. We hand over many hundreds of thousands to them in a month.

Q.—How, then, can you ascertain whether it is through the fault of the employees that the work has been badly done? A.—It is very easily told. When the work leaves one hand it goes to another, and, before it passes through the second, we can tell whether the work has been properly done, in the first process, or not.

Q.—Is it not a fact that you imposed a fine on a person who received the work in the second process, while the guilt rested on the person who had done the first process? A.—No.

Q.—You swear to that positively? A.—Yes, I do.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You say you can tell the person with whom the fault rests? A.—Certainly we can tell.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How could you ascertain, on one of those bobbins, that the thread on the inside is sound? A.—The thread on the inside is the same as on the outside—it is supposed to be so.

Q.—Can you swear, when you hand one of those bobbins to an employee, that the thread on the inside is good? A.—It is supposed to be good. We do not hand a bobbin over to our help, but by hundreds and thousands, as they come from the frame and pass from one process to another.

Q.—When the work which is done with those bobbins is badly done, you impose a fine on the employee, without knowing whether the bobbin was good or not. A.—When the work passes to the next frame, we can tell whether the yarn is properly put on the spindles or not. If there are bad knots, and other difficulties, we know where to go. Each spindle is numbered, and each girl has a number, and we can go back to the girl who made the bad work. Everything is numbered, so that we can tell where to go.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You think you can tell where the fault lies, even when the thread is not good? A.—Yes; it is very easy to tell. We have matters so arranged that we can tell the girl who made the bad work; we can go right straight to the hand that did it.

Q.—You declare positively, then, that a fine of \$5.00 was never imposed in the St. Anne's Cotton Mill? A.—Never in my time, and I have been there ever since the Mill started. No such fine was ever imposed in my time.

Q.—The evidence was that \$5 was imposed and that it was reduced to \$3? A.—No; \$2.50 was the highest ever placed on the books and that was for damage done.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are not the judge of the fines which are imposed? A.—The overseer does that, but he does not do it without my advice.

Q.—Has an employee on whom a fine is imposed the right of appealing to any other officer of the Company? A.—Yes; they have a right certainly, if they choose

to do so, or they have a right to leave at the time and get their pay if they wish to do so.

Q.—Who is the officer to whom they may appeal? A.—The president or manager or any one they like.

Q.—You have told us that these fines were imposed without the knowledge of the president, how then can they appeal to the president? A.—They can go and speak to him if they like and let him know their grievances if they choose to do so.

Q.—Do you not think it would be rather hard for a workman to go to Mr. Gault in order to have him remit a fine of 50 cents or a dollar? A.—No, I do not think so; if they choose to go they can go.

Q.—Is the system of fines carried on in the factory with the knowledge and consent of the directors of the Company? A.—I never got any consent from them.

Q.—Did you ask for their consent? A.—No; I have done the same here as I have done in other factories.

Q.—Have you worked in other factories for the same directors? A.—Yes; for some of them. I don't know exactly for what number of them.

Q.—In what factory? A.—In Cornwall and in Hastings when Mr. Gault was connected with that establishment. I have worked in Stormont and the Canada Cotton Mill.

Q.—Do you enter those fines in the book which is submitted to the directors? A.—Not that I know of. They are in the pay book.

Q.—Have you the pay book with you. A.—No; that is down at the office.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Will you bring it up? A.—Yes; I have nothing, however, to do with that book after it leaves the Mill. We send our time book down and it is entered into the pay book. Mr. Patrick Shannon has charge of the book.

Q.—Do you enter in your book the total amount due the employee and also the amount of the fines that have been imposed upon him and the balance that is coming to him after the fines have been deducted? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you tell us, to the best of your knowledge, the amount of the fines imposed in the Ste. Anne's Cotton Mill during the last year? A.—I have it on a paper here. The amount was given to me from the books of the paymaster. \$71,426 wages paid; \$1,029 fines.

Q.—Who prepares those pay envelopes? A.—The paymaster.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Who keeps the time of the hands? A.—The overseer of each department.

Q.—They have the fining of the employees too? A.—They are the ones who put it down, but not without my consent.

Q.—And the overseer of each department hands his pay roll to the paymaster? A.—The time books come down every two weeks, and I look over them before they are sent down to the paymaster, and he keeps them and enters them in his books.

Q.—Thus this amount of fines you have mentioned includes the fines imposed during that year on all the men, women and children employed at those mills? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that any of the employees have appealed to one of the directors concerning any of those fines? A.—I am not aware of it, I never heard of it.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that any employee after being willing to pay the fine imposed upon him was discharged and the fine was deducted from his wages? A.—No; I do not know that that ever happened.

Q.—Did you ever consult the officers of the company with respect to the legality of those fines imposed? A.—No; never.

Q.—You are the judge yourself of what you consider the wrong that has been done to the company? A.—Yes; in the factory.

Q.—What would be done with an employee who not being paid should pay himself by carrying away a piece of cotton? A.—If we found it out, we would haul him up for it I suppose. Stealing you mean?

Q.—Yes; stealing if you like? A.—I don't know of anybody who has had to steal a piece of cotton to get their pay.

Q.—Can you affirm that you were never mistaken in imposing fines? A.—I would not say in three years. I don't think it, not to my knowledge.

Q.—Do you believe you might have been mistaken once? A.—No; I do not think it. I may have been mistaken— I don't think it.

Q.—You admit you might have been mistaken? A.—I don't think I have ever been mistaken in making a fine.

Q.—You never made a mistake? A.—I am as liable to mistakes as any other man is.

By Mr. FREED:

No. Q.—Do you investigate every case reported in which a fine is imposed? A.—

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How can you find out that the fine was rightly imposed? A.—From the bad work that I see.

Q.—Do you yourself impose all the fines? A.—No; not all, but I see them.

Q.—Can you certify to the fact that all the fines that you did not yourself impose were rightly imposed by others? A.—Yes; I think I can. The bad work is all marked down in the books and I can look at it myself. Each overseer marks down such and such bad work of such a kind made by such a number. He enters the different causes and I could see the entry. So many bad spools from such a girl. And I can see the entries every time I go into the room if I open the book.

Q.—Do you look into this book every time a fine is imposed? A.—I do not know. I look at it every day or every two days, and see what fines are entered. If a hand is careless I perhaps see marked in the books so many spools broken or so many bobbins and I know how much they should be fined for them.

Q.—Do you never impose any fines except for bad work? A.—Yes, we have a few.

Q.—In what cases? A.—In the case of help staying away from work, leaving their frames standing.

Q.—Will you tell the Commission by the terms of the engagement now before us where you find authority for imposing a fine on an employee who does not turn up to work? A.—I have no particular authority. I have orders to carry on the work regularly, and if some stay away two or three times a week I must do something to prevent it.

Q.—Then you do it without authority? A.—I do it on my own responsibility—yes.

Q.—They can go off without pay? A.—If they are fined and are not satisfied with it we pay them and let them go.

Q.—Is the fine which has been imposed paid to him? A.—If they choose to take their pay and go it is. It would be no use fining if we turned around and gave it to them again.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—The question was when a hand was fined and he chose to go away you paid him all his wages? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You never retained the fine from a man who left the establishment? A.—In what case?

Q.—It does not matter what case. Did you ever retain the fine? A.—No; I don't think I ever did. If there was a fine imposed the week before, of course we would keep it.

Q.—You state that when a workman is not willing to submit to the fine imposed on him you discharge him? A.—No; we do not. If he wants to go himself he can go.

Q.—What do you do when any employee refuses to submit or pay the fine imposed on him? A.—We would tell him that he could pay the fine or he could go, just as he pleased. He has to pay it if he stays.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Suppose a man came in and you fined him 25 cents and he refuses to pay, do you discharge him? A.—No; if he goes on with his work we pay him.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—If he does not choose to go, how is it? A.—If he does not choose to submit to the fine we will let him go.

Q.—This, therefore, is the only appeal the employees of the mill have within their reach—pay or go? A.—They have that option—they have that privilege.

Q.—Were you brought before the Recorder on a certain suit of some girls employed in your factory in November last? A.—Sometime ago, yes.

Q.—Will you explain to the Commission the reason that you were brought before the Recorder? A.—They left without giving any notice—they went out on strike and tried to make us pay them and we would not do it. Ten or twelve of them did so—that was all. They all left their work at 12 o'clock noontime.

Q.—Did you refuse to pay the wages due to these girls? A.—We did at the time they walked out.

Q.—By virtue of what engagement did you retain those wages? A.—By the authority of those rules; they left without giving any notice.

Q.—Is it not a fact that after the girls had signed the engagement you changed the nature of the work from day work to job work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you consider those girls were still employed under the same engagement as they had signed before that time? A.—After they worked a week or two without refusing—yes. Some worked a couple of weeks after we changed the system.

Q.—Do you believe that a female operative would be obliged to accept the terms imposed by a company such as the St. Anne's Manufacturing Company? A.—A girl is not compelled to accept the terms.

Q.—Did you consult your female operatives when you changed your system of work from day work to job work? A.—Yes.

Q.—In what manner did you consult them? A.—By speaking to them and telling them we were going to make a change.

Q.—What would you have done if they had not been willing to accept that change? A.—Perhaps I might have been willing to remain under the system we were following; I don't know.

Q.—Did you, at that time, obtain their written consent to this change as you did when they entered into the first engagement? A.—No.

Q.—Did you consider this change from day work to job work necessitated a new engagement on the part of the employees? A.—Not after they accepted it.

Q.—Have you any proof that they accepted this change? A.—Certainly I have the proof.

Q.—Did you speak to each of those employees? A.—Not to each one; no.

Q.—Is it not possible that some of those female operatives to whom you did not speak were not willing to accept the change? A.—I didn't hear anything about it at the time; no objection was taken at the time.

Q.—You took no means to ascertain? A.—Not particularly. They all went to work right on after the change was made.

Q.—Are there many cotton mills in Montreal? A.—Three, I think.

Q.—Two of them, I believe, belong to one company? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you believe those female operatives on whom you imposed a change of work could have found employment in either of the factories in Montreal? A.—I think so; I could not say about that.

Q.—Was this change effected in the interests of the female operatives of the Company? A.—Not any more than in the interests of the Company.

Q.—This change was made for some reason was it not? A.—Yes; it was made for a reason. It was made in favor of those girls putting them on piece work and they could earn more money.

Q.—Has your pay list since that time increased for the same kind of work? A.—Yes; it has on a certain kind of work they were on. They make more pay by piece work than they did by day work.

Q.—You have said that the female operatives were out on strike? A.—Yes; they went out on strike.

Q.—Do you know the reason of that strike? A.—On account of that change some of them struck.

Q.—You state that those female operatives went out on strike because of that change? A.—That is what I understood from them.

Q.—Do you state that they remained on work 15 days after this change took place? A.—A couple of weeks.

Q.—You have stated that those female operatives had accepted that change? A.—Certainly.

Q.—You said possibly that they could have been on strike 15 days after having accepted the change? A.—I don't know. Twelve of them took a notion to strike. That is what they pretended to say when they came to Court.

Q.—Is it not a fact that those female operatives wanted to leave the factory because they had not agreed with your son as to the amount of their wages? A.—No.

Q.—Is it not a fact that those female operatives went on strike because there was a disagreement between them and your son, as to a certain account relating to a doff? A.—There was some little dispute about a check. A couple of girls claimed they had not got their check, and we were satisfied they had got their check, because we had every way of telling. We can tell by the doffers on the frames what work has been done.

Q.—That is the reason they went out on strike? A.—Yes.

Q.—It was for this change in that engagement? A.—I don't think it was; I think it was on account of that or something of the kind. I don't recollect exactly about it.

Q.—You have just sworn that they went out on strike on account of the engagement? A.—It was at the bottom of it, for if it had not been for that, they would not have been getting out checks. There was a dispute about a couple of checks. A couple of girls caused the whole thing.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What is the condition of the conveniences in your factory? A.—First class; they are good.

Q.—What do you consider first class? A.—Clean, nice and tidy.

Q.—How far are they separate from each other, those for the men and women? A.—There is a partition between the two; the men go in like here, and the women go into the other place; there is a partition between the two.

Q.—How high is the partition between them? A.—Seven or eight feet.

Q.—Is the ceiling open on top? A.—It is open on top.

Q.—Are the doors close together? A.—No.

Q.—How far apart are the doors? A.—About two feet; there is a partition between the doors.

Q.—Do you consider that a good arrangement for the convenience of men and women? A.—It is about the best I ever saw. In most of the factories where I have been, there is generally only one door.

Q.—Will you tell us if you ever saw anything indecent, or immoral, about the employees of your mill? A.—No; I never did.

Q.—Are you constantly in the mill? A.—I am in the mill constantly. During the five years past, I have never been absent one day during working hours.

Q.—Are you in the different departments, or are you in the office? A.—There is no office there; I am up and down in the mill.

Q.—Have you heard of any complaints in regard to the immoral conduct of any persons in the building? A.—No; I have never, not one. There is a very poor chance for such things going on, where 400 or 500 hands are employed.

Q.—Have you ever heard of cases where females have been on one side of this partition, in the closet, and males on the other, and things were thrown over from one to the other? A.—I don't know, but they could do that if they chose.

Q.—It could be done without your knowledge? A.—Yes; certainly.

Q.—Could a great many things take place among the employees with your knowledge? A.—Something like that could; a good many things could take place.

Q.—Immorality might be practiced without your knowing it? A.—Yes; but somebody else would know it; somebody interested would know it.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You mean somebody connected with the mill? A.—Yes; somebody who had some authority.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—What proportion of the boys and girls employed by you are able to read and write? A.—I cannot tell you that.

Q.—Tell us what proportion were able to write their own names in that book? A.—No; I cannot tell you. I do not take their names in the book. The paymaster does that and I don't know whether he writes them or not.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that women are employed in your factory who are not in a fit state to be where young boys and girls are employed? A.—No; I do not know of it.

Q.—You are positive about that? A.—I don't know, but that there have been a case or two about that. I have noticed something of that myself; but I never thought anything about the boys noticing anything.

Q.—Do you know whether that person was a single or married person? A.—There have been single and married also.

Q.—To what extent has it prevailed? A.—I think two or three have been in the mill during the five years.

Q.—And you are positive that no immoral actions ever took place there? A.—Not to my knowledge in the mill.

Q.—Have any of your employees ever been before the Magistrates for immoral conduct? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—None in your establishment? A.—Not to my knowledge, no.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you, when you engage a child, ask his age? A.—I do not, the man who takes down the name does. Whatever age they give him he puts it down.

Q.—The first name in the book I see is Frances Nartelle, aged 10 years; Emma

Bouchard, aged 10 years; Albinard Dennis, aged 11 years. On the first page of the book now submitted of the 25 names on the first sheet not one was able to write.
 A.—We don't know that. A great many would not take the pen and write although they could write.

Q.—Have you yourself personally any interest in the fines that are imposed?
 A.—Not a particle of interest in any way. I would rather give them the fines than take them, from the hands if they would do what is right.

Q.—Did you pay the girls whom you brought before the Recorder? A.—Some of them who came back we paid. That was left to their own option.

Q.—Those who did not return you did not pay? A.—No; and we did not pay all those who did return.

Q.—Is it not a fact that the Recorder in giving his decision in that case stated that it was the duty of the Company to pay those girls, because they were not willingly guilty of the charge of which they were accused? A.—I didn't understand him; he did not speak English and I did not know what he was saying.

Q.—If it not a fact that Mr. Prefontaine brought together the officers of the Company who were present for the purpose of translating to them what the Recorder had said? A.—No.

Q.—Is it not a fact that Mr. Prefontaine answered in the name of the officials that the directors would be consulted in this matter? A.—I did not hear anything about it.

Q.—You were present in Court? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Did you see Mr. Prefontaine speaking to the Recorder after the Recorder gave his judgment? A.—I do not know, he got up and came out with us.

Q.—You say you did not see Mr. Prefontaine make that remark to the Recorder?
 A.—I did not.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you a list of the amount of the wages of employees you confiscated last year without giving notice? A.—I have not a list of them.

Q.—How are those confiscated wages entered in your books? A.—They are entered in the pay books—they are deducted from those who left without notice. Everything is in the books.

Q.—Do you know how much was confiscated last year? A.—I do not know.

Q.—Did this confiscation of wages happen often? A.—No; not very often, not unless somebody left without giving notice.

Q.—When an employee is discharged do you notify him? A.—We do if we do not require him. If he does his work properly, and we don't require him we give him two week's notice.

Q.—Did you refuse to accept notice when an employee notified the foreman directly telling him at the same time to notify you? A.—They are not supposed to notify me. It is quite sufficient if they give notice to the foreman of the room. I would not take a notice from one of the hands.

Q.—Do you know that some of the employees after having notified their foreman were obliged to work during an extra 15 days after having given notice? A.—No.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you swear that if any of the parties gave notice to the foreman, the 15 days notice, you would at once accept that and not keep them at the mill? A.—Certainly we would not keep them, they are then free to go. It is 12 days notice we require, two weeks. If they give a notice of two weeks that is all we require.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—I notice that in the book which you ask the employees to sign it states that all employees shall work on all holidays except Christmas and New Year's Day and any other day the Company may see fit to set aside. Have your employees ever protested against working in the mill on a statutory holiday in this Province? A.—Not since we made that rule.

Q.—Have they not protested to you? A.—Not one, not since the new rule was made.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—If they did protest what would you do? A.—I don't know, they never did—I don't know what I would do. I could not do anything particularly, but I would speak to the manager.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—Could they have protested to the foreman of a department without your knowledge? A.—They might have spoken to him.

Q.—Has he spoken to you about it? A.—No; never.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you know that, under the old rules, if any of the employees were absent on the 25th of March, the feast of the Annunciation, they were compelled to pay fines for being absent? A.—I think they were not; not one. They were never asked to pay any fines for such a thing.

Q.—Was a fine inflicted? A.—Not one.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—If they did pay a fine, would it appear on the books? A.—There was no such a thing spoken of.

Q.—It would appear at the date in the books? A.—Yes; at the very date, if there was a fine made.

Q.—You swear that none of the officers are entitled to one cent of the fines? A.—Yes.

Q.—They are obliged to account for every cent of money they receive from fines? A.—They don't receive it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—What would you do, to-day, with an employee who refused to work on a legal holiday? A.—I would discharge him, probably.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—When the fines are entered in the books, is the offence for which the fine is charged, entered with it? A.—No; it is not.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—When a hand is discharged for being absent, on any day, do you retain the wages coming to him? A.—No; we pay them.

Q.—So, then, an employee who wishes to leave the Mill, would only have to absent himself for one day, and then turn up the next day and ask to have his salary, and go? A.—No. If he stayed off one day and came back, and we discharged him for staying away, we would pay him.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You would not necessarily discharge him? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are you aware that under the law of the Province of Quebec, there is a special law, with respect to notices that have to be given to employers, and it provides penalties to be incurred in case of people leaving without notice? A.—No.

Q.—Are you aware that certain workmen were brought before the Recorder and fined, in very small sums, when they left the employment of their employers? A.—No; I am not aware of it.

Q.—Are you not aware that the 15 days wages, which you retain, exceeds, by a very large amount, the sum which the Recorder, according to law, has the right of imposing on an employee who leaves without giving notice? A.—I don't know.

Q.—Then, you have not the least idea that you acted contrary to the law of the Province of Quebec, when you were imposing those fines and confiscating those wages? A.—No; I did not know it. I acted according to the rules of the cotton factories I have always worked in.

Q.—Who framed those printed regulations? A.—I don't know. They were here when I came here—when the mill was started.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you been employed in many cotton factories? A.—Seven.

Q.—Where? A.—In Auburn, New York State; Manalac, New York State; Hastings, Ontario; Cornwall, Montreal, and one mill in the Southern States.

Q.—In all those factories are the same rules observed? A.—The same rules, to a certain extent.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—In the United States also? A.—Also in the United States, for bad work, and wilful damage. If we did not do something, we could not run the mill.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You think a cotton factory could not be worked unless a system of fines was carried out? A.—Not well; you would be discharging help every day.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What are the hours of labor in this cotton mill? A.—Ten hours; sixty hours a week.

Q.—At what hour does work begin in the morning? A.—Half past six.

Q.—And you work to what hour? A.—To a quarter past six at night, three-quarters of an hour is allowed in the middle of the day; we close work on Saturday at twelve o'clock, making sixty hours per week.

Q.—Have you worked in the evenings? A.—Occasionally, not very often.

Q.—When you work in the evenings, how long a time is allowed for supper? A.—No time is allowed if we run one hour.

Q.—What time is allowed if you run to nine o'clock? A.—We don't stop for supper. The hands double up, and we let part go out and get their supper, and come back again.

Q.—You do not stop the machinery? A.—No; we very seldom run to nine o'clock.

Q.—How long is it since you ran to nine o'clock? A.—I cannot tell you.

Q.—Did you run to nine o'clock this winter? A.—I don't think it.

Q.—Did you run to half past seven? A.—Yes; we have run to a quarter past seven. We very seldom run until that time, unless we have a breakdown, or something, during the day, and have to stop five or ten minutes, or one hour, or whatever it may be.

Q.—Is weaving pretty hard work? A.—Not if it runs well; it requires very close attention.

Q.—Do weavers frequently spoil goods to such an extent as to have fines imposed on them? A.—They make a good many bad pieces unless they are careful.

Q.—Then, the work needs their close attention? A.—Yes; some weavers have been there five years, and they have not been fined twice.

Q.—Is the same close attention required of a spinner? A.—The same thing all through.

Q.—Is spinning harder work than weaving? A.—No; I think not, it is about the same.

Q.—Would you consider that a child of fifteen years could give the close attention to weaving, or spinning, required of a good hand? A.—Not of fifteen; they are not put to it, as a rule, at fifteen.

Q.—Could a child of twelve give that close attention that is necessary to weaving? A.—No; very few are weaving at from twelve to fifteen years.

Q.—How would it be about a spinner of twelve? A.—No; we have no spinners of that age, but they are doffers.

Q.—Would a girl of nine be able to give that attention to the spinning required? A.—No; we have no spinners at that age. Our small help do not work more than seven hours in the mill.

Q.—Read the sixth name on that page (book handed to witness)? A.—“Mary Latour, aged 9.” We don’t know whether that age is right—it is only her own word of mouth.

Q.—What is her occupation? A.—Spinning. She is simply in the spinning room, but she is not a spinner—she is not spinning.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—When you work until a quarter past seven in the evening are the children of 12 years compelled to remain in the mill until that time? A.—Some of them are and some are not; it depends whether their work has been done or not.

Q.—Some may remain and some do remain? A.—Yes; exactly.

Q.—You do not stop the machinery? A.—No.

Q.—A child of ten might remain at work from a quarter to one until a-quarter past seven without food or rest? A.—No; if we are going to run one hour at night we tell them at noon to bring their lunch with them.

Q.—And how is it when you do not notify them to that effect? A.—It very seldom happens that I do that without going and telling the overseer that I want him to run one hour at night, and to tell the help to bring something to eat.

Q.—At what time are they sent away to dinner or supper? A.—When the factory shuts down they go home. They are not sent away—they go home when their time is up.

Q.—At a quarter past seven? A.—At a quarter past six; if we run one hour later it is a quarter past seven.

Q.—The children of ten years who work from a quarter past one to a quarter past seven are employed continuously until that time? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are the children paid by the job or by the week? A.—They are paid by the day generally.

Q.—What number of hours constitute a day’s work? A.—Ten hours.

Q.—From half-past six in the morning to a quarter-past six in the evening? A.—That is for five days. We run a little more if we have to stop for some time.

Q.—When they work till a quarter past seven are they paid one hour extra? A.—Yes. If they only work two hours in the week they get a quarter of a day for it.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Read this name in the book? A.—“Frances Nartelle, 10 years, mill spinner.” That means she is in the mill spinning room and is a doffer.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Are not the employees whose names figure in the book you have produced compelled to submit to the engagement contained in that book? A.—Certainly, to the rules.

Q.—Is that in case that those children whose occupations figure as spinners or as employees in the mule room would be compelled to fulfil the duties pertaining to those occupations? A.—Yes.

Q.—If an error has happened it is the employer who suffers? A.—I don't understand you.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—In the case of those two children entered as spinners; does the fact of their being entered as such oblige them to be spinners? A.—No. It simply means that they are in the spinning department.

Q.—Could you employ such a child as a spinner? A.—No; we could not because the child could not do it.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—How long is it since you worked in New-York State? A.—About 20 years.

Q.—Do you think the same rules that you submit here are in existence in the cotton mills there? A.—Yes; I think they are in the cotton factories.

Q.—Name us a factory where they are imposed? A.—I cannot particularize one.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You do not know of any factory where it is otherwise? A.—No; I do not know of any. Some of the help we have that came from the United States tell me about their being fined and so on.

Q.—Were the fines that you impose in existence in the New York Mills? A.—In much the same manner.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—I understand you to say that you refuse to pay wages to employees who do not give you the notice required? A.—Yes; we refuse for we require their services.

Q.—Are there many errors such as you have spoken of in this book? A.—I don't know. That entry simply means that the child is employed in the spinning room, not that she is a spinner for she could not do the work.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You think that book could not mislead any one? A.—No.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—You think that your books are not kept properly? A.—No.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—You say that employees leaving the mill have to give two weeks' notice? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you discharged any employee without giving any notice? A.—I have.

Q.—Do any of the employees who work in your establishment work without boots and shoes? A.—That is at their own option—they may; if they like to take off their boots they can go barefooted—they have the privilege of doing so.

Q.—Do they do it? A.—I see some little boys doing it; I never saw any grown-up people doing it.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—If you discharged an employee without notice do you give him any extra pay? A.—No. If we don't require him we let him go without notice, and we pay him.

Q.—If you discharged him, for any cause, without notice you pay him up to the day of the discharge? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Did you not at one time discharge employees for want of work for them at the factory? A.—No; I don't know that I ever did. They went, we gave them notice beforehand.

JAMES JACKSON, Superintendent of the Hochelaga Cotton Mills, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are fines imposed at the Hochelaga Cotton Mills? A.—Certainly.

Q.—By whose authority? A.—The foreman of every department in the cotton mill, has always to do his own fining, except in connection with the weaving room. There is a special man to overlook the cloth—a cloth looker. He examines the cloth as to its quality. In case of there being any bad cloth handed in the girl is brought down and spoken to in regard to it, and a fine is imposed either according to her name or her number. She knows the consequence of making bad work.

Q.—Is she always responsible for bad work? A.—Not in every case.

Q.—Do you know if fines were imposed when employees were not responsible? A.—I do not.

Q.—How can you tell the difference between bad work consequent upon the action of an employee, and that resulting from defects in the cotton itself? A.—The man who overlooks the cloth is a practical man. If bad cotton is given out the girl tells the overseer of the room, and he looks at it, and if it is faulty, it is placed on one side. If the overseer finds that bad work done in weaving is not due to the weaver herself she is not charged for it, and in some cases the warp is taken away and sent back to the room whence it came.

Q.—Are you perfectly satisfied that any of those inspectors do not impose fines through pure spite? A.—I am; I have only one man who inspects for 1,300 looms. He decides whether bad work is the fault of the weaver or not, and also decides the amount of the fines that shall be imposed.

Q.—On what does he base his opinion as to the amount of fines that should be imposed? A.—According to the damage done to the cloth.

Q.—He is the only judge as to the fine to be imposed? A.—No; the overseer is sometimes called upon to judge and even sometimes I am called in by the overseer.

Q.—Have you printed rules with regard to the fines? A.—No more than that bad cloth will be fined. That is what we call a cloth list. (Paper handed in).

Q.—You have stated that fines were imposed by the foreman; what is the amount of those fines? A.—They vary from ten cents to \$1.00. We never fine a weaver a whole dollar at one time; we generally impose ten cents and other small fines.

Q.—In other departments do fines range from ten cents to one dollar? A.—All through the mill.

Q.—Why are they imposed? A.—For bad work and carelessness in breaking machinery or wilful damage.

Q.—Do you retain in your employment an employee who willfully breaks a

piece of machinery? A.—Certainly, if he has a mind to stay. We fine him for it; if he does not stand the fine he leaves.

Q.—And if he leaves do you retain the fine? A.—Yes; if he willfully breaks machinery and we can prove it.

Q.—You compel him to pay or to leave? A.—Certainly; if he wilfully breaks a machine we make him pay the damage, and if he does not like it he can leave—still we make him pay for it.

Q.—Have you an account of the fines imposed in your factory last year? A.—Yes. The wages paid in the Hochelaga Cotton Mills for 1887 was \$214,559.00; the fines imposed were one-fifth of one per cent, or \$1669.00 for 1130 hands.

Q.—Are there, among those fines of which you have spoken, any fines imposed on children? A.—I could not say. I suppose there are; there are all kinds of fines there.

Q.—Do you believe a child of ten years, employed in a factory, is capable of judging exactly as to the work required of him? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you a list of the wages that were confiscated at the Hochelaga Cotton Mills last year? A.—No; I have not.

Q.—To whom must we apply to have such a list submitted? A.—So long as Mr. Wilson, of the St. Anne's Factory, is going to appear before the Commission, I will allow him to bring the Hochelaga statement at the same time.

Q.—Are fines imposed with the knowledge of the Directors of the Company. A.—I could not tell you that. The books are there, but I could not tell you whether they look at the books or not. Each overseer has a time book, which is sent to the office every two weeks. The time is transferred to the pay book, which is in the office all the time, and never leaves the office.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you ever imposed fines yourself, individually, for the breaking of machinery? A.—Yes; but not in my capacity of superintendent. I have when I was overseer.

Q.—You did not consult any other person, when you were overseer, in regard to that matter? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you a practical machinist? A.—I am a practical manufacturer.

Q.—You are not a practical machinist? A.—No; I do not consider I am. I never served my time.

Q.—How do you know that machinery has been broken through carelessness? A.—They never fine a hand for breaking machinery unless they see him.

Q.—Machinery does break, I suppose, through being defective? A.—I know that. If an overseer saw a man run a truck against a machine, and break it, he would fine him; but if the machinery was broken by accident, of course, the employee would not be fined.

Q.—Is not a practical machinist a better judge, as to whether machinery has been broken through carelessness or not? A.—He could not tell whether it had been broken through carelessness any more than a man who never saw it.

Q.—When the machinery is broken, do you send for a practical machinist? A.—We have a machine shop.

Q.—In the machine shop, have you a practical machinist? A.—Yes.

Q.—He repairs it? A.—Not all the time. The machinery is sometimes fixed by the overseer. If there is a break in a certain piece, we take it out and get a new piece, for we keep duplicates in the shop.

Q.—If it is a complex piece of machinery that is broken, he does it, I suppose? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is he not a better judge in that manner? A.—Not in the breakage, but he is a better judge of how to put the breakage together.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—If the machinery broke while running, would the operative be fined for it?
A.—Not if he did not break it himself through carelessness.

Q.—Suppose it was broken entirely from wear and tear? A.—We cannot fine for that—that would never do.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—What do you do with the cloth, after you have fined an employee for spoiling it? A.—We put it into seconds.

Q.—I mean, when you fine the employee for spoiling a piece of cloth, what do you do with it. A.—It goes into seconds.

Q.—What do you mean by seconds? A.—Second quality.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you the general oversight of the book-keeping departments? A.—No; I examine all my books before they go into the office. The office is a separate thing entirely.

Q.—Have you employees under your charge for the inspection of those books? A.—Every overseer has a time book, and a fine book, and the time book is the fine book, and every two weeks, before the books are sent to the office, they are sent to the superintendent's office, and he goes over them. If he has anything to find out, or any information is desired, he sends to the overseer of the book in question, and gets the desired information.

By THE CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How long have you been superintendent of the mill? A.—For the last five years.

Q.—Have you worked in any factory in the United States? A.—Yes.

Q.—When did you live there? A.—About eleven or twelve years ago.

Q.—You have been in Canada since? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the practice in mills in the United States; were fines in vogue?
A.—The practice was the same as it is now.

Q.—Have you any reason to believe that that has not been changed? A.—It has not been changed up to the last few months.

Q.—You are sure of that? A.—I am positive.

Q.—Can you carry out work in the factory without a system of fines being in vogue? A.—No; we would have to close down, and give up manufacturing, for all our goods would be seconds.

Q.—Would it be possible, in every case of bad work, to have the question brought before the court, and have it decided? A.—We would be at Court all the time.

Q.—Could you not go before the Courts with cases of wilful damage to the amount of ten cents? A.—Take, for instance, the card room. We have twenty girls working on piece work there, and the bad work they make passes to the weaver, and if it is bad it causes a great deal of inconvenience. Each tender marks her bobbin with a different colored chalk, red yellow or black, and those bobbins pass up stairs, and if they are all right we never hear anything more of them. If there is any bad work they are taken out upstairs, and sent down again. There is a notice that two cents per bobbin will be charged for every bad one. When the bobbins go down the overseer takes count of them.

Q.—The bad work done by operatives may cause delay to other operatives, I suppose? A.—Yes; it would cause delay all through

Q.—So the bad work of one operative does not merely relate to that person, but affects others as well? A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you been in St. Anne's Cotton Mill? A.—I have been in the mill; but I have never been connected with it.

Q.—How long have you been employed in the Hochelaga mill? A.—Going on eleven years.

Q.—Have you seen anything grossly immoral there? A.—No; I have not. Once in a while we get pretty hard cases, from over the line, who want to get rid of something, but as soon as we come across them we fire them out.

Q.—There is nothing like open immorality? A.—No; I have never seen anything.

Q.—Has any father or mother complained to you about the conduct on the part of boys? A.—No.

Q.—Are you a father of a family yourself? A.—Yes; I have seven children.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you believe if you employed more adults and less children there would be less fines imposed? A.—No; I do not think there would. I think, as a general rule, the older persons get fined more than the smaller ones.

Q.—Probably the children only assist in the work and do no work themselves? A.—The older persons have separate work. A man runs a machine and he has one of the children to feed that machine, to put bobbins in. That is all the child has to do—they have nothing to do with the machine; they simply supply the machine with work.

Q.—Are the employees of the St. Anne Cotton Mills very much inferior to the employees of the Hochelaga Mills? A.—No; because I taught the largest part of them myself—they are Hochelaga help.

Q.—Can you explain how it is that the fines which amount to four-fifths of one per cent at the Hochelaga Mills are one and a-half per cent, at the St. Anne mills? A.—They are on a different class of work from the lower mill.

Q.—Would not that difference depend on the manner in which the fines were imposed? A.—I could not say, I am not sure. I am not aware of the fines imposed in the St. Anne Mills.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You say the mills are employed on different kinds of work? A.—We run fine work and they run coarse work.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How much would a young woman earn in the spinning room? A.—All our frame spinners are generally from nineteen to twenty years of age. We pay them so much a side. A girl will run twelve or fifteen sides, none are less than twelve; and the wages will amount to 75 cents a day.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How much more than by the week? A.—We never allow them to run more than fifteen sides, which is sufficient for any girl to run.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Do you know of any agent being sent to the Saguenay to look for help? A.—I think a few years ago I sent an old man down to the Saguenay to pick up some help.

The CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What year was that? A.—Five or six years ago.

Q.—Do you swear you did not send any one there in 1886, that is two years ago? A.—Not specially. If any one was going down and asked me if I wanted help I always said yes. I did not send any one on purpose at that time.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Do you always look for help from that district? A.—Where a corporation has employed about 1,500 hands there is always help coming and going.

By the Chairman :—

Q.—If you did, would it not show the general capacity of that district? A.—I have always found the Saguenay people pretty good help as a rule.

Q.—If you did choose a particular place from which to get your help it would be, I suppose, because they were capable people? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Have you ever invited help from the Saguenay when the mill was already full? A.—No; I would be very foolish to run into extra expense on that account. I never looked after help when the mill was full.

Q.—Did you ever dismiss local help in order to make room for help outside? A.—No. You must bear in mind that the Saguenay help is green help, and we never discharge trained help to take on green help.

Q.—Is there not help enough in Montreal to keep the mills going? A.—There is a surplus in winter; in the summer sometimes there is a scarcity. Some of the men go on the wharves, and any where else.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG ;—

Q.—Do you even get green help in Montreal? A.—Yes; right along.

Q.—Which is the cheapest help, the green help from the Saguenay or Montreal? A.—It is not a matter of pay. We generally pay them one thing. We do not pay Montreal help any more than Saguenay help, or Saguenay help any more than Montreal help. We have a scale of prices whether they are good or bad hands. If they are bad hands they do not, of course, earn so much—if they are good ones, they earn good wages.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Are the people who come to you from abroad less able to be independent than those living in Montreal? A.—I think so. If you take the English they are a little more independent than the French. They are born in a hotbed of strikes in the old country and are always ready to strike.

Q.—If employees come from the Saguenay or any place outside of Montreal, are they less able to be independent than the families residing in Montreal? A.—No; I do not think it. All our help from the Saguenay has always been respectable looking help, as if they had not been wanting for anything.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—They are not starved people? A.—No. I prefer the French to the English help, and I would not hire the English if I could get the French.

Q.—Is that not because the French are cheaper labor? A.—No; but they are more agreeable to get along with. Although I am an Englishman myself, I speak of facts, and I give my experience.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—If the English employees are hard to get along with, must it not be the same in regard to an English employer as well as an employee? A.—I do not know.

JOHN BEATTY, Printer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—You are foreman of the composing room of the *Witness* I believe? A.—I am superintendent of the whole establishment.

Q.—Are you a practical man? A.—Yes; I have been 36 years in the *Witness* office.

Q.—How many journeymen printers are connected with your establishment? A.—We have 55; we have six apprentices, two in the composing room, two in the newspaper department, and two in the job department.

Q.—How many compositors are there employed on the paper? A.—About 34.

Q.—Are they all on piece work? A.—No.

Q.—Are the compositors employed on the paper, paid by the week? A.—Some are; those setting type are paid by the week.

Q.—How many are there? A.—From 25 to 30, 30 is the highest number. We have adopted an excellent plan now of paying printers according to their work, both as regards the quantity and the quality of the work. It is done in this way: heretofore we have had to take on inferior hands sometimes, in fact I might call them drones, I am sorry to say that a good many connected with our business are such. If they get one week's work they will not work another week but they will drink a large portion of their money. Those hands we have had sometimes to take on because we could not help ourselves, and they would demand as much wages as men who were more capable and unfortunately the Union demands it for them. We now arrange the matter this way; we put a man at work and find out how much he can do per day, how many thousand ems he can set. After a day or two we look at his proofs. If they are clean and if he is a fast compositor we will pay him accordingly. We pay the ordinary compositor per day 25 cents per thousand, Then we go from that and pay a man who will set 30,000 ems a week at the rate of 27 cents per thousand.

Q.—Have you men in your establishment who set 30,000 ems per week? A.—Yes. Then the man who will set 40,000 ems per week will get at the rate of 28 cents per thousand, and a man who will set 50,000 ems will get at the rate of 30 cents per thousand.

Q.—Have you men who will set 50,000 ems solid matter per week? A.—Yes; several. In our office the majority of the men remain with us a long time; we have a man who has been there from 15 to 20 years.

Q.—You do not pay all round, the prescribed scale of the Union? A.—No; because I find this Union business a drag, and it enables the drones to live upon the honest men—or they rather try to live upon them, although they will not work more than a week at a time. I have gone from here to New York, and have seen men who left us here hanging around the street corners in New York.

Q.—You went to the *Witness* office in New York? A.—Yes.

Q.—That also is a non-Union establishment I believe? A.—Yes. It is a separate establishment from the office here. I have frequently gone there because it has been my business to go sometimes between the two places, and I have had an opportunity of judging the men I met on the corners around there.

Q.—Would you find any difficulty in obtaining first class compositors if you were to pay the standard rate of wages? A.—None whatever,

Q.—If you paid them the standard rate of wages? A.—No difficulty.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest apprentice you have in your establishment? A.—We have one young message girl bordering on 15 years. At the time she came to us I did not want to take her, but her mother begged me to do so as she was in indigent circumstances. The girl is employed only half her time. She sits on a chair and she carries copy from the editorial room to the reporter's room and from the reporter's room to the compositors, that is all she does. She has a desk at which she

improves herself, as I know she should be at school, and she has not had enough education.

Q.—Have you any girls setting type? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many have you so employed? A.—We have about 15 girls.

Q.—How much per thousand do you pay the girls? A.—The rates vary from 15 to 24 cents per thousand.

Q.—Do they correct their own proofs? A.—They do.

Q.—They are employed on piece work? A.—Yes; we were the first office in the country to introduce girls—that was some 15 years ago.

Q.—How long have the girls, as a rule, been with you? A.—We have some girls in our shop who have been with us 15 years.

Q.—And you still pay them 24 cents per thousand? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think that some of the girls are as competent as men in setting type? A.—No.

Q.—Not after they have been 15 years at the business? A.—No; we don't keep them at work so many hours as the men—we shorten their hours of labor. We find they are not able to stand a day's work like a man, and we do not rush them as we do the men. Accordingly we do not want them to work so hard.

Q.—Do you not think that a thousand ems of type set by a girl at the rate of 15 cents per thousand is worth as much to the proprietor as one thousand ems of type set by a man? A.—No; she would not set it as fast—she would not be so reliable.

Q.—Do you consider they are properly paid for what they set? A.—We would pay 40 cents per thousand to a good hand rather than pay 25 cents to a poor hand. In publishing afternoon editions we find if one hand is a minute or two behind, it delays the paper going to press; consequently we want to get fast hands and no girl can compete with men.

Q.—Did you ever offer 40 cents per thousand ems to good compositors? A.—No; we never did—we would prefer to do it.

Q.—If you would offer 35 cents per thousand do you not think you would get good men? A.—We have all the good men we want, the best in the city. I think we are paying the highest price paid in the city to our men.

Q.—What would be the average amount earned per week? A.—Do you mean by compositors?

Q.—Yes. A.—It varies very much. Is it piece work you are talking about?

Q.—Yes. A.—The wages run from \$7 to \$15 or \$16.

Q.—Do the men whom you have working by the week set the fat matter, such as tabular matter and advertisements; have you no men on piece work who could set those? A.—Yes; but we prefer to have it done by regular week hands. Of course, we give the fat matter to the piece hands in this way. Certain men take charge of the stones each week, and they get the fat matter during that time, and make \$16 or \$17 when they have the fat matter. We don't like to take it from them and give it to other men as is done in other places.

Q.—They take it week about? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it the same with the advertisements? A.—No; they are set by the compositors.

Q.—In other words, that matter goes to the office? A.—What we call tabular matter is fat matter.

Q.—Are not advertisements fat matter in your opinion? A.—Yes; but there is other matter much more so, such as the correction of tables, and so on. A man can get a thousand inside of five minutes sometimes.

Q.—Take tables that are to be corrected, such as pickups—standing tables that require correction? A.—They go to the men; the piece hands get the benefit of them.

Q.—Are they paid a price and a half or table prices for matter of that kind? A.—When it is new matter.

Q.—But when it is pickup it is not so? A.—Yes.

Q.—In regard to the girls who are employed on piece work, does it not require a competent man to look after their work sometimes? A.—No.

Q.—They are all competent to set type? A.—Not all. We train some of them, and in other offices I find they do not do that.

Q.—Are your apprentices indentured? A.—No.

Q.—Do you not think that the indenturing system would tend to make better printers? A.—I don't think it would, I can see some reasons why such would not be the case. A boy who became indentured might turn out to be a drone, and we would be obliged to keep him, although it would be injurious both to him and to us, and if they want to go away, which they do very often, they skip across the lines and that is the end.

Q.—Do you take on apprentices? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you ever ask them about their education? A.—We do that invariably, and try whether they can read or write.

Q.—If they are not capable of reading and writing you do not accept them, I suppose? A.—We do not; we tell them it is no use their going to learn the trade. There are boys who are in the habit of going around to different offices and trying to get higher wages, but we refuse to employ such, unless they bring a letter from the office in which they were last employed.

Q.—How much matter per hour do you consider a competent man capable of setting? A.—We have three hands who will set close upon 1000 ems per hour.

Q.—Do you consider that extra fast work? A.—I do.

Q.—What would you think of an office that could show up from twelve to fifteen compositors able to set from 1000 to 1500 per hour all round, would you consider them good men? A.—I would.

Q.—Are there any offices in Montreal where all the fat matter goes to the piece hands—where all the matter that goes into the paper is placed on the hook? A.—I am not in a position to say.

Q.—Do you think it is possible to do that in a city office with all the hands? A.—I think it is not.

Q.—Do you ever put piece hands on time to set advertisements? A.—Very frequently.

Q.—Then the piece hands are competent to set advertisements? A.—Some of them are, and some are not. The compositors who do go on advertisements would prefer not to do so; and the reason we don't put them on, is, that they think it unfair if we don't put all the piece hands on.

Q.—Taking a boy on, how long would elapse before you would be able to find out that he was competent to make a printer, and that that was his calling? A.—About six months.

Q.—You could not tell it within six months? A.—I might, but it would be very difficult; we have to give them a trial at case and see what they can do.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of your office? A.—It is excellent. It is regularly scrubbed out, and washed, and those girls we have there are trained to take care of flowers and birds—we have 14 canaries and 200 plants.

Q.—Do the doors of the office open inwards or outwards? A.—Some inwards and some outwards, the outside doors open inwards.

Q.—Are the doors locked at a certain time in the morning? A.—No; they are kept open from a quarter to seven all through.

Q.—How much do you pay per week to a book and job hand? A.—We pay from \$9 to \$12.

Q.—Does the \$12 include the salary of the foreman? A.—No; the salary of the foreman is \$18.

Q.—How many hands are there in the book and job office? A.—10.

Q.—How many of those 10 hands receive \$12 per week? A.—One.

Q.—Are there any journeymen under \$9.00 per week in the job office? A.—No.

Q.—Do you find close competition for job work, such as contract work in

Montreal? A.—Yes. We introduced the Saturday half-holiday here; but the prices are cut so low here, that in making up our estimates, we find that those offices that do not give the Saturday afternoon can undersell us and put in lower rates.

Q.—Are you aware there is printing done in the Reformatory in Montreal?
A.—I have heard of it.

Q.—Is that kind of work injurious to the employing printers in Montreal?
A.—I should think it is, particularly so as I do not believe they pay taxes, while we have to pay very heavy taxes. I don't know what should be done in order to give such people work; but they could do their own work, such as school books and so on, or they could get out a little sheet every day if they want to improve themselves.

Q.—Do the stationery shops in Montreal send out agents for the purpose of soliciting printing in order to get their paper sold; have you known that to be the case in Montreal? A.—I could not state positively, but I know there are agents going around who carry samples, and I am astonished to see the prices they can do work at. I believe something of the sort is done, and I believe we ourselves have to do work that they get. For instance they get from Railway Offices work such as printing envelopes and of course we get the job from them. We take it at a paying rate, but it is very poor pay I can assure you.

Q.—It is a species of sub-contract system? A.—Yes; I believe it is.

By Mr. CLARKE :—

Q.—In the early stage of your evidence you spoke of being compelled to employ a certain class of labor; what do you mean by that? A.—At certain seasons we advertise for help, and as we cannot get enough of good help we are obliged to take what I call drones when we cannot do any better. We have now adopted a plan of paying the men according to their merits as I have already stated.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Is there a Typographical Union in Montreal? A.—I believe there is; I don't belong to it.

Q.—Do you know if a scale of wages is provided by that Union for evening papers? A.—I have heard, at one time or another, that there is, but I don't know it as a fact.

Q.—Do you know if you pay to any of your hands a higher rate than the Union scale calls for? A.—I don't know.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—When you take a boy into your printing office you will, no doubt, usually keep him at work before putting him at the case? A.—It is usually a year or sometimes longer, if the boy does not care about it. We ask him what particular branch he would like to be placed at. Sometimes he prefers not to go to the case, but prefers to go to the press, and we leave it to their own wishes. But I advise them as to what work I think would suit them, and then the boy may take it or leave it.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Do you think you pay the journeymen a lower scale of rates than the Union calls for? A.—I should think we do owing to the fact that we pay them according to the work they do. The Union demands that all men—I know that is their rule—should get paid alike, that is journeymen.

Q.—You do not know whether your rates are lower or on an average, a little lower, about the same or a little higher than the Union rates? A.—I don't know. I believe we pay the highest rates in the city.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Have you had any labor troubles? A.—16 years ago we had, and then we

closed the office and refused to give the men their demands. We took on girls, and we have some of those girls to-day, and we have never had any strikes since, and I don't think we ever will, so long as we have the girls to fall back upon. They know that we are independent of them. One of the great faults I see with those Unions is that they demand that a poor man should get equal wages with a good man who is both steady and competent—that is, that equal wages should be paid to a man that is not steady, and not competent. Such a man will not work if he has the work offered to him, for more than one week, but he will go and get drunk after he receives his wages. Another thing I notice is that tobacco and liquor have a bad effect upon those men—they in fact demoralize them, as I judge. I know some offices in the city where you can see tobacco chews and tobacco an inch deep around the frames.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—If a superior mechanic is willing to put himself on a level with an inferior mechanic, is that not his lookout, and not yours? A.—Unfortunately some of them have to do so; they cannot help themselves.

Q.—Is it not your business too? A.—It is my business.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Did you ever belong to the Typographical Union? A.—I did.

Q.—How long ago was that? A.—36 years ago, in this City.

Q.—The *Witness* is not looked upon by the craft as a Union office? A.—No.

Q.—Neither is your establishment in New York? A.—I believe not.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—But you do not refuse to take Union men? A.—No; we have Union men in the office now, and good men.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you pay them on the Union scale? A.—We do not recognize it.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You carry on your business to suit yourselves? A.—Yes; we carry on our business for ourselves, and not at the dictation of others.

By Mr. HEAKES ;—

Q.—What was the cause of the strike, in the *Witness* office, 15 years ago? A.—It was a demand by the men that we should give them all the advertisements and everything that came in. They would like to have all the fat and give no return for it, and so on.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you not think the compositors on piece are entitled to everything that goes into a morning paper? A.—On a morning paper they are entitled to more than on an afternoon paper.

Q.—Is it not an understanding, that when a man sets on piece, he is entitled to everything that goes into the paper? A.—It would not work, and I will tell you why. For instance, advertisements that must be displayed according to the orders given by the advertisers, compositors on piece would not give the required time to set, but would put them up slap-dash.

Q.—Are you aware that in every newspaper office in Toronto, advertisements and tabular work all go on the hook? A.—I am not aware of it.

Q.—Toronto papers are open to be criticised by any practical man; you look at them sometimes? A.—I do. If you take up some of our advertisements, you will

see that a compositor, on piece work, would scarcely make a thousand in a day, and that would not pay. Some of them, such as Carsley's, are set in such a way that a man would not make more than 2000 in a day.

Q.—Do you think the advertisements are set in the *Witness* in a superior manner to those appearing in other papers in the Dominion? A.—I have been informed by several of our patrons that they are; both by Mr. Clarke and by Mr. Glass, two merchants, who told me that our advertisements are better set up than any other advertisements.

Q.—By looking at the advertisements in the *Witness*, I do not see that they are much displayed? A.—Sometimes they are at Christmas time, when there are fancy advertisements.

Q.—Do you think a dry goods man going into a printing office is able to dictate the way in which his advertisements should be set, to a practical man? A.—Such a man as Mr. Glass is, he is a practical man, Mr. Clarke is also a printer.

Q.—We will leave out practical men. Do you consider that merchants who advertise are competent to inform a practical printer as to how the advertisement should be set? A.—I think such men as Mr. Carsley and Mr. Glass are.

Q.—I mean outside of practical men? A.—Such a man as Mr. Carsley understands his business, and I think he could do so.

Q.—But generally speaking do you think so? A.—Generally speaking, business men are very well up in those things.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—At all events they pay for them and want them set in a certain way? A.—Yes; I have known men to order advertisements out because they have not been set up as they wanted them set.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you ever known the proprietors of large newspapers to refuse to insert advertisements that were not set according to the style of the office? A.—Only last December or January I was informed by both Mr. Clarke and Mr. Glass that they had given orders to a certain office to set their advertisements as they were in the *Witness*, and as they were not done so, they ordered them out.

Q.—Suppose a merchant in Montreal wanted an advertisement three columns wide and one deep on the front page of the *Witness* would you allow it to be done? A.—No; we do not usually.

Q.—You would not allow a merchant to have his way in that respect. A.—No; we put in certain matter there.

Q.—Provided he was willing to pay you well would you allow it to be done? A.—No; we would not do it. We have made arrangements for certain class of advertisements to appear there, and they invariably do appear there.

Q.—So merchants have not all their own way as regards newspapers? A.—No; certainly not. There is another subject to which I wish to refer. I am Chairman of the School Commissioners of St. Lambert, and I notice that the doors are kept closed until about nine o'clock in the morning. Children who have come half a mile or a quarter of a mile, and who happen from the clock of the house being wrong, to have got there half an hour too early, you find perishing outside of the school, waiting to get in. I made a request to the teachers to open the doors earlier, but I was informed that when they were employed that was not in the agreement. I have seen this same state of things in the city schools here.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Who makes the regulations, the teachers or the Commissioners? A.—The Commissioners, of course, have the power to do it. I will mention to you an instance that came under my notice during the last two months.

Q.—Then this was the fault of the Commissioners not the teachers? A.—Unfortunately the teachers cannot be got to do it in most cases. I have seen this in the city, and have reported it at headquarters. I have seen the Coté Street School kept closed and the children perishing outside.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Did you make any representations to the authorities about the matter?
A.—I did.

Q.—To the proper authorities, the Commissioners? A.—I did at that time; it was some time ago. I have been in the habit of going backwards and forwards to New York, and I have seen the excellent arrangements there, and I have brought this matter up here. I was answered by one of the heads of the Department of School Commissioners in this city, and in reply I showed pretty clearly that there was great room for improvement here. There they have open rooms and a playground to receive the children before they go into the school, and they have all sorts of amusements with which to enjoy themselves. I am now speaking of Brooklyn.

Q.—Did you get any distinct answer whether they would attend to the matter or not? A.—No.

Q.—Did they ever take any direct action about it? A.—No; I am simply showing you now the difference between the United States and here, and I think we should try to improve our schools.

Q.—You have the law yourselves and the power to exercise it? A.—It is not exercised.

JOHN LYNNAS, Ship-laborer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—I understand you wish to make some statement in regard to the evidence given by Captain Barclay? A.—I wish to contradict what Captain Barclay said in his statement. He stated that he never knew any of the Allan ships to be overloaded.

Q.—Do you say you know them to have been overloaded? A.—Yes; two years ago a vessel was overloaded and went to Quebec where the crew refused to take her across unless she was discharged.

Q.—And what is the name of that vessel? A.—I think it was the Sarmatian.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Have all the vessels the Plimsoll mark on them? A.—Yes.

Q.—Was she down below that? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What time of the year was it? A.—Last summer twelve months.

Q.—It was in the summer of 1886? A.—Yes.

Q.—How much water did that vessel draw when she was overloaded as you say?

A.—Their draft I think is 25 feet of water.

Q.—How much water is there in Lake St. Peter in the summer? A.—I have seen ships loaded down here to 27 feet, three inches.

Q.—In the summer time? A.—Yes; I don't know what the ship was drawing, but she was over her mark. The Allan Company promised the crew a month's extra pay if they would take the ship home as she was, below Plimsoll's mark.

Q.—Do you know that she is a Mail boat? A.—Yes; she is a Mail boat, but the Mail boats have no more privileges than the others.

Q.—What is the next thing you find wrong with Captain Barclay's statement?

A.—Part of the crew, the biggest part volunteered to take the vessel home to get the extra month's pay. Those were discharged who would not take her home for the extra pay, and they were working along with me in Montreal.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you know this of yourself or did they tell you? A.—I know it from the papers, and from the men on the ship, and from the men who were discharged because they demanded the extra wages when they got to Liverpool. They were discharged and told they would never be employed in the Company's service any more.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What is the next thing Captain Barclay said, that you say is wrong? A.—That is all I have to say about Captain Barclay. The cashier said that he never closes the wicket sooner than seven o'clock at night. Exactly at ten minutes to five the bell rings on the ship for the officer's supper. He closes the wicket in his office then. When I worked there in the summer there were only three of us who did not get paid, and as the bell rung for supper I went to him and said: "There are only three of us, will you pay us?" He banged the wicket in my face and made us wait till ten minutes or a quarter to six.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—What is the time for paying? A.—They start to pay about two o'clock, or half past two.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What is the next thing you have to say? A.—The Insurance Agent, who was examined this afternoon, said he cannot get at the men.

Q.—We don't want you to say what Mr. Rolland said; but we want to hear what you have to say? A.—I say that the 'Longshoremen, of Portland, have not to pay \$15 before they are able to do one hour's work. They can go to work by paying \$2.

Q.—To whom do they pay that? A.—To the 'Longshoremen Sick and Benefit Society.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Is that Sick and Benefit Society connected with the one here? A.—No. They tried to bring this same insurance down there. The first year Mills and MacMaster of the Dominion boats demanded one cent on the dollar of the pay for insurance. The authorities of the United States demanded that every man be paid in full for his labor. We work ten hours and get ten hours pay. Another thing is this: he said that the reason why he did not pay the men on the Dominion Line the same amount of money for the same insurance was, that the men are not so well qualified as those on the Allan Line. I say that the hatchmen on the Dominion Line—I don't care if there were 60,000 tons on the ship or even the weight of the ship itself—there are men on the Dominion Line who would be able to rig their gear and take it out of the ship without any accident. I myself get one of the highest wages paid to men working on the dock, and I have to pay this cent on the dollar and yet because I am working on the Dominion Line I will only be allowed four dollars a week while Allan's men are allowed five dollars. I don't think it is right to make a difference in the men in regard to this insurance. I don't think it right that the men should have insurance money stopped from them in defiance of their wishes. Every man is free in this country, and it is but right that he should be paid his full wages, and if he wishes to insure himself he can do so.

Q.—When you are employed by any other Line, do you not know that you are under the same regulations with regard to the insurance as the Allan men are? A.—It is all the one insurance. I pay from fifteen cents to twenty cents a week for that insurance. If I earn thirteen dollars a week, I am stopped thirteen cents.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Are there any other facts you want to state? A.—There are facts I want to state about the grievances that exist along the shore.

Q.—What are they? A.—Another thing is this: a gentleman of the Allan Company said that men receive only twenty-five cents in Boston, Portland, and New York. I contradict him. I have worked in the three places. The wages in Portland are thirty cents for day work, and thirty-five for night work; in Boston they are thirty cents for day work, and thirty-five cents for night work; and in New York city they are forty cents day work, and sixty cents night, and \$1.00 an hour for Sunday work.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you know anything else? A.—There are great grievances existing in connection with 'longshoremen. And, in my opinion, the men in Montreal are worked harder than in any other port in the world.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Could you not go away from here? A.—No.

Q.—What I say is, that if 'longshoremen are so badly treated in Montreal, why do they remain here? A.—They cannot help it, because a man has his wife and his family.

Q.—It does not cost much to go away? A.—It costs a good deal. If a man is able to go away he may have to leave his family behind him, and may not be able to take them with him.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Tell us any other grievances along the dock, not already mentioned by Mr. Tart, or other witnesses? A.—The stevedores here will hire you and tell you to go to work. It will take you three-quarters of an hour to rig a ship, and you will get nothing for it. You will get paid for that time in any other port. Then, when you move from one hatch up to another, you will have to rig up again, and you will get nothing for that.

Q.—Is that the practice with outside stevedores? A.—It is with the Dominion and Beaver Lines, and the Donaldson Line.

Q.—Have you made any effort to try and have this time allowed you? A.—The men have made a good many efforts, but they have not got it. The largest part of it is due to the foremen on those Lines who are working for the stevedores. They will work ten hours, and only get nine and a half, or nine hours' pay. The man who was on the hatch before, got the vessel discharged in such and such quick time, and so to gain favor with the stevedores, the foreman will cut off a half an hour, or an hour from your time.

Q.—You should try and avoid working with people of that description? A.—You cannot do it in Montreal very well. You have such a long winter before you, and most of the men remain in the city during the winter, and there is nothing practically for them to do, that you have to do the best you can in the spring.

Q.—Why do you not bring the stevedore up in the office for which you are working? A.—I have complained to the stevedore. McMaster has told me he did not want any foreman to wrong any man out of five minutes of his work; but the foremen will do it.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—This is not done on the Allan Line of Steamers? A.—No; I am not talking about the Allan Line, but of another matter. Another thing is, they will order you to work, and you will perhaps wait till ten, or half past ten, and then they will tell you, you can go home, that there is nothing for you to do. You go home, but you are allowed nothing for the time.

Q.—Do Mills and MacMaster treat you in the same way in Portland? A.—No; we have the pay when we have earned it.

Q.—They do not deduct from you a half hour occasionally? A.—No; they pay you, in Portland, for all your work.

(Translation.)

OLIVIER DAVID BENOIT, Boot & Shoe Maker, of Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Are you a boot and shoe maker? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you work by the day, or by the piece? A.—By the day.

Q.—Can you tell us if wages in the boot and shoe trade have increased in the past ten years? A.—No; I beg your pardon. They have been lowered, instead of increased. They have been lowered by about 15 to 20 per cent in certain branches.

Q.—Are young people employed in your trade? A.—Yes, a few; but only a few among very young people.

Q.—Are there young people, who are employed in your trade, engaged as apprentices, or to do certain lines of work, and help other workmen? A.—It is only as helps in the factory.

Q.—Do they serve a certain number of years before they are looked upon as mechanics? A.—As soon as they get a chance of increasing their wages by taking the place of a mechanic, or even of a man who has a family to work for, they do so.

Q.—They cannot be regarded as boot and shoe apprentices? A.—No; they cannot be so regarded, because there is the machinery. Every one works in his particular branch; and, naturally, if you work in one branch for twenty years you cannot make a boot, nor even a shoe.

Q.—These young people are, therefore, unable to make a pair of boots or shoes after they have done what they call their apprenticeship? A.—They have no apprenticeship at all, and when they leave a factory, they are skillful in only one branch of the trade. Take myself, for example; it is about twelve years since I left the factory, and about twenty years that I am working, and I am able to do only a single branch of my trade.

Q.—There are very few boot and shoemakers to-day, who are able to make a pair of boots or shoes? A.—There are in the factories very few boot and shoe men who can make a boot or shoe; they are so few, indeed, that they can hardly be found at present. In other words, the boot and shoe makers of old times and the boot and shoemakers of our time are not the same men, because the boot and shoe men of old times could make a shoe or boot, make the uppers, sole it, or make the pattern and put it on the last, and then finish it and put it on the foot, whereas the pattern general rule, all the men working in factories, especially the large factories, are able to do only one kind of work, as to set a heel or sew a sole, or set the uppers, because to-day perfected machinery has replaced hand work.

Q.—This means that to-day a perfect machine can make a boot or shoe or a series of machines can make a boot or shoe without the help of workmen and only assisted by young people? A.—That is true in a great measure.

Q.—Has the introduction of machinery in the boot and shoe trade, resulted in a

lowering of wages? A.—Yes; and that is the reason that I came here, before this Commission to say that our wages have been lowered, and not only the wages but the work has decreased, inasmuch as to-day one machine most certainly takes the place, on an average, of five or six men.

Q.—Does machinery have, as a result, the lowering of prices in boots and shoes?
A.—Well, machinery brought on competition, and competition has been spread and been distributed over hand work, I think, and I am certain that, so far as the goods themselves go, if they have been lowered in price, it is the workmanship that has suffered.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What you are asked is this—whether the prices that rule to-day are the same as the prices of other days, that is, a boot or shoe of the same quality is cheaper to-day than it was before the introduction of machinery into the boot and shoe trade. Is that so? A.—It is precisely the same thing with the exception of the few cents more or less one way or the other.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you believe that it is possible to make boots or shoes by hand as cheaply as they are turned out by the machinery? A.—There is a house here, in Montreal, which began about five or six years ago to make boots and shoes by hand. The two members of the firm, at the time that they started, were not very well up in means—as I could prove to you, and to-day, after having worked five or six years at the handworking of boots and shoes they have realized a handsome fortune. Lately, however, machinery was introduced into that house; the employer had to give it up only a few days ago. He said that if the machines had not entered his factory he would never have allowed them to enter.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—It follows hence that it is possible to make a boot or shoe as cheaply by hand as by machinery, and machinery has been of no injury to you at all, if you can make shoes as cheaply by hand? A.—I do not see how you can say that machinery has not injured us.

Q.—But if you can make a shoe as cheaply by hand as by machinery how can you make out that machinery is harmful to you? A.—Yes; but you must consider that one machine can be put down as equivalent to twenty men, and that I, for instance, may be thrown upon the street. In that case who enjoys the benefit? It is the man who manufactures.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is it not a matter of fact that the boots and shoes turned out by machinery are of inferior quality to those made by hand? A.—Yes; far inferior.

Q.—Have you ever worked by the piece? A.—Never.

Q.—What are the hours of work in the factories both by day and by week? A.—Ten hours and a half a day, and we work up till three o'clock on Saturday which makes sixty hours a week.

Q.—What are the average wages? A.—From \$7 to \$8 a week, for the men.

Q.—Do you know what the salaries are for the girls? A.—The wages for the girls in our department, that is for those who make what is called the uppers, are from three dollars and a half to four dollars and a half a week.

Q.—How are you paid and how often are you paid? A.—Every week.

Q.—On Saturdays? A.—Yes; at three o'clock.

Q.—You are paid on the Saturday up to what day? A.—Up to Friday evening.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You are paid what is owing to you on Saturday? A.—I beg your pardon. We are paid only up to the Friday evening preceding.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—How are you paid when the Friday is a holiday? A.—We are paid up to Thursday; and the following week we are paid the balance.

Q.—If you are paid up to Thursday evening there is no balance left? A.—Yes; there is. We are paid up to the end of the day when we get our money. In other words we are always one day behind hand.

Q.—That is to say that you have always the Saturday in arrear? A.—Yes; we have always the Saturday in arrear. For instance, when there is a holiday during the week, which falls on the eve of pay day, such as Friday, we are paid on the Saturday; but it is the Friday that is considered as the last day of the week. If it is Friday that is a holiday, then we are paid on Wednesday night, and Thursday's pay is held over.

Q.—Do you pay for gas at the factory? A.—No. They made the hands pay for it in certain factories; but, as for me, I cannot bear witness to that.

Q.—Without naming the factory where you work, will you tell us what is its sanitary condition? A.—In certain departments, it is quite passable; in others, very bad.

Q.—As to the privies, are they clean and kept in good order? A.—Yes; they are very clean and well kept.

Q.—Are they separated for men and women? A.—Yes; and the morality is also good.

Q.—Do the men leave the factory at the same time as the women and children? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is the exit through the same door? A.—Yes; by the same door.

Q.—How do the doors of your factory open? Inside or outside? A.—The last door on the outside opens on the outside and the others open on the inside. In other words, on stepping down from the last stairway there is a door which opens on the outside and the main door, at the entrance to the building, opens on the inside, while the last door outside, for the winter, opens outward.

Q.—How many floors are there in your factory? A.—Four besides the basement.

Q.—Is there any salvage apparatus in case of fire? A.—Latterly buckets with water have been placed about the building with barrels alongside the buckets.

Q.—Are there any ladders outside? A.—There is only one, in front of the building.

Q.—How many persons are employed in this factory? A.—About two hundred and fifty to three hundred, when times are good.

Q.—In case of fire, do you think that the ladder on the outside would suffice to allow the hands working in the upper storys to make good their escape? A.—I leave this honorable Commission to judge for themselves. There is only one ladder in front of the building and, if every body had to pass that way, they would pass pell-mell.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Are there any stairs in the inside? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many stairs are there on the inside? A.—There are four stairways which makes one for every flat.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—What are the wages of "mounters"? A.—These have been lowered in the past few years, especially since the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty

two, when the strike was on. Now they are introducing a perfected machine meant for mounting shoes. In the meantime there is no such machine as yet in Montreal. These machines can be manufactured here in Montreal. I do not know when they will be ready.

Q.—When these machines shall be put up what will be the wages of mounters ?
A.—The wages of mounters will be from about \$6 to \$9.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have you worked in the United States ? A.—No.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—What are the wages paid to men who are in charge of the pegging and sewing machines ? A.—Generally speaking those who work by the week make from \$10 to \$12 a week, and those who work by the job, naturally, have some weeks where they make about the same, and sometime less.

Q.—And those who work by the case ? How much do they earn ? A.—There are sixty pairs of shoes in a case. As to their wages that depends on what they do. The average is from \$1.50 to \$2.75 a case.

Q.—What is the nature of these goods ? A.—As to boots and shoes made by machinery, that is, what is called "Goodyear Welt," the men make \$3.50 to \$4 the case. That depends on the quality ; but a man cannot make up more than three or four cases a week.

Q.—Are you aware whether there are any patent rights on the machinery in use at Montreal ? A.—Yes ; on the "Goodyear Welt" alone, for the last four months ; and on the "Mackay" and the "Bigelow" a little more is paid,—about half a cent more a pair.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do hands working by the piece arrive at the factory at the same hour as the hands who work by the day ? A.—Yes ; the rule is the same for every one working either by the day or by the piece. They must arrive at the same hour. This is the rule of the factory.

Q.—Do the hands, working by the piece, get their work as soon as they arrive at the factory ? A.—At times they do not get work during the whole day, and are obliged to remain doing nothing up to a late hour of the day. When they have work they begin at the usual hour, and when they have none they simply wait.

Q.—Are they obliged to stop at the factory ? A.—They are obliged to wait. If the foreman tells them to wait, they are forced to wait.

Q.—If those who work by the piece arrive five minutes after the closing of the doors, in the morning, have they any fines to pay ? A.—No ; they have no fines, but they are obliged to lose two hours and a half.

Q.—Does this happen at all times, or only when there is no work for them. A.—At all times of the year, no matter what day, and the rules are so severe, that a few days ago, I saw the doors closed quite rudely on a man who had been working by the piece.

Q.—Do men, working by the piece, lose a great number of hours in the week through want of work ? A.—At the present time, I am positive that there are some, who, very certainly, lose thirty hours a week in certain lines.

Q.—Would it be possible to give work to these men in a regular way, and give them the hours free, during which they do no work ? A.—Certainly ; if the foreman would only give himself that much trouble, I think that it might be done. Thus, if I am a man working by the piece, the foreman must certainly know me, and why, knowing that I have no work to do, does he keep me in the factory, and why does he not let me go home to attend to other business, which I may have to do ? But, no ; I am forced to stop in the factory, whether I have work or not.

Q.—When a worker by the piece finishes his work on Saturday at nine or ten o'clock, is he forced to stop in the factory until the hour when the other hands are paid? A.—He is not paid before the others, and I saw a man, working by the piece, wanting to leave at twenty minutes before twelve, to go out and get his dinner, and who was told that he could not leave the works.

Q.—What do you call a "team-runner?" A.—That is the contractor, or a man, who has a branch, for instance, to make soles, or to mount, or to heel. This man has three or four persons working under him, and it is he that is called the "team-runner."

Q.—Does this man make any profit on the hands that he employs? A.—There are some men who do. Do you refer to the present time, or since I have been in the trade.

Q.—Let us speak for the present? A.—There are some facts which took place only last week. One man had another employed under him, he realized an amount of some twenty odd dollars, whilst his employee went off with only eight dollars. The first had worked only four or five hours a day and the second had worked about nine hours a day.

Q.—Are these sub-contractors absolutely necessary to conduct the work? A.—No; the foreman could easily manage the thing himself, if he chose. Why do they do it in some branches, while in two or three reserved branches they do not do it?

Q.—Do you believe it would be unjust to get rid of these "team-runners" and give higher wages to the workmen engaged in those branches? A.—I believe that these "runners" should have long since been done away with, and the work would have been none the worse in consequence. This is the root of all the trouble in the factories, and this is what brings on all the trouble. I may say that I have seen strikes caused by the fact that contractors sometimes took salaries more than double those of their employees, and that the hands who worked for these people went home with a slender salary, while the bosses of the establishment knew nothing about the whole transaction.

Q.—*In fine* the sub-contractor is one employer in the service of another employer? A.—Yes.

Q.—The employer of a factory determines on a price with the contractor and the contractor makes another price with his men? A.—That is it precisely.

Q.—Do these "team runners" exist in all factories? A.—I may say that they exist in all factories.

Q.—Do you know of any factory in which the employers have themselves been boot and shoe operatives, and who maintain this system in their own establishments? A.—Yes.

Q.—They must, therefore, find in it some advantage or other? A.—I know that the contractor is responsible for the work. He is bound to answer to the questions of the foreman and the manager. There are a foreman, a manager, and the employer over and above this contractor. Finally, all the world is made up of good people, and the one who works the hardest gets the least on Saturday, and it is he that is the slave.

Q.—Are fines imposed on workingmen in the boot and shoe manufactories? A.—Not to my knowledge—not in the factory where I worked.

Q.—Are the men made to pay for boots and shoes that may be damaged? A.—Yes; and if you will allow me, I shall set forth the way in which they are made to pay. I suppose that I am a contractor, or "team runner," and it so happens that while a boot or shoe is being cut it gets damaged, then the foreman says to the contractor: "You are obliged to pay for this boot or shoe." It is thus understood that the sub-contractor is paid to see that such things do not happen; and, on the Saturday, he takes that damaged shoe or boot, walks up and down the establishment, and takes chances, making each one pay five cents for a chance, at a raffle; and then he puts the boot or shoe on the table, and causes it to be drawn with dice; and, in this way, often makes money therewith.

Q.—Why are dice used? A.—It is neither more nor less than a game to make the men pay the price of the boot or shoe. The contractor goes up and down the establishment, and asks five cents for a chance to pay the pair of shoes. Everyone throws the dice, and the one who wins the boot and shoe, carries it off for his five cents or ten cents, according to the number of chances he has taken.

Q.—What I want to establish is this: Does not the “team-runner” receive a profit in order that he may answer for the boot or shoe? A.—Yes.

Q.—And when a boot or shoe is damaged, he sees that it is paid for by the hands? A.—Yes; in some way or other.

Q.—That is he draws a profit, and incurs no responsibility? A.—Yes.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Will you tell us why those men, of whom you spoke a while ago, lose thirty hours a week. Is it because the employer wants to get rid of them, or is it really because there is no work to give them. A.—We shall suppose, for an example, that the factory receives an order for sewing, in that case the parties who work in the sewing department get the benefit of this order, and those working in the pegging department are obliged to take what comes along. Naturally, the boss, having a contract only for sewing, and not having a contract for pegging, those who do the pegging are obliged to go about their business, and the boss has not to pay them, because he has no work to give them.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do these cases happen often? A.—They happen in every season, because when it is the right season for one class of goods, it is not the season for another.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Have workmen a price list in Montreal? A.—Yes; that is to say, the employer says: “Let me have a look at my neighbor’s list, and I will pay the same price,” and, when he has brought the neighbors list, he says again, “Bring me the next neighbor’s list,” and when the other neighbor’s list is brought, it is always the same thing, and the question is as to who will pay the least.

Q.—You have no general list? A.—No.

(Translation.)

ELIE RICARD, shoemaker, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have heard what the last witness has just said? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you anything to add to the evidence which he has given? A.—I can only ratify what Mr. Benoit has been saying; and I must add that there is a considerable feeling of depression among the boot and shoe mechanics for the past few years, because the working man has been replaced by the machine. That is, if you will allow me, I do not wish to speak of all machines; but I wish to speak of a certain number of machines which come into straight opposition with our handiwork, and do not turn out a better job than what is done by the hand. Only it works faster, and that is the reason that our markets are glutted with fearful rapidity. So much so that we have competition on the market and that the dealers complain, and a great number of manufacturers complain as well. It is not only the boot and shoe trade that suffers; but business in general, because boot and shoe makers scatter the fruit of their toil among all classes of society. This is what

frightens business men, and if consumption is diminished, while production is increased we cannot arrive at a good result. With regard to wages, about where I am employed the wages are from \$8, \$9 and \$10 a week. There are men who make more and others who make less; but I think that we get the highest prices because we work by hand.

I do not wish to detain you too long. The witness who spoke before me has told you pretty much what I wanted to say. If you have any questions to put to me I am ready to answer.

(Translation.)

LOUIS HORMIDAS LARAMÉE, Dry Goods Clerk, of Montreal, sworn:

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are employed in a dry goods store? A.—Yes.

Q.—As a general rule, what are the working hours in these stores? A.—In certain stores, from seven o'clock in the morning to eight o'clock in the evening, and in others, from half past five in the morning until ten and eleven o'clock in the evening.

Q.—Are there many stores which open at half past five in the morning? A.—Not a great number.

Q.—Is there a special reason why these stores should be open so early? A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—Are not these stores situated in the neighborhood of railway stations? A.—No.

Q.—Are there many stores that close at ten o'clock at night, as you say? A.—The number is pretty considerable.

Q.—Is the business that is done at night of any importance? A.—It has gone down sensibly within the past few years. In certain streets, evening sales have decreased from 75 to 80 per cent.

Q.—Are you aware that the chief stores of Montreal—those who do the most business—close early? A.—Yes; the most influential merchants close early.

Q.—In what part of the city are situated those stores which close early? A.—In Notre Dame Street the largest stores close at six o'clock.

Q.—Are there stores on St. Lawrence Main Street which close at seven o'clock? A.—I think that, at certain times of the year, there are one or two stores closing at seven o'clock.

Q.—The most important? A.—Yes.

Q.—And on St. Catherine Street? A.—There, the general rule is eight o'clock. The doors are closed at eight o'clock, and the clerks are retained till nine, ten and eleven o'clock at certain stores.

Q.—Are they regularly kept in like this, or, is it only at certain times of the year? A.—About five or six months in the year.

Q.—What are they employed at? A.—They make up and assort goods.

Q.—In your opinion, is this work up to eleven o'clock absolutely necessary? A.—This work can easily be done the next morning, from eight o'clock to half past nine, while the clerks are not busily engaged.

Q.—Are the young girls, employed in these stores, made to stop up to the same hours as the young men and the clerks? A.—Yes; in many of the stores.

Q.—In the stores closing at eight o'clock, and keeping their people in until eleven, are young girls kept also? A.—Yes; in certain stores, on Saturdays chiefly, they are kept till midnight, and sometimes till one o'clock, and sometimes two o'clock in the morning on Sunday.

Q.—Do you mean to say that they are obliged to work on Sunday morning?
A.—Yes; they oblige them to work on Sunday morning.

Q.—Up to two o'clock? A.—Yes; during the busy season.

Q.—Are these the young ladies who wait in the store, or the dressmakers? A.—It is the milliners who trim the hats.

Q.—What necessity is there to keep them up to two o'clock in the morning?
Is it because they deliver goods on the Sunday morning? A.—Yes; on the Sunday morning.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—To whom do they deliver them? A.—To the customers. The milliners have not the time to trim the hats before eleven o'clock or midnight, and they send them out in the morning, because it is too late to send them that night.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Does this happen often during the year? A.—In the months of April, May and June, particularly in May and June, it happens almost every Saturday, and in the autumn, in the month of December, it sometimes occurs.

Q.—When the milliners work up to two o'clock in the morning, do the employees in the shop remain in the shop also until two o'clock? A.—No. They keep the young men to take them home at that hour.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that employees who have refused to stay until two o'clock in the morning, on Sunday, or other days, have been dismissed? A.—No; I have no knowledge of that.

Q.—Employees in stores are paid by the week, are they not? A.—By the week. In some stores they keep back the salary and only give an account.

Q.—They keep an account upon the first week? A.—They keep an account. A merchant, I suppose, wants the money. Then he gives only an account to his employee and settles with him later—a month or, perhaps, two months after.

Q.—How are you engaged? By the month, the week, the day or the year?
A.—By the year generally.

Q.—But how are you paid? A.—Paid every week.

Q.—You are engaged to be paid every week. In your engagement are the hours of work stipulated? A.—No; not where I am employed.

Q.—But, in a word, you are engaged with Mr. _____ to work for him, every day for a year, is it not stipulated that you shall work from such an hour to such an hour? A.—Occasionally they make a certain definite arrangement for instance, that we must arrive at eight o'clock in the morning and work till half-past eight in the evening; but the hands that are able to obtain this favour are few in number.

Q.—When you are made to work till two o'clock in the morning, either to wait on the milliners or for some more serious work are you paid anything extra? A.—No.

Q.—Are you paid in money? A.—Yes; generally in money.

Q.—Are there any stores where the employees are forced to take their goods from the store itself? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—You say that your engagements are made by the year. When the employer fails in his business how are you treated? Have you any experience of such things? Have you had an employer who failed in business? A.—Yes; that has happened to me five times.

Q.—Will you tell us what was your experience? A.—At the time that the bankrupt law was in force we had three month's salary by preference. In these last years we are allowed thirty days; but really have no right to them.

Q.—And, at the present time, in what position do you find yourself when a merchant goes into insolvency? A.—When a merchant goes into insolvency in the month of June or the month of July, we are put in a very awkward position. Often times we are unable to get situations before the following spring.

Q.—And you are allowed nothing for the breaking of your contract by the insolvency? A.—We have generally thirty day's salary, but there are employees who get nothing.

Q.—In what condition are dry goods employees when they owe money? A.—The whole of their wages is seized.

Q.—Have you known fathers of families whose wages have been seized? A.—Yes. I have known some.

Q.—What is the feeling of business employees on the question of the seizure of salaries? A.—That they be put on the same footing as working men.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—But you would much prefer to have the seizure of salaries done away with altogether, would you not? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you know of any business employees who have borrowed money from money lenders? A.—Yes. I know of some.

Q.—Do you know what interest they paid? A.—I could not tell just exactly.

Q.—Do you know whether they paid heavy interest? A.—Yes; they paid heavy interest.

Q.—About how much? Fifty or sixty per cent? A.—Sometimes I have seen a man borrow a certain sum, say \$5 or \$6 and return the same at the end of about a fortnight and pay \$1 or \$1.50 of interest.

Q.—Do you know whether this thing happens often? A.—This thing has happened sometimes to my knowledge.

Q.—Do you know whether there are any business employees who have borrowed money and who have delivered a bill of sale on their furniture to the lender? A.—No. I never was aware of that.

Q.—As a general thing do employees, who make purchases in the store where they are engaged, get any reduction in prices? A.—Yes. In certain stores there is a reduction of ten per cent and in other stores they buy cash plus ten per cent of advance on cost.

Q.—Do business employees and dry goods people serve an apprenticeship? A.—Not a regular apprenticeship.

Q.—That is they go into the business young and learn whatever they can pick up? A.—An employee can go into a store, and at the end of a year he can leave it to go into another and so on.

Q.—Are the lads called "cash boys" generally very young? A.—Yes; there are many who begin at ten, eleven, and twelve years.

Q.—Do they stop in the store until the doors are closed? A.—Yes; they stop until the close.

Q.—When the store closes at ten o'clock or eleven o'clock, or midnight, as on Saturdays, do the cash boys stop in the store? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it a fatiguing trade for children? A.—Yes; very fatiguing. The same may be said of the young lads who carry parcels, although they are a little older. On Saturdays they, too, stop in the store till midnight.

Q.—The young lads that you speak of, do they carry parcels on Sunday mornings? A.—Yes; that happens very often.

Q.—Up to what hour do they work on Sunday mornings? A.—They have a certain number of parcels to carry, say three or four, or four or five, parcels to deliver sometimes. It may be only one. That all depends on circumstances.

Q.—In the months that you have just been speaking of, when Sunday work is almost general, in the months of June and July, are these lads obliged to return regularly on Sunday mornings to carry parcels? A.—They are not directly obliged.

Q.—How do they know that they have to come? A.—They are told as much the night before. The number of these stores is not very great.

Q.—Are the stores that close so late large or small establishments? A.—These things happen in some large stores.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are you aware that girls employed in such stores have been obliged to give up their engagement on account of the cost of clothing and the smallness of their wages, and take service as domestics or housemaids? A.—Not to my knowledge.

(Translation.)

ALFRED VIGER, Leather-cutter, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are a leather-cutter? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—We have already heard leather-cutters who have detailed to us almost everything that happens in their trade. Have you any knowledge of their evidence through the papers? A.—No, sir.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the shop in which you work? A.—I believe it to be in a good condition; well ventilated and well heated also.

Q.—You are paid every Saturday? A.—Yes; regularly every Saturday.

Q.—What are the wages which you earn at the present time? A.—The ordinary wages, generally speaking, are from seven to eight dollars and a-half per week; but I believe that employees are not paid as they ought to be, according to the demand. I believe that those who receive eight dollars per week ought to get ten dollars, and those who have ten dollars should have more in proportion. I believe that wages ought to be at least two dollars per day.

Q.—Have the salaries been increased during the last few years? A.—I do not think that they have been increased for fifteen years.

Q.—Has the work been increased? Are there more leather-cutters in town now, than there were then? A.—In our department I do not think that the number has increased.

Q.—All the work is done by hand, is it not? There is no work by machinery? A.—Everything is done by hand.

Q.—Are there many apprentices in your trade? A.—I think there are too many, that is what causes a great nuisance to the workingmen, inasmuch as the apprentice engages for a while in one factory and then when he feels that he is improved a little, he goes off to another factory; and spoils the mechanics' prices.

Q.—Is leather imported already cut? A.—Upper leathers are imported from England, and other lines of work are manufactured in other factories.

Q.—These upper leathers imported from England, are they cut from leather which is not made in Canada? A.—From the same leather which is made here in Canada.

Q.—Do accidents occur in your trade? A.—In consequence of the close surveillance of the foreman they occur very rarely.

Q.—Are there any employees who object to employing men belonging to Trades Unions? A.—I do not see any in our line.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Are there men not belonging to a Union who work with you? A.—There are some who belong to the Union and others who do not belong to it.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Has there been any decrease in the wages of leather-cutters during the past

ten years? A.—There has been none so far as I am concerned; but that comes from work having decreased in our line. At least I think that is the reason.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG—

Q.—Are you aware that paper is sometimes substituted for leather in the manufacture of boots and shoes? A.—That does not come within our line. It belongs to another department, and I cannot answer that question.

February 18th.

ANDREW F. GAULT, President of the Hochelaga Cotton Manufacturing Company, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Does the Hochelaga Cotton Company own the St. Anne's Cotton Mill? A.—Yes.

Q.—Does it own the Montreal Cotton Mill? A.—No; its works are at Valleyfield, and that Company is distinct from the Hochelaga Company.

Q.—Have you taken any active interest in the working of the Hochelaga Mill, or have you left that to the manager—I mean the interior working? A.—In the interior working of the mill I have taken I may say no interest whatever—that is no active interest.

Q.—Have you received any notification from the Government of the Province of Quebec of the passing of a Factory law for this Province, and were you required to conform to the law which made it illegal to employ a boy under 12 years of age and a girl under 14 years of age in the factories? A.—I never to my knowledge received any notice of that kind.

Q.—Now when your attention has been drawn to the employment of children in the factories will you inform the Commission if you think that boys under 12 and girls under 14 years of age should be so employed? A.—I think it would be better if they were not.

Q.—Would you object to a law which would require that boys under 12 and girls under 14 should not be employed more than half their time and be compelled to go to school in the morning or afternoon as the case might be? A.—It would, of course, be a very serious change to the mill to have that law put in force, because it would necessitate having two sets of help, and they would be difficult to get. So far as I am personally concerned I would object to nothing that would improve the condition of the working classes.

Q.—Do you not think that the clause of the Factory Act permitting the employment of children under 12 for 12 consecutive hours for six consecutive weeks should be repealed? I may say that that clause states that the hours of labor of a child, young girl and woman shall not be more than 12½ hours on any one day, or 72 hours in a week, and such exemption shall not extend for more than six weeks in the year. Thus you see that this exemption can extend for six consecutive weeks for 12½ hours a day. A.—Practically they do not work more than sixty hours per week now.

Q.—Do you not think that law should be repealed so as to prevent this being done? A.—I think so far as I know that sixty hours per week are sufficiently long hours.

Q.—How long have you been in business in Montreal as a merchant, and do you employ commercial travellers who travel in the Province of Quebec and other Provinces? A.—I have been 35 years a merchant in Montreal.

Q.—And you employ travellers? A.—Yes; both in the Province of Quebec and other Provinces.

Q.—I presume that when those travellers follow your instructions you never repudiate what they have done in your name? A.—We generally agree to what has

been done. At the same time we hold ourselves open to refuse orders or anything of that kind, and we would not hold ourselves responsible for collecting money.

Q.—If an agent, by your instructions, makes a bargain with a man, you will not repudiate it? A.—No; that is the usual course of business.

Q.—I presume, when those travellers, acting under your instructions, make a bargain with a dealer, you do not repudiate it? A.—Of course not.

Q.—I presume you would not act differently as president of the Cotton Co.? A.—Certainly not, I believe in carrying out agreements.

Q.—Do you know anything of any alleged promises made by an Agent of the factory, a Mr. Thibaudeau, to residents of the Saguenay district, with regard to wages, which have not been carried out by the Company? A.—No; I know nothing whatever about it. All I have heard is, that a man went down to Saguenay, and brought some help; I know nothing about what promises he made, or what he said.

Q.—It has been stated here that a factory operative having taken an action against the Company, it was dismissed by the Recorder, who, at the same time, stated that although the plaintiff had no legal, she had a moral right, to payment of the wages earned by her; do you know anything of this case? A.—No; I do not. When was that.

Q.—In October, or November last? A.—I never heard of it; I don't know anything about it.

Q.—Would you, as a general rule, consider that the factory should pay wages earned, although the same had been forfeited, occasioned by trifling misconduct; and what would you do in your individual business under the circumstances? A.—There is a rule in the factory, which, I think, should be observed; that is, that people who do their work should be paid; if not, there must be some way of trying to get them to do it.

Q.—But I am speaking of trivial misconduct? A.—In the factory it is necessary to have strict rules.

Q.—Do you think there could be exceptions to those rules? A.—There can be exceptions to anything; but there must be strict rules for the general conduct of business.

Q.—Do you think there may be cases where there may be exceptions? A.—Where there is no malice, or malicious intention, it would be quite right to make an exception.

Q.—If complaints were made by parties, who had been fined, would you consider it your duty to have the same investigated? A.—I would refer the cases to the manager.

Q.—And would you be satisfied with his report, or would you, under certain circumstances, investigate the cases? A.—I think that is a matter for the manager altogether; it is none of my business, and I would not interfere.

Q.—Then, practically, there is no appeal from any decision given by the manager? A.—The manager has full charge of the mill, and if any parties appeal to us we would certainly be willing to argue the matter with the manager, if anything of importance.

Q.—Do you think the levying of fines should be strictly enquired into by the directors, in the interest of the employees of the factory? A.—I don't think it would improve things very much. I think that is a matter of detail for the superintendents to attend to. It is a matter that the superintendents in every factory look after. I don't think the directors should make it their business to enquire into those things.

Q.—Do you not think that the operatives under your charge have a right to appeal to you if they consider they have been ill-treated by one of your servants? A.—Of course, they have a right if they wish to do so.

Q.—But, if it is merely a formal right, what would be the use of it; would you under certain circumstances attend to their complaints? A.—I have in one case

listened to their complaints, and urged that what they asked should be granted. That is the only time I have ever been appealed to.

Q.—Was it attended to? A.—Yes; I believe the matter was settled satisfactorily to the operatives.

Q.—Have you during your visits to the factory noticed any act of immorality or heard any complaints from any one on that score? A.—No, never. I have always found the help in the mill to look respectable. I have gone through many mills and I have never seen any mill where the help looks more respectable than in the Hochelaga cotton mill—that is, so far as I could see by going through the mill.

Q.—There was nothing in the personal inspection of the mill you have made to lead you to think there was anything wrong going on? A.—Nothing whatever. I have heard the late manager say frequently that he considered the help as good a class of help as any on the continent, in the matter of morality especially. He spoke of the help in the very highest way he could.

Q.—Would you consider it your duty to dismiss anyone who would have misused his position so improperly in regard to a female operative, and would you dismiss any operative, male or female, who was guilty of immoral acts? A.—If the matter was brought under my notice I would certainly urge the manager to do it. The gentleman who was the late manager was as high-toned a man as ever lived in Montreal, and at the same time just and generous.

By MR. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you made a personal inspection of the factory? A.—I have gone through the factory frequently in a general way; I have never gone into the details.

Q.—Have you ever paid any attention to the situation of the conveniences for men and women in the factory? A.—Never more than passing by them—I have seen the place, but have never gone into them.

Q.—Has it ever come to your knowledge (it has been stated that men and women use the same convenience in the factory) that those places were not sufficiently divided to prevent contact of the sexes? A.—That is the only thing I have seen in this evidence that I thought might be improved, and that under any circumstances we would alter. We talked the matter over last night after seeing the evidence, and we will certainly endeavor to make the necessary alterations. I think it is a pity that men and women have to go to the conveniences by the same entrance, although it is the case in most mills.

Q.—Would it not be improved if separate entrances were furnished to men and women? A.—I suppose it would be.

Q.—And would it not lessen the temptations to which women are subject if they were released from work say fifteen minutes before the men? A.—I think it would be a good thing. It would alter the work in the mill, of course.

Q.—Personally you are not cognizant of the infliction of fines on the employees? A.—I know there is a system of fines in all mills. I know nothing of this matter more than it is customary to fine hands for bad work.

Q.—You are not aware whether the employees are fined for other offences than bad work? A.—I understand they are fined for any malicious damage. For instance: a boy might turn around and break a pane of glass through maliciousness. He may break a machine without there being any necessity for doing so. In such a case I think he should be fined—it is the only way to keep them right.

Q.—Are fines inflicted for any other causes than bad work and malicious breakage? A.—For being late or something of that kind.

Q.—They are fined for being late? A.—I fancy so.

Q.—Are they fined for any other cause? A.—I think that is about all—two or three causes.

Q.—You would not be aware if fines were inflicted for any other causes in the mill? A.—So far as I know these three causes cover them; there may be other things that I don't know about. Fines are imposed for bad weaving—bad weaving

is the principal cause of the fines, and that is through carelessness on the part of the weavers, or because hands will not take the trouble to learn.

Q.—Would you consider fining of the employees for such trivial causes justifiable?
A.—After being reprimanded several times, if they still did not do what they were told to do, I think it would be only right either to discharge them or impose a small fine, or do something in order to have proper discipline.

By THE CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—That is only in case of continued offences? A.—Certainly; not for the first or even a second offence, but if the offence was continued.

By MR. HEAKES :—

Q.—At whose discretion is punishment inflicted? A.—I believe at the discretion of the foreman in the department—whatever department that may be.

Q.—The foremen inflict the fines and the Company carries them out? A.—I believe they are frequently remitted.

Q.—Have you ever heard of any cases of the ill-treatment and abuse of girls in the factory? A.—Nothing was ever brought before my notice.

Q.—If such did take place in the factory what would be the action of the directors; for instance: if boys or girls were beaten by the foreman? A.—If it was brought before our notice we would, in all probability, have it investigated.

Q.—And none of those cases have been reported to the directors? A.—No.

Q.—There can be a great deal going on inside of the walls of the factory, I suppose, without the directors ever hearing of it? A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—So far as the directors are concerned they are desirous of carrying on the business in a straightforward way, and making the operatives as comfortable as possible? A.—We have always had that in view.

By MR. FREED :—

Q.—Have any orders been given by yourself as President, or by the Board of Directors to the Manager or Superintendent of either of the mills regarding the age of children employed in those mills? A.—I think not, it has never come before us.

Q.—Did you say in an interview with a representative of a Montreal paper, that in your opinion the children were working too long hours? A.—I said it was a pity that they were obliged to work so long.

Q.—Is it not possible to work shorter hours? A.—It is just as I have already stated that we would require two sets of hands, and it would be difficult to get them, of course it is possible to do away with children altogether, and do the work by grown-up people, and when we got accustomed to it we might perhaps do the work as well. It has, however, been the custom to employ young help in cotton mills. The work is very light and there is not much labor about it, and probably they are sometimes just as well in the mills as they would be about the streets.

Q.—Does it follow that if they were not in the mills they would be playing about the streets? A.—The chances are they would be.

Q.—What proportion of the children of Montreal under ten years attend school?
A.—Do you mean for the whole of Montreal.

Q.—Yes. A.—I could not say.
Q.—Is it not fair to presume that they would be attending school and not playing around the streets? A.—That class of children do not seem to go to any school; I don't know why it is.

Q.—Have any orders been given by yourself as President, or by the Board of Directors to the Manager or Superintendent relating to the conditions under which fines should be imposed? A.—No.

Q.—You leave that wholly to the Manager? A.—Mr. Whitehead up to his death had everything in his own hands.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—To-day it is Mr. Jackson ? A.—Mr. Jackson is the present Manager.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Have any orders been given by yourself as President, or by the Board of Directors touching the confiscation of wages in case of employees leaving your service without giving notice ? A.—We have never been consulted on that matter.

Q.—Do you think it right—I am not speaking of the law on the subject, I don't know what that may be—to confiscate the wages of parties leaving without giving notice ? A.—I suppose so if they leave without proper cause. If they are engaged to work out a certain term they should not leave within the term, I think.

Q.—Do you think that children under 12 years should be kept at work continuously from 12-45 to 7-15 P.M. without an opportunity of leaving the mill to get food or rest ? A.—They are long hours. I don't know whether that has been done. I see by the evidence that such things have occurred ; but it must have been very seldom.

Q.—Do you think it is right to employ children of 12 years at all ? A.—I think at 12 years a child should be able to work.

Q.—Do you consider it right to employ children of 11 years ? A.—I think 11 years is the youngest that should be employed.

Q.—Do you consider it right that children of 10 years should be employed ? A.—No ; I think it is too young.

Q.—Do you consider it right to employ children of 9 years ? A.—No ; I think it is too young.

Q.—Yet you permit this to be done ? A.—I don't think we have a child of 9 years at the Mill. Some of the children of 9 are apparently older than some at 10 or 11.

Q.—If your superintendent employs children of 11 years you think that is something of which the directors would not approve ? A.—After it was brought to their notice I don't think they would. Speaking for myself I would not.

Q.—When the mill is operated continuously without stopping the machinery from 12.45 to 9 at night is previous intimation always given to the employees so that they can provide themselves with lunch ? A.—That question I cannot answer.

Q.—Would an unmarried woman be permitted to work in your mill whose condition indicated that she had been guilty of immorality ? A.—I think it would be better not.

Q.—If your manager or superintendent permitted such a thing that would be something the directors would not approve of ? A.—I think so.

Q.—If you were to employ fewer children in the mill would not the necessity of fining the hands be less than it is now ? A.—I think the fines are principally among the weavers. So far as I know, the fines are generally with the weavers, and they are as a rule adult help.

Q.—I am requested to ask you if weaving is done in Ste. Anne's mill. A.—Yes.

Q.—Why should the percentage of fines be greater in Ste. Anne's mill than in Hochelaga mill ? A.—That I cannot tell you, except that there may be a worse class of help there.

Q.—If your manager stated that he himself has educated the great majority of the employees in the Ste. Anne's mill, would you consider that evidence that they were good help ? A.—Not necessarily. He may have help that never would be good—some people never can make good help.

Q.—If the manager has stated that the employees of the Ste. Anne's mill were largely educated by himself and were superior help, I suppose that answer would be final as to that question ? A.—I would be willing to take his statement to that effect.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—As a matter of fact do you know that different classes of work are made in the two mills. A.—The class of work is different—it is a different class of goods they make at Ste. Anne's as compared with the other mill.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Has the amount of the fines and the nature of the offences for which the fines have been imposed ever been submitted by the manager to the directors? A.—No.

Q.—You have taken no personal interest in the fines whatever? A.—We only know that such things exist, we have never gone into the matter. It has never been brought to our notice.

Q.—The fines go into the treasury of the Company? A.—No; I think we lose all the fines, because of the bad work that has been done, and we have to sell the goods for less price.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—But the money goes into the treasury of the Company? A.—The fine is taken off the work. They give you so much bad work, and you get less money for the work, in respect to which the fines are exacted. We consider that when we fine a weaver fifty cents we, generally speaking, lose one dollar.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you fine people, who work for low wages, in consideration of the fact that they have not yet learned their business? A.—Yes; I suppose that would be correct. People who are learning cannot expect to get the same prices as those who have been there a number of years.

Q.—You keep them at work at low wages because they cannot do good work, and you fine them because they do bad work? A.—I cannot say about that. All I can say, is the general principle, that a poor weaver cannot earn as much as a good weaver, because she does not produce so much good material. Poor hands get, I suppose, the same price, for weaving, that the better hands do, but they receive so much less, actually, on account of the fines.

Q.—What is the subscribed capital of the Company? A.—The Hochelaga Company?

Q.—Yes. A.—The stock of the Company is \$1,020,000.

Q.—Is it paid up? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know what the amount of last year's dividend was? A.—Ten per cent.

Q.—That would be \$100,000? A.—About that.

Q.—The fines last year amounted to \$2,698, in the Hochelaga Mill? A.—That I do not know, except from hearsay.

Q.—If that is the amount, as stated by your manager yesterday, that would be more than 2½ per cent of the total amount of the dividend? A.—I suppose so.

Q.—Do you consider you have lost money by those fines? A.—Yes; because you cannot obtain so much for the product those hands give us.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Do you not think it would be better if, instead of fining employees, you were to discharge them? A.—I think, after fining them several times, it would; but it would be a pity to discharge them, if they were willing to work. They cannot earn good wages if they do careless work. I think the fines are merely intended to stimulate them to do their work a little better. It is no advantage to us to fine them—it is a loss.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Do you know that young employees, who work in your factory, have been supposed to sign the rules without knowing what they were signing? A.—It is very little use making them sign them. I don't know whether it has occurred that young hands have signed them. I don't understand how they can do so, because a great many of them cannot write.

Q.—Do you not think those rules should be read to the children, and to all the employees, before signing them? A.—I think it would be only proper.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Would it not be better to allow all the female help to leave the mill a quarter of an hour before the men? A.—On thinking over this matter of which I have already spoken, that of the women leaving before the men, I don't see that it could be done because it would stop the whole mill. You could not keep the men in; if the mill was stopped they would go out in spite of you. In the case at Cornwall we had hands jumping from the windows—you could not keep them. You could not stop the mill and let the women go first and then the men.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Would it not be possible to have the males and females leave at different doors? A.—That would be more practicable, but you could not make a difference in regard to time for when the women left, the whole mill would stop.

Q.—When the machinery stops all the work comes to an end in the mill? A.—It would have to stop; one set of hands could not go alone without the other.

Q.—If an employee of the mill should give testimony detrimental to the manager would that person not be in danger of dismissal? A.—I don't think so. We want the truth and nothing but the truth. We don't care what the result is. We are open to have our whole mill and its management gone into from the start.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Is it not a fact that people are dismissed from the factory without you knowing about it? A.—Yes; I suppose so. The mill is conducted in that regard without my knowledge; but, at the same time, I don't think that a vindictive spirit would be carried out from what I know of the management.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Suppose any of the hands testified against the manager could he not be discharged without your knowledge? A.—Yes; the management of the mill is independent of me so far as that matter is concerned.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—From your experience have not low wages a tendency to impoverish and demoralize? A.—I don't think they get low wages; I think the wages in Cotton factories are higher than in some other departments of business.

Q.—Are there any women of 15 or 17 years earning \$3.00 or \$3.50 a week? A.—There may be, but a good hand will earn \$7 or \$8; that is something to work up to.

Q.—When a young woman pays for board, say \$3.00 she has not much left? A.—I don't think they pay more than \$2.00 or \$2.50 down there.

Q.—When she has paid for respectable board she must have a very small amount left for clothing and other expenses? A.—The rule is that they are not alone but living with their parents. They are not often girls who are alone who go to work there. They come there with their families and live with their parents generally.

Q.—Are employees generally sought for who live with their families? A.—We would prefer them.

Q.—Is that looked at when young women are engaged for the mill? A.—We look upon it as an advantage where there are families, and in order to carry out that idea we have built 50 or 60 cottages so as to give the employees of the mill nice comfortable homes.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You believe most of the girls live with their parents? A.—A great many of them do. I think the young girls who go to the mills as learners would probably all live with their parents. I don't think a girl earning \$3.50 per week would undertake the work otherwise.

DAVID MORRICE, Montreal, called and sworn :—

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You are one of the directors of the Hochelaga Cotton Company, I believe? A.—Yes, and selling Agent as well.

Q.—Have you taken any personal interest in the internal working of the Mill? A.—No.

Q.—You visit the mill now and again, I suppose? A.—I am in the mill very frequently, sometimes two or three times a week.

Q.—Have you ever perceived anything that would make you suspect any immorality going on there? A.—Never.

Q.—Have any complaints ever been made to you on that score? A.—Never.

Q.—If you had seen anything you would have enquired into it? A.—Yes.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Do you go through the different departments every time you visit the mill? A.—Not usually. My duties bring me no more immediately into contact with the Manager, and probably the character of the business I have in hand would take me to a certain part of the mill.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—You know nothing about immorality in the mills of the Company? A.—I have never heard a word about it.

Q.—Do you concur in Mr. Gault's remarks in regard to the conveniences? A.—I have never noticed in passing through the mill the entrance to the conveniences, but I have never heard any complaints regarding them. I quite concur in the remark of Mr. Gault when he stated that it might be advisable to have them altered, and no doubt that will be attended to at once.

Q.—In the interest of the morality of the employees would it not be advisable to do so whether convenient or not? A.—Decidedly.

Q.—Can you tell us why your rules compel employees of the Cotton Mill to work on legal holidays? A.—No, I think it is customary. I don't know of any other Mill in the city that shuts down on the holidays unless, it may be, on Christmas or New Year's day.

Q.—Taking into consideration the long hours the people are employed, is not it a hardship to deprive them of the holidays? A.—I think not. The hands work ten hours a day and although the hours are somewhat long the labor is not severe.

Q.—You think that two holidays in the year are sufficient for working people? A.—That is another question. They have the Saturday afternoon—the mill closes at one o'clock on Saturday. I work a great deal longer myself, I can assure you.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You would not refuse an employee absence for one day if he requested it?
A.—Such a matter as that is entirely in the hands of the manager.

Q.—I mean so far as you are concerned? A.—If any of my employees come to me—and they come frequently, asking to go away, leave is granted to them unless something unusual occurs.

Q.—One of the Commissioners wishes to know whether you oblige your men to work on Dominion Day, for example? A.—I don't know. I would require time to consider such a question as it would depend upon special circumstances. I don't think I would take the ground of compelling the men to work on that day.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Supposing an employee wished to be absent from the mill and went to ask you instead of the manager and you gave him permission would he suffer anything?
A.—I would not dare do such a thing as to give an employee permission to be absent; that would be entirely out of my province as a director.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You leave that to the manager? A.—Yes, wholly. In such matters as the internal working of the mill we have never taken the position of doing anything, but we have left all those subjects entirely in the hands of the General Manager. I am connected with a number of other mills, and it is so in every mill with which I am connected, as it is I think with every mill in the United States, both woollen and cotton.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—As a matter of fact do you believe that an employee does get permission to leave the mill? A.—From the mill?

Q.—Yes, say for a day? A.—I have no knowledge. I have been in the mills when I have asked for some one and I have not noticed him there—he had been out for the day.

Q.—You think they get occasional permission to leave? A.—I think so.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Have you, the Manufacturers of Cotton, a combination or organization?
A.—There is a Cotton Association in existence. All Cotton Manufacturers are not members of it.

Q.—Have you any objection to telling us what the objects of the Association are?
A.—The general object of the Association is the regulation of the output of the mills and the value of the goods.

Q.—They regulate the prices of the cotton, do they? A.—They regulate the output of the mills and the value of the goods—Yes.

Q.—Are there any fines imposed on members of the Association for violation of the rules? A.—I don't think it is necessary for me to answer those questions—although there is nothing in them specially.

J. K. WARD, recalled :

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Are you connected with the Hochelaga Cotton Company? A.—No.

Q.—Are you a shareholder in the company? A.—No.

Q.—Are you connected with the St. Anne's Mill? A.—No. I am connected with the Montreal, St. Henri, Coaticooke and Magog Mills.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—You have heard mention made of fines, respecting Hochelaga and Ste. Anne Mills? A.—The conditions are about the same in all the mills I have any knowledge of. The fines imposed are more especially fining weavers. I never heard of any fines being imposed in any other branch of the industry except weaving.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you ever heard any complaints about immorality in Cotton Mills, that is as regards any particular mill? A.—No; I have not, I have not heard of any directly.

Q.—As a director of mills have any complaints been made to you? A.—No. In regard to the question of having separate closets for employees I know that in all the mills I have anything to do with, the closets for the females are not in the same portion of the building as are those for the males, but are entirely separate. I have no doubt that it would be desirable, if it was convenient that they should be as far apart as possible, perhaps one at one end of the flat and another at the other end; but that would involve considerable more expense. The closets in the mills that I have known are separate and distinct though in the same part of the building. In regard to the question of fines I may say that I have never heard of fines being imposed for any dereliction of duty or carelessness in my experience, but they were almost entirely confined to the weavers, because most of the other hands in the mill work by the day, and it is not easy to find fault with any of their work, but in weaving it is very easy to find individuals who should be fined as every piece of cloth is marked and when it goes to the cloth-looker for examination it is easy to know who did it and who should be fined if the work is bad.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you think it would be a good provision if the law were to specify the number of water closets to be provided according to the number of hands employed? A.—It might possibly be regulated by law, but I think of course those are matters that are taken into consideration by the architect before the mill is built, and closet arrangements are made in proportion to the number of hands proposed to be employed.

Q.—You think the contractors or architects should see to that matter? A.—The contractors would hardly look into it, it would be a matter more specially for the manager or architect.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Then it would be a mere question of expense to have them made separate at one end of the building or at the other? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you not think in the interest of all concerned it would be better to have this done? A.—I think it would be.

Q.—And the expense would not be a very large amount? A.—Not a very great deal. The fitting up of the closets would be the same whether at one end or at the other.

Q.—The drainage of the building must be made under any circumstances I suppose and the connections would not cost very much? A.—Undoubtedly so.

Q.—And a great deal of familiarity would thus be avoided? A.—Of course. It shocks the modesty of young people to have to go into conveniences before others. However, it is a matter of detail and it would be desirable to have it done as I have said. The question of the Factory Act has been referred to. I would say that in my

opinion though we have a Factory Act now that is the law at present, it having been proclaimed.—I believe we have both a Dominion and a Provincial law now.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

There is no Dominion Act.

By the WITNESS :—

The Provincial is based upon the Dominion Act.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Upon the Ontario Act.

By the WITNESS :—

We have at all events a Provincial Act which is law really though not put into operation for the simple reason that Inspectors require to be appointed by the Government. We think in some factories with which I am associated that there should be a law put into operation to regulate the hours of labor of children and the ages of children and so on, an Act something like the Imperial Act under which children are not allowed to work more than seven hours a day, and have to go to school, there being compulsory education in force there. If that could be done here it would be very desirable—there can be no question about it. That is on general principles but unless such a law was applied throughout the whole country it would be difficult for one mill to compete successfully with another when one mill carried that out and another did not. A general law would of course be required to affect all alike so that all the mills might be placed on the same footing.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Will you have a statement of the fines imposed in your mills sent to the Commission. A.—I will, but it will take some little time to prepare.

JOHN S. HALL, Advocate, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You are a practicing advocate in this city? A.—Yes.

Q.—What are the goods exempted from seizure? A.—The goods exempted from seizure in the Province of Quebec are those set forth in articles 556, 557 and 558 of the Code of Civil Procedure. The articles are as follows, viz. :—

1. The bed, bedding and the bedsteads in use by the debtor and his family;
2. The ordinary and necessary wearing apparel of himself and his family;
3. One stove and pipes, one crane and its appendages, one pair of andirons, one set of cooking utensils, one pair of tongs and shovel, one table, six knives, six forks, six plates, six teacups, six saucers, one sugar basin, one milk jug, one teapot, six spoons, all spinning wheels and weaving looms in domestic use, one axe, one saw, one gun, six traps, such fishing nets and seines as are in common use, and ten volumes of books;
4. Fuel and food, not more than sufficient for thirty days, and not exceeding in value twenty dollars;
5. Two draft horses or oxen, one cow, two pigs, four sheep, and their fodder for thirty days, together with one plow, one harrow, one working sleigh, one tumbril, one hay cart with its wheels, and the harness necessary for farming purposes, one sewing machine, one washing machine and a wringer;

6. Tools and implements or the chattels ordinarily used in his trade to the value of thirty dollars ;

7. Bees to the extent of fifteen hives.

Nevertheless, the things and effects mentioned in paragraphs four, five and six are not exempt from seizure and sale when the suit is to recover the price of their purchase, or they have been given in pawn. Under Article 557 books of account, titles of debt or other papers in the possession of the debtor are exempt from seizure, saving those mentioned in Article 565.

The following are also exempt from seizure, under Article 558, viz. :—

1. Consecrated vessels and things used for religious worship ;
2. Alimentary allowances granted by court ;
3. Sums of money or objects bequeathed upon the condition of their being exempt from seizure ;
4. Sums of money or pensions given as aliment, even though the donor or testator has not expressly declared that they should be exempt from seizure ;
5. Wages and salaries not yet due.

Alimentary allowances and things given as aliment may, however, be seized and sold for alimentary debts.

Under Article 628 the following are also exempt from seizure, viz. :—

- Pay or pensions of persons belonging to the army or the navy ;
- Salaries of public officers ;
- Contingent emolument and fees due to ecclesiastics and ministers of worship, by reason of their actual services, and the income of their clerical endowment ;
- The salaries of school teachers.

As an amendment to Article 558, there was a statute passed by the Province of Quebec, 44 and 45 Victoria, Chapter 18, declaring that wages due to laborers shall be liable to seizure only for a proportion not exceeding one half ; and under Section 2 the word "laborer" shall be applied only to those who work and are paid by the day, week or month (*operarius*). By an amendment to Article 628, a statute of the Province of Quebec, 38 Victoria, Chapter 12, that, "In future the salaries due and to become due of all public servants or employees, in the Province of Quebec, shall be liable to seizure in the proportions hereinafter set forth, for any debt incurred subsequently to the coming into force of this act, notwithstanding any provision to the contrary contained in Articles 558 and 628 of the Code of Civil Procedure of Lower Canada.

The proportions of such salaries liable to seizure shall be :

1. A fifth of every monthly salary, not exceeding one thousand dollars per annum.
2. A fourth of every monthly salary exceeding one thousand dollars but not exceeding two thousand dollars per annum.
3. A third of every monthly salary exceeding two thousand dollars per annum.

The Act also provides how the salaries shall be attached by means of a writ served upon or left with the head or deputy head of the department or office, in which the public servant or employee is employed. Under 31 Vict., c. 20 provision is made for certain exemptions to people who occupy certain public lands. The summary of this Act is as follows :—

"From the time of the occupation of any lot of land, and during the ten years following the issue of patents for the lands of settlers, conceded and granted as aforesaid, the following chattels shall, without prejudice to article 556 of the code of civil procedure, be exempt from seizure under any writ of execution issued out of any court whatsoever, in this Province."

The Statute then goes on to describe seven classes of articles, being very much the same exemptions as are provided in Section 556, extending the articles to meet the wants of a settler. Under Section 6, vehicles and other implements of agriculture are exempted from seizure.

Q.—What is your opinion as to the law respecting the seizure of wages? A.—It is perhaps a little difficult to form an opinion on that question, but I am quite

convinced the present system of seizing wages in the Province of Quebec should be abolished. There is difficulty in deciding as to how far the wages of a working man should be seized. Some people have argued that the seizure of wages should be abolished altogether while others have contended that to abolish seizure altogether would, to a certain extent, affect the credit of the working classes. The law now does exempt one-half the wages of a working man from seizure, and I think if seizure by garnishment of wages were abolished entirely and it were left in the hands of a judge to use his discretion as to whether the defendant was able to pay the debt and at what time, all parties would be reasonably satisfied. As there is at the present time a provision exempting one-half of the wages from seizure in certain cases of certain persons, it will be a fair proposition to exempt them altogether, say up to the sum of \$25 especially as the costs of executing by garnishment are so heavy. For instance, if a working man has a judgment against him for any amount under \$25 and is earning \$7 a week, one-half his wages can be seized every week, namely \$3.50, the balance being exempt from seizure, and yet the lowest possible costs of the execution of seizure would be \$3.50, that is allowing bailiff's services within one mile, and if the bailiff had to travel a greater distance, of course, expenses would be heavier. In cases where the judgment is between \$25 and \$40 the cost of seizure would be \$5, and between \$40 and \$50 it would be \$7.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Will you tell us if those exemptions from seizure apply in cases of seizure for rent? A.—They do.

Q.—Are tools also exempt? A.—Tools and implements, and other articles used in this trade, to the value of \$30, are exempt.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Under the law of the Province of Quebec, can employees be compelled to work on legal Holidays? A.—I do not know that the question ever before came under my notice.

Q.—I see that, in the regulations of the Hochelaga Cotton Manufacturing Company, there are these words: "Employees are required to work on all holidays except two, Christmas and New Years Day." A.—I never saw that regulation before, and, of course, it is a very important question to answer off hand.

Q.—This question is important because, if an employee is absent on one of those days, he or she is liable to lose fifteen days salary. A.—If you chose to leave it, I will give you an answer on that question.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—What are the legal holidays of the Province of Quebec? A.—They are set forth in article 2, of the code of civil procedure, namely :

1. Sundays.
2. New Year's Day, the Epiphany, the Annunciation, Good Friday, the Ascension, Corpus-Christi, St. Peter and St. Paul's Day, All Saints' Day, (the Conception) and Christmas Day;
3. The Birthday of the Sovereign;
4. Any day appointed by royal proclamation, or by proclamation of the governor, as a day of general fast or thanksgiving; Easter Sunday, Ash Wednesday, and Dominion Day.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—What is the privilege given to laborers, clerks, or others, for wages? A.—That article is defined by article 2006, of the Civil Code, giving them the privilege for three months salary in arrears.

Q.—In what position is the balance? A.—For the balance, they would rank as ordinary creditors on the estate.

By Mr. HEAKES:

Q.—That applies to employees in stores? A.—Those not employed in stores would have the preference for arrears covering three months.

By Mr. FREED:

Q.—Tell us what meaning the courts give to the word "compagnon"; do they limit the word to what we understand as journeyman in English? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you able to tell us whether a workingman, signing a contract, which he has not read, and which has not been read to him, would be held by the courts to be bound by that contract? A.—If he disputed the contract?

Q.—Yes. A.—I presume he would dispute the contract, and say he was induced to sign it by error, or in some other way, and if he proved that it was not read over to him, no doubt the judge would take that into consideration.

Q.—If a person has simply signed his name in a book, and it was proved that he had not read the document, and that it was not read to him, would he be held to be bound by the contract signed by him? A.—Unless he urged some other grounds, he would be held to be bound by it, for it would be taken for granted that it was read to him.

Q.—Suppose he should prove that it was not read to him and he never read it what would be the result? A.—He would have to account for the fact that he had put his signature to it. If he said he put his signature to it through some error or fraud or coercion and proved it, no doubt the judge would relieve him.

Q.—If a man thought on signing it that it was simply for the purpose of getting his name on the record how would it stand? A.—If that could be shown the judge would probably relieve him.

Q.—Under those circumstances if a workman should leave without notice would it be legal for his employer to deduct fifteen days' pay from his wages? A.—If that question came up and the defendant showed to the judge that he thought he was simply signing a pay roll or something to get himself on the roll and books of the company, that part of the agreement which might require him to give notice would be set aside and he would be bound by the ordinary municipal by-law which provides that certain notice shall be given.

Q.—Suppose an operative knew of this rule as a common rule of the establishment how would the case stand? A.—He would be bound by that.

Q.—Whether he signed it or not? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—If he was not bound by that contract would the common law give the employer authority to deduct any of the wages due? A.—The judges have held in a number of cases that the employees are bound to give notice, and if the employers have suffered a certain amount of damage which they consider equal to the wages of the employees, they generally lose the case.

Q.—The law then would warrant the employers in assessing the damages done and in collecting the amount from the money due the employee? A.—The cases that have come up have been cases of wages due to men amounting to \$7 or \$8 and the Court has generally considered that the damage done to the employer from the men having left him is equal to this sum; and in a great many of those cases the employer shows that he has been to some little trouble or inconvenience in getting a man to take the other's place. That is what our judges in a variety of cases have held here.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Has the employer the right of retaining wages due to an employee without bringing the matter before the Court? A.—He assumes that right and the judge has sometimes said that he is right and sometimes he may say that he is wrong. If an employee is sick and unable to come to work he is paid his back wages.

Q.—The law already provides that an employee, leaving his work without due notice, may be sentenced either to a fine or imprisonment or to both; can he also be compelled to lose his wages? A.—An action under which he would be fined and imprisoned would be an action before a justice of the peace or the Recorder's Court in this city, and any action in regard to wages would be an action before the Civil Court, and therefore, when the question arose, the judge might decide that if the individual had suffered fine and imprisonment he had suffered sufficient punishment.

Q.—Then in no case has an employer the right to take the law in his own hands and keep the money? A.—No; he has no such right, generally the employer allows the employee to sue for it.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Will that apply to journeymen mechanics, as well as to journeymen in other businesses? A.—It has always received a very liberal interpretation from the judges, because this code was formed on a law that existed many years ago, when those were principally the classes of men who could claim the privilege.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—The judges give it a wide interpretation? A.—Yes; a very wide interpretation.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—In case of a builder failing, and leaving a building under construction, but unfinished, would that law protect the working men engaged on the building to the extent of three months' wages? A.—In my opinion, it would not.

Q.—Would it protect them to any extent? A.—If a man failed, as they have frequently, under the Insolvent Act, and the estate was distributed, a working man would come in as a privilege creditor on the general estate. It is my opinion that the working man would have no particular privilege on the works at the present time.

Q.—Not on the building on which they had given their labor? A.—No; and I see there is a case reported in Volume 22 of the Canada Law Journal, where that question came up. There was a statute passed in the Legislature of Quebec, 44 and 45 Vict., c. 17, which purported to give sub-contractors, and workmen on the building, a certain amount of privilege for their wages remaining unpaid. The statute provides that this can be done by means of a notice given by the working man, if he was unpaid, or by the sub-contractor, or contractors, if he was unpaid, as in a case in which he had a privilege. But I am not aware of any particular case where this statute has been acted on. It is simple in its terms, but, for some reason, no one has taken advantage of it; sometimes it is a long time before a statute gets into common use.

(Translation.)

10th February, 1888.

BENJAMIN ANTOINE TESTARD DE MONTIGNY, Recorder of the City of Montreal,
sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—The Commission is desirous of knowing the reasons which you have to give for having permitted masters and employers of labor to chastise the children under them. The Commission would wish to hear your explanations on this head? A.—Well, it happens often that questions and disputes between master and servant are brought before the Recorder's Court, which is the natural tribunal for their settlement.

However, these are indirect questions which arise in regard to offences which come rather under the jurisdiction of other Magistrates, as, for instance, cases of assault. I have had occasion, several times, to pronounce blame on foremen for having exercised severity which I deemed unreasonable. But I have discharged others when I judged that the chastisement was deserved. I have had occasion, more than once, to deliver my opinion on this point, in the presence of masters and apprentices, brought up before me, and I laid it down as a principle that the master has the right of correction on the person of his servant, and more particularly his apprentice, provided always,—and this well understood,—that the correction be within the bounds of reason. In order to make them seize my thought better, I have given them examples by saying, “Well, sir, you have a right to give an apprentice a shaking; you have a right to pull him by the ear, gently; you have a right to strike him on the hands, and then on his posterior, or any part of the body, where there is no danger that the child’s health may be in any way damaged or injured.”

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Does the law allow this? A.—That is the interpretation that I put upon the law.

Q.—Can you give us the chapter or the text of the law, according to which you gave this opinion? A.—I gave that opinion, because I consider it in accordance with common sense, which is the natural law, and conforms with positive Divine law, and the civil law. I did not think that I should be called upon to cite the law; but I can send, if the Commission desire them, a great number of authorities on this point.

Q.—We ask you only for what you are willing to give us? A.—Yes. But if the Commission wishes I will send in the authorities. Everything depends, naturally, on what is understood by reasonable, or rational correction. That depends on a host of circumstances, such as the age of the child, his constitution, etc.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You wish to say—is it not so—that every case deserves a special interpretation, and attention? A.—Without doubt. It is within the discretion of the Court to judge the correction which meets the case, and which will be reasonable. Thus, a correction may be reasonable in one case, but not in another. Everything depends on the age of the child, its sex, and the degree of insubordination. Moreover, it also depends on the power which the employer, or master has—power which has been conferred upon him by the parents before giving him the charge. This is why I say that it is, particularly in the case of apprenticeship, that this right exists, because, generally, apprentices are placed in the care of the master in order that he may take charge of them, to act as the father of a family towards them.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you look upon this as reasonable correction—throwing a girl of eighteen years of age on the floor and then striking her with a stick of wood? A.—I could not decide on a simple question such as this, because, in my capacity as judge, I am in the habit of hearing both sides and looking into the circumstances of the case; and it is always my custom, after hearing one side to listen to the other. All depends on the proof that might be made. All that I can say is that, in the case of apprentices, especially when the father has entrusted his child to the employer—I hold that his right of correction goes as far as that of the father.

Q.—If the defendant in a case before the Recorder admitted that an individual had thrown down a young girl of eighteen years of age and had then struck her, would you hold this individual guilty of assault? A.—All depends on the circumstances, on the manner in which she was struck, on the way in which she was thrown to the floor and generally on the manner in which she was treated, in fine the result depends on a host of circumstances; and that is the reason why, in a case of assault,

there are fifty different decisions. There exists another inconvenient thing in my delivering decisions on facts submitted outside of the Court; because the case might come up before me and that would be sufficient to cause my authority to be questioned.

Q.—Is it not a dangerous system to allow certain individuals to correct their employees, particularly when it is considered that the bearing of men is very different with each person? A.—It is dangerous as all rights are when they are abused. For my own part, as father of a family, I correct my children, and when I sent them to school I authorized the master to correct them. I have children—and I have got to my twelfth—who never needed correction, and I have others whom it would be impossible to deal with if they were not corrected.

Q.—Did you ever give permission to any employer in Montreal to correct children? A.—No; I have no permission to give any one. Only I express my opinion upon the Bench, and thus people have based their mode of action upon that opinion.

Q.—One of the Commissioners believes that some one has declared before this Commission that he had been authorized to correct children who had been apprenticed to him? A.—I have never given permission to correct children, and the proof that I could not give such permission is that in a case where a person should correct anyone, he could be brought before another magistrate who would have considered my permission as unwarranted. I think, however, that he would have based his decision on what I had said.

Q.—Did you ever give a commission to a constable in a factory in Montreal? A.—Yes, sir, certainly; I often swear them. I do not know whether these special constables are for factories or anything else; but every day I swear in special constables.

Q.—Does the law of the Province of Quebec allow an employer to engage a special constable in his establishment, with the object of correcting his employees? A.—Every magistrate is authorized to name special constables to carry out the orders of the employer or to maintain the peace; but I do not know any law which authorizes a magistrate to appoint a special constable, with power to correct the children.

Q.—Does there exist a law which authorizes an employer to lock up his people in a dark chamber or "black-hole," or in any other apartment? A.—The law to which I referred merely gives in a laconic sense—like all good laws—the right of correction, and of what this correction consists depends upon circumstances as I have already said. If you wish to know my opinion, upon the question—upon the fact of whether locking up a child in a cell is reasonable correction, I am of opinion that it can be done and that, indeed, there is less danger in carrying out such correction than in striking the parties, provided, however, that it be not in a place which would injure their health, and that they be not deprived of proper food.

Q.—Do you consider that the permission given to a "boss," to correct his apprentice allows him to shut that apprentice up in a dark room and deprive him of food, air, light and other necessaries of life? A.—When I said that the correction ought not to affect the health of the child I answered that question, inasmuch as light and food are necessary to health.

Q.—Does the law define the limit of corporal punishment as concerns females in this province? A.—Not at all. I don't know that it does.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that a man has been sworn as a special constable, after having been dismissed from the regular police force of the city of Montreal? A.—I have no knowledge of it; but it is possible that such might have happened; because, in the police, as in any other body, when a man is repentant and has given proofs that he has been corrected, he can again be admitted to it.

Q.—Is the precaution always taken to obtain information as to the character of the men who apply to be sworn in as special constables? A.—That is the duty of the chief, because it is he who names them. The only thing that I have to do—and

it is an old formula—when they are brought before me to be sworn, is to make them swear that they will do their duty to the best of their knowledge and ability. I make them swear that they do not belong to any secret society, and I also make them swear to be faithful to Our Sovereign Lady the Queen.

Q.—What surveillance is exercised over a special constable who is sworn to take care of the factories? A.—The surveillance is that when there are complaints against him, the Magistrate ascertains whether or not he has done his duty, when he is brought before him.

Q.—Is there no other supervision, except when they are accused before the Magistrate? A.—There is the supervision of those who employ them. They are paid by the proprietors either of factories or shops who need special constables to take care of them, and, if they fail in their duty, they are discharged. In this consists the supervision over them.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Mr. Recorder,—There was yesterday expressed a difference of opinion as to a judgment which you had rendered. Will you allow me to recall the facts. Perhaps you will be able to give us the reasons for that judgment. Here are the facts:—Four or five young girls in the Hochelaga Cotton Factory instituted an action against the Company to recover wages which had been withheld from them, because they had left their work without giving notice to the Company. I was myself (Mr. Helbronner) in Court when you gave judgment. You maintained the position of the Company stating that the girls had no right to recover their wages. The difference is this:—I am under the impression that, after having delivered your judgment, you addressed the representatives of the Company then in Court, and said to them:—“I have been obliged to condemn these young girls; but I believe that they acted hastily, without bad intention, and I would ask the Company to pay them their wages.” Here are the circumstances in dispute. This happened in the month of November last? A.—I remember that. It often happens that the employees of factories without specially mentioning cotton factories bring their principals before the Recorder's Court to recover their wages, and, in this special case, I remember that there was one condition. There was a condition, that they had signed, if I remember, in which in every particular they had acquiesced, which was as follows:—“that in leaving without notice a portion of their wages would be forfeited.” I consider these engagements as sacred as the law itself, provided, however, that they be not contrary to good morals and to the law. And I take occasion to reply to a question which has already been addressed to Mr. Hall, of whether employees were obliged despite an agreement to that effect, to work on holydays. For myself I consider that an engagement made contrary to the religious convictions of an employee is immoral. When, in a case where I am obliged to maintain the pretensions of an employer, who confiscates, according to agreement, a portion of the wages of an employee, I do so because I am so obliged by the law; but in this particular case which has been submitted to me by the learned Commissioner (Mr. Helbronner) I remember, in effect, that I recommended the factory to pay the wages, since the factory had immediately found employees to replace them, and that consequently the factory had suffered no loss.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are there ever appeals from your decision? A.—From all my decisions there is an appeal, and I am well satisfied that such is the case. There is an appeal or rather recourse by *certiorari*, and although sometimes the law refuses the appeal or the *certiorari*, the judges of the Superior Court generally decide that there is always recourse to *certiorari*, which is a want of privilege. With this I am content.

R. W. EATON, Manager of the Merchant's Cotton Manufacturing Company, St. Henri Mills, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How are fines levied in your mill? A.—We levy what we call necessary fines; not excessive fines, because I don't know of a case where a fine is imposed for any grave offence, but the employee is discharged.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—For what offences are those fines imposed? A.—For poor work, which is evidently produced by negligence.

Q.—Upon what class of operatives are they imposed? A.—The great majority are imposed on operatives employed in weaving cloth.

Q.—Are any fines imposed for carelessness in dropping cotton on the floor or anything of that sort? A.—I don't think they are anywhere.

Q.—Or for loud talking? A.—No.

Q.—Or for lateness in coming to work? A.—No. For those classes of offences we discharge the operatives if they are persisted in after the first caution by an overseer.

Q.—Can you tell us what amount of fines was imposed last year? A.—Our wages last year amounted to \$100,000.00 within \$50.00; our fines were \$253.73. That is on all the operatives an average of less than $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents a week. I say we don't make our fines excessive because we believe in discharging our help for repeated offences.

Q.—When a fine is imposed for inferior work do the goods affected in that case necessarily go into seconds? A.—Five per cent of our goods are seconds, and probably that is the case with every mill in Canada. This is one twentieth upon which we lose ten per cent. Our production is decreased by poor work for which fines are imposed by 1-200 or on an out put of \$400,000 our out-put was decreased 1-200 of that amount, and the fines imposed are about 1-400. In other words we extracted from the help in fines about one-eighth of what we suffered from wholesale dealers.

Q.—Are no goods put into seconds except those spoiled by the carelessness of the operatives? A.—Goods not of first quality.

Q.—So all of those inferior goods are not due to the fault of the work people? A.—Not always, because it may be in some cases due to causes that they could not prevent. In taking a piece of cloth from one department to another it might by some accident roll off and get caught in something which might not be the fault of any one.

Q.—You are not able to tell us then the quantity of goods which are put into seconds because of bad work on the part of the operatives? A.—No; I can say now that, as a rule, our fines would be about one-half what we suffer in the weaving room. Of course, there is negligence on the part of small help, which we must expect. This you meet by their lower pay.

Q.—Do you fine the small help? A.—There is only one department where we fine the employees, and that is in the spooling room for bad work there, it is always the result of simple negligence, because it is the most simple operation in the mill. Bad work in the department is very detrimental later on and when it is persisted in we sometimes impose a fine, simply a matter of a few cents, to call their attention to the bad work. We impose a fine also in order that the parents may see it marked on the envelope, that it may thus attract the parents attention—they see ten cents marked as a fine and they will want to know about it. They will then find out from the children how it occurred, or they will go to the overseer and speak about it, and that generally effects the result we desire.

Q.—Do you inflict corporal punishment upon your hands? A.—No.

Q.—What are the hours of labor in your mill? A.—Our hours of labor are from half-past six in the morning to six at night, three-quarters of an hour being allowed

at noon. On Saturdays we stop at three o'clock. In our mill the cleaning of the machinery is done during the running hours. The time I have spoken of includes the time from when the engine starts till it stops.

Q.—Do you ever work at night? A.—Sometimes.

Q.—In case you work at night is there any stoppage for supper? A.—We work no longer than a quarter past seven at night.

Q.—When you work to a quarter past seven do you keep straight on? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do the hands have any opportunity to get food? A.—Yes; but there is hardly any department in the mill in which the operatives do not work all the time. In a cotton mill an operative is employed every moment. Children, men or women have to eat while the machinery is going if the mill works to a quarter past seven.

Q.—Would they be able to do that without detriment to the work? A.—They would have an opportunity during a few minutes.

Q.—If the foreman came in and found the operatives so employed would they be likely to be reprimanded for it? A.—Not in a case like that.

Q.—Have you ever seen it done yourself? A.—We have only run extra once, and I have been connected with this mill two years. At that time the operatives did not care to work extra, and they asked why I wanted to work extra. They thought it was a way adopted to get extra work from them. I took them into my confidence, and told them there was a certain number of orders which by the ordinary running of the mill we could not get out in time. If those orders were not filled I was afraid the wholesale dealers would not order again, and I considered it as much to their advantage as to ours that this should be done; but I remember very distinctly I told them at that time, that after they performed the extra amount of service required, the overtime would stop. The records of our books show that the production was something enormous at that time. I do not believe the hands like overtime. There are, however, periods in a contracted market like that of Canada when overtime is necessary for a certain time; in fact, at some seasons it has been necessary to stop the mills and in other seasons to run overtime. The ups and downs are very great here.

Q.—How are the water closets in the mill, are they separate for the sexes? A.—Ours is a new mill, and there are modern conveniences.

Q.—Are the approaches to the water closets separate? A.—Yes.

Q.—So a man could get into the closets without being seen by the female operatives? A.—Yes; all new mills are built that way.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest child employed by you? A.—I have had a little census taken of the mill this morning. We have about 420 operatives. In the weaving room the youngest child is a boy, fourteen years this spring. In the spooling room, where the little fellows are employed, there is one boy of eleven years; he has just come in, and is a bright, smart boy. There are three girls of twelve years, and two girls of thirteen, and all the rest are over fourteen. In the card room there are three girls twelve, two of thirteen, and one who, to my great surprise, says she is ten—she is much larger than many a girl of twelve or thirteen. She is a smart little girl, and she has a place to sweep up about as large as this room.

Q.—Are any very young children employed at machinery which is dangerous and requires close attention—I refer to young children under fourteen years of age? A.—The girls in the spooling room and a boy that is there also, are what we call doffers.

When a machine is fitted up its bobbins will become empty, and the children have to take out the bobbins and change them. As a little inducement to the hands, there is a longer time given to do the work than is necessary, and it is so arranged that they can do it in two-thirds of the time allowed. In the spooling room that class of help is sitting down about one-third of their time.

Q.—Is it necessary for them to keep their attention on the machinery all the time? A.—No; only when it is started. They have nothing to do with running the machinery.

Q.—When you run over-time do you pay the weekly hands for over-time? A.—

Yes; they all work by the day, and they receive pay accordingly. In a cotton mill, as in any other place, you want to have an operative at his post. I don't want to be obliged to fine any of them, or to have operatives that require to be fined. Sometimes we have to use a corrective of that sort.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Kindly tell us, when those children do not complete their task in the allotted time, if they are punished and how? A.—They are generally punished by our sending them home.

Q.—When they are sent home does there pay run on? A.—No.

Q.—They are discharged? A.—Yes; if they cannot do their work. The work is nothing beyond their capacity.

Q.—You have told us what the lowest fines are, kindly tell us the amount of the highest fines imposed? A.—I would say that the highest fines are in the weaving room—they are about one-half of the price of the weaving. If the price for weaving a piece of cloth fifty yards long is forty cents, a fine amounting to twenty cents might be imposed for a poorly woven piece.

Q.—If a party spoils more than one piece of cloth how often are they fined before they are discharged? A.—It depends whether the hands came in and wanted to learn or whether they came into the mill as experienced weavers.

Q.—You said the fines were used as a corrective? A.—Yes.

Q.—And after they are fined they are discharged. I want to know how often they are fined before they are discharged? A.—I am afraid I cannot answer that question. As a general thing an operative who lives in the village, and comes in to learn, would require to be there only a very short time before she would make fairly perfect cloth, and so her fines would be decreasing instead of increasing.

Q.—Are employees fined more than once before they are discharged? A.—A regular weaver, presenting herself as a weaver, if she was running four machines, and all four pieces of cloth would be bad, she would be fined for each piece of cloth.

Q.—That would be the first time; are they ever fined after the first before they are discharged? A.—Yes; I believe if a weaver does bad work she is fined; there is, however, a difference between bad cloth made negligently or willfully. When it is done willfully they are discharged.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—When operatives are discharged, do they get all the money coming to them? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are those young girls, who go to the mill, fairly educated, can they read and write? A.—I am sorry to say, I don't think a great many of them can do so.

Q.—Are they afforded an opportunity to improve their education between the hours of commencing work, and the stopping of the mill. A.—Very little, I think.

Q.—I suppose you never consider that kind of thing? A.—The Company considers it with a great deal of care. I am sorry to say it. Of course, when there is a difference of language, it interferes a little with the work. In our case, and I presume it is the case with other Companies, the Company would be very glad if a Factory Act were carried out, and arrangements made under it, by which the children would become better educated. You can understand, in regard to small help, that it is as one of the overseers said to me: "I have more trouble to keep the small help out of my room, than I have to keep them in it." A man will be working at the mill, and his daughter working there also, and he may have a small child, whom he desires to have there, for instance, in the spooling room. Often you don't want to take the child, but if you do not, he and his daughter will go out, and they will go to some mill where the whole three will be employed. A law which would render it impossible for such a child to obtain employment at any mill would be advisable.

Q.—You would be in favor of such a law? A.—Yes; because it would be for the good of all concerned. It would make your cotton cloth come higher to the public, but, of course, they would not care for that. I would sooner pay double the price, and I believe the majority of the millmen are of the same way of thinking; only it is not easy for me to try and live up to an imaginary law, without some other mill doing it, for, of course, it places our stock at a disadvantage.

Q.—When the cotton mills all combine, for the purpose of keeping up prices, could they not consider the question of mill management in regard to employees? A.—They could.

Q.—Could they not make arrangements on a proper basis? A.—When the mills combined, it was not so much to keep up prices, because our prices are practically no higher than they are for a similar cloth in the United States to-day; but the combination was really to keep the mills, as you might say, from cutting each other's throats. Over two years ago, cloth was made and sold at a loss to the mills, probably to the extent of two or three cents per pound. Cotton was converted into cloth at a loss, certainly that was the case in the grade cloths. That occurred about the time I came here. The combination never forced prices higher than the prices for similar goods in the United States.

Q.—Still the combination makes a minimum rate of prices? A.—Yes; I sell goods to-day above the combination price, and there is no combination to back it up. I suppose other mills do the same.

Q.—Do you sell goods under the combination prices? A.—Certainly not.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You say the combination is to prevent you from selling at a ruinous price? A.—I say the combination is for the purpose of preventing the mills cutting each other's throats, as was being done through intense competition in the different mills.

Q.—And you say the mills, years ago, were losing money? A.—Yes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—What opportunity has a young woman, when she is working at the Mill, to improve her mind? A.—I don't think she has any more opportunity than if she were working in a store, or around the house.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You leave the question of instruction to the father and mother? A.—I am not a school teacher. I say that if there is anything which the law can correct, enact such a law; but when it is enacted, see that every mill carries it out. Another point is, that it should be a Dominion Act, so that it should not apply to a particular part of the country, such as St. Johns, New Brunswick.

The CHAIRMAN ;—

It is a question of law, as to whether the Dominion Government has the power to do so.

WITNESS :—

Very well, then, we will not enter into that.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Is it possible, for the cotton mills of the whole Dominion, to run continually for one year, ten hours a day? A.—Yes; we ran last year, continuously, ten hours a day.

Q.—I mean, all the mills in the Dominion running ten hours a day, continuously, for one year? A.—We all ran ten hours, continuously, last year.

Q.—Is there sufficient demand for the out-put of all the Dominion, running ten hours a day, for a year? A.—I could not tell you. Some lines of goods, such as colored goods, might accumulate, and grade cloths might fall behind, and light goods hold their own. I could not tell you how that would work.

Q.—Would it not be better, for all concerned, if the mills were to work constantly not more than eight hours a day—would not that be more satisfactory? A.—I don't know whether it would satisfy you, for it would make cloth come higher, and you would have to pay more for it. The old ladies of the country are those who tend to maintain the present rates, and, if they were willing to pay me for the cloth, we could run the mill only eight hours. There is a certain amount of capital invested, and it should realize six per cent, or some other rate, and the help have to receive so much, and this makes cloth come higher.

Q.—Do you think that any company that demands over six per cent interest, on capital invested, is open to the charge of usury? A.—I could not tell you that, because I do not know.

Q.—Do you think 20 per cent is too much interest to receive on capital invested? A.—That is not in my department. I am not a financier, but a mill manager; but, if you desire me to give an opinion, it is this: that the mills should make a profit to such an extent, that it might return a fair rate of interest to the investor, and be able to lay by a sufficient amount of money to keep the mill in repair, and be able to purchase new inventions that are coming out, and displacing the old machinery, and thus be able to place new machinery in the place of the old. That might amount to 20 per cent interest, although, of course, it would not amount to 20 per cent divided among the stockholders.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Would you not also calculate that there would be a loss in some years? A.—I say the rate of profit should be at such a rate as to cover that. The maximum might be 20 per cent in one year, and in another year it might be nothing.

Q.—How long ago is it that the English cotton spinners were half ruined? A.—I don't think the profit should be far from 15 per cent that is my honest opinion.

Q.—In order to get six per cent? A.—To declare a dividend of 15 per cent would be absurd, but you could declare five or six and I think the profit should be 15 per cent in order to keep everything in first class shape. I may be two or three per cent out of the way, as I am not a financier, but that is my opinion.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—In the statement you gave in the first part of your evidence you said that the Cotton Company spent \$100,000 in wages; was that the amount expended for wages on operatives only? A.—Yes; irrespective of the amount paid for salaries. The actual wages were \$99,952.55, and the amount of fines was \$253.00.

Q.—Are you prepared to swear to that statement? A.—Yes; I have sworn to it. Those are the records taken from the wages' book.

Q.—Are you aware of fines being imposed in other factories in Canada? A.—No. I only suppose there are some fines imposed.

Q.—Have you ever had charge of any other factory in Canada? A.—Yes.

Q.—And also in the United States? A.—Yes; I am from the United States.

Q.—I suppose you are aware there is a factory in the United States which has night schools supported by the owners of the mill? A.—I think there are several that have night schools.

Q.—Do you not think such factories in the United States not only have schools in which they teach their operatives reading and writing but that the law makes this provision? A.—Yes; the law says so.

Q.—Do you not think that Cotton Companies paying 23 per cent dividend could afford to be more liberal towards their operatives? A.—I think I will not say anything about that question, if you will pardon me. You understand that where high

fines are imposed there will be high wages given to provide for them—I make that reservation in this matter. I say where there are high fines there naturally goes along with them rather high wages, so that the average result will be practically the same. I say this, that if a factory all the year through, and especially in the summer when there is a scarcity of labor, is able to obtain plenty of labor it is proof that the hands are fairly treated. It would be to me a sign of hands being well treated without my knowing anything about the circumstances of the mill.

Q.—When employees are fined are their wages taken into consideration? A.—In the weaving room the hands are paid so much per piece, and if bad work is done fines are imposed as a stimulant to turn out good work.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Do you pay any premiums in case there is exceptionally good work produced? A.—No; I think the practice is wrong.

Q.—You do not do it in your mill? A.—No.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you not think that a kindly word of warning to those young women would be calculated to have as much effect as a fine? A.—They have plenty of them. The fines are not excessive.

Q.—Do you not think that every ten cents of the small wages the operatives receive is all important to a family? A.—There is no girl, who works for \$1.50 a week subject to any fines in our mill.

Q.—What is the lowest amount of wages a young girl earns, say fourteen or fifteen years of age, in any department of the mill? A.—I cannot tell you exactly at the moment. I should think somewhere from forty-five to sixty cents a day.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—In those cases you would not fine them? A.—In that particular department I have in mind, there are no fines imposed.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do any of the young girls, earning \$3.00 or \$3.50 per week, pay for their board? A.—No; I think there are hardly any girls receiving that sum who do not live with their families right in the village.

Q.—Have you any young women working at the mill, who pay for their board? A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—How much per week does the board cost? A.—I think from \$2.50 to \$3.00 per week.

Q.—Do you not think it is very difficult for a young woman earning \$3.50 a week, to have to pay \$3.00 for board; how much would she have to clothe herself? A.—I doubt if there is anyone who does that.

Q.—Do you make a special point in selecting hands, of taking those who belong to families? A.—Yes; we make a special point of it.

Q.—Do you not engage those who have no families? A.—We make a special point of engaging those who have families. Sometimes help comes in, in the expectation that they are going to work up, and in a little while earn more money.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you think they are better earning \$3.00 a week, than going about doing nothing—they have to live I suppose? A.—I would say, that when girls come to the mill their mothers often come with them, and beg the chance of getting them on to work. For instance, there was a mother brought a girl the other day. I said she was small. The mother replied: "I went into the mill about that age." I told her the terms on which we took hands, and that at first she would get very little pay.

She replied that she understood that, and she knew where she was going to start. She told me the particulars of her own case, and how she had worked up until she was able to make good pay.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Would not young women and girls be better off if they went into domestic service, rather than into a cotton mill? A.—I told you that I don't know what to think in regard to domestic service. I have only been here two years, and there have been four months that I have not been able to get a girl for the house, and I have asked lots of the hands in the mill to go as servants in my house, but I could not get one to leave.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—What wages did you offer them? A.—I pay the girl for my house \$13.00 a month, and her board—the same board as I get.

Q.—And a girl would not leave the mill for that? A.—As I say at our house; we have been for four months without a girl out of the two years, and I have been very anxious to get help.

Q.—And you could not get a girl to go into your house as a servant? A.—I could not get one. You understand that in regard to hands working in the mill, they have to work hard to earn high wages, but the wages depends very much on their own ability. Speaking of wages, I may say that I could show you two weavers, side by side, who work on the same cloth, and one earns \$21.00 in two weeks, and the other \$13.00 or \$14.00.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You don't believe in paying the same wages to people of different capacity? A.—No; that is simply absurd. In our business you could not afford to do so.

Q.—You could not pay \$21 to a hand who earns \$13? A.—I pay them according to how many yards of good cloth they turn out. Both of those are good weavers and to each of them we are paying the same rate but one earns much more than the other.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—You are the judge of a man's ability, I suppose? A.—No; I am not. I consider the man himself is. We pay so much per piece, and when he earns his wages that of course is his money.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Is it not rather unfair that when some little damage is done by an employee he should be left to the mercy of the Superintendent or the foreman so far as the fining is concerned? I understand hands have been fined for other offences not laid down in the rules, and left to the mercy of the superintendent? A.—What offences?

Q.—Any offence they may choose to name as offences? A.—I know of nothing of the kind.

Q.—Are you not aware that they are fined for some things not laid down in the rules? A.—No; I am not. My rules are here.

Q.—I am not speaking about your rules? A.—I don't know anything about any one else's mill.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Do you think the girls would be better off in service than in the cotton mill? A.—Yes; I think so. They would have a better chance to get married, and they would make better wives afterwards, a great deal better.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Are those rules put up in your factory so that the hands can see them?
 A.—Yes; that is, everything except the notice in the weaving room stating that for certain kinds of imperfections there are to be charges made.

REGULATIONS OF THE MERCHANTS MANUFACTURING CO.

DUTIES OF OVERSEERS.

1. The Overseers are to have the management and control of the hands in their respective rooms, and keep a correct account of their time and work, and report to the Manager, daily, the names of all employees from whom they have accepted notice of intention to leave.
2. They are to be punctual in their rooms at the time of starting; to be absent only when necessary during working hours, unless by permission of the Manager; and to see that all those employed are in their places in proper season.
3. They are to attend in keeping their Rooms and MACHINERY in good order; to see that all DIRT and WASTE is removed daily; to give particular attention to cleanliness throughout; to see that water-tanks and buckets are well supplied with water, and that the buckets are always in their places, and used only in cases of fire.
4. They may grant leave of absence to those employed under them, when hands are provided to fill their places; otherwise they are not to grant leave except in cases of absolute necessity.
5. They are to have particular charge of the lights in their rooms, and to be the last to go out of their rooms at night.

DUTIES OF HANDS.

1. All persons are required to observe the Regulations of the rooms in which they may be employed.
2. They are not to absent themselves without the consent of the Overseer, except in case of sickness; and they are to send information of the cause of absence to the Overseer.
3. All persons are held accountable for any IMPERFECTION in their work, or damage to machinery, when such imperfection or damage is the result of neglect.
4. All persons intending to leave are required to give ten days' notice in writing of such intention to the Overseers of their respective rooms; and no person will be considered honorably discharged, or entitled to wages then due, unless this regulation is complied with.
5. Want of capacity, uncleanness, unfaithfulness, intemperance, profanity, or improper treatment of Overseer or associates, will be considered sufficient cause for dismissal WITHOUT NOTICE.

DUTIES OF WATCHMEN.

1. The Watchmen are to have entire charge of the premises, outside and inside, EXCEPT during working hours; to see that the doors and entrances are properly secured, and the fires and lights left safe for the night; they are to remain on duty until relieved by their successor, and if not relieved at the proper time, to give notice to the Manager.
 2. They are to thoroughly understand the working of the Fire Apparatus, and to see that it is all ready for use. In case of an alarm of fire they are to be ready to start the pumps when required so to do.
- Any person or persons found guilty of taking from the Mill or Yard, Clrth, Yarn, Waste, Oil, or any article belonging to the Company, will be discharged and dealt with according to law.

The having or carrying Friction Matches within the Mills, or Smoking on the premises, is strictly prohibited.

A compliance with these Regulations is considered part of the contract with persons employed by the **MERCHANTS MANUFACTURING COMPANY**.

WALTER PAINE,

St. HENRI, October 30th, 1882.

Manager.

(Translation.)

J. O. LABRECQUE, Agent and Accountant, of the City of Montreal, 28 years, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You were employed for a number of years in dry goods stores? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You are perfectly posted as to the working of all the departments in the dry goods business? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you tell us at what age, on an average, they take apprentices into the millinery and dress-making departments? A.—About twelve years.

Q.—What are the hours of work which these children have to work? A.—They begin at about eight o'clock in the morning and they finish at six or seven o'clock in the evening.

Q.—Have they any time for rest during the day? A.—An hour to go to dinner and an hour to go to supper.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that children of that age have worked later than seven o'clock in the evening? A.—Not of twelve years; but of fourteen.

Q.—What work did they make them do? A.—A very hard work—continual runnings, going errands, carrying hats, going to fetch them and going to the whole sale stores.

Q.—Do they take the trouble to teach them the business? A.—Not during the first year. It may be said that they begin to teach them the business about the middle of the second year.

Q.—What is the average salary of those children? A.—The first year they get nothing; the second year it varies from 25 to 50 cents a week; then it amounts to \$1 commencing with the third year.

Q.—Are these children employed during the whole year? A.—No; these children are employed all the time when there is much work to do, but when the dead season comes they are given a holiday and return when work revives.

Q.—Then they are not apprentices, but are messengers or factors, so to speak? A.—Yes; and if they lose one day, even at fifty cents per week, they charge them for their time. If they lose a half day they charge them a half day.

Q.—They are not engaged by contract? A.—No, sir; it is the first milliner in the department who is charged with engaging them.

Q.—What is the salary of dressmakers and milliners? A.—From \$1.50 to \$5 per week, the head milliner getting from \$8 to \$10 per week.

Q.—What are the hours of labor for dressmakers? A.—In January, February and March from eight o'clock in the morning till the closing of the store. If the store closes at ten o'clock at night they leave at ten o'clock at night. In April, May and June, from eight o'clock in the morning to eleven o'clock at night, and the eve of festivals and on Saturdays from eight o'clock in the morning to one o'clock the next morning—sometimes until two or three o'clock on Sunday morning. That is to say, they work as long as there is work to do. In a word on the eve of the great

festivals such as St. Jean Baptiste Day and the Fete Dieu they finish at four or five o'clock in the morning. In July, August and September they begin at eight o'clock and finish at seven or eight o'clock in the evening, that is to say when the store closes. In October, November and December they work from eight o'clock in the morning to eleven o'clock at night during the week and to one o'clock in the morning every Saturday. During the week they finish from half-past eleven to midnight.

Q.—When the work women make extra hours of labour, as you have just mentioned, do they receive any payment for that work? A.—No, sir; not any.

Q.—Whether the work be 60 or 80 hours per week they receive the same salary? A.—Yes, sir; always the same thing, and, moreover, if they lose a quarter of an hour they charge them with it.

Q.—Are the work women obliged to work on Sundays—on Sunday morning? A.—Yes, sir; they are obliged. In any case, if they do not lose their place, matters are made most disagreeable for them.

Q.—To your knowledge have you seen in the stores where you worked young girls working up to midnight during the week and to two or three o'clock in the morning on Sundays? A.—Yes, sir; to three and four o'clock even. I have myself waited for girls to take them home at that time.

Q.—Have you seen young girls sick after having worked that length of time? A.—Yes, sir; frequently.

Q.—The stores close on Saturdays at midnight, do they not? A.—Yes.

Q.—The work women remain in the store, after that? A.—Yes, they remain in the store; after it is closed they continue to work.

Q.—Do they make the clerks wait at the same time? A.—Yes; so as to take the girls home.

Q.—Do they make the children whom they call "cash boys" wait as late at night? A.—Yes; there are some of them who wait to take the girls home.

Q.—Do you mean to say that you have seen them keep children of fourteen years and under up to two, three and four o'clock on Sunday morning? A.—Yes.

Q.—And if those young people refused to stop, so to speak,—to spend the night in the store—to wait until the girls have finished, what would be their position? A.—There are some of them who would lose their places.

Q.—This work which is done during the night of Saturday and Sunday, is it sent home on Sunday? A.—Yes; on Sunday forenoon.

Q.—Who generally delivers these goods? A.—The expressman accompanied by a young man.

Q.—Is this the regular custom during the months of the seasons you have just indicated? A.—Yes; during the busy months it is the regular custom.

Q.—Then you declare that there are stores in Montreal which regularly work every Sunday from one o'clock in the morning to nine and ten o'clock in the forenoon—that is to say, which compel their employees to work? A.—That is to say the milliners go away towards two or three o'clock in the morning, and the expressman comes towards seven or eight o'clock and distributes the hats and other articles which have been trimmed during the night. He makes the distribution during the Sunday forenoon.

Q.—In cases where it is the expressman who delivers the goods, and the house has a vehicle bearing its name, is it that vehicle which goes out or is it rather another vehicle? A.—No; it is a private vehicle which they employ.

Q.—What are the salaries of the expressmen? A.—Seven dollars to eight dollars per week. I know some who get nine dollars.

Q.—What are the hours of labor? A.—They begin at five or six o'clock in the morning in January, February and March; they finish towards nine o'clock or half past nine in the evening. In April, May, June and July they finish towards eleven o'clock and midnight, and on the eve of holydays and Sundays they finish about two o'clock or half past two, and return towards seven o'clock on the mornings of

festivals and Sundays, finishing about ten o'clock or half past ten in the forenoon. This sometimes gives nineteen and twenty hours of work.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that expressmen have refused to do this work?
A.—No; because they had too much fear of losing their places.

Q.—If they should refuse, what would happen? A.—They would find other people to do it.

Q.—Are there only milliners, young people, and express conductors who work in the store on Sundays? A.—I have seen employees and clerks working in the forenoon, the afternoon, and all the evening, addressing circulars, making inventories, and doing other work.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that employees have refused to do this work on Sundays? A.—No, sir. Some, according to their engagement, had permission not to work. For example: I have seen some of them working the whole Sunday, the evening, and Monday. They then found themselves sick, and have been charged their day.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that this Sunday work attracted the attention of the authorities? A.—Yes, sir; to my knowledge it was once denounced from the altar in St. James' Church. There are parents who have complained to the priests, and that came to the ears of the Curé of the Parish of St. James, and he spoke of it. I also have spoken to some of the relatives that I was coming before the Commission to expose this Sunday work, and they told me that they should be very glad if I could secure the stoppage of Sunday work.

Q.—In spite of the denunciation from the altar, Sunday work has continued, has it not? A.—It continues just the same; a little more concealed, that is all. For a certain time it had some effect. The employees said "it has been denounced," when they asked them to work; but in general it has been the same thing.

Q.—At what age do apprentices enter the stores? A.—At thirteen or fourteen years; but sometimes they do not appear to be more than eight years.

Q.—Are they engaged by contract? A.—No; not the first year.

Q.—What is the salary? A.—Fifty cents to one dollar per week.

Q.—What are their hours of work? A.—At first they leave towards half past six, seven o'clock, or eight o'clock in the evening; but at the end of a year, they are as late as the clerks.

Q.—When the stores do not close before midnight, they only leave at midnight?
A.—Yes, sir. More than once I have had children complaining to me, and saying: "Mr. Labrecque, I am very tired; will you let me go?" I have said to them: "go! Pass by the back door, and take care of yourselves."

Q.—It is to these young people that they entrust the business of taking home the milliners at four o'clock in the morning? A.—Yes; but generally such children are older, say, about fifteen years.

Q.—Then, these young people of thirteen to fifteen years are compelled, on Saturdays, to stay from eight o'clock in the morning, until Sunday at three or four o'clock in the morning, when the milliners work up to that hour? A.—It is not as general as that. They take them a little older; because children of that age are too much afraid of the dressmakers to go home with them. They generally take them from sixteen years and over.

Q.—Do these young people make good clerks at the end of three or four years? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do they teach them to fold the pieces, display the goods, and such like?
A.—Yes; display and fold the goods. They are placed with a good clerk, in a department, and thus they become the assistant of that clerk. It is a good method of teaching.

Q.—As a rule, what is the sanitary condition of Montreal stores? Are they well ventilated? A.—The sanitary condition is not excellent. There are some stores that are all right, and others that are very unwholesome. The smell of the goods is always close.

Q.—There is not sufficient draught to carry off the smell that escapes from the dry goods? A.—No; particularly at night, when the air is heated by gas.

Q.—In winter, are these stores well heated? A.—Yes; they are very well heated.

Q.—In summer, are they well ventilated in the evenings? A.—Yes.

Q.—Generally speaking, are there separate closets where the young women work? A.—Yes; quite separated. The gentlemen go below, and the young ladies above.

Q.—After what you have been able to judge for yourself, is the state of health of these young people, who work for such a length of time, a satisfactory one? A.—No; it is not satisfactory.

Q.—May the young ladies, attending behind the counter, take a seat during the day? A.—That is strictly forbidden. Whenever they sit down they are severely reprimanded.

Q.—Is there any system of fines in the dry good stores of Montreal? A.—Not that I know of. I would draw the special attention of the Commission to the case of young ladies obliged to remain standing the whole day, from eight o'clock in the morning until midnight.

CHARLES P. SCLATER, Secretary-Treasurer of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—You are secretary-treasurer of the Bell Telephone Company of Montreal, I understand? A.—Of the whole of Canada.

Q.—Have you the immediate management of the office in Montreal? A.—Not the immediate management—simply the accounts at the end of the month come to me with all the details.

Q.—Can you give us the particulars respecting the office in Montreal? A.—Yes; it is divided, of course, into several branches. There is an exchange which does the operating with the telephone business—the operating done during the day is done by females. Then there is the line men's work which is all out of doors work, and there is the inspectors of instruments in different places, done by another class of men. And then there is also the manufacturing department which we conduct here.

Q.—How many persons are employed in the telephone exchange? A.—Do you mean girl operators?

Q.—Operators? A.—The girl operators are about fifty altogether.

Q.—What are the ages of those girls? A.—Never under eighteen or twenty—that is the lowest age; full grown girls are what we employ.

Q.—How many hours are they required to be in the office? A.—Full time operators work nine hours a day, from eight till six in the evening with one hour for dinner. There are also what we call half-time operators, who work nine hours and act as reliefs when the operators are at dinner or at other times when they go out.

Q.—What time is the office closed at night? A.—It is kept open all night. We have also night operators who are men.

Q.—About what will be the salary of a good operator? A.—The female operators receive \$20 a month and work nine hours a day.

Q.—How long is required to learn the business? A.—It generally takes them about three months, during which time we term them half-time operators.

Q.—The work requires pretty close attention I understand? A.—Yes; pretty close attention.

Q.—Is it fatiguing work? A.—There is no movement in it. If there is any strain it is a mental strain. The operators have to listen attentively and act promptly.

Q.—How many line men have you employed? A.—It varies between fifty and seventy in Montreal. You refer to Montreal, I suppose?

Q.—Yes. A.—Between fifty and seventy.

Q.—Do accidents frequently occur to those line men? A.—No; very rarely.

Q.—Do they ever fall from the posts? A.—No; I never heard of a case of that kind in Montreal.

Q.—In the winter time the work is very cold and the men have to endure a good deal of exposure I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—What wages do they receive? A.—The lowest is \$1.25 a day and the rate goes up to \$2 to men of experience who have been long with the Company.

Q.—Are there any fines imposed upon the girls in the head office? A.—No; no fines.

Q.—If they do not prove competent you simply let them go? A.—We simply let them go, that is all.

Q.—Are any fines imposed on your workmen? A.—No, I believe not; they are simply docked for the time they are off.

Q.—Are they given constant employment? A.—Those who are on the regular staff, about fifty of them, have constant employment.

Q.—You employ extra men to whom you give occasional work? A.—Yes; partial employment.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What is the pay of a half-time operator? A.—\$12.00 a month, and she works five hours a day.

Q.—How long should a girl be what you call half-time operator before she becomes a full time operator? A.—About three months if she is a bright girl.

Q.—Then she will receive full pay? A.—Yes; she will be put on full pay.

Q.—How frequently are your operators paid? A.—Once a fortnight.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do the young girls in the central office in Montreal receive more than those employed in the central office in Toronto? A.—No; just the same I think, just the same. The local manager may make a special arrangement, but they are paid about the same I think.

Q.—Do they ever work at night? A.—Not the young lady operators.

Q.—Were they ever called back on Sunday morning? A.—No; That work is done by male operators.

Q.—Have you ever known any girls called back on Sunday mornings in Toronto? A.—I could not say. The local manager might make a special arrangement and I would not be acquainted with it.

Q.—What is the pay of a night operator? A.—The pay of a night operator is from \$30.00 to \$40.00 a month.

Q.—What time do they leave off in the morning? A.—Some at seven and some at half-past seven.

A. W. MORRIS, Cordage Manufacturer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What kind of cordage do you manufacture? A.—We manufacture cordage out of various materials, almost all the different hems, Russia, Manilla and Ciel.

Q.—Do you manufacture rope, twine and every class of cordage? A.—Yes; we manufacture self binding twine for self binding harvesters largely.

Q.—What is the duty imposed on imported twine for self binders? A.—Twenty-five per cent.

Q.—How do the selling prices of binding twine in Canada compare with those in the United States? A.—Our prices have been lower at least twenty per cent during the last three or four years.

Q.—Are they so now? A.—At the present moment there is a National Cordage Company formed in New-York composed of sixteen American manufacturers, who are now trying to force the rest of the manufacturers in the United States to join them and form a combination. The National Company started with five firms and they have forced sixteen others up to to-day, to join them. They have thus far succeeded by controlling the hemp, Manilla, and entering New York and selling the manufactured article about cost. Although our prices are I think as low as theirs to-day.

Q.—How does cord, such as binding twine, manufactured in Canada compare with the average of the binding twine manufactured in the United States? A.—I think it is superior.

Q.—Have you compared the two varieties so as to have a knowledge on that point? A.—Some of the largest manufacturers in Canada, that is the Dartmouth Rope Company of Halifax and ourselves, have had the preference for export orders via New York to supply South America and the West Indies with our goods.

Q.—Was that twine for export the same quality of goods as is manufactured here for self binders? A.—The same kind exactly. I might add that the Dartmouth Company have sold very large lots in the United States and paid the American duty and made a profit out of them.

Q.—You employ a large number of hands at your establishment? A.—We have about 180 or 190 on the pay roll.

Q.—Men, boys or both? A.—Men, boys and girls.

Q.—Does it require any great skill to work at your business? A.—No; none whatever.

Q.—What wages do the men earn? A.—I have brought my wages book with me which you can inspect if you desire. They earn from \$1.20 and \$1.25, we have one man receiving \$3.00 a day and a number \$1.75 and \$2.00.

Q.—How many hours a day do they work? A.—Ten hours and twenty minutes for six days in the week, and they leave at four o'clock on Saturdays; this makes sixty hours a week.

Q.—Do they work by the piece? A.—No; we have very few working by the piece, we have a few.

Q.—What are the ages of the boys who work for you? A.—We have none under fifteen I think.

Q.—You require pretty strong boys to work at your business, I believe? A.—No; the work is very light.

Q.—What wages do the boys get when they begin? A.—We have four or five on the pay sheet at fifty-five cents a day, which is the lowest rate. After they have been at work a few weeks they are advanced; most of the boys get sixty cents a day.

Q.—What wages do the girls earn? A.—From \$7.50 up to \$9.00 a fortnight. I find by my book that the rate is from \$7.50 up \$9.60.

Q.—Are they put on the same work as the boys? A.—No; they run spinning machines.

Q.—Is that heavy work? A.—No; it is very light work.

Q.—Do they remain with you any length of time? A.—As regards both male and female, taking the employees in our establishment as a whole, I think, at least, sixty per cent have been with us for fifteen years. Most of the girls remain with us till they marry if they do marry.

Q.—How frequently do you pay? A.—We pay fortnightly.

Q.—Would there be any difficulty or trouble occasioned by paying your hands weekly? A.—We would be perfectly willing to do so, if they would prefer to have their wages paid weekly. We have asked them a number of times, and they were perfectly willing to let it remain as it is.

Q.—Are your workshops comfortable, and in good sanitary condition? A.—I think they are all during the year. They are heated by steam, and are very light.

Q.—Are they well ventilated? A.—Yes; they are well ventilated.

Q.—Have you separate conveniences for the males and females? A.—Yes; we are now putting up a new addition altogether, and are also adding a lunch room for those who have to remain for their dinner every day. The plans are out for the building now.

Q.—Do you fine your work people for imperfect work, or for any other reason? A.—I had that list made up just before I came here. I paid out last year about \$50,000.00 for wages, and our fines amounted to \$12.50. There were only seven different cases of fines, and our foreman stated to me that our fines were all levied for willful neglect, or carelessness in damaging machinery.

Q.—You have not imposed any fines, except for damages done to machinery? A.—That is what our foreman told me just before I left. The total amount of the fines was only \$12.50 on \$50,000.00 paid as wages during the last twelve months.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Do the girls sometimes work at night in your establishment? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are they paid extra when they work at night? A.—No.

Q.—How long do they work? A.—I made an error when I said they were not paid extra, for they really are, as for four hours at night they are given five hours pay, that is, from seven to eleven at night. They are only employed during the very busy season, and we never force a girl to work unless she wishes.

Q.—Do they go home at eleven o'clock? A.—They all live in the neighborhood.

Q.—Do you allow them to sit down to work? A.—They sit down when they can, but running spinning machines they cannot sit down very well, as they are obliged to move about.

Q.—They are on their feet fifteen hours sometimes? A.—There are very few of those who work at night; they ball the twine, and they sit down most of the time.

Q.—Have you a dressing room for the female operatives? A.—No; we have the plans out for the building, which will contain one.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you any young girls, who work for you, who receive under \$3.50 a week? A.—I see there are three girls under \$3.50 per week.

Q.—How much do they receive? A.—Two receive \$3.00 and the other \$3.25; they have all just been newly taken on.

Q.—You have no girls less than \$3.00? A.—No; we have no employee in the place with the exception of five boys now who receive under \$3.00 per week.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Have you ever had an accident in your establishment? A.—No; not for a number of years. I think we have had three or four there; a man was killed three or four years ago.

Q.—Was there any inquest held on that man? A.—Yes; at the General Hospital, I believe.

Q.—Is it the usual thing to hold inquests at the Hospital when a man's family live in the city? A.—He died in the Hospital. I could not tell you anything more about it. His widow now works for us.

Q.—Are there any printed rules and regulations put up in your establishment? A.—We have printed rules but we have not paid much attention to them for many years.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are the rules in regard to fining put up? A.—I think there is one rule

which says that any employee remaining away without giving notice at the office, unless due to sickness, shall be fined \$1.00. But that has not been carried out in years.

Q.—Do the hands get all the statutory holidays or are they compelled to work on those holidays? A.—We make an arrangement with our hands. We have had different meetings and discussed the matter over with them and the result is that when we are not too busy we allow them to stop work on those days. If these holidays come during the busy season and we consider it absolutely necessary to work we state the fact to them and we have no difficulty about their working. We give them a great number of holidays during the year.

Q.—When you give those holidays or when they are kept with the sanction of the firm are the hands paid for the time. A.—No.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—When a hand on piece work makes a large sum in a fortnight is he or she paid up in full? A.—I should think so. The foreman makes the amount up on each flat.

Q.—You would not think of deducting part of the amount they earn? A.—We in the office know nothing of that kind done. Of course I am perfectly willing that my foremen should come before the Commissioners; they know a great many of those matters a great deal better than I do.

R. JELLEYMAN, Paper Box Manufacturer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:

Q.—Are many people employed in making paper boxes in Montreal? A.—Yes; a great many are employed.

Q.—Are the hands principally male or female? A.—The hands are principally female.

Q.—Are they adults or children? A.—They are all the way from twelve years to twenty or twenty-five years of age.

Q.—What would be the age of the youngest girl in your employ? A.—At the present time I have none younger than fifteen years of age.

Q.—Is the work very hard on the employees? A.—No; it is not.

Q.—Can they sit at it or must they stand? A.—Some sit and some stand.

Q.—Are they permitted to sit when it is possible for them to do so? A.—Yes; they are.

Q.—What wages will one of those girls receive when she begins work? A.—At one time when I employed more hands, I used to have them come on for one week to see if they could learn the business properly. If I found them of no use at the end of the week I let them go. Sometimes I have given them something and sometimes nothing; but generally I give them \$1 for the first week.

Q.—At the end of the week if you found them able to go on what would you give them then? A.—\$1.50 a week.

Q.—For how long do they work for \$1.50 per week? A.—That just depends on how smart the girls are.

Q.—Do you keep them on \$1.50 a week for a year? A.—Oh, no; sometimes not for a month. Some girls come right into the business at once.

Q.—How do you determine whether they ought to have their wages raised? A.—We can tell by the quantity of work done.

Q.—Do you always give an increase when they turn out a satisfactory amount of work? A.—Yes; but not too fast, of course, or we never could keep running the establishment. There is a great deal of piece work done.

Q.—How soon do you put them on piece work? A.—Some do not want to go on piece work. At first, when I introduced it some years ago, the hands did not like it. The smartest girls like piece work and the slow ones do not; they would rather be on work by the week.

Q.—As a matter of fact do you find the piece hands earn more than those who are working by the week? A.—Yes; if a girl is any way smart.

Q.—Are the piece hands and the week hands put on the same kind of work? A.—Yes; they are employed on about the same class of work.

Q.—Take a woman of eighteen or twenty years of age, who has become very expert, what wages does she receive? A.—A good fast hand will make all the way from \$3 up to \$5 and \$6 a week. I have known them make more, \$7 and \$8.

Q.—Do your hands remain with you any length of time? A.—I have had a family of seven and I have one yet, all the rest having got married.

Q.—Have you any system of fines in your establishment? A.—No; not to say fines—no. We tried the fine system, but it was more bother than it was worth.

Q.—Have you any system of punishment in your establishment? A.—No; only paying them off.

Q.—You mean only by dismissing them? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—And you pay them when you dismiss them? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you retain any wages when you dismiss them? A.—No.

Q.—Do you require them to give you notice when they leave your employ? A.—No.

Q.—At what age do you take boys into your establishment? A.—We have not any boys employed.

Q.—Do you employ men? A.—Yes; all men.

Q.—As foremen, and so on? A.—No; we act as our own foreman.

Q.—What do you pay a man? A.—We pay a man from \$7.00 to \$11.00 a week.

Q.—Is much skill required to do the work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Would they have the standing of journeymen in other trades? A.—They are no use for other trades.

Q.—Have they the same standing in your trade as journeymen have in others? A.—Yes.

Q.—They are skilled workmen? A.—Yes; they are skilled workmen.

Q.—Do those skilled workmen work for \$7.00 a week? A.—No.

Q.—What is the wages for which a skilled workman works? A.—We have only got four men now—two men at the machines at the present time. We have had more, but that is the number we have now. They commence at \$4.00 per week.

Q.—Are the rooms, in which the hands are employed, warm? A.—Yes; they must be warm, or they could not work.

Q.—Are the ventilated? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you separate conveniences for males and females? A.—Yes.

Q.—How frequently does the sanitary inspector visit your shop? A.—I think he has been once or twice; I could not say exactly.

Q.—Has he made any suggestion in any way? A.—No.

Q.—None at all? A.—None at all. Our establishment is well ventilated.

Q.—Are the machines in your shop dangerous? A.—No; there is no danger about them.

Q.—Have any accidents happened in your establishment? A.—Only through carelessness. The knives might come down and chop their fingers off, if they did not take care. They have done that with boys, but only through their own neglect.

Q.—What hours do your hands work? A.—In winter, we generally work from

eight till five or six; that depends on how busy we are. Eight o'clock, I think, is early enough for girls in winter.

Q.—What is the time in summer? A.—Seven o'clock.

Q.—And they work till six? A.—Yes; they leave at six.

Q.—Do you ever have any night work? A.—Occasionally.

Q.—Do you give extra pay when the hands work at night? A.—Yes; a pay and a half.

Q.—And how late do they work? A.—Not later than ten o'clock. We generally leave at nine o'clock, if we can. It is only for a very short time we work at night.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do the doors of your factory open outwards or inwards? A.—They open inwards.

Q.—Are they kept locked during the day? A.—No.

Q.—Do you allow employees to stay away on holidays? A.—Yes; unless we are very busy. I have no trouble in that respect.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—At what kind of work are the men employed who earn \$7.00 per week? A.—On a machine running out stuff; it is quite easy work.

Q.—On the presses? A.—On the presses and what is called a scoring machine.

Q.—How many men have you employed at \$7.00 per week, and how many at \$11.00? A.—We have only four men at the present time.

Q.—How many of those receive \$7.00 per week? A.—One.

Q.—And the others receive \$11.00 per week? A.—No; only two receive 11.00.

Q.—Do you print any labels on those boxes? A.—No; the printing is all separate.

Q.—Have you any printers employed? A.—No; not at present.

Q.—Have you ever had any printers employed in connection with box making? A.—Yes; I used to have printers.

Q.—Did you set up your own type? A.—I had a man to set it up.

Q.—How much wages did you allow him? A.—That is sometime ago. I think I paid \$10.00 or \$12.00 a week to the man who looked after that.

Q.—Where do you find the market for the boxes you make? A.—In the city.

Q.—Is yours only a local trade? A.—We send our boxes all through the country.

Q.—Do you find keen competition in the box trade? A.—Very much so.

Q.—Do you find it difficult to compete with the box manufacturers in Ontario? A.—That does not interfere with us. The boxes are too cumbersome and cost too much for freight, as a general thing, to ship any distance. The box trade has, of course, changed very much in recent years. I have been in the trade for fifty years. It was nothing when I commenced, and we could not get material to make the boxes. All the machines have come from the United States so far, but we can make them here now.

Q.—Are any of the boxes made by hand—is pasting done? A.—Yes; they are all made by hand. There are pasting machines.

Q.—For what are boxes made by hand, pasted, used? A.—Shirts, collars, shoes, shelving boxes. The shoe box is the principle trade now—that is for bulk. Everything goes into boxes nowadays. And then the fur trade uses a great many.

Q.—The hardware boxes are generally made by machinery, I understand? A.—No; they are made by hand. They are cut by machinery and put together by hand.

Q.—Is pasting required on the hardware boxes? A.—Yes.

J. P. EDWARDS, Manager of the Canada Jute Company, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What class of works do you produce? A.—Our principal business is manufacturing bags, grain bags and bags for various purposes.

Q.—Do you employ many hands in your establishment? A.—We employ about forty hands.

Q.—Are those hands male or female? A.—About ten are male and about thirty are female.

Q.—Are they young or old? A.—The males are all adults; but the females are perhaps half from fifteen up, from fifteen to twenty-five.

Q.—Do you think you employ any under fifteen? A.—We make no limit as to age, but we find that under that age they are not competent for the work.

Q.—Is the work pretty hard? A.—No; it is steady continuous work, though turning bags for the hands.

Q.—What wages will a girl receive when she commences work? A.—She receives about \$2.50 a week to commence with. After a short time she gets higher pay.

Q.—Do none get less than \$2.50 per week? A.—No.

Q.—How long would a girl remain at \$2.50 per week before she obtained an increase? A.—That would depend altogether upon her skill. If she was a smart girl she would increase very rapidly, probably, in two or three months, and after a year or two or perhaps less would get skilled with the machines. They are paid by piece work and some girls earn as high as \$8.00 or \$9.00 a week in some cases.

Q.—Have you any in your employ who earn as high as \$8.00 or \$9.00 a week? A.—We have only two or three girls who are quick enough to earn that sum.

Q.—How many earn \$8.00 per week? A.—We have a number earning from \$6.00 to \$8.00 per week, perhaps ten or twelve.

Q.—Do they remain long in the factory? A.—The hours are from seven till twelve and from one to six and on Saturday we close at one o'clock.

Q.—What I mean is this: do they remain a long time working for you? A.—Yes; we have very few changes.

Q.—What do the men earn in your establishment? A.—The men earn from \$7.50 to \$10.00 per week.

Q.—Do skilled men work for \$7.50 per week? A.—Not skilled men.

Q.—They are ordinary laborers, I suppose? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are your work rooms warm? A.—Yes; they are heated by steam.

Q.—Are they ventilated? A.—Yes; fairly well ventilated. We are just building a new factory which will be a great improvement on the present one.

Q.—In the new factory will there be separate conveniences for the males and females? A.—Yes; we have that division in the present one.

Q.—Is your machinery dangerous? A.—There is only one machine that is dangerous in our factory.

Q.—Is that as well protected as it is possible to protect it? A.—Quite so.

Q.—Has the Sanitary Examiner examined it? A.—Yes.

Q.—Does he examine machines or only look at the sanitary condition of the shop? A.—Only at the sanitary condition of the shop.

Q.—Have you any night work at your establishment? A.—A very little for the girls, but pretty often for the men.

Q.—When you require them to work at night, either men or girls, do you give them any extra rate of wages? A.—No; the same rate as for day work.

Q.—What proportion of girls working for you are able to sign their names? A.—All are to my knowledge.

Q.—Are they ever required to sign their names to any rule or pay list? A.—

No; but there are occasional requirements in the sewing flat in that direction—not any signing of a rule, but in connection with their work.

Q.—So you are under the impression that they are able to sign their own names?
A.—That is my impression.

STEDMAN A. LEBOURVEAU, Secretary and Solicitor of the Law and Order League, Montreal, recalled and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Can you tell us how many passenger steamboats calling at the port of Montreal, are licensed to sell intoxicating liquors? A.—I could not. Their licenses are for the boats while they are making their passages, and, of course, they do not come within my duties in connection with the Law and Order League. I have no knowledge in regard to that matter, and information can be obtained from the Inland Revenue Department.

Q.—On what authority are the licenses to sell liquor granted to a steamboat Company's passenger boats? A.—They are licensed by the provincial authorities.

Q.—If a boat has a license for one province, and goes into the territory of another province, does it continue to sell under that license? A.—My impression is that the Company would have to get a license from each province.

Q.—You do not know what the practice is? A.—I could not tell you that. I know our own provincial law relating to the matter of steamboat licenses.

Q.—Do ferry boats, or boats having a local trade sell intoxicating liquors? A.—I think they do; I cannot say from my own personal knowledge. I may state this, that the boats that run on the river here sell drinks, but whether they are intoxicating, or temperance drinks, I cannot say. I cannot give you an answer to that question.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What is the case in regard to boats running from Montreal to Quebec? A.—They have licenses.

Q.—And what are their hours of selling? A.—The only restriction against selling, I find in the License Law is, that they are not allowed to sell in any port, or wharf, or any point of disembarkation, or stoppage. The only other restriction is that they are not allowed to sell to soldiers, sailors, or apprentices, after eight o'clock at night, knowing them to be such.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—That is under the Quebec License Law, I understand? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Will you kindly tell us how the liquor licenses in Montreal are obtained; also as to what steps have been taken to procure a license, and what the license costs? A.—If a party requires a license for an inn, or a restaurant, his application has to be certified to by twenty-five of the Municipal electors, in the Municipal Polling Division, in which the place to be licensed is situated. When he has procured that certificate it is filed with the Clerk of the Crown, who is clerk of the Board of License Commissioners of Montreal. After these conditions are complied with, there is a list posted up in the office of the Clerk, containing the names of the applicants, the places for which they require licenses, the nature of the license, and the date of filing of the application, and the name of the ward, and the date on which the application will be taken into consideration; and this notice has to be posted up for, at least, fifteen days before the application can be taken into consideration, after this

the authorities are supposed to make enquiries to ascertain as to whether the place is a suitable place to receive a license, and whether it meets the requirements of the law or not, and they are supposed to investigate as to whether it has the necessary rooms and stable accommodation. If no opposition is made, the license is signed by, at least, two License Commissioners, one of whom is the Recorder. But in the meantime, while this notice is posted up, anyone can make opposition to the license being granted. The license can be refused if the person is not a proper person to receive the license, or if the place does not possess the necessary accommodation required by law; but, in the latter case, a very strong case has to be made or the license is granted. Or if the application is opposed by the majority of the Municipal electors of the same Polling District, residing in the district, and if they make that opposition in writing, signed by the majority, the Commissioners have no power or authority to issue a license. In the other cases they can use their own discretion. The applicant afterwards proceeds to the City Hall, where he obtains a certificate from the City Clerk establishing the annual rental or value of the premises for which the license is sought. The applicant there deposits this certificate from the City Clerk, and the certificate is confirmed by the License Commissioners, with the License Inspector. He then obtains his license upon paying the requisite fee, and upon entering into bonds for the proper keeping of his house, and that if his house is not properly kept, all the fines will be paid. The fee in the City Hall is \$8.00, and at the Court House it is \$1.00 on each application. The applicant has to pay, as a license fee, before he gets his license for an inn, or restaurant, \$200.00, if the premises are of the annual rental and value of less than \$400.00; he has to pay \$300.00 if the premises are of the rental or value of from \$400.00 to \$800.00, and he has to pay \$400.00 if the rental or value is over \$800.00. That is the fee for an inn or restaurant. The fee for a retail grocery shop, in the city of Montreal, is fifty per centum of the annual rental or value of the premises, provided, however, that in no case shall it be less than \$70.00, nor more than \$150.00. And at the last Session of the Quebec Legislature there was an additional fee of \$10.00 imposed on every license in addition to those fees I have just mentioned.

Q.—Then a shop licensed to sell liquor does not always cost the same amount?
A.—No; it is according to the rental. All those licensed are according to the rental.

Q.—Would that account for so many liquor shops being found in the poorer districts of this city? A.—No; I don't think it. The premises in those sections are generally of lower rental, and the customers of those shops are in the neighborhood. If you take first class groceries they do not allow drinking on the premises; but the others are groceries in name only, but their principal trade being in liquors and then keeping only a few groceries in order to comply with the technical requirements of the law. They would not require more valuable premises in which to carry on their trade.

Q.—If there was a regular tariff charged for those licenses all over the city would there be as many of them as there are at present? A.—It would depend upon the rate charged.

Q.—Take the highest rate you paid for grocery licenses? A.—If the highest rate was paid I think a good many would find it very difficult to raise the amount of money necessary. They have to work very closely during the latter part of the year now in order to get sufficient funds to obtain a license for the next year.

Q.—I suppose some obtain a license for as low as \$60? A.—\$80 is the lowest. The license fee is \$70 for premises up to \$150, and there is then the ten dollars additional.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Could you give us the average number of voters in each polling sub-division in Montreal? A.—The number would run all the way from 175 up to about 300. Each polling sub-division is supposed to have about 250; that is the way in which

they are sub-divided. When the voters lists are revised those who do not pay taxes are struck off, and the revising board combines two or three electoral districts into one if there are only a few voters in them. This being the case there is no fixed definite number, but the average would be in the neighborhood of 250.

Q.—From your standpoint in connection with the carrying out of the statute do you think that 25 voters are too few to sign the application in favor of the license?

A.—Certainly we do. We think they should get at least half—that if we are obliged to get a majority to keep saloons out, we don't see why they should have any greater privilege. But they should obtain a majority in order to obtain a license. But I may say here that every advantage is given to the applicants for licenses.

Q.—Do you think the requirements of the law such as the number of rooms and other accomodation are carried out? A.—Our law contains a provision that every inn shall contain all the utensils necessary to prepare meals for not less than ten persons, and a dining room and at least two bed rooms.

Q.—You mean two bed rooms outside of the requirements of the family? A.—Yes; outside of the requirements of the family.

Q.—Do you think the requirements of the law are practically carried out in every respect? A.—My opinion, based on information I have obtained in connection with this work during the last five years, is that it is not. A few years ago there was a dispute for some causes as to whether the house possessed the requirements required by the law, and there was a contest before the License Commissioners on the point. The Commissioners decided to investigate the matter for themselves. They visited a number of places and were astonished at what they saw, and I believe several places represented to them as being well furnished were nothing more than mere hovels.

Q.—Who appoints the License Commissioners? A.—They are not appointed. Certain officers are *ex-officio* License Commissioners. According to the law the two Judges of the Sessions of the Peace and the Recorder are *ex-officio* License Commissioners. I desire to add that up to the present time our society, the Law and Order League, has had to depend principally upon voluntary contributions for funds with which to carry on the work, and the bulk of our means has not come from fines.

LEWIS COHEN, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—You desire to make some statement to the Commissioners respecting patents, I understand? A.—I do.

Q.—Under what disadvantage are working men in getting out patents as compared with men who have means in Canada? A.—That is the object for which I have come before the Commission. My idea is that a patent should be granted to every one when he applies for it and that without cost. As the law stands at present there are many valuable patents lost to the inventor as well as to the Government. The Government should not lose the benefit of the inventor's skill. Suppose a patent was granted under the system I propose, for a valuable invention, a certain royalty might be paid on it to the Government and in this way the Government would not be a loser nor would the patentee.

Q.—If this were done would not the Government be flooded with applications for patents of no value? A.—My idea is they would not be. A committee or body like a jury composed of competent judges would consider the patents and reject those that were useless and many a trifling thing that is now patented would not be patented then. At the present time patents are granted too rapidly and too frequently for trifles. In my opinion only good and valuable inventions should be allowed to be patented and not those little improvements which are made almost every moment. At present an inventor without means can never get justice; that has been the case as

regards myself personally, and I have been victimized before the Courts and have never got anything. Patents were stolen from me openly and sold by men of capital in the city and I have no recourse. My idea is that the Government would have an increased revenue from such a plan as I have proposed, namely: That of a royalty by which they might receive, for example, \$10.00 or \$15.00 a year for ten years on the patent instead of receiving \$25.00 as they do at present.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What does it cost at present to get a patent? A.—The fee to the Government is only \$25.00 and it costs \$25.00 for specification and so on; in fact some patents cost about \$100.00. I have four, five or six lying now which I cannot bring forward as I do not occupy as good a position as I formerly did in Montreal. I have met Shylocks here, as the papers of Montreal have stated.

J. X. PERRAULT, Vice-President of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Does it come within the province of the Chamber of Commerce to occupy itself with questions relating to labor and capital? A.—Certainly.

Q.—It is part of the duty of that body to cause tribunals for summary decisions in such matters to be established? A.—Yes; our Board has taken up the question of a special tribunal for the collection of small amounts, sums under \$25.00. We have found that parties having those amounts to collect have to incur very large costs under the present arrangements of our judicial tribunals, and we have caused the member for Montreal East, Mr. David, to prepare a bill, which was submitted to the Quebec Legislature last session, and by which it is arranged that for a comparatively small amount a laboring man, having a claim of \$10.00, \$15.00 or \$20.00, might easily go before the tribunal and obtain a judgment in his favor. The Bill will probably pass next session, although it failed to pass last session, because a good many lawyers, no doubt, think their bills will be reduced by its adoption. The object sought to be obtained in the case of a laboring man who owed a small amount was this: that the tribunal might have power to arrange for the payment of the debt by instalments, weekly or monthly, instead of the man being called upon to pay the debt at one time, which a workman is often unable to do, whereas if the payments are extended over six months or a year, he can wipe off the debt and save the law expenses.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Could this be done without expense to the debtor, or at a trifling expense to him? A.—Yes. Naturally the lawyers have to get their fees, but their fees would be reduced to a minimum.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—The question is whether there should be a lawyer for a \$25.00 case? A.—Another thing is this: that special tribunal would take up those cases at once and not postpone them in favor of heavy cases which take up a great deal of time, and cause a loss of a great deal of time on the part of the witnesses in the smaller cases, by their having to wait until the heavy cases were first heard; and settlements could be obtained in a sort of amicable way.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Have you considered this question: whether those cases could be settled

without the intervention of lawyers at all? A.—We went on the general principle that such a system might be carried out. You might obtain a copy of the bill from Mr. David, who had charged of it at the last session.

Q.—Copies of the bill have been printed? A.—Yes. It did not go further than the second reading last session, for it was submitted late.

By Mr. HELBRONNER;—

Q.—You have made a study of the improvements you consider desirable to be made in the Port of Montreal. Will you kindly furnish the Commission with your opinion on that subject? A.—Yes; we have studied out the question from the point of view of the laboring men who were employed in the harbor. In Montreal the harbor has been kept in a very bad condition, so far as mud and dust are concerned, and we have decided to seek to remedy that condition. We have also asked for water fountains to be placed in different parts of the harbor for the benefit of the workingmen, and that larger and improved lamps be placed there, so as to prevent accidents, especially at night; but so far the Harbor Commissioners have not acted on our suggestions.

Q.—If certain improvements, asked for by the Chamber of Commerce, were granted, would they not have the effect of protecting a certain portion of St. Ann's ward, which is largely inhabited by workingmen? A.—Certainly. We have already submitted a plan of the work required to prevent the inundating of the city, which plan is now under consideration. Of course the working people suffer a great deal from the inundation every year, the water being in the streets and houses to a depth of five or six feet.

Q.—There were three inundations last year, I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you kindly tell us what the opinion of the Chamber of Commerce is with respect to the observance of Sunday? A.—Yes; we have considered that question. We look upon Sunday as a day of rest and enjoyment for the laboring classes, and when I say laboring classes, I mean commercial as well as manual labor; and we have asked that railway and tramway excursions might be allowed, so that the people may enjoy the fresh air on the Sunday, and do so without leaving work. We have also asked that the Post Office remain open to citizens in order to get their correspondence, and we believe, also, that the art collections should be open on that day, as they are in other large cities, especially in Europe, so that the people might enjoy themselves, after service, visiting the collections of art, and painting, as well as the libraries.

Q.—The Public Library is now open on Sunday afternoons, the Fraser Institute?
A.—Yes, and the Art Gallery.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—When would you propose that the people engaged working for other's pleasure on Sunday, should have their rest? A.—Some must sacrifice themselves to the masses, and we would have to ask the clergymen not to work on that day, if you were to push that argument to the extreme.

Q.—Are you aware that working men in other cities have petitioned against the very things for which you have asked? A.—No; in Lower Canada we do not look upon Sunday as a day of penance and severity. I know that under the Reformers, in some countries, the Sunday laws are very severe, and a man was not allowed to kiss his wife on Sunday. We have always done those things in Quebec, and even our children do them.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have not the priests of this parish denounced those Sunday excursions?
A.—Yes; certain Sunday excursions. When I speak of excursions, I mean the ordinary railway, which allows a man to go and see his relatives outside of the city.

Q.—Have not the priests denounced them, and said that they created a great deal of vice? A.—Certainly, there are a class of excursions that have done so.

Q.—I am asking you if the priests in the parish of Montreal have denounced them? A.—I am just going to explain. The priests in the parish of Montreal condemn a certain class of excursions to certain districts, to certain people, who go there, not to enjoy the fresh air, but something stronger. But we have other classes of excursions, like those the Terrebonne runs every Sunday morning to Cour de Cour.

Q.—If I were to mention names, I think you have mentioned a wrong name there? A.—It is a certain class of excursion which is run every morning in regard to which no one has found fault as regards the class of people going there.

Q.—Have the priests of Cour de Cour preached against those excursions? A.—No; I do not know it.

Q.—Has not the Roman Catholic Bishop Fabre also spoken against the non-observance of Sunday? A.—Certainly.

Q.—And also against Sunday excursions? A.—Against those excursions to which I have referred, but not against the regular trips run by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Richelieu Company, or against the regular trains—nor against the New-York train which runs every Sunday.

Q.—Are you aware if the Archbishop has been asked his opinion about Sunday trains—morning trains on Sunday on the C.P.R.? A.—No; I am not in the confidence of the Archbishop.

Q.—Do you think it is for the benefit of religion that a train should leave here early on Sunday morning and go through the parishes about the time of church service? A.—I consider that if a man has gone to church in the morning—and we are obliged to go as catholics—he should enjoy himself the rest of the day by taking trips outside for the benefit of his health and enabling him to work and support his family during the week.

Q.—Is it for the benefit of religion that there should be a Sunday morning train going to Quebec passing through the parishes during the time of church services? A.—If those who belong to the church are made strong during the week and do their duty to the church, I think it is for the benefit of the church. A catholic has to go to church every Sunday, that is the obligation. He must go to church, but when he has been to mass he is at liberty for the rest of the day to enjoy his Sunday in a respectable way, that is not to get drunk. Of course, it is always understood that he behaves himself properly.

By MR. HEAKES:—

Q.—Would it not be better to pay a workman more wages and give him Saturday afternoons for excursions? A.—That would depend on how they would use the afternoon. I think they could use Sunday to a very great advantage—in fact they do so. A great many people go out of the city on Sunday to visit their relations. Most of our working people are from the country and come in from the outside neighborhood.

Q.—Could they not use Saturday afternoon in the same way? A.—They might if they did not lose anything by doing so; but they could not if they were to lose their days' work.

By MR. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Is there a building section in connection with the Board of Trade? A.—We have contractors on our board.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—There is no separate organization in connection with the building trade? A.—There is an association of contractors in the city, but they are not affiliated with our organization.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you employers of labor connected with the Board of Trade? A.—Certainly.

Q.—Are any of them in connection with the building trade? A.—We have in our organization the great manufacturers of this city.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you several members of the Chamber of Commerce who are wholesale liquor dealers, and is it a fact that the Chairman is a wholesale liquor dealer? A.—Yes; Mr. Dufresne, our President, is a wholesale grocer and liquor dealer and tobacco dealer.

Q.—Will you please state to the Commission the opinion which the Chamber of Commerce holds in regard to the licensing question? A.—We have passed resolutions on the temperance question, we believe licenses should be based on population—that there should be a reduction, but that the number should be based on the population of the city. We have reported also in favor of a heavier license so as to reduce the number. We are strongly of the opinion that the number of licenses should be based on population judging from experience, and the Recorder has stated that there is at the present time no cast iron rule as regards the number to be granted and that can be granted.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What was the effect of the Dominion Act while it was in force in regard to the number of licenses in this city? A.—Its legality was contested and we had not time to try its effects.

Q.—Nothing was done that would show its effects? A.—No.

Q.—Have you any prohibition members of the Chamber of Commerce? A.—As a general thing the French people are not for prohibition; we are for temperance but not for prohibition.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—The Chamber of Commerce, I understand, has taken means to establish a labor exchange. Will you please explain its method of working? A.—We find in Montreal great difficulty in getting workmen when we want them. We have to go to an intermediary who has several men under his charge, in order to get a laborer. On the other hand servants and people who wish to engage themselves have to hire by a go-between, who charges both sides a commission for his services, and it is difficult, I say, to obtain people when we want them, and for those who wish to engage themselves to do so. We have therefore organized what we call a labor exchange; that is to say during certain hours, say, from eleven to one, those who want employment and those who wish to engage help may meet at a certain place and contract with one another, in the one case to obtain the labor they want and in the other to obtain the situations they desire, without any cost. The idea is that the representative of the Quebec Government here, who is employed to place emigrants who come to the immigration office, should extend his duties so as to place, not only those who come from the other side, but our own people, and thus prevent them going to the United States for the want of employment here. It is only a month or so, since we proposed to establish this labor exchange and it has not got into working order yet; but we believe the Local Government would be favorable to this scheme, and we have a central place where those who want work and those who want workmen can meet face to face to make contracts. That is the system pursued in Paris and I have seen it there myself. They publish every day in tabular form the name of those who offer themselves and the names of those who want help, each on a special sheet. If you want a carpenter or a servant you can go there and consult

the sheet and obtain the necessary help. On the other hand, men desiring employment can meet employers there and enter into engagement without cost.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—That is what we call a labor bureau? A.—It is a labor bureau.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Will you also arrange the rate of wages? A.—No; we have nothing to do with that matter. The engagement may be registered if they desire, but the labor exchange will not interfere with wages or terms, or anything of that kind.

Q.—Do you intend to have this labor bureau self sustaining? A.—It will not cost anything. We have already an employee of the Government who does this very thing for foreigners, and we think he should do it as well for people of the country. It is a fair proposition I think.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—He is an immigration agent? A.—Yes; in Montreal. I have seen the gentleman, and he thoroughly approves of the plan.

Q.—While you were at Liverpool, did you not make a special study of the emmigration to Canada? A.—I was witness of a very important fact while I was in Liverpool two years ago. Just as I was taking the Canadian steamer I saw a clergyman go into the dining room there, in the ordinary room where we had our meals, and the steward brought up a pile of circulars—yellow papers. I asked what they were. They were circulars that the people named inside of the documents were qualified to emigrate, and were good people—in fact, that they were tip-top emigrants. That gentleman just took the back of those circulars and began to sign them, till the whole batch was through. It did not strike me that he had seen much of them before. He went off the boat. This was on the Allan steamer. The Dominion Line steamer was leaving at the same hour; I went there and the same process took place. In about one hour the gentlemen certified to hundreds of people as being desirable emigrants, who very often do not turn out as well as we would like them to do.

Q.—Are those circulars, such as you have mentioned, such as to entitle the persons to receive a Government bonus? A.—I fancy so. They were the ordinary circulars that have to be signed by a clergyman to entitle a party to emigrate under certain circumstances. I suppose you are aware that this thing is asked on the other side.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Do you know whether that gentleman was a clergyman or not? A.—He had a white necktie, and, in fact, he had the dress of a clerical gentleman. I imagine he was one; he looked very much like it.

Q.—Are you aware that the clergymen signing those circulars are required to state, on their own knowledge, that they have been acquainted with the particular individual as an agricultural laborer, and, at all events, that he is not a mechanic? A.—I suppose so. He did not look at the circulars at all, but he took the pile up on a table and signed on the back of them.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You do not know what was inside? A.—I asked what it was.

Q.—You do not know whether they were properly signed inside? A.—No. It struck me that the outside signature was made without looking at the contents.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—The Chamber of Commerce, I believe, has also taken into consideration the

question of the postal weight of letters. Can you state to the Commission the opinion of the Board on that subject? A.—We have asked the Government to allow an ounce letter instead of half an ounce, as is the rate to-day, because the poor people in the country are not supplied with the tissue paper used by the mercantile community. They use heavy paper, and, moreover, their writing is large, as they are not accustomed to handle the pen. If you, therefore, confine them to a half ounce letter it will be a very small one; if you want to give them a chance to write a good long letter they need the full ounce weight. We, therefore, ask that the postal weight in Canada should be one ounce, as it is in the United States.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Is that the law in the United States? A.—Yes; one ounce is allowed in the United States. In the United States you can send one ounce for two cents; in Canada you can send only half an ounce for three cents. If you send a little more than half an ounce, here, it costs you six cents. This postal rate becomes very expensive to people who are not furnished with light writing material, and who write large.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Would not this apply to commercial men as well as to poor classes? A.—Yes; but commercial men avoid the trouble to a great extent, by using light writing material. A working man cannot do so; because he has not the material, and he cannot write small enough.

Q.—Is not a great deal of mercantile correspondence conducted at the present time for which they use pretty heavy paper? A.—Yes; mercantile correspondence and that of a workingman are in different positions; for, if a workingman is writing to his wife, or children, he does not put the same number of lines on a sheet of paper.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What rate is required on a one ounce letter, posted in the United States, for Canada? A.—Two cents.

Q.—What would a one ounce letter, posted in Canada for the United States, cost? A.—Six cents.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Are you aware that Bishop Laffêche, of Three Rivers, has done all he possibly could to prevent the boats running on Sundays? A.—No; I have enough to do to follow my own Bishop, without following other Bishops.

Q.—Are you aware that these men who went on board the Allan and Dominion steamers, at Liverpool, could not have obtained their passage unless they had certificates from their clergyman? A.—I do not know anything further than I have stated.

LEWIS Z. BOUDREAU, Printer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—You are President of the Montreal Typographical Union, I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many English printers are there in Montreal? A.—About 300 as near as we can calculate.

Q.—About how many printers are employed? A.—100 in round numbers.

Q.—How many females are employed? A.—Between fifty and one hundred.

Q.—What is the scale of your Union on piece-work in connection with news-

papers, morning and evening? A.—I understand the scale is 28 cents for evening newspapers and 32 cents for morning.

Q.—What is the highest rate per thousand ems that women receive? A.—To the best of my knowledge the highest rate is 29 cents per thousand ems.

Q.—What would be the average? A.—I suppose the average would be about 20 cents per thousand ems, perhaps a little more or less, I am not positive about it.

Q.—Are there many stereotyped plates used in Montreal? A.—Not a great many to my knowledge.

Q.—Do you consider the use of stereotypes is to the detriment of journeymen printers? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are those stereotypes manufactured in Canada or do they come from the other side? A.—Some come from the other side and some are manufactured in Canada.

Q.—What rate ought to be charged from them in fairness between the importer and the journeyman printer? A.—Full value I should judge—the full rate per thousand ems.

Q.—It is worth as much to the proprietor as if the type was set up in Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is there any printing done in the Reformatory and the charitable institutions here? A.—I believe so, yes. I have seen printing with the imprint of the Reformatory on it; I was never in the Reformatory printing office.

Q.—Does that work belong to the Reformatory or to an outside contractor? A.—That was outside work—the work I saw with the imprint on it.

Q.—Do you know the price charged? A.—No. I have always heard that it was done a great deal cheaper than the regular rates, but I have no positive knowledge on the subject.

Q.—Do you believe that is also an injury to the employees and the employing printers? A.—Yes.

Q.—What kind of work is done at the McKay Institute? A.—I have been given to understand that commercial work is done there, work for large corporations. I have never been there myself but I have good reason to believe it from statements of other persons who have been there and who have told me.

Q.—Is there any railway printing done there? A.—I understand that a large corporation gets its printing done there, or at least a portion of it.

Q.—Outside employers look upon railway printing I believe, as very good and profitable work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is one thousand ems of type set up by a woman as valuable to the proprietor as one thousand ems of type set up by a journeyman printer? A.—One thousand ems of type, provided it is accepted, set by a woman is equally as valuable as one thousand ems of type set by a man.

Q.—Do you know any office in Montreal that requires competent men to look over the work thus set up by women? A.—I have seen the foreman do so and with the apprentices in the same way.

Q.—And yet the employment of these women at the cheap rate is profitable to the employer in the face of this extra superintendence? A.—The extra superintendence is only required for young girls, the older ones do not require any superintendence. It is for the benefit of the employer just the same.

Q.—Do you know any young women, who having been apprentices at the business and worked there for four or five years, are as competent to set plain matter as journeymen? A.—Yes.

Q.—And do you believe those women should be paid the same prices as are paid to the journeymen? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know any establishments, newspaper offices, in Montreal that get certain classes of type set outside of the office? A.—No; not to my knowledge.

Q.—Do you know any class of work going into newspapers that is done in job offices for the purpose of saving money and taking it from the piece hands? A.—I have heard of this being done, but I have no positive knowledge of it. I have heard

men employed in other offices say this, but it has never been done to my knowledge.

Q.—What is the average ability of the compositor in setting type in Montreal?
A.—As near as I can ascertain the figures will run from \$14.00 to \$16.00 per week this is according to the figures we have obtained from the employers.

Q.—Do you think a compositor on piece work is as competent to set advertisements on piece and also tabular matter as is a compositor who works by the day?
A.—In the majority of cases, yes.

Q.—Can you give us any reason why compositors on piece do not receive that class of work to do? A.—The reason I have always assigned was that the advertisements and fat matter were always set on time to save money.

Q.—Did employers ever present any document to the Union protesting against that contract work in the Reformatory? A.—No.

Q.—You do not know of that? A.—No. Do you mean as to whether they ever gave any opinion on the subject?

Q.—Yes. A.—The Union got opinions from the employers on that question.

Q.—What were those opinions? A.—They were all against this convict work, the Reformatory work.

Q.—Is it required in Montreal for employers to have their name and firm registered? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Have you ever known work culled and the fat matter taken away from compositors on piece work and given to time hands? A.—I have heard of it but I have never seen it done.

Q.—As a representative of the printers of Montreal do you approve of the system existing in connection with the employment of apprentices? A.—No.

Q.—Will you explain yourself on that matter and how you would prefer that system to be changed? A.—I believe an apprentice should be indentured for five years. At the end of that time, the employer, if he has not made a competent printer of the apprentice, should give reasons why the boy has not proved fit to be a printer or pay damages.

Q.—How long would it take a competent journeyman to ascertain whether a boy has the ability to learn the printing business or has a liking for it? A.—He could find it out within a year I should judge at the most.

Q.—Can you tell us the reason why some foremen and employers object to indenturing apprentices? A.—No; I could not exactly give their reasons for refusing to do so.

Q.—Does immigration affect the printing business in Montreal? A.—Not to any great extent.

Q.—Have those who have come here, to your knowledge, been willing to work under the prescribed scale of wages? A.—Some were and some were not.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the printing offices in Montreal? A.—Some of the printing offices are in a first class state as regards their sanitary condition; others require considerable looking after. I have been given to understand that in some of the printing offices the floors have not been scoured since the men went there and tobacco spit is half an inch deep. No attempt is made to clean those places. In regard to the other offices the arrangements are very good.

Q.—Is there anything in your laws, either local or international, to prevent incompetent men from coming into the organization? A.—There is.

Q.—Do I understand you then that within the craft it is the most competent men who are within the organization? A.—Yes. There are competent men outside of the organization too, in this city there are some very good men outside.

Q.—Those you call competent men outside of the organization, were they ever inside of the organization? A.—No.

Q.—Are there any fire escapes in connection with the printing offices in this city? A.—I believe in two offices there are fire escapes but I do not know whether

such are in connection with any of the others. There is no fire escape where I work.

Q.—Do you know any office in Montreal, where the men and women are employed on piece, where charges of favoritism have been made by the foremen towards the women? A.—Not under my notice.

Q.—What is your opinion in regard to the establishment of a bureau of Labor Statistics for the whole Dominion? A.—We are strongly in favor of that proposal.

Q.—Will you tell us what advantage, in your opinion, might be derived from it? A.—It would do away with middle men in my opinion and bring employers and employees face to face to make their own engagements.

Q.—Is it customary in Montreal when engaging young men for the printing business that the foreman or proprietor should question them in regard to their education? A.—I have never known it to be done.

Q.—How many hours constitute a day's work on a morning paper in this city? A.—Between twelve and thirteen hours.

Q.—I mean is there any number of stated hours here that the men must receive composition? A.—On morning papers?

Q.—Yes. A.—No.

Q.—Are there times in a morning newspaper office where the men are idle and yet not allowed to go home? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do they receive anything for the idle time when they are waiting around? A.—No; they do not.

Q.—Do you think they should do so according to the rules of the craft? A.—Yes; I do.

Q.—Have you ever heard or do you know of any office in Canada that does allow such waiting time? A.—I have heard of it.

Q.—Are there any men working as journeymen who receive under \$9.00 per week? A.—I believe some are working for less than \$9.00 per week in this city.

Q.—Do you think your organization compels men to pay more to men than they are worth? A.—No.

Q.—Is the scale of wages the minimum amount according to living rates; is that the way the scale of wages is framed? A.—The scale of wages is framed on the lowest minimum rate.

Q.—On the lowest living prices that prevail? A.—Yes; for a fair hand.

Q.—That is to say for an average hand? A.—Yes; for an average hand.

Q.—Do you know men receiving more than their minimum rate for their extra ability? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the rate of day work per week? A.—Between \$9.00 and \$10.00 in this city.

Q.—What rate is laid down by your Union? A.—The Union has no regular rate here. Some work for \$9.00 and some for \$10.00 per week.

Q.—Do any receive over \$10.50 per week? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it right that a slow hand, although that hand may set type correctly, should receive, as they receive, a lower rate per thousand than a quick hand? A.—It is not right in my opinion.

Q.—If they are slow they are paid accordingly on account of their slowness? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it right, according to the rules of the craft, that they should receive a lower rate of wages than the standard? A.—On piece work?

Q.—Yes. A.—No.

Q.—How long have you worked in Montreal? A.—I have worked here about twelve years.

Q.—Can you tell us if the cost of living has increased or decreased or has it been stationary during those twelve years you have been here? A.—To the best of my knowledge it has largely increased during those twelve years.

Q.—During those twelve years has the price of composition per thousand ems increased? A.—It has increased very little.

Q.—Has house rent increased? A.—Yes.

Q.—Would you tell us how much per cent it has increased in your opinion?

A.—Between fifteen and twenty per cent I should judge.

Q.—Do you think a working man with a family of two or three is able to obtain a house in a respectable locality in this city within three quarters of a mile of this place for \$4 a month? A.—No.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

No. Q.—Is there any black-listing in connection with your trade in Montreal? A.—

Q.—Do you allow young women to join the printers' Union? A.—Yes.

Q.—Does your Union allow young women to join the Union who have not served five years at the trade? A.—No.

Q.—Do you permit men to join the Union who are not competent printers?

A.—We have a provision in our laws against that, but, of course, incompetent men get in sometimes, we cannot help it.

Q.—But they are not allowed to enter the Union if you are aware they are incompetent? A.—Not if we know it.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Yes. Q.—Are there any offices in Montreal that use type under the standard? A.—

Q.—And how is that measured; is it measured fairly according to the rates of the office using type of this standard? A.—It is measured just as it is; it is not measured according to the standard rates.

Q.—It is not measured one way as the next lowest class of type? A.—No.

No. Q.—Is that the general and universal way to measure this kind of type? A.—I do not believe it.

Q.—When type is under the standard is it not the uniform practice to measure it one way as the next lowest kind of type? A.—Yes.

Q.—This is not measured in that way? A.—No.

Q.—How many offices in Montreal are using that kind of type? A.—Just one unless the new standard is different. I believe that will include two or three other offices, but I have not looked up the new standard.

Q.—Have you ever known proprietors of newspapers here to get fonts of type cast that was not according to the standard? A.—I have seen the type coming into the offices where it was used.

Q.—Type set up, that is under the standard, is it a benefit to the employer or to the men? A.—It is a loss to the men.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What price is generally paid to children working in newspaper offices?

A.—From the statements we have received from employers I believe the rate is from 12cts. per thousand ems up; that is on piece work. You mean boys and girls I suppose?

Q.—Yes. A.—The general rule is to pay them from \$1.50 to \$2 per week. On piece work they receive, as I have said, from 12cts. per thousand ems up.

Q.—Are children allowed to work by the piece during their apprenticeship?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are they permitted to do it by the rules of your Union? A.—There is a rule against it.

Q.—What do they do generally? A.—They set plain matter—that is piece work.

Q.—At what age do they commence to work by the piece? A.—I suppose, be-

tween fourteen and fifteen; as soon as they know how to set type a little they are placed on piece work.

Q.—That is during their apprenticeship? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you had, in any of the offices where you have worked, children who have come out of the Reformatory? A.—No.

Q.—Are there many who have small printing places at their houses? A.—I have no positive knowledge of that.

Q.—Do you know any case? A.—I do not know any.

Q.—Are there three hundred English compositors in this city? A.—Yes; English.

Q.—When you receive an incompetent man into the Union, what do you do? A.—We generally make him serve another year as what we call an apprentice member. That is provided for in our rules.

Q.—When you oblige him to work in that capacity, do you ask that he be paid the same amount as a competent man? A.—Not if he is an apprentice member.

Q.—Can you tell us the different prices paid as between Canada and the United States? A.—I can give you a pretty good idea from our report. At Philadelphia night work is 40 cts. per thousand ems; day work, 37 cts. per thousand ems; \$13.00 per week.

Q.—And what is paid outside of the newspapers? A.—\$18.00 a week for job work. The rates at Boston are 45 cts., night; 39 cts., day; \$15.00 per week.

Q.—Have you the prices paid in New York? A.—No; but I understand prices are: 46 cts., day work, and 50 cts. night work; and \$18.00 per week. In Canada the prices are: 37½ cts., night work; 33½ day work; and \$11.00 per week.

Q.—Is that for sixty hours? A.—It does not state the number of hours. The printers who have been there tell me they work fifty-four hours there. Toronto, 30 cts., night; 28 cts., day; \$11.00 per week, and fifty-four hours.

Q.—Do you know how the advertisements and commercial matter are given out in Toronto? A.—I have heard of it.

Q.—How is it given? A.—I have heard that it is all given to the piece hands in Toronto.

Q.—In regard to a newspaper in Montreal that employs, say twelve to fifteen girls, on piece work, at 28 cts. per thousand, which is the highest rate paid to girls, is not the proprietor getting the paper turned out more cheaply than a proprietor who employs journeymen? A.—Certainly. A proprietor who employs a certain number of females can produce his paper cheaper than if it is all set by journeymen.

Q.—Give us an average of the amount? A.—I cannot do that; I have never given it any attention.

Q.—Does it amount to much on weekly wages? A.—It must amount to a considerable sum.

Q.—Are the men paid weekly in Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are they always paid in cash? A.—Yes; they are paid in cash.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—You are sufficiently acquainted with the opinions of the Typographical Union as to be able to tell us what their opinion is on the question of arbitration in the settlement of disputes between capital and labor. Please tell us their opinion? A.—I am pretty certain their opinion is in favor of arbitration.

Q.—Has the Union ever advanced any particular form that arbitration should take? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do they generally take the trouble in printing offices to teach apprentices their trade? A.—In some cases yes; and in some cases no.

Q.—Are there many printing offices where they employ children too young to carry materials? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is the work too heavy for a child? A.—In some cases it is. When a boy has to drag a cart around like a horse, I say it is too heavy work. I had to do that when I was an apprentice.

Q.—Did the Union protest against the manner in which contracts were given for printing by the Corporation? A.—The Union entered its decided protest against the way City printing was given.

Q.—What method do you propose as the best for doing that work? A.—We propose to have the work distributed around to the different offices, so that each office would get a fair share of it, and at a fair rate.

Q.—Was that done? A.—It was done partly, but not generally in the way we wanted it done.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—I understand that none but English speaking printers belong to your Union?
A.—English printers are supposed to belong to our Union, provided they work under the jurisdiction of the Union. The city is divided into two divisions as regards our trade; and a man can be under the jurisdiction of the French Union or the English Union?

Q.—There are two Unions then, English and French? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is the scale of wages the same in each Union? A.—Yes; that is supposed to be the case, although it is not always carried out.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—At what time are morning newspaper hands expected to go to the office on Sunday evening? A.—At seven o'clock on Sunday evening.

Q.—Can they not begin work at twelve o'clock Sunday night? A.—They could do so, but they would have to work on Saturday up to twelve o'clock if it were done.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Would the printers themselves like to make that change? A.—No; I do not think so. I have heard them talking about it, but do they not want that change. They would rather have Saturday as at present.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—You think that would be killing two nights for the sake of obtaining one?
A.—Yes.

Q.—When a piece hand is taken off his frame and put on time work, does he receive as much per hour as if he was on piece work? A.—No.

Q.—Do you think he should do so? A.—Yes; most decidedly.

Q.—What is generally the cause of a man being taken off piece work and put on day work? A.—He is generally taken off, as far as my knowledge goes, to set advertisements. That is done when there is a rush of advertisements and the time hands are not able to set them all; he is then paid at the rate of twenty cents per hour.

Q.—Is there any sick benefit in connection with your Union? A.—There is no sick benefit, but there is a funeral benefit.

Q.—Do they pay anything extra on that account? A.—Yes; we pay an assessment for that.

Q.—There is a special assessment for that? A.—Yes.

C. J. McGUIRE, Printer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—You have heard the evidence of the president of the Union, Mr. Boudreau?
A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you corroborate that evidence given by him? A.—Yes, I do.

Q.—Is there anything you desire to add that would be of importance to the Commission in regard to your trade? A.—I do not think of anything just now. I can corroborate especially what Mr. Boudreau said about work being done in the Institutions.

Q.—You can speak of it as a fact? A.—I saw the work and was informed by the manager of the printing office that he had done a large quantity of such work.

Q.—Do you know that work done in that establishment has been the means of keeping men out of work? A.—To a certain extent it must have that effect, because if the work was not done there it would be done down town.

Q.—Is it done cheaper there than it would be in offices down town? A.—Yes; I think they have four boys and six girls or six boys and four girls, I do not know which, and in doing this work they certainly must do it at a cheaper rate.

Q.—Do the parties who do the work receive any remuneration or does it all go into the funds of the institution? A.—I do not know about that.

Q.—Do you know anything about the work done in the Reformatory? A.—I do not.

Q.—Do you think those establishments and institutions should be registered when they do contract work? A.—Decidedly so.

Q.—What would the consequences be of their being registered—would they be compelled to pay taxes? A.—I do not understand your question.

Q.—What would be the consequence of their being registered—would they be compelled to pay taxes? A.—I should think that men employing these people at reduced rates of pay should be made to pay the same rates of taxes as other employers have to pay who in addition have to pay higher rates for labor.

Q.—Do you think it would be a benefit to the working-class, if there was a Bureau of Labor Statistics established for the Dominion? A.—Decidedly so.

Q.—Have you given that question any thought? A.—Not particularly. I agree with what Mr. Boudreau has said in regard to that matter.

Q.—Has the Union to your knowledge any objection to women becoming members of it? A.—It is provided by our constitution that they may become members.

Q.—But must they receive the prevailing scale of wages before they become members? A.—Decidedly so.

Q.—Have you anything to add or any information to give that would be of benefit to the Commission in regard to your trade? A.—Nothing but this; that the reduction of a man's pay per thousand ems is not the only way his wages can be reduced.

Q.—Tell us another way in which they can be reduced? A.—The boss can reduce them by a system of taking away the tables for which formerly compositors received double price or a price and a-half, and giving them to time hands. They also take the advertisements away. The advertisements, I believe, go on the hook in Toronto. I think a man could afford to receive a lower rate of pay per thousand ems if he got the advertisements to set, and he could make more money at the smaller rate if he had the fat matter to work on.

* * * Gate man, Grand Trunk Railway, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—You are employed as a gateman for the Grand Trunk Railway Company, I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—What crossing are you employed at? A.—At * * * street crossing.

Q.—How many hours do you work per day? A.—I work twelve hours per day.

Q.—How many hours do you work on Saturday? A.—I work twelve hours on Saturday.

Q.—Do you ever work on Sunday? A.—Yes; every other Sunday.

Q.—Do you get anything extra for working on that day? A.—No; we only get paid for the day.

Q.—It has been stated here that the gatemen receive \$1.00 per day. Is that the case? A.—No; I get 85 cents per day.

Q.—Is there any gateman who receives more than 85 cents per day? A.—Yes; about nine men receive more than 85 cents but they have more duty to perform than a gate.

Q.—Have you not the same amount of work at * * * street as there is at Mountain street? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many men are employed at each crossing? A.—Two men, except at Mountain street where there is only one man at night.

Q.—How often do they change from day to night work? A.—They change every week.

Q.—Are you insured in the Grand Trunk Provident Society? A.—Yes.

Q.—In what class are you insured? A.—I am insured in class 2 D.

Q.—For what amount are you insured? A.—For \$750.00.

Q.—What premium do you pay for that sum? A.—It generally averages about \$1.00 a month taking it all through.

Q.—How often are you paid your wages? A.—We are paid every month, on the 12th of every month.

Q.—How much does the man at Richmond street crossing, attending the three switches and two semiphores, receive? A.—\$1.10 a day.

Q.—How much would a man in the yard receive for the same service? A.—A man in the yard doing about the same work would receive about \$15.00 per month.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Could you insure if you had the opportunity for less than \$1.00 per month, the amount you pay? A.—I have to pay 5 cents per death for all men who die in all the classes; but if a man dies in Class D, in which I am insured, I have to pay 15 cents. If a man dies in the same class as that in which you are insured you have to pay a certain amount, but if a man dies in any class lower you have to pay a certain smaller amount.

Q.—I see that you earn \$25.50 per month and pay \$1.00 out of that per month for insurance? A.—Yes.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Did you ever make any effort to have your wages increased from 85 cents per day to \$1.00 per day? A.—Yes; and fought hard for it.

Q.—You did not succeed? A.—When the Grand Trunk commenced to stop whistling I spoke to the man who came down to see us and he said we would have to look sharper about the work on account of the whistling being done away with on the trains coming through the city. I said to the man that seven or eight years ago when there was only one track and not half as much work to do as there is now we got 85 cents per day, and now there were two tracks and three times the amount of work to do and yet we only received the same pay. I said it would be very good if

we got more added to our wages. He said he had nothing to do with it and we must go down to Mr. Hickson or Mr. Stephenson. I said you might just as well take a nine foot wall and try to get a three foot door through it as to go down to see them.

Q.—Are you a single man or a married man? A.—I am a single man—I do not know what I would do if I were married.

T. FLAWN, Printer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—You are a printer, I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you worked at the business in Montreal? A.—I have worked at the business here about twelve years.

Q.—Have you read any of the evidence given by printers? A.—Yes, I have read the evidence given by the foreman where I worked last, and I want to deny emphatically a good deal he has said which was not true. In the first place he said I was one of the five men who left that office, and he said we were under the influence of liquor. I say we were not, we were all perfectly sober so far as I could see and so far as I am personally concerned.

Q.—Did any man leave that office lately? A.—Yes; in the last year or two there have been about five men left.

Q.—What was the cause of their leaving? A.—They had special grievances. It seems as though they wanted to cut us down not merely by reducing the price, but by cutting the work in such a manner that we could not make much. In the first place they got the headings for the different departments electrotyped, such as the veterinary and all those departments. All we got was the catch line "Add veterinary." They also took away tables and diagrams, or anything of that kind, and did not place them on the hook.

Q.—Who set up that kind of matter? A.—Sometimes the foreman himself. Sometimes he gave it to the time hands. I saw one time hand employed on it.

Q.—Are piece hands generally competent to set that kind of matter? A.—They are generally so. I daresay there may be some girls who are not; I am sure of that because I have taken work from a girl to set up, because she was not able to set the tables and so forth.

Q.—Do you mean to say that there is discrimination practiced between men and women in that office on account of the difference in the prices paid them? A.—I do. Matter such as poetry and the puzzle column, which is fat matter, is given to girls to set by the piece.

Q.—Do you know the sanitary condition of the offices in Montreal? A.—Wherever I have worked they have been very good.

Q.—This office to which you have referred; what is the average weekly wages they earn on piece work? A.—So far as I know I do not think they receive more than 20cts. per thousand ems.

Q.—Are you referring to the men? A.—That is taking the whole office. The men receive from 29cts. to 30cts. per thousand ems; there are six men there.

Q.—And you think the average rate per thousand is 20cts.? A.—I think so.

Q.—You think then that offices employing cheap labour like that have an advantage over offices which employ journeymen at the prevailing scale? A.—Certainly.

Q.—In your opinion is it a small or a great advantage? A.—I think the bosses do it a great deal to save themselves against a strike. They have to employ a great many more help—while they pay less they have to employ more hands.

Q.—Have you any other information you can furnish the Commission in addition to points that have been covered by other witnesses? A.—No, I do not think I have except this: in regard to apprentices the girls only serve you may say a

couple of months or so, while the boys have to serve four years, and are often kept employed cleaning windows and such like work.

Q.—The girl apprentices are put on piece work much sooner than the boys?
A.—Yes; as soon as they are able to know anything about piece they are put on piece.

Q.—Can you give us any definite reason for that fact? A.—Probably it is because they cannot do much and it does not pay to keep them around there on time—and so they let them make what they can till they get competent.

(Translation.)

ALBERT P. PIGEON, President of the Typographical Union Jacques-Cartier (French section), of Montreal, sworn:

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are president of the Typographical Union Jacques-Cartier? A.—Yes, sir; French section.

Q.—Is the constitution of your Union precisely the same as that of the English Union? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How many French printers are there in Montreal? A.—About one hundred and seventy.

Q.—How many women? A.—We have no women employed in French printing offices.

Q.—Are there any French printers imported into Canada under contract? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Is there a great number of stereotype plates employed by French printers? A.—No; not exactly.

Q.—Your Union has never uttered any complaint on that score? A.—No; not to my knowledge.

Q.—Could you give us any information as to the work which is done at the Reformatory? A.—The work done at the Reformatory consists, generally speaking, of factums, and these are turned out cheaper than anywhere else.

Q.—Has the work done at the Reformatory had the tendency to lower the wages of French printers? A.—There is no doubt that, up to a certain point, it has had that effect.

Q.—In the offices where you have worked, have you seen any young boys, from the Reformatory, at work? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Among the printers of your acquaintance, and working at the trade, do you know of any French Canadian who served his apprenticeship at the Reformatory? A.—No, sir. They are not able there to turn out journeymen printers.

Q.—You are of opinion that they cannot learn their trade there? A.—No; they cannot learn their trade there; but they work well enough all the same to do an injury to the printers of the city.

Q.—Do you know how long it is since a printing office was established at the Reformatory? A.—I could not tell you. I know that it dates back several years, but just how many I could not say.

Q.—Is there a good system of apprenticeship in the French printing houses? A.—No, sir.

Q.—What fault do you find with the prevailing system of apprenticeship? A.—I believe that apprentices ought to be engaged by contract; and that there should be a Board of Examiners to question the young people.

Q.—And who would give them a certificate of capacity? A.—Certainly.

Q.—How long do you think that a lad should work before becoming a journeyman. A.—Five years.

Q.—At what age do you think that he ought to begin to learn the trade? A.—In any case not before fourteen or fifteen years of age.

Q.—And thus you would make a journeyman of him at twenty years of age? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are the apprentices paid in the French establishments? A.—The first year they are paid, generally, \$1.50 a week.

Q.—And what do they get the second year? A.—In the second year, that depends; but it is a couple of dollars, and the last year about five dollars, or five dollars and a-half, a week.

Q.—How long do they serve at the present time? A.—At the present time they serve five years. But what is unfortunate is, that if an apprentice works in an establishment, without being engaged by contract, he leaves that establishment and goes to another place, where he sets himself up as a journeyman. There is where the misfortune lies. Sometimes they are not good journeymen.

Q.—Do the journeymen whom you admit into your Union require to prove that they have served their apprenticeship? A.—We make them prove it when we can.

Q.—What steps do you take in order to admit only competent men into your Union? A.—We seek information from those who know them, and those who have worked with them.

Q.—They are not called upon to prove practically their capacity by standing up at the case composing something? A.—No; and it is just for that reason that we should have a Board of Enquiry to examine their capacity.

Q.—Do you know how many apprentices there are at the Reformatory? A.—There are fifteen working a fifteen cents a day.

Q.—How many men are there? A.—There are three journeymen.

Q.—Are there other institutions which have printing offices? A.—Yes. There are many of them. There is the House of Providence, and the institution which Mr. Bondreau mentioned to you. There is also the Mackay Institute and the Hochelaga Convent.

Q.—Do these institutions work for factories? A.—I am not sure about that. The only establishment which works on a large scale is the Reformatory. At the Deaf Mutes, I think that they make bags chiefly, and some work is also done at the Christian Brothers, on Cotté street.

Q.—In speaking of the Christian Brothers, do you mean to say that they have a printing establishment in their school? A.—I think that they have one at the school and on the other side of the street as well; but I am not certain. But they have one at their school.

Q.—Have you obtained the opinion of a certain number of French employees of the work done at the Reformatory and in other institutions? A.—The majority is opposed to work being done by institutions subsidized by the government. I mean city work; that is work taken from the outside.

Q.—When you have admitted a workman into your Union and have discovered, after a time, that he is incompetent, what do you do with him? A.—We put him back to his apprenticeship as during his last year and we try to get him to leave the trade when we see that he will not be able to become a good journeyman.

Q.—But before admitting him should you not make him pass before a committee to ascertain if he is able to do work as a mechanic should do? A.—Yes; as I have just told you, we take information.

Q.—Is it within your knowledge that a certain number of printers work, during the day in the offices and keep small establishments of their own at home? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the effect of these small establishments on the printing business in general? A.—It does not produce a good effect, these men holding two positions. If all the heads of printing firms were obliged to be registered as keeping an office, per-

haps, this would cause the number to diminish, for then they would be obliged to pay a tax.

Q.—Do you mean to say that these small establishments pay no tax? A.—Certainly not; because they have their printing office in their private dwelling. They pay only ordinary taxes.

Q.—Are you aware that certain of these establishments have turned out work at prices far below the prices paid to regular printers? A.—As to that there is no doubt that some of them take in work at lower prices; because they do not pay much rent and can afford to work more cheaply.

Q.—Have you any suggestion to made to the Commission in regard to your trade? A.—I am of opinion that on the stereotype plates imported into Canada a very high rate of duty should be laid. I would have the duty as high as 75 per cent being certain that it is very injurious to our trade.

Q.—Instead of stereotype plates are not matrices imported of late years? A.—Matrices are also imported; It is a great drawback to printers?

Q.—What duties are levied on these matrices? A.—I could not tell you exactly.

Q.—Who has charge of the Reformatory? A.—I do not know the name of those Brothers: another thing which is very injurious to printers is, that an establishment exists at Montreal to my knowledge, where the hands are not allowed to take their lunch within the building; when a printer is obliged to reside a little outside of the city, on account of the high rates of rent within the city, he is forced to carry his dinner with him, and in this establishment which I speak of, he is put out of doors at noon, the gates are shut on him and he may not return before one o'clock. He must therefore eat his dinner wherever he can on the side-walk, if he does not find another place.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What is the general condition of the establishments in which you have worked? A.—Middling. In fact it may be said bad.

Q.—Do not the city inspectors pass through these establishments sometimes? A.—I have not seen any in the establishment where I am employed. I fancy that the inspector does not fulfil his duty properly, for if he passed through a little oftener he would see that in certain establishments, the sanitary condition is not good. I may add also that there is no salvage apparatus in any establishment at Montreal, but one.

Q.—Do you speak of French establishments? A.—Yes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you know any paper in Montreal whose advertisements are set and measured at the rate of nonpareil measurement, and that the public are charged at the rate of agate measure? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you not think that, according to the rules of the craft a compositor should receive also the benefit of the agate measure? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And it is not done? A.—No, sir.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What are the hours of work in your trade? A.—The hours are generally ten during the day, and thirteen hours for the night.

Q.—At what time do you close on Saturdays? A.—It is only since last summer that certain establishments have closed at one o'clock.

Q.—Is a reduction of salary made to the compositors working by the week? A.—They make up their time by making more time during the other days, that is for those who work by the week, because those who are engaged by the piece lose their time on a newspaper. A man who works during the forenoon only loses three or four hours in the afternoon.

Q.—What are the wages of compositors working by the week? A.—\$9.00 and \$10.00.

Q.—How much by the thousand ems? A.—It is twenty-eight cents for the evening paper and 30 cents for the morning paper.

Q.—Do you know whether there are any printers who have to earn their wages in merchandise? A.—No, we are always paid cash.

(Translation.)

ONESPHORE CORRIVEAU, Printer, of Montreal, sworn.

By MR. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Did you hear the last evidence that was given? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In the interest of work itself, have you anything to add to what the witness has just said? A.—As to work, it is pretty much the same as Mr. Pigeon has just told you, except that certain establishments close on Saturdays at one o'clock, and that the time is not kept back; in other establishments the time has to be made up.

Q.—At what hour does work generally begin? A.—Work generally begins at seven o'clock in the morning, and in jobbing establishments there are several that begin at half past seven in the morning, and close at half past six in the evening.

Q.—Are fines imposed on the men who come in late? A.—Yes; in certain establishments, there are fines for late arrivals, but the practice is not general. If the men lose five minutes they are charged for one hour.

Q.—Have many accidents taken place in the shop where you work? A.—To my personal knowledge I am aware of two.

Q.—What sort of accidents? A.—A lad, who was about ten years of age, and I am not certain whether he was ten years of age, had two fingers of a hand cut off. It was I who withdrew him from the machine.

Q.—What kind of a machine was it? A.—A small Gordon press.

Q.—Is such a machine dangerous for a lad of that age? A.—It is dangerous if they are not watched, and allowed to play too much.

Q.—As a general thing, accidents are scarce enough in printing offices? A.—Accidents happen often enough, especially with boys working at the presses, and, in other establishments the precaution is not taken of placing the machine in a safe place. For instance, in a certain establishment here in Montreal, the shaft of the machine is on the floor, and anyone coming near that spot, and who wore an apron, is often exposed to have his apron rolled around the shaft, as has happened. One man had his apron and one of the legs of his trousers torn off, and the boss did not repay him the worth of his trousers.

Q.—Have you any knowledge of the fact that children of this city, working by the piece, have received from the hands of foremen a certain quantity of work which should have been done by men? A.—It often happens, indeed, that apprentices are made to do the work which should be distributed among the men.

Q.—In this way, they gave the apprentices the easiest work, and they gave the men the hardest work? A.—No; the apprentices had no choice. They took their work as we did. There is a box for all of us, and we do not know what we are taking. The apprentices drew their "takes" along with us; only, this cut off some of an hour's composition.

Q.—Are you aware that in certain establishments the foremen work at the case to the detriment of the journeymen? A.—That happens.

Q.—Does this working at the case come within the scope of the foreman's duties? A.—No, sir.

Q.—He thus takes the place of a man? A.—Yes; and that is furthermore the

reason why apprentices do not profit by the hours of work, because the foreman takes from the apprentices the first work that they ought to do, that is, setting up the story.

Q.—The apprentices are under the control of the foreman, are they not, and it is his business to teach them their trade? A.—Yes.

Q.—When the foreman is at the case, what do the apprentices do? A.—It happens that they play, or pretend to sweep the floor.

Q.—And that is the time when they are exposed to accidents? A.—It often happens that the foreman goes to the case also to please the proprietor, and show that he does some work.

Q.—Printers, working by the piece, do their own correcting, do they not? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can they be forced to make correction which they should not make, and correct proofs which were never made by them, and which are corrected by the editors? A.—Yes; this does happen.

Q.—Is this a source of great loss for the printers? A.—Yes; it happens that the editors make alterations which sometimes take us half a quarter of the time to compose them, but this is not done on a large scale.

Q.—I believe that the corrections made by the editors are generally made by the foreman—a “ringer” is made around the matter to be corrected? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you mean to say that, in the establishment, the men are not paid for their corrections? A.—No; they are not paid. In certain establishments they have their faults corrected, but the correctors are paid by the hour.

Q.—When these corrections are paid for do they belong to the printer who did the work? A.—There are men appointed for this work, but when they have not the time to do it, they pass it over to the man who works by the piece.

Q.—There are regulations in every office, are there not? A.—The regulations are made by the men belonging to the Union, formed into a committee.

Q.—Are these regulations favorably received by the employers? A.—In certain offices, where they were shown to the owners, they were accepted. I have a couple of those general regulations here, and they are just as much to the advantage of the employer as to the advantage of the employee.

Q.—In the factory where you work do the owners make any objection to these regulations? A.—No. In our regulations it is set down that a workman must not let his gas burn, when it is not necessary, and he must pick up his letters, which is very advantageous for the employer, because when he leaves his letters lying on the floor, it is a loss for the establishment.

Q.—You made your regulations in a spirit of justice, as well toward the employer as toward the workmen? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you anything else to add? A.—I should say that for the apprentices, under the present system, we cannot turn out good journeymen.

Q.—Why? A.—Because he is sent outside too often, and, on the other hand, they try to make him earn money too fast. When they get pretty well up in composition, they are put to piece, with journeymen, and hence it comes to pass that they cannot work at the different lines.

Q.—Are they taught their trade as it should be taught? A.—No.

Q.—Do you judge that the average class of apprentices of Montreal have received training enough to make them good compositors? A.—No; because it happens that the majority of apprentices cannot read all the manuscripts, and they fall into errors and mistakes in compositions for which the employers are blamed.

Q.—Have you ever met, in the offices where you have worked, apprentices who came from the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What do you think of them as mechanics? A.—There are some working with me, and I cannot say that they learnt their trade. What they do learn is how to play, and they are a worse lot than the apprentices whom we ourselves form and train.

Q.—Have you seen no others than these? A.—No, sir.

Q.—How many years or months had they worked at the Reformatory? A.—I could not say exactly, but I think it was six or seven months.

Q.—Would they know as much as apprentices that had spent six or seven months in your shop? A.—They did not know how to set a single line. Those who work in our office, can compose, after two months, which is more than the others do.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—How old is the youngest of the apprentices whom you know? A.—About fifteen years, I think. I have already worked with apprentices younger than these, but, at present, I know none younger.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest with whom you worked? A.—I know one who was about ten years old.

Q.—You have spoken to us of a lad, ten years old, who was hurt by a Gordon press, was he employed on the press when he got hurt? A.—Yes; he was helping the man who worked at the press, but, it was while playing, that he had his fingers caught.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—What has been the result of a Union for the printing workmen? A.—The result of the Union has been the bettering of their condition and the advantage of their employers, quite as much as the advantage of the men themselves. On the one hand, the employer has the advantage of having competent men under him, through the means suggested to him by the Union, and, on the other hand, the workmen has the advantage of being assisted. It happened, during the course of the year, that, as Treasurer of the Jacques-Cartier Typographical Union, I paid out about eighty dollars to assist those who were out of work, or were hard up by sickness.

Q.—In what year was your Union established in Montreal? A.—I could not exactly say. In one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one or one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two.

Q.—Were there any strikes in the French offices? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Not for a long time? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Have you witnessed any strikes? A.—No; I never saw any in the Jacques-Cartier Typographical Union. There has been no strike there since I am a member of it.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Who generally works the presses, women or children? A.—It is rather the children who work on the presses.

Q.—Is it the men who run the press? A.—On certain presses, when an apprentice has served a certain period of apprenticeship, he sets the form himself, and goes to show it to the foreman.

Q.—Do you judge that it requires an able apprentice to set up the forms? A.—Yes; and it also happens that they make the apprentices carry forms too heavy for their strength, and, on the other hand also, in certain establishments, the engine is under the management of the pressman, who often can let his engine go, against the corporation by-law, during the time that he loses sight of it. I should also wish to draw the attention of the Commission to the fact that young apprentices are often obliged to wet the paper in unwholesome places, especially during winter, in cold water, which is injurious to health. I, myself, caught inflammatory rheumatism in doing that sort of thing.

Q.—Have you anything else to add? A.—I do not know if we could not have a law to prevent the following; but, in certain establishments, the doors are closed immediately after the hours of work, and they are opened only at the beginning of working hours, and men who are obliged to come in before the hour are forced to wait at the door, and thus often catch cold. There are other establishments that

require that spoiled work shall be paid for, and this spoiled work is often the fault of the employer, as I have personal knowledge in saying. It was the fault of the foreman, if the work was spoiled, and those who did the work were obliged to pay for it.

(Translation.)

EDMOND PARENT, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer at the Reformatory School of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

- Q.—Mr. Parent, you are a manufacturer of boots and shoes? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—You have your shop at the Reformatory school? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Have you other shops beside this? A.—No.
- Q.—How many hands have you in your employ, without counting the children of the Reformatory? A.—About thirty hands, and about twenty girls beside the men.
- Q.—How many young people do you employ in the Reformatory? A.—About fifty. At the present moment I have fifty-three.
- Q.—How old are these children? A.—In the department of work by hand, there are about twenty, running from thirteen to fourteen years.
- Q.—Is much work done by hand there? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—Do you understand by hand work—a work which consists of taking leather and turning it into boots and shoes wholly by hand, without the use of machinery? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—On an average, how many of these children do you employ; how long a time are they held to serve under you? A.—It is hard to tell. There are some who do three months, others six months, and others one year. The longest that I know of was a year and a half.
- Q.—Do you judge that when these children leave your shop they know their trade? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—How much do you pay the children? A.—Fifteen cents a day.
- Q.—Do you pay rent to the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—You pay that much to the authorities of the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—How much rent do you pay? A.—I pay \$10.00 a month.
- Q.—Will you tell us how much a shop of the same size would cost you in town? A.—I could have every bit as good for \$10.00 a month.
- Q.—Do you pay the taxes? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—You pay the taxes for your shop at the Reformatory? A.—For the front shop. The whole is divided into two departments. There is one part which belongs to the Reformatory, and the front belongs to me.
- Q.—Is the front a shop? A.—Yes; it is a shop at the front.
- Q.—The part at the front, in other words, the store, is that included in the \$10 which you pay to the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Can you tell us how much you pay in taxes? A.—I cannot tell you that.
- Q.—Do you pay the water? A.—Yes; I pay the water for my gas engine.
- Q.—Do you pay the water for the gas engine which is in the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Naturally, you pay the taxes on the front store? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Do you pay the Reformatory for your fuel and your lighting? A.—No; I supply these things myself, and I pay for them.
- Q.—Does the Reformatory supply you with engines, work benches, etc.? A.—No.
- Q.—It supplies you with only the four walls? A.—Yes, sir; only the four walls.

Q.—The goods which you manufacture at the Reformatory are the current marketable goods, such as manufactured in the other establishments of the city are they not? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are the men allowed to correct the children who work under their orders? A.—No, sir.

Q.—If there are any complaints to lodge against them, these are made to the Brother who is present, and who watches over their good behaviour? A.—Yes, sir. There is a brother who watches on every floor.

Q.—And they attend there while the lads are working? A.—Yes, sir; they attend the whole time that they work.

Q.—How many hours do these children work? A.—Seven hours and a-half a day.

Q.—Have they any school hours? A.—They have, in the forenoon; but I know nothing of it personally.

Q.—These boys are given to you during thirty days for nothing are they not? A.—Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—What do you call thirty days? A.—The new pupils who come to me work thirty days in my shop for nothing.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have you any knowledge of boys having left your establishment and who were unable to make a living by their shoemaker's trade? A.—No; the little that I know about them is that they all made their living well.

Q.—How long have you had this contract? A.—These eight years.

Q.—Was it you who opened the boot and shoe business there, or was there another firm before you? A.—It was I who opened it. When I first went in there, the school was carried on like a college. I took the children from out of the yard and set them to work.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Can you give us an idea of the other trades that are carried on in that establishment? A.—No; I know only my own business.

Q.—Do the children who are employed by you or in the other branches of trade learn all the different branches of that trade? A.—Yes, sir. Those who are in for three or four years have the advantage of learning their trade.

Q.—Do those who learn their trade continue to work for you? A.—Yes; at the present time I have one couple only.

Q.—Do the directors of the Reformatory retain the whole amount of the money which you are bound to pay them for these boys? A.—I know nothing about that.

Q.—Do you know if a certain amount of wages is retained and that this money is remitted to the lads when they leave the Reformatory? A.—I have been told so; but I cannot affirm it. The Brothers themselves have told me.

Q.—Is your shop heated at your own cost? A.—Yes, sir; at my own cost.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—What sort of boots and shoes are manufactured by you? A.—All the most common lines.

Q.—Where do you find a market for your goods? A.—The whole is sold in Ontario and Quebec alone.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Is your firm incorporated? Have you anyone in partnership with you? A.—I am alone and I am not incorporated.

21st February.

Z. LAPIERRE, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer, Montreal, called and sworn :

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—How many men are employed, in Montreal, in the boot and shoe industry?
A.—I am unable to tell you, for I am very little acquainted with other people's business and the number of men they employ.

Q.—Do you employ a large number of hands yourself? A.—I employ from 150 to 160 hands.

Q.—How many hours a day do shoemakers work, as a rule, in factories? A.—Ten hours a day.

Q.—Is the work shortened on Saturdays? A.—I give them one hour. I allow them to leave at five o'clock and I pay them for the time.

Q.—How frequently are the hands in your factory paid? A.—Weekly, every Saturday.

Q.—Do they work by the week or by the piece? A.—The hands are pretty well divided in that respect. I should think about one half work by the piece.

Q.—What wages do you pay a skilled workman who works by the week? A.—It depends on the kind of work he is employed on. He may be a skilled hand, but he may not get the work he is capable of doing.

Q.—Take the highest of those who are not foremen, what wages do you pay them? A.—They would be the men, I suppose, working on the machines—they receive \$15.00 per week.

Q.—Take the wages you pay to a skilled workman, how much would that be?
A.—Outside of what we call lasters, in our business, skilled workmen are not required, for most of our work that skilled men would be required for, is now done by machinery. Those men are now getting, I should say, about \$12.00 per week.

Q.—Do you employ any men, making shoes, who receive less than \$12.00 per week? A.—Yes.

Q.—What would be the lowest wages you pay to any of your workmen? A.—I suppose these men would earn from \$7.00 to \$9.00 a week.

Q.—Do you employ many boys? A.—No; two or three only.

Q.—Have you any apprentices in your employ? A.—No; we do not take them as apprentices.

Q.—Have you any women or girls in your employ? A.—Out of the entire number of 150 or 160 hands, I should say that one third would be women.

Q.—How long do those women work, before they become skilled, so as to become good workwomen? A.—Most of the women we employ take their work home into their families. They have their own machines at home, and they get their work done there.

Q.—You give it out by the piece, I suppose? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you able to tell us about how much those women earn? A.—Yes.

Q.—About how much do they earn? A.—About \$5.00 per week.

Q.—Is that after they become pretty skillful? A.—Yes; they have to be working at it for two or three years before they can earn that amount.

Q.—How many hours do they work in order to earn that amount? A.—Ten hours. They would not require to work any more than that time.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the workshops in the boot and shoe trade in Montreal? A.—I believe it is very good. There are exceptions, of course; I do not know them.

Q.—Does the sanitary inspector visit the work shops very frequently? A.—Not that I know of; I never saw him.

Q.—How many stories high is your factory? A.—My factory is five stories.

Q.—How many stairways are there to each story? A.—One.

Q.—Is your factory supplied with fire escapes? A.—No.

Q.—How wide are those stairways? A.—Each stairway is four feet wide I suppose.

Q.—How many people would be working in any of the upper flats of the building? A.—I should say about eighty, but they are divided into different flats.

Q.—How many people would be working in one story? A.—About twenty-five people I suppose or something like that number.

Q.—In case of an alarm of fire would there not be danger in consequence of the people rushing down stairs all at once? A.—No, I do not see any risk as we use no stove; the premises are heated by steam.

Q.—Have you any fire escape outside of the building? A.—No.

Q.—In regard to the outside doors do they open outwards or inwards? A.—They open inwards.

Q.—What means have you provided for extinguishing fires? A.—Everything that the insurance companies require.

Q.—Have you separate conveniences for men and women? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are the approaches to those conveniences separate, that is the doors leading to them? A.—Yes; they are on different flats?

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you any females working in the building? A.—Yes.

Q.—What does an operative on day work earn by the week? A.—Those who are working inside are not what I call skilled hands; they are used more to put the goods into packages, and it does not require a very long apprenticeship to be able to do that.

Q.—What would their wages be by the week? A.—From \$3.00 to \$5.00.

Q.—What would be the difference as between \$3.00 and \$5.00? A.—Perhaps \$4.25 or \$3.75.

Q.—At what age do you take those girls to work in the factory? A.—I do not think I have any younger than eighteen years. Yes, there is one; she is working with her father and she is not over fourteen.

Q.—Is the girls' room separate from the men's room? A.—No.

Q.—Have you any dressing room provided for the women? A.—No.

Q.—They have to dress in the same room as the men work in? A.—There are only five girls working in the whole factory and they can easily dress themselves without being seen by the men if they choose.

By Mr. FRED.

Q.—Is there a combination among manufacturers of boots and shoes to sell their goods at a given price? A.—No.

Q.—Is there any combination among shoe manufacturers at all? A.—No. There was a shoe association years ago, but it did not amount to anything.

Q.—Do you find your business interfered with at all by prison-made shoes? A.—No. Our class of goods is far superior to any made in those places.

Q.—Does the fact of boots and shoes being made in penal institutions affect the price at all? A.—Not with me, because they do not manufacture the same class of goods as I do. They may interfere with other people, but they do not with me.

Q.—Has it not the effect of keeping down the wages of operatives? A.—No; they have no skilled labor there. They cannot turn out a good shoe there. I have seen the boots and shoes that they make.

Q.—Do they turn out large quantities of boots and shoes? A.—They call the quantities large, but I do not think they turn out a great number.

Q.—Not from what you have seen? A.—No.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are first class boot and shoe fitters scarce in Montreal? A.—I believe they are sometimes scarce.

- Q.—Do they work by the piece? A.—In most places I believe they do.
- Q.—In your establishment do they work by the piece? A.—We have done that work outside for about three years now.
- Q.—Do you know how much per case they receive? A.—Yes; there are different qualities of course.
- Q.—Take the high class kid, for example? A.—About \$7.00 a case, I suppose.
- Q.—How much per hundred do you pay for sewing on buttons on high class kid boots? A.—I believe the fitters do that themselves.
- Q.—Is it not a separate branch? A.—The button holes only is a separate branch; they do not do the button holes.
- Q.—How much per hundred do you pay for working button holes? A.—Sixteen cents a hundred.
- Q.—Is that the price of high class boots? A.—Of all classes. It is done by the hundred button holes.
- Q.—Have you any young girls who earn under \$3.00 per week. A.—No; not in my establishment.
- Q.—The majority of your work is done outside? A.—So far as women are concerned it is. That is, the fitting portion.
- Q.—You give the work out to different parties, and they employ other help? A.—Yes; or they do it themselves. Most of the girls have got married, and have bought machines, and do the work at home themselves. That is how it has come about.
- Q.—Do you know the difference in prices paid, as between Montreal and Toronto? A.—No; I am not aware of the difference.
- Q.—Have you any competition with Ontario? A.—I feel no competition from anywhere; I carry on my business regardless of anyone else. They do not seem to interfere with me, and I do not interfere with them.
- Q.—Do you know if there are many wholesale manufacturers in Montreal who send their goods to wholesale dealers in Toronto? A.—I don't think it is done by first class houses.
- Q.—How long will it take a young woman to become a first class operative, that is, a boot and shoe fitter? A.—It would depend a good deal on the chance she had to learn, but I should think one year would bring her pretty well up.
- Q.—She would have to commence at the lowest rung of the ladder, I suppose? A.—Yes; and be well cared for, more so than is generally the case. They are not properly taught their business. Persons set them on a certain class of work, and they have to stop at it for perhaps five or six years, if it pays the boss. That is the way they teach them.
- Q.—Do you do any inside pasting in your establishment, that is, pasting inside soles? A.—No; nothing but the sock lining, no pasting work at all.

By Mr. WALSH:—

- Q.—Have you a machine that works button holes? A.—I had one. I quit it, because I can have them made cheaper outside.
- Q.—Have they machines outside to work them? A.—Yes; lots, and good ones too.
- Q.—Do you think, at the price of sixteen cents per hundred, they can earn much? A.—It is poor living. At one time we used to pay sixty cents a hundred; we paid that when I got the machine. It paid so well that every body went into it, and now they are doing it almost for nothing.

ROBERT REID, Sculptor, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Are there many men employed in the marble business in Montreal? A.—Not a great many. I should say not more than 100.

Q.—How many hours do they work as a rule? A.—Ten hours a day unless in the winter time when they stop work when it gets dark.

Q.—Is there not a climatic reason for stopping in the winter? A.—No. The difficulty in cutting marble by gaslight is too great, you cannot do it successfully.

Q.—Do you employ both skilled and unskilled workmen? A.—Yes; we have them proportionately skilled and unskilled; it depends upon the aptitude of the men.

Q.—Have you many apprentices in your establishment? A.—We generally have from six to eight, I think there are six now. That is, taking marble and granite together. We work both materials together.

Q.—What will a boy receive who goes to work at that business with the intention of learning it, that is, when he begins? A.—If he works in granite we pay \$2 per week for the first year.

Q.—And what do you pay when he works in marble? A.—It depends on the age when the boy comes. If he comes on a five years apprenticeship his wages will be—I don't know the rules of other shops—but in my establishment he will receive \$1.50 per week. If he comes for four years he will start with two dollars per week.

Q.—What is the lowest age at which you take boys to be apprentices in your establishment? A.—I never take anyone under 15, we prefer to take them at 16.

Q.—What will a good skilled marble cutter earn? A.—\$2.25 to \$2.50 a day.

Q.—During how long a portion of the year will they be able to work as a rule? A.—All the year round. They work less hours in winter.

Q.—In winter time when the days are short, and they thus lose some time, their pay is reduced proportionately? A.—Their pay is reduced proportionately, at the beginning of November as a rule.

Q.—With that exception, can a good workman rely upon getting pretty constant work the year round? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are the shops in which the men work, comfortably warm? A.—Always; it is necessary for the working of marble to keep them comfortable.

Q.—Do workmen in stone or marble suffer much from the dust? A.—I have not noticed that they have, although medical men say they do, but my experience of 30 years, following the lives of men whom I knew as apprentices at that time, would lead me to say not.

Q.—Have any means ever been devised to keep dust out of the lungs of stone or marble cutters? A.—No. When I have heard that question discussed it has generally been recommended to wear a good mustache or beard. In winter the danger from this is more by reason of the cold weather than it is in the summer time. In summer I do not think there need be any apprehension on that score.

Q.—In summer I suppose the dust is dispersed by keeping the windows open? A.—Yes; and having free circulation of air.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Particularly marble dust, I suppose? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Is there a surplus of hands or a scarcity of hands, as a rule, in Montreal in your business? A.—I think there is enough for the demand.

Q.—You have no difficulty in getting hands when you need them? A.—Not as a rule. We have experienced it at certain seasons when there was a rush of work.

Q.—Have you many applicants for work whom you are compelled to turn away?
A.—Not a great many. We have them of course. I had one this morning.

Q.—Do stone-cutters come here from Aberdeen? A.—Yes; they come from the United States and from Scotland.

Q.—In considerable numbers? A.—Not in considerable numbers. We can always tell when there is an influx of stone-cutters because applications come from the Emigration office to us as a rule.

Q.—Are any of those or many of those, from whom such applications come, assisted immigrants? A.—No, I think not. I think they are all able to take care of themselves.

Q.—I mean have they come to Canada on assisted passages? A.—No. I mean by my statement that they have made the venture on their own account without assistance.

Q.—How frequently do you pay your hands in your establishment? A.—I pay every fortnight.

Q.—Did they ever ask you to change the system to that of weekly pay? A.—Some years ago it was our custom to pay weekly, but the majority of the men at that time asked to have it made fortnightly.

Q.—Did they make the application to you? A.—No; but I consulted with them at that time and it suited my convenience a great deal better, and since then it has been fortnightly pay.

Q.—Would it be a matter of great difficulty or trouble to pay them weekly now?
A.—None whatever. We can of course prepare the pay list as quickly for two weeks as one week, and of course it is an advantage in that respect. Another reason which induced me to adopt the fortnightly pay was the fact that we had a steadier run of regular work after paying by this arrangement, because a certain amount of time was lost the following Monday or Tuesday in each week. There were always a certain number of absentees and that is still the case.

Q.—The men have never asked you to return to weekly payments? A.—Never. It would be no inconvenience to do so, but I don't think they desire it.

Q.—Are the boys in your establishment indentured? A.—Always.

Q.—You are bound to teach them their trade thoroughly? A.—Yes.
Q.—Do they learn all branches of the trade? A.—They learn everything they are capable of learning; they are afforded every opportunity to do so.

Q.—Are they taught lettering? A.—Yes; lettering and carving and so on.

Q.—When they remain during the four years apprenticeship, will they as a rule be competent and good workmen? A.—If a boy is attentive to his work and shows any ambition he ought to be a perfect workman.

Q.—Are there any means provided in Montreal by which marble-cutters or stone-cutters can obtain any technical education outside of the shops? A.—There is the government school.

Q.—What do they learn there? A.—They learn I believe—I have never enquired into it particularly—a very good course of geometrical drawing, architectural drawing, free hand drawing and modelling.

Q.—Have any of your apprentices attended those classes? A.—Only one I think.
Q.—Are you able to say whether it has been an advantage to him or not? A.—I know it has.

Q.—You approve of those schools? A.—Decidedly so. I think they are a great help to the apprentices in connection with their work.

Q.—Are the apprentices required to do any work besides that of actual stone cutting or work actually connected with the trade? A.—When an apprentice enters a workshop of any kind he is expected to do what he is told to do the first year or so. There is a certain amount of work to be done that apprentices have to do, such as sweeping the shop, lighting the stove, keeping it going, putting on the shutters and running errands.

Q.—Are the apprentices required to do this work after the first year of their apprenticeship? A.—Not as a rule.

Q.—Do they become too valuable to do that kind of work the second year?
A.—That is the reason.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What are the wages paid to stone cutters in Montreal? A.—They range at different prices; the prices depend upon the season. I have known stone cutters to get as high as \$4.00 a day.

Q.—Taking the average wages of a stone cutter in the summer season, what will they be? A.—\$2.50 or \$2.25 a day.

Q.—Do granite cutters get more wages than stone cutters? A.—They receive just about the same.

Q.—How many hours do they work? A.—In the summer time they work ten hours, in the winter they work from daylight to dark, that is to say they work from seven o'clock in the morning to dark.

Q.—What is the condition of the workshops in this city? A.—I believe the condition is good. I know the condition of my own shop—I don't know the condition of other shops—but I think the condition of all the shops is satisfactory to the workmen.

Q.—Are the floors of the shops dry? A.—Yes; the floor in my shop is perfectly dry.

Q.—You never heard any complaints about wet floors in stone cutting establishments? A.—No.

Q.—Did you ever know of a case of a man being laid up with rheumatism through wet floors in marble works? A.—No; I never heard of it.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Where do you get your marble? A.—I obtain my marble from Italy and Vermont.

Q.—Do you get any marble in Canada? A.—No.

Q.—There are marble quarries in Canada, I believe? A.—They are not developed.

Q.—Have you any idea whether the marble we have in this country is of equal quality to that in Vermont? A.—Possibly it may be, but there is so much speculation on that question.

Q.—Is the Canadian marble hard and crystalline like that of Vermont or is it soft like that of Italy? A.—The texture is very good. For building purposes Canadian marble is satisfactory, but for decorative use a great many other elements are required than for building purposes. You want texture, color and so forth. For ornamental work Canadian marble at present is not suitable.

Q.—It is not so soft as Italian marble and not so easily cut? A.—The marble I have in my mind is pretty much of the same texture as the Italian marble. The Italian marble is much harder and closer grained than the Rutland or American marble. The American marble is valuable because of its whiteness and softness.

Q.—Do you employ any female polishers? A.—No; I never have.

Q.—Do you know if any are employed in Montreal? A.—Yes; I believe they have been.

Q.—It is not pretty hard work for females? A.—No. It depends on what they do; but there is no reason why a female could not do a certain class of marble polishing, just as well as a man.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you do sawing stone and marble? A.—No; I do not.

Q.—Do you use steam machinery? A.—Yes; but it is only in working granite. I have no steam machinery for marble.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Did you ever use any Newfoundland marble? A.—Yes; I have had specimens sent to me.

Q.—What is the texture of it, what is your opinion of it? A.—The pieces were very small, but judging from the samples it promised a very fine class of marble indeed, as fine as anything I have ever seen; but it is very difficult of course to form any opinion from a little piece or little pieces.

Q.—Did you ever use any other colored marble from there than the usual white? A.—Nothing from Newfoundland.

Q.—Are you aware that they have any other colored marble there? A.—No; I am not aware of it.

Q.—Did you ever see any Newfoundland red granite? A.—No; not Newfoundland granite.

Q.—It is not so bright and clear a granite as the Peter Head granite nor so distinctly mottled? A.—I have never seen it. There is a growing market for granites of that kind.

T. J. MOCOCK, Axe Manufacturer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How many men do you employ in your establishment? A.—24; sometimes 26; it varies two or three; generally about 24.

Q.—Do you manufacture any other class of edged tools besides axes? A.—No; sometimes we do a little odd work but it is principally axes.

Q.—What class of axes do you manufacture principally? A.—Chopping axes.

Q.—You makes mechanics' axes, carpenters' axes and so on I suppose? A.—Yes; carpenters' axes.

Q.—What wages do axe makers earn on an average? A.—My men make pretty good wages; they all work by the piece. I guess the lowest any of the helpers receive is \$1.50 a day, but our wages go up to \$2.50 and \$3.00—the men have made \$4.00.

Q.—Do you use machinery to manufacture axes? A.—Yes; tripping hammers.

Q.—What hours are the men required to work? A.—They do not work much more than seven or eight hours. They start in the summer as early as they can, sometimes half past five or six and work till about twelve. They quit when they like and start when they like. That is the way we are doing. They can do any quantity of work they like, but when there is a rush we expect them to work harder.

Q.—Are the axes all made by hand and none cast? A.—Yes; they are all made by hand.

Q.—Do you take apprentices into the business? A.—No; we have never had any apprentices. Once in a while we bring in a helper but not very often.

Q.—Will you tell us what the average earnings of a man in your business will be in a week, taking an average? A.—About two dollars a day.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Does that include grinders and polishers? A.—Yes; I guess it will include both. That will be a pretty good average.

Q.—Is there a heavy rate of mortality among grinders? A.—Not many cases. I have been in the business eight years and have never lost any men. There used to be a heavy rate—the work used to be done with the stones dry—now they are turned out when the stones are wet.

Q.—Is there any suction fan to carry off the the dust? A.—I have not one. I

am, however, building a new shop, where I will have all the latest modern improvements.

Q.—Is there much water standing in the grinding room? A.—Yes; in our present premises.

Q.—If there is much water on the floor, is it not liable to produce disease among the hands? A.—No; because they are generally prepared, and wear rubber boots. There is always water running on the stones, and it is pretty hard to keep the place dry.

Q.—Are there any accidents to the hands from grinding stones bursting? A.—I have heard of one, but there has been none in my own case.

Q.—Where do you get your grinding stones? A.—The ones I use come from Cleveland, and some come from New Brunswick.

Q.—Which are the best, the ones from Ohio or the ones from New Brunswick? A.—That is a matter of opinion. Some people prefer those from New Brunswick, but I think those from Ohio are the best.

Q.—Do the men wear respirators? A.—They wear sponges over their noses.

Q.—How many grinders have died from lung disease, to your knowledge, or any disease arising from their occupation? A.—I have never lost any, but I have known that in other shops quite a number have died, not so many recently as in former years, when they used to turn the rod out dry, but now we turn it out wet. The dust does not fly around as much.

Q.—Have you any knowledge as to how the wages you pay your men compare with those paid in similar shops in the United States? A.—I think they compare pretty evenly.

Q.—What is the difference, if any? A.—I could not say.

Q.—Do the men in your trade travel much between different shops? A.—Not my men; but there are men coming and going, who will take a job, and after a little while leave it. Axe men, generally, are very fond of moving from one shop to another, and they travel around a great deal. They will come here and stop a little while, and then jump out to another shop; but my men do not travel much. I have a lot of men who have stopped here for a number of years.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How many axe factories are there in the Dominion? A.—That is more than I can say. I can tell you pretty nearly how many large factories there are. There is one at St. Catherines, one at Galt, one at Dundas, and my own here, and there are several small places.

Q.—Do you know how the rate of wages paid in the St. Catherines Axe Factory compare with the rate of wages paid in Montreal? A.—I believe my men receive better wages than those at St. Catherines.

Q.—Do you mean for the same number of hours? A.—Yes. Of course that is my own personal opinion; I believe it is so.

Q.—Do you employ any women at polishing stones? A.—No; an axe factory would not be a very good place for women.

M. C. MULLARKY, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:

Q.—You are a manufacturing boot and shoe maker, I understand? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you heard the testimony given this afternoon by a witness in your trade? A.—No.

Q.—Do you employ a large number of men? A.—I employ a large number of persons, women, men, boys and girls.

Q.—What will be the age of the youngest boy in your employ? A.—I could not tell you. Since the Commission was appointed, I have recommended that an Act should be placed on the Statute Book providing that no child under fourteen years should be allowed to work in a factory, unless he or she could read and write well. I try to stick to that rule myself. I could not tell you the age of the youngest boy, however, in my establishment.

Q.—You cannot tell us the age of the youngest girl you employ? A.—No. But I discourage the employment of young children all I possibly can.

Q.—How many hours do your hands work? A.—Ten hours a day.

Q.—How many persons do you employ altogether? A.—I could not tell you exactly, because we give a good deal of work outside to be done, in the way of fitting, and other classes of work, and the person who takes it will employ other hands. I should suppose that we employ, perhaps, 300 or 400 altogether.

Q.—Inside and outside? A.—Yes.

Q.—What wages will a skilled mechanic earn at the shoe making? A.—Good skilled men will make their \$12 easy, and they have made as high as \$16 per week working on piece work.

Q.—What do you give them when they work by the week? A.—We pay them by the week all the way from—for a man—\$6.00, 9.00 and \$10.00 per week. It depends what they are working at.

Q.—What do women earn who have worked at the trade for say three or four years? A.—Some girls who work piece-work have made as much as \$6.00 or \$7.00 per week.

Q.—What would be about the average wages do you think? A.—There are very few working piece-work, but they will average at piece-work, that is the girls, about \$5.00 per week.

Q.—How many stories are there in your factory? A.—Six stories.

Q.—How many flights of stairs are there to each story? A.—Only one.

Q.—What is the width of those stairs? A.—That I could not tell you.

Q.—Are they straight or crooked? A.—They are winding stairs.

Q.—Are there any fire escapes? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many people work on each floor in your establishment? A.—That I could not tell you.

Q.—What preparations are made for the extinguishing of fires? A.—We have iron water buckets hanging up, six or seven on each flat, and we have a large tank or barrel with water in which there is a good quantity of salt.

Q.—Have you a separate convenience for men and women? A.—Yes, certainly.

Q.—Are the closets or conveniences on separate floors? A.—On the girls' flat there is a separate closet for themselves.

Q.—Are the sexes entirely separated in their work? A.—No.

Q.—They are working in the same rooms? A.—Yes; that is in the fitting room the men and women work together, because the work is too hard for girls to do, and we must have men with them, turning boots inside out and rubbing down the seams of boots—for that work women are not strong enough. We, therefore, have a certain number of men on that floor to work with the girls. Down below we have girls to six heels and to put heels to the heeling machine and work on that kind of work. They have to work with a man because a man has to run the heeling machines and a girl waits upon him.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—At what kind of work are young women employed who receive \$5.00 per week? A.—Tacking welts and tacking heels and also sock lining.

Q.—What are the wages you give to a good woman boot and shoe fitter? A.—We pay \$5.00, \$6.00 or \$7.00 and so on. I know we pay some \$7.00.

Q.—Are they paid by the week or by the case? A.—By the week, all are hired by the week.

Q.—Are good operatives scarce in Montreal? A.—Sometimes they are.
 Q.—Does much of your work go outside? A.—No, not a great deal. I don't give any outside that we can possibly do inside; but we have three or four men who do fitting for us and who employ people, perhaps forty or fifty hands are working for them outside altogether.

Q.—You give out the work and they employ people and those people are not responsible to you? A.—The others I know nothing about, what I know is with regard to the people receiving the work from us.

Q.—Is it a kind of sub-contracting? A.—Yes; they take and do the work for me and bring it back to the shop.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—When you take a young boy or girl, and he or she commences work, how much do they receive? A.—What I have already stated.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of your shop? A.—I think it is pretty fair.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of your first floor? A.—It is very good.

By Mr. CLARKE:—

Q.—Where is this outside work done; is it done in the city? A.—Yes; in the city.

Q.—Where do you find a market for your products? A.—From London, England, away up to the North West, part of Canada, and Belfast, Ireland, and down in Temeraire, and all the West Indies.

Q.—Is the manufacturer of boots and shoes in the Province of Quebec in a better position to manufacture the same article than is a manufacturer in the Lower Provinces? A.—I don't know; I could not tell you that. They don't make many shoes in the Lower Provinces.

Q.—Do you ship many boots and shoes down to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island? A.—Yes; we ship all we possibly can down there—we ship considerable.

Q.—How much cheaper can you manufacture them in Montreal than they can be manufactured in New Brunswick? A.—I don't know.

By Mr. McLEAN:

Q.—Is there any paper used in the manufacturing of boots and shoes? A.—Not that I know of.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are there many wholesales in Montreal who ship goods to wholesales in Ontario, Toronto and Hamilton? A.—I do; I don't know how many more do.

Q.—Wholesales in Montreal ship to wholesales in Toronto? A.—Yes; I am a manufacturer, and in Ontario they are jobbers. They buy from me to sell again, the same as a dry goods merchant may go to Manchester to buy dry goods.

Q.—Do you know if manufacturers in Montreal have their own private mark on their goods—do they send them out with their own private mark? A.—No; not that I know of.

Q.—Do manufacturers make boots here for Ontario wholesales with the marks of the wholesales on the boots? A.—I could not tell you.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You don't know? A.—I do not.

By Mr. CLARKE:—

Q.—To what do you attribute the success of the Quebec and Montreal shoe man-

manufacturers as compared with those of other provinces? A.—I have been a long time at the trade and that is a problem I have not yet solved.

Q.—Is it the cheap labor here? A.—I presume it is cheap labor. I stated before the Committee of the House of Commons that we had cheaper labor in Montreal than they had in Northampton, England, and that is, perhaps, the reason I am able to send shoes to London and Belfast.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG —

Q.—Do you think the statement made by the Warden of the Central Prison, in Toronto, is correct, namely: that boots and shoes are made cheaper in Montreal and Quebec than they are made in the Central Prison in Toronto? A.—I don't know what they cost in the Central Prison. If the Warden will give me the figures, I will compare notes and tell you.

By Mr. McLEAN:

Q.—Do you know that there are many Ontario manufacturers who come down here and buy job lots? A.—They come down here two or three times a year and buy their stock.

Q.—You don't know of any manufacturers in Ontario who send leather here to be manufactured, and have it sent back as boots and shoes? A.—No, I do not.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What is the amount of wages you pay in your establishment? A.—I have paid as much as \$2,800 per week. I will average from \$75,000 to \$100,000 a year.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you impose any fines on your employees? A.—No; unfortunately I have sometimes to bounce them.

Translation.

Tuesday, 21st February, 1888.

CALIXTE AIMÉ DUGAS, Judge of Sessions of the Peace of Montreal, sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Will you give us your opinion upon the question of licenses, of the manner in which they are granted, and the number of licenses? A.—Although I am one of the Commissioners, and to a certain extent responsible for the great number of licenses that are granted annually, I believe, with the rest of the public, that there are too great a number of them granted. As a reason, I attribute it to the law and not to the Commissioners, considering that the law, such as it is, does not allow us to limit the number of licenses, if we desire to apply it according to its spirit. Although it appears at first sight that we have complete discretion in this direction, as judges and administrators of the law, however, we believe that this discretion ought to be exercised according to the spirit of the law.

Q.—How are the hotels, the taverns, and the restaurants divided? A.—We have in the Province of Quebec two sorts of licenses; the hotel license, which obliges to accommodate or lodge the traveller and to feed him, the other which does not allow one to lodge him, but which makes it necessary to feed him. As for the restaurants, it is defined by law to be a place where they constantly or occasionally feed people. It is this word "occasionally" that has always forced us to apply the law with so much liberality. We have asked on various occasions different legislators to change the

provision of the law, which would then allow us to apply it in a far more restricted manner; but up to the present they have not seen fit to do so, although, I have no doubt that at the next session there will be changes in this and other directions.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Does the law limit the number of licenses according to the returns of population in the cities? A.—No, sir.

Q.—For what reasons can the License Commissioners refuse a license? A.—For immorality, for infraction of the license law, and for having committed a felony. In each case it is within the discretion of the Court to annul the license.

Q.—What is the practice followed in the case of a man who sells liquor outside of the specified hours? A.—It is to condemn him to a fine purely and simply.

Q.—Does the law provide for cancelling the license after more than three infractions? A.—No, sir. The same discretion exists as well for the first as for the third, no matter what subsequent infraction. It is only an affair of discretion, and we do not like to exercise it; but, in the case of discretion, it is an experience which the Courts of Justice do not like, except in extreme cases, to exercise that discretion which the law accords them in all its vigor.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do the Commissioners believe that they are obliged to give licenses to all who comply with the regulations with what is required by law? A.—Certainly. The Commissioners believe themselves to be the administrators of the law, having to apply it according to its spirit; and up to the present they have considered—and they are strengthened in that opinion by competent authorities that they were obliged to grant licenses to all persons who have not been rendered unworthy, and against whom there is no opposition by the absolute majority; for according to the law the absolute majority in a ward has the right to oppose the license on taking the necessary steps.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Would it not be better to have a uniform charge for licenses? A.—If I am competent to give an opinion I say yes, certainly; and with taxes much higher than at present.

Q.—Do you not think that a house paying only a miserable license is more dangerous than a house paying a higher license? A.—I have often had occasion to publicly express my opinion on this point, and here it is. I have always believed, and I still believe that nothing ought to be spared to make the business of hotel keepers and restaurants as respectable as possible, and I have always believed that the most efficacious means was to abolish the lowest class of hotel and to assure that respectable people a permanent license, so long as they complied with the requirements of the law, which ought to be as severe as possible.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Would you be in favour of a law that there should be a certain distance between one tavern and another? A.—I do: and know this by reason of the fact that I administer justice and try to administer it equally for every one. I am in consequence prejudiced upon the question; but I should be opposed to any regulation under which every citizen would not be equally protected by the same law; in this sense that if A and B present themselves under the same circumstances in order to obtain their license, I do not see why a license should be granted to A while they refuse one to B.

Q.—But in this case you are considering the interests of A and B rather than the interests of the citizens? A.—My way of looking at this objection is this. Make your laws as severe as possible, protect yourself by the law against any infraction or

bad conduct or violation of the regulations, and then grant licenses to those who are worthy of them.

Q.—As Judge of Sessions you have an opportunity of posting yourself as to the evils produced upon the population by the use of liquors? A.—Yes, sir; I much deplore the thing; understanding that at least 80 or 90 per cent of the crimes have liquor as their excuse.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—The system of permanent licenses exists in England, I believe? A.—I can scarcely say whether or not it exists in England. I am altogether opposed to the present system of making them pay fines. I find it an unworthy one; that is to say, I consider it an unworthy course to take the means which are employed to bring these people to punishment. I find it improper for the government to pay individuals, who themselves break the law, and induce others to infringe upon it, in order that these latter may be punished. The means of remedying this condition of things, would be the appointment of a sufficient number of police, who should be charged with continually visiting licensed establishments, and those where it is supposed liquors are sold, and arresting and prosecuting those whom they suspect to be guilty of its infraction, and to punish those who should be taken in the actual commission of this offence.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you know anything as regards the classification of prisoners? A.—I find that the present system is one of the causes of great injustice and immorality towards persons who are often sent either to prison or to the penitentiary. I do not consider it to be just, to send a person arrested for a first offence, or an error which may have been committed, to pass months or years alongside of hardened criminals, such as murderers, professional thieves, and others. This is actually most demoralizing, above all, upon young people, who, once they have left prison, generally seek the companionship of those whom they have met in prison, or in the penitentiary, and thus they increase the number of professional thieves, and other evil-doers.

Q.—Have you ever studied the question of ascertaining whether or not the young men, sent for the first time for a long term, become reformed, and are ever respectable citizens? A.—I do not know. On the contrary, and this is why we always hesitate, we are always embarrassed to know what to do when we have to pronounce a sentence, even for most serious crimes committed by young people. I understand that young people over sixteen years are here spoken of. Our embarrassment becomes greater still when we have to deal with young people under sixteen years. It is true that according to circumstances, we can send them to the Reformatory school, as it very often happens that these young people count a repetition of offences of slight consequence. We feel the necessity of punishing them, but we find that a term of two or three years in the Reformatory is too long. On the other hand, we hesitate to send them to prison for a few days, or a few months, for fear that the contact with criminals may ruin them for ever.

Q.—What do you think, generally speaking, of children who have passed two, three, or four years in the Reformatory? A.—I believe that actually the system that is followed, I do not speak from the point of view of our Reformatory at Montreal only, is, perhaps, the only one that could be followed in a country like ours. However, I should prefer to see these children upon a large farm, and separated as much as possible from each other, but the reason given against such a system is our severe winters. A great number of those who go to the Reformatory school, return either to the prison, or to the penitentiary, but latterly we have seen a very considerable change for the better.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge personally, that long hours of work, and low of small salaries have a tendency to encourage habits of intemperance among the working classes? A.—I cannot express an opinion as to that. All that I can say is, that it is regrettable to know that drunkenness is too prevalent among our working classes. I often ask myself whether the exclusion of alcohol, as much as possible, and the introduction of wine and beer would not bring a change in this particular.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Have you learned whether or not drunkenness was greater after pay days than at other times? A.—The Recorder is in a better position to answer that question than I am, because he sees the drunkards on Mondays and I do not see them at all.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you not believe that, in a great number of cases, intemperance or drunkenness is the result of poverty? A.—Intemperance may be attributed to many causes, to poverty occasionally, and to the natural inclination that a man has to seek some distraction or amusement even though it be harmful. This is why I have often regretted that, in a city like Montreal, the municipal authorities have not thought it to be their duty to take means to create healthful amusements, which would have for their effect, I believe, in a great number of cases the stopping of drunkenness and the neglect of the family. I may cite as an example the fact that during the summer, when music is played there, from 8,000 to 10,000 persons are accustomed to gather in the Viger Garden every evening, composed of the husbands, the wives and the families.

(Translation.)

Tuesday, 21st April, 1888.

ADJUTEUR CARMEL, Printer, of Montreal, sworn,

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—We have already the number of men employed in printing offices. What I want to ask you is this: "What is the influence of work done in the Reformatory upon the printing trade in Montreal?" A.—Its influence is very great. I have had a printing office for ten years. Four or five years ago I employed eight journeymen.

Q.—And how many do you employ to-day? A.—Scarcely three.

Q.—To what do you attribute this diminution? A.—To the institutions sustained by the Government; to illegal competition and nothing else.

Q.—Did you print many factums? A.—Yes; several years ago I printed a great many.

Q.—What was the average price paid by the lawyers, six or seven years ago? A.—\$1.50 per page.

Q.—What is the price paid to-day? A.—One dollar to legitimate printers.

Q.—What has caused that reduction of 50 cents per page? Is it the competition of the printers among themselves, or rather the competition of the Reformatory? A.—The competition of those institutions. I ought to say that it is not alone the Reformatory school which makes the competition. There are a crowd of institutions in the town which have printing offices, and which seriously interfere with us. They do a great deal of other work.

Q.—Which work for the public? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Which are those institutions? A.—The institution at Coteau St. Louis,

which has the largest printing establishment in Montreal, and which does work for nothing or next to nothing.

Q.—What is that institution at Coteau St. Louis? A.—They are Friars. I do not know anything else. I have myself seen their office and it is a very considerable one.

Q.—Is it also a Reformatory School? A.—I cannot tell you what it is; but it is an institution maintained by our Government, by the Local Government particularly.

Q.—How do the children who are there, get there? Are they placed there by their relatives or sent there by the Courts? A.—By the Courts, I believe, and these are the very children who cause us illegal competition.

Q.—What is this institution called? A.—I do not know the name. There is another of them on Coté street.

Q.—The establishment of which you speak on Coté Street, is not the printing office outside of the school? A.—Yes, sir; on the other side of the street.

Q.—Naturally it pays taxes? A.—I have no doubt.

Q.—Who work there? Are they apprentices or journeymen? A.—Apprentices. There is only one journeyman, I believe. Of all the business branches in Montreal, I believe the printers suffer the most. This is the greatest plague we have. It is inconceivable competition. If you will allow me I will say that my work is not inferior to any in the city of Montreal, and yet, I am not able to get \$1 per page. I do not think that the institutions have ever charged \$1 per page. They have never charged it and they never will.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that they have charged much less? A.—Yes, sir; About one-third less.

Q.—Can you do work, and pay your workmen reasonable prices, and do the work at the rate these people charge? A.—It is impossible to pay \$10 per week to men and make factums at less than \$1 per page.

Q.—Have the printers petitioned to have this abolished? A.—Yes, sir; I made a petition myself to the Quebec Government.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—When was that? A.—Last year. The Hon. Mr. Taillon put it in the basket, several others were made, Mr. Holland made one.

Q.—Do you know that official documents are put in a basket? A.—I know that for a long time we have made many petitions.

Q.—Will you answer my question? Do you know if, as a matter of fact, the Government put the petitions in the basket? A.—Well I did not see them put in the basket, and I do not know it.

(Translation.)

Tuesday, 21st February, 1888

NARCISSE DUVAL, Printer, aged 34, of the City of Montreal, sworn:—

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How many workmen do you employ? A.—Six.

Q.—How many apprentices? A.—I have three apprentices.

Q.—Are these apprentices engaged by contract? A.—No, sir.

Q.—What are the wages generally paid in Montreal, for men, by the week? A.—I do not engage them in that way. I make them work by the piece, at so much the page.

Q.—Is it special work that you do? A.—It is special work that I do. I principally am engaged on factums.

Q.—Is it not true that there are offices in Montreal where the men earn a salary of only \$6.00 a week? A.—There is a great variance in the wages of the men. According to my plan the workman is, naturally, paid what his work is worth. I look upon that as much the best way, and as for his work, he is more careful about it, for this system tends to make it better, and induce him to be more careful with his work.

Q.—You have just told us that you print factums. Is the price paid to-day for factums, by lawyers, higher or lower than what was paid some years ago? A.—Much lower.

Q.—How much lower? A.—Lower by a good third.

Q.—To what do you assign this lowering of prices of factums? A.—To the Reformatory School.

Q.—You are of opinion, then, that this School of Reform has done a great deal of harm to printers? A.—Yes, sir; I am quite positive about it, especially in this particular branch. When you ask a reasonable price for a piece of this work you are invariably told: "Well, we can go and have it done for so much at the Reformatory." The owners of the offices at the Reformatory have called on all the lawyers, and offered to print their factums at so low a price that we could not live on it.

Q.—Do you think that if the Reformatory did not print factums, printers would make better wages than they can to day? A.—I have not the slightest doubt about it.

Q.—Have you ever had in your employ an apprentice coming from the Reformatory school? A.—I have one just at present.

Q.—What do you think of his ability? A.—He is very able.

Q.—How long did he work at the Reformatory? A.—Three years, I believe.

Q.—Did he know his trade when he got out? A.—Passably well; but not thoroughly so.

Q.—Did he know his trade as well as an apprentice who would have worked with you or in some other office for three years? A.—It is hard to answer that question; the lad was very young.

Q.—He came to you immediately on leaving the Reformatory? A.—Not immediately; but in a short time after.

Q.—How much did you give him a week when he went in with you? A.—I believe that I gave him three dollars a week.

Q.—And with three dollars from you he did the same work for which he was paid 15 cents a day at the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—So that you are made to pay \$3 for work which the Reformatory contractor gets for ninety cents? A.—Yes, sir; that is it. You can see from this the competition which we have to meet.

Q.—You are of opinion, of course, that it is hard to keep up competition under such odds? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG —

Q.—How much do your men earn a week? A.—From \$7 to \$10.

Q.—How many men have you in your employ? A.—Three men.

Q.—Is it the foreman who gets \$10 a week? A.—They all work by the piece.

Q.—How much do you pay your best man? A.—They all work by the page. I mean by the factum page. That is the work that I am doing now.

Q.—How much do you give them by the page? A.—I give them from twenty-five to thirty cents a page according to whether they have depositions or the factums properly so called.

Q.—You pay from 25c to 30c a page. How many thousand ems are there in a page? A.—We have pages with 1,200 ems.

Q.—How many hours do your men work a day? A.—From seven o'clock in the morning to six o'clock in the evening.

Q.—Are you aware that there are any printers here, in Montreal, who give from 40c to 50c a page for their factums? A.—Yes, sir; there are parties who pay more than we do; but they make more profits in proportion. In other words they ask more than we do.

Q.—Was the lad whom you have in your service and who came to you from the Reformatory school, an able workman when he entered your employ? A.—He was not very able.

Q.—Do you think that you could have had a young man of the same age, and of the same ability who, after three years work in another establishment, could have done as well? A.—No; I do not think so. But I must give you, in a few words, all the circumstances of the case. The father or rather it was not the father—the boy was an orphan—but his uncle it was that put him under my charge and requested me to take proper care of him. He said that he did not know what to do with him, telling me what were the boy's circumstances, and his cast of character.

Q.—Do you not think that a young man, having worked so long as that, could not make better wages in some other establishment, than those which you gave him?

A.—Well, he was not worth more than that. I think the reason must be that the lad had been uncared for.

Q.—What do you mean by uncared for? He was three years in the Reformatory was he not? A.—There, they did not oversee his work closely. I have no proof of this; I only think so, but I have this reason for saying it, that during the year he has learned a great deal.

Q.—Have not the printing contractors of this city presented a petition demanding the abolition of trade work in the Reformatory? A.—No petition was ever presented to me.

Q.—You were never called upon to unite with them in making such a petition?

A.—No; I do not remember it.

Q.—The hands that you employ, do they speak English and French? A.—They speak English and French, because the compositors speak the two languages.

Q.—Do your printers belong to the English Typographical Association or to the Jacques Cartier Union? A.—I do not think they belong to the one or to the other.

Q.—In the typographical sense of the word is your office a Union office? A.—No, sir.

(Translation.)

Tuesday, 21st February, 1888.

EUGENE GLOBENSKY, Editor and Proprietor of the Reformatory School printing office, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—For how many years have you had your offices at the Reformatory? A.—Six years.

Q.—Was there a printing establishment there before you took yours there? A.—No, sir.

Q.—How many Reformatory school children do you employ at the present time? A.—Between twelve and fourteen.

Q.—Have you, at certain times, employed more of them than that? A.—I have never exceeded fifteen.

Q.—On what condition did you get hold of the Reformatory school? On what terms of payment? A.—We have them so many days for nothing, and then we pay them fifteen cents a day each.

Q.—Have you had the apprentices whom you have with you, in your offices for several years? A.—No; not for long as reformatory children. They change them very often. For example, these children leave us at the end of six months, or a year, and go to another trade, for these children are perfectly free to learn the trade which they wish, and then, if that does not please them, at the end of some time, they leave us. Moreover, there are many of them who go out pardoned at the end of six months, or a year. Thus they change very often.

Q.—For how long a time has an apprentice in your establishment, at the present, worked with you? A.—I have not had one, I think, who worked three years. The longest, in any event, is three years.

Q.—Have you had any who worked three years? A.—Well, I think, yes.

Q.—Do you pay more to those who are in their third and second years? A.—No; it is always the same.

Q.—Whether they render you much or little service it is always the same price? A.—Yes; it is always the same price, and there are those who are all the time without rendering any service. We keep them all the same, and we pay them the same thing.

Q.—How many men do you employ in the Reformatory? A.—We have ten at the present time.

Q.—You have heard what Mr. Duval, printer, and a witness, who has already been heard, has said *apropos* of factums? A.—Yes.

Q.—If you have no objection to tell it, what price do you charge for factums at the present time? A.—Well, I heard Mr. Duval, and I am ready to prove, when he wishes it; that Mr. Duval works much cheaper than I do, and I can prove that the prices which he charges to advocates are seventy to seventy-five cents per page, while, for my part, I charge one dollar per page, less a discount which I make to certain advocates who pay cash. Now, Mr. Duval, has declared to you that he employs about six men; these are employees which he does not have continually. These are people who have nothing to do, and who charge twenty-five cents per page, for you know that a journeyman cannot earn his living at twenty-five cents per page on factums. This is a specialty with me, I am fitted out to do considerable numbers of them. Thus, recently, I turned out 343 pages of factums in ten days' time.

Q.—Are you a printer yourself? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Were you in a printing office as an employee, before you took the offices in the Reformatory? A.—No, sir. That is to say, that when I took the printing office I took a partner, but I am not a printer myself.

Q.—Do you know what was the price which the advocates paid for their factums before you began your printing office in the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir; I was employed in a lawyer's office for three years—with Messrs. Lacoste and Globensky as accountant.

Q.—What did they pay for factums at that time? A.—I believe that they paid between \$1 and \$1.80 per page.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How many copies of factums do you generally give? A.—Fifty copies.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you work in the Reformatory school for the Pacific Railway? A.—No, sir.

Q.—How much rent do you pay at the Reformatory? A.—\$8 per month. I occupy one flat. It is particularly on account of the great bargain that I made for rent that I am able to work under the other printing offices in the city.

Q.—How much would you pay in the city for an office of the same dimensions as that which you occupy at the Reformatory? A.—Well, before I left St. James street where I occupied the fourth story—that depends entirely on the situation and the story, and for a printing office one is just as well on the fourth as on the

first story—and one can obtain a fourth story for \$10 to \$15 per month, about as good as that I now have.

Q.—Your workshop and your office are altogether in the Reformatory school, or have you an office on the street? A.—My office is on the street. My entrance door is on the street.

Q.—Do you pay taxes? A.—Yes; I pay my business tax.

Q.—Upon what? A.—Upon the printing establishment, as I should pay my taxes were I in town.

Q.—Do you pay your taxes upon a rental of \$8 per month? A.—I pay upon a rental of \$100 per annum.

Q.—Does this include your office or your works or only the office which you have on the street? A.—The office is with it. There is only a partition which separates the office from the workshop.

Q.—Do you pay for water? A.—No; I do not pay for water.

Q.—How can you pay a business tax and not pay for water? A.—I receive my account from the Corporation for my business tax; but I do not receive one for water.

Q.—Do you pay for lighting? A.—Yes, sir; I pay for my gas.

Q.—Do you pay for heating? A.—No; I am heated by the house by a steam pipe.

Q.—Did the Reformatory supply you with your material or a part of your material? A.—No, sir; never.

Q.—You only get the four walls? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—No tables, nothing? A.—Nothing at all.

Q.—Do you know what is done with the 15 cents which you pay to the children if they give them a part of it? A.—Yes; I have always heard it said that the children leave the establishment with a couple of suits, an overcoat, all that, and some money. I am, by my contract, bound to teach the scholars. I have a man to whom I pay \$12 per week to show them the business and who is there for that specially.

Q.—Have you ever employed as journeymen, children who had made their apprenticeship with you at the Reformatory? A.—Yes; I have three of those prisoners to-day. One of them earns \$5 per week; the other \$7 and the third \$8 per week.

Q.—These three journeymen are among the journeymen of whom you speak at the present time? A.—Yes, sir; they finished their time of detention and I have kept them since.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—How much do you pay your work people? A.—I pay journeymen the Union prices—that is to say, \$10 per week.

Q.—You pay ten workmen \$10 per week? A.—No. I have several of them to whom I pay \$10. I have them at \$9, and at \$8. Those at \$8 and \$9 do not belong to the Union.

Q.—How many of them have you to whom you pay \$10 per week? A.—I have three of them, and one at \$12 per week.

Q.—The one at \$12 per week is the foreman? A.—Yes.

Q.—It is he who teaches? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many have you to whom you pay less than \$10 per week? A.—I have one at \$9, and I have three at \$8.

Q.—You have from twelve to fourteen boys, to whom you pay fifteen cents per day? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You have work continually for these 22 or 23 persons? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you people who solicit work for you? A.—Not at the present moment.

Q.—Have you ever had them? A.—No; not a regular agent. I have had for some time one of my second cousins who had nothing to do, and who took orders.

Q.—In general the work comes to you of itself without you having to run after it? A.—It is I, who attend personally to that.

Q.—What is the price you generally charge for factums? A.—From \$1 to \$3 per page.

Q.—Do you know that the Court fixes the prices of factums? A.—Yes; I am fully aware of what is being done in my line of business.

Q.—What is the price fixed by the law? A.—One dollar per page.

Q.—And you charge from \$1 to \$3? A.—In the case of tables of the Privy Council I charge \$3 for the tabular matter, and \$2 for the running matter.

Q.—Do you sometimes make tenders for work? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you not think that it is sufficiently difficult for a man who generally pays wages of \$10 per week, that it is difficult for him to compete with you who only give fifteen cents per day to twelve or fourteen boys, and only \$7 to \$10 to men? A.—No; not at all, because you see a man at \$10 per week does much more than a child at fifteen cents. Moreover, this winter particularly, one could have the best men at \$7 per week—as many as you wished. They were suffering from hunger. They had no work.

Q.—Can you, this winter, have men belonging to any Union for \$7 per week? A.—Well, I have not tried. I have my men and I do not change.

Q.—Do you not think a good man is worth more than \$7.00 per week. A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Why do you not give first-class men first-class wages? A.—I always pay first-class.

Q.—When young boys come to learn the business of printing in your office, do you seek to warn them not to learn another trade? A.—Never; I never speak to an apprentice.

Q.—They go to it from choice? A.—When a pupil goes to the Reformatory School they ask him what he wishes to do. They inform him of the trades there are in the establishment; they ask him which he likes the best, and the child has the choice.

Q.—Do you keep the children as workmen after their term of imprisonment? A.—I have replied to that already. I have three of them; but it depends.

Q.—Have you ever kept them? A.—Yes; I have already answered that I had three of them, but those whose conduct is bad, the Superior does not allow us to keep. Those whose conduct has been good during their incarceration we are allowed to keep.

Q.—When they are kept after their term of imprisonment, do they get more than 15 cents a day? A.—They receive more. They are no longer in the school; they are like other workmen.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How many hours do these children work? A.—They begin in the morning at a quarter to nine—they ought to be on hand at half past eight—and they leave at half past nine. They have, then, a quarter of an hour for recreation. Then they return and leave at a quarter before noon. They come back at half past one. This makes about seven hours work per day. Moreover, they have many holidays.

RICHARD POWERS, Moulder, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How long have you worked at the moulding business in Montreal? A.—I have worked at the trade about seventeen years.

Q.—Are you a piece hand or a day hand? A.—I am a day hand at present.

Q.—Have you worked on piece? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is piece work more exhausting than working by the day at your trade?
A.—Yes; it is actually nothing but slow suicide for a moulder to continue working piece work

Q.—On machinery you mean? A.—The moulder continuing to work piece work on machinery is either in his grave at 45 or otherwise a broken down man.

Q.—Has a piece worker to work harder than a man working by the week? A.—He is supposed to do about two and a-half days' work in one day, or two days' work in one day anyway.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is a man obliged to work at piece work here because he will earn less money in proportion at piece work than at day work? A.—Yes. For instance, take axle boxes. A man at Clendenning's makes 16 axle boxes for \$4.00, and a man working day work, in the shop where I am, makes six for a day's work, and he receives from \$2.00 to \$2.50 a day. So I calculate that the shop working piece work pays less wages to the men according to the work that is done.

Q.—Do you know whether any men in your trade have been blacklisted? A.—There were 75 thrown out of employment at one time because they were Union men, and on several occasions there have been one or two cases where Union men have been thrown out of work and had to walk the streets a number of days before they could procure employment.

Q.—What was the cause of that labor difficulty? A.—It was a strike, or, at least, it was a lockout, I may say, in Clendenning's.

Q.—Did the men desire to arbitrate before resorting to a strike? A.—No; I don't think that they did at that time. Of course, every means was exhausted before they did go out on strike.

Q.—Have you ever known moulders to be engaged by contract? A.—I believe that the Grand Trunk authorities engaged eleven moulders in the old country, and had contracts signed by them.

Q.—Is that contract system injurious to Canadian moulders? A.—Yes, it is; because a man who signs a contract I consider to be nothing but a slave, for he binds himself right over to his employer.

Q.—Is the ventilation of the shops in Montreal good or bad? A.—In the shop where I am, it is pretty good.

Q.—What is the general condition of all the shops as regards ventilation? A.—They are pretty good I think; but there are two shops in this city where the closets are in an unsanitary condition, those shops are Clendenning's and Ives'.

Q.—What is the nature of the closets? A.—They are just open troughs.

Q.—Are those closets located near the furnace? A.—Yes; they are in both cases located near the furnace where the iron is melted.

Q.—I suppose that the smell is anything but agreeable during casting? A.—There is an awful smell there sometimes.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is it increased during casting, and worse than it is at other times? A.—During casting we don't generally have time to take notice, because we are pretty well run at that time.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Is the drinking water located near those closets? A.—I cannot answer that. I did not take particular notice where the drinking water was.

Q.—Do you know any shops where the proprietors compel their men to wait outside in the cold for their pay? A.—Both those shops I spoke of, do that.

Q.—You mean they compel the men to wait outside in the cold? A.—Yes.

Q.—Cannot the men go inside? A.—They could if the employers would come

in with the money to them, but they don't do so. You stand in the cold with your wet clothes on.

Q.—You are not allowed to enter the office where the cash is paid? A.—No. In one case the cashier comes to the door and pays you on the street. In the other, there is a kind of place in the office, and that door is generally closed, but if you get in you might as well be on the street, as the door is kept open all the time, and you are in the draught.

Q.—Have any men caught cold from exposure in that way? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Do you think if there was a bath room and wash basins for the men they would take advantage of it? A.—Yes; they would be very happy to have anything of that kind.

Q.—There is nothing of that kind in the city? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Do you think it would be taken advantage of? A.—Yes; it would be taken advantage of.

Q.—Is it difficult to get good moulders in Montreal? A.—No; I don't think it is. Not if employers will pay a fair day's wages, but in some of the shops the employers seem to want to get hands for the least money possible.

Q.—What is the difference in the wages paid as between Montreal and any city in the United States with the same population? A.—A moulder in the United States, a regular job moulder, will receive at least \$2.50 a day, while here you will have to be a pretty fair moulder to get \$1.75 a day. And then, if you deduct lost time out of that pay here, and one thing and another, it will not amount to very much over \$1.60 or \$1.40 a day.

Q.—Do they work longer hours in the United States than here? A.—No; I don't believe they do. Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Is there much idle time in some of the shops during the year? A.—In the stove plate line there is. Coming on towards the New Year there is, for a while after New Years there is sometimes a month or six weeks idle time.

Q.—Taking all classes of moulding together, and spreading the wages over the year, how much do you think a moulder will earn here. A.—I think about \$1.40 a day, that is taking a bad year with a good year.

Q.—Do you think \$1.40 a day would be the average? A.—Yes; and taking bad moulders with good moulders. There is an odd moulder here who will have \$2.50 a day. Some are working for \$1 a day, I believe.

Q.—Will you tell us, in regard to the apprentice system, whether you consider it a good or a bad system? A.—It is rotten in this city.

Q.—How is that? A.—Because some of the employers employ a lot of boys and break them in on one class of work, and keep them at it throughout the length of their time; and they put them on piece work, which I think is very wrong altogether. I always hold that a boy should be properly instructed in his business, which he is not to-day.

Q.—How many years do you think a boy should serve, to learn the trade properly? A.—According to our constitution, four years in order to learn one branch properly, and he can afterwards pick up any branch that he wishes.

Q.—Did you ever work in the Grand Trunk shops? A.—Yes; I think I worked nine months in the Grand Trunk shops.

Q.—What are the wages in the Grand Trunk shops as compared with other shops in this city? A.—I think the wages are about the same as any other day shops. They are paying as low as \$1.40 a day, and as high as \$2.50.

Q.—How often are they paid in the Grand Trunk shops? A.—Once a month, and ten days pay is kept back.

Q.—For what reason is ten days pay kept back? A.—Very likely to make up the time.

Q.—Are all the hands at the Grand Trunk shops compelled to join this insurance

scheme? A.—Yes; they are compelled to join that insurance, and I think it is nothing but a fraud.

Q.—How is that? A.—You pay between 70 and 78 cents a month for that insurance. All you are supposed to get out of it if you meet with an accident, is \$250, and I think \$3 a week while you are sick. For the same amount of money invested in other companies we could get cheaper insurance.

Q.—Is there any limit to the sick benefit? A.—Yes; I believe so. But I didn't take particular notice of the rules.

Q.—Are apprentices compelled to join this insurance in connection with the Grand Trunk Company? A.—I cannot answer that question. I don't know whether apprentices are compelled to join it or not. I believe they are.

Q.—Is there any money kept back from the apprentices? A.—There is one shop in the city where \$50.00 are kept back as a guarantee that the apprentice will serve his full apprenticeship.

Q.—Those are indentured apprentices? A.—I believe in that firm they are indenturing them now, but they have not been indenturing them for some time.

Q.—Do you think it would be much better for a moulder of the Grand Trunk, if he was paid weekly or fortnightly? A.—I think it would be. There are several advantages in weekly or fortnightly pay. I know that some time before I left, they got up a petition, and sent it to the manager to get paid fortnightly, and an answer came back that they could not do it, that it was never asked before, and they could not do it now. That was the answer the men got.

Q.—Is there any garnishment of wages on account of the non-frequency of paying men in connection with the Grand Trunk shops? A.—Not to my knowledge.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you think proper facilities are made for moulders when they are carrying metal about the shops? A.—In some of the shops they are not. They are in a dangerous position sometimes. Boxes are in the road, and one thing and another, and in winter nights the shops are very dark.

Q.—Do you know of any founderies where the floors are higher than the platform in front of the cupola? A.—I did not take particular notice of that, but there are some men who will swear to such a thing.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—If boxes were left around was it the fault of the men, or the foreman, or the boys? A.—Very likely of the foreman, for he should look after that. If he is a competent man he will not allow boxes to be thrown in the road where metal has to be carried.

Q.—Have you any other information to give to the Commission in regard to your trade? A.—No; only I want it understood that in the present shop, where I am working, that is Mr. Shancroft's, he does everything in his power to make the shop comfortable for us.

OWEN DUFFY, moulder, Montreal, called and sworn :—

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How long have you been working at the business? A.—I have been working at the business about nine years.

Q.—Are you a machine moulder or a stove plate moulder? A.—I am a machine moulder.

Q.—Have you heard what the last witness said about piece work being much harder work than day work, and do you agree with his statement? A.—Yes, and I am a piece working man myself.

Q.—Have you anything to add further than what has already been stated in

regard to this branch of business? A.—No; but I think they have made it pretty light so far as piece work is concerned. I think I work a little harder than some have explained to-night.

Q.—Do you have to work harder than the ordinary run of moulders? A.—No; we don't have to work harder if we don't wish to work. You have to work harder to make a day's pay, the way things are going now.

Q.—Taking the wages paid to moulders by the piece, how much harder would a man have to work, in order to make a day's pay, than if he is working on day work? A.—He would have to work about three times as hard in order to make a good day's pay such as a moulder can make.

Q.—What is the difference between the earnings of a man on piece work, and the wages of a man on day work, or is there any difference in the amount earned at the end of the week? A.—There is no standard. If a man is able to hold out, and work continuously all the time, it is to his advantage at the end of the week, if he has piece work.

Q.—How much more, at the end the week, would a man have, who works six days at an ordinary rate, by piece work, than a man who works day work? A.—About \$3.50 or \$4.00. He might not have that sometimes.

Q.—Do you know anything about moulders not getting their wages when they were earned? A.—Yes; I am one of them myself. That is the reason I came here.

Q.—Do you mean that you have not been paid in your shop? A.—I will tell you as far as I can. I have been working all the last fortnight. I worked ten days last fortnight and made, in the ten days, \$29.75, and when I got paid on Saturday night I got \$25.75. On Monday morning I went and asked one of the bosses there, that owns the place, for my time that was coming to me. He said, "what time?" I said, "I am \$4.50 short." "It is a damned lie," he says, "you are not." I said, "I am." So I went into the foundry again. He did not give me any satisfaction. He said, "I will see about it." So I went in and hung around the foundry all day, till about 12 o'clock, and then I was getting kind of lonesome, so I went out and had a couple of glasses of beer to drown my sorrow. I went away in the afternoon. I lost that day through it. This morning I went in and asked him for my money again, and he said it was not coming to me, "but I will see about it." I asked the manager of the foundry then to make up my time, that is, what I made the last fortnight. He made up my time, and my book was the same as his. He said the money was owing to me; whether I would get it or not he didn't know. That showed that the junior partner kept the money for himself.

Q.—Do you know if it is the general practice in the moulding business in Montreal, for the employers to retain a portion of the wages of their employees? A.—I have known it to happen, either two or three times. In the shop where I work, one man was short \$10.00, another was short \$3.00, and another was short \$1.10. One man, after he had been working a fortnight for 18 cents a box, was paid at the rate of 12 cents a box. When he went to ask for the balance of the money the boss told him that he was only paying 12 cents.

Q.—Have you anything else you wish to tell us? A.—In regard to the water closet where I am working, I may say that I am working at the back of it. About once in the week we get the smell of it. It sends me home occasionally.

Q.—Are those places inside the foundries? A.—Yes.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—With regard to that expression, that the junior partner got the balance of your money for himself—do you know that to be true? A.—I don't think, myself, that the old gentleman knew anything about his having the money.

Q.—There might be a question with respect to the discount upon your work or something of that kind. If he kept it back for that reason, we could understand it, but you say he kept it back for his own use? A.—If there was any discount he always tells us—the Manager tells us we have such and such a thing discounted.

Q.—Do you know that the man actually kept that money for his own use? A.—That is my opinion.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—How is it that you waited till Monday before you counted your money? A.—I count my money when I get it, but we have no opportunity of speaking about it. If I were to go to tell him about it he would jump at me and say: "Come on Monday." Lots of the men know the kind of a gentleman he is.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Is your money put in envelopes? A.—No, it is put into a tin box.

Q.—Is it marked what you get? A.—I don't think it is marked.

Q.—So you have to take it out of the box, and count it, before you know what the amount is? A.—Yes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you know any shop where if a moulder is late ten minutes, he is locked out? A.—Yes; I know one shop where if a moulder is late three minutes, he is locked out.

Q.—Is that a hardship on the moulders? A.—It is; because when a man loses the first two hours in the morning, the best part of his day is gone.

Q.—Is that locking-out a benefit to the employer in the long run? A.—I could not say about that, so far as piece-work is concerned, but I think that if a man loses two minutes or three minutes, that is, on piece-work, it is in one sense of the word, a loss to the employer, because he loses that time. It is a larger loss to the man who is locked out. I know myself, I have gone in the coldest day in winter to a foundry outside of the city here, and have had to walk about two miles, and not only walk but run, and have been sweating when I got there, and the door has been slapped in my face; and I was working piece-work.

Q.—Was the door shut just when you were entering? A.—The whistle had just done blowing.

Q.—Would the door be locked upon you till the afternoon, and would you have to go home again? A.—No; it was locked till nine o'clock. There was a small passage where you could stop in till nine if you had a mind to do it.

W. PHELAN, moulder, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you heard the evidence of the last witness (Duffy)? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you approve of it? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you approve of it in every particular? A.—Yes, I do.

Q.—Have you anything to add to his evidence in connection with his trade? A.—Yes; I have, in regard to short paying. There is a certain firm in this city that makes it a practice to pay the men short. If you get paid on Saturday night, and you go in to speak to them, they will tell you to go out of the office, for there are plenty of men walking around—there are plenty of men to do the work. You must either go home or do without your money. Sometimes he will give it to you, and if you get him in good humor, he will speak to you, but if not he will put you out of the office. I have known many men to be short like that, and get no satisfaction. I myself was short very often.

Q.—Is no satisfaction given when complaint is made? A.—No; he will swear at you.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

- Q.—Who pays you your wages? A.—Generally the master.
 Q.—There is no time-keeper? A.—There is a time-keeper, but he does not pay the wages. The master pays the wages.
 Q.—Does the time-keeper keep the time of the men who work by the week?
 A.—He keeps the day time. In working piece-work, your books may be right with the manager's books, but when you come to get paid, the boss himself makes the mistake.
 Q.—The time is generally correct in the men's books as compared with the time-keeper's books? A.—Yes; in the manager's books, on piece-work. The time-keeper keeps the day-work time.
 Q.—Did you ever try to recover wages by process of law? A.—I have not.
 Q.—Did you ever know it to be tried by any of the hands? A.—No, I do not. I have often told him I would fetch him to law, and that is how I got it; but once I did not get it.

JOHN O'FLAHERTY, Moulder, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. WALSH :—

- Q.—You are a moulder, I understand? A.—Yes.
 Q.—Did you hear the evidence of the other witnesses? A.—Not all, I heard some.
 Q.—Do you work by the day or by the piece? A.—I work by the day.
 Q.—What are the usual wages you receive? A.—I receive \$11.00 per week.
 Q.—Have you to complain of any errors in your pay at the end of the week?
 A.—I have not.
 Q.—Have you any complaints regarding the sanitary condition of the place in which you work? A.—No; not in the shop I work in, but I have worked in other shops where the sanitary condition was very bad.
 Q.—In what respect do you mean bad—what is the condition? A.—I know in one shop where I worked the closet was an open vault; I worked there in summer when it was very warm weather, and the stink reached me, and I was away down the shop probably, at least thirty or forty feet from the closet.
 Q.—Were you obliged to work constantly in the vicinity of that closet? A.—I had a bench to work at, and I was supposed to work there while in that shop.
 Q.—Was it near the closet? A.—I say it was about thirty or forty feet away, it may not have been quite so much, I do not want to be exact to a foot.
 Q.—Did you make representations to the manager regarding the matter? A.—I did not, because I knew it would have been useless.
 Q.—Will you please give us your opinion in regard to the condition of the foundries otherwise, say for instance as regards ventilation? A.—The ventilation is very good in winter because you might call it an open shop; but in the summer it is not very good.
 Q.—You think then, it is too cold in winter for your ordinary work? A.—If you are close to the stove you will be pretty warm in front, but your back will be freezing.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

- Q.—Have you known any moulders to be locked out who were a few minutes late? A.—Yes; I have worked at Williams' Sewing Machine shop just outside the city limits. I have been late on several occasions. I have run from my house, one mile, to the shop, perhaps in the middle of winter when it was very cold, and because I was one, two or three minutes late I could not get in, while at the same time I

have seen men who came out by the train get in. But they did not let men in who walked.

Q.—Was it the general rule to close the door at that time? A.—Yes; it was.

Q.—Would it be to the benefit of the employers to lock the shop? A.—In our department I do not think so, as we were working by the piece. I have known even the foreman of the shop to be locked out, and the men did exactly what they liked until after nine o'clock when he could get in. The men during that time had no foreman to look after them, and consequently it could be no benefit to the employer to lock the foreman out, or in fact to lock any of the men out working piece work. I think the employers are losers by that. Of course, a piece hand, if he were locked out for a portion of the day could not put up as much work on the floor that day as usual; of course, not so much as if he had been let in.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—You say that the places are very cold where you work? A.—I did not say where I am working now; I did know a shop where it was very cold in winter, that is Ives' shop.

Q.—Was it so cold that the frost would get into the sand? A.—I have found the sand frozen so that we could not wet it over night.

Q.—What would be the result of making castings with the moulds in that state? A.—We have often made castings with frozen moulds, and sometimes they would keep their shape as a casting; I have seen castings come out of a frozen mould. Still if the sand was frozen we could not make moulds till it was thawed out.

By Mr. CLARKE:—

Q.—Are you compelled to work by the piece where you are now? A.—Not where I work.

Q.—Are they generally compelled to work by the piece? A.—In a good many shops they are. In Ives' shop he has a class of men whom you could not hire by the day because they are not worth a day's pay, but he makes them do piece-work, and he thus gets all they are able to do out of them.

Q.—He could not get a good mechanic unless he paid a good day's pay? A.—Those men are compelled to work piece-work.

Q.—Is only the poorer class of mechanics engaged on piece-work? A.—Boys and laboring men. Of course it is an inferior class who work such work as sewing machine legs, and little castings such as those.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are all the men who work on piece-work inferior men? A.—No; they are not all inferior men. There are first class men who work piece-work; still we would all rather see piece-work abolished, because I do not think it is a benefit to the men. A man, moreover, does not last so long on piece-work as day-work.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—What is your opinion in regard to the apprentice system in this city? A.—It is pretty rotten in this city.

Q.—Will you explain the reason and suggest any system you would like to see adopted? A.—I would like to see apprentices bound or indentured to serve a certain term of years, say four years, and thus have a good chance to learn the trade, and if they do not become good workmen at the end of that time, the boss should be called upon to explain it, and explain why the boy is not competent. Boys run too much from one shop to another. If a boy at a shop is put on piece-work he will be kept to it. Of course he will earn more wages than he would by day-work. Probably a boy who is earning 25 cents a day is a better and a bigger boy and better up in the general class of work than is another boy, who after being at work a few months

earns \$1.00 a day on piece-work, while, as I have said, the other boy has probably obtained 25 cents a day.

Q.—How old should an apprentice be before he is apprenticed to the moulding trade? A.—The trade is a pretty hard one to go to, and I think a boy should be at least fourteen or fifteen, and I would say even seventeen. A boy needs to be about sixteen in order to be sufficiently strong.

Q.—Are proper facilities supplied in the shops during castings? A.—You must discriminate as between the different shops. There are some shops where the gangways are kept nice and clear, and there is every chance for a man at piece, to handle his metal without burning himself. There are other shops, however, that are very much neglected. In such cases a man sometimes has to climb over boxes on the gangway, and the way is not kept clear: he has to watch himself especially when it gets dark. The shop in which I work has an electric light, so we have plenty of light, and you cannot find any fault with that shop. I know there are shops that are dangerous in this respect. There is McDougall's for example. There is another shop that is about twelve feet high. After the blast is put on at night there are planks put up for the men to come down to the lower platform, and the men have to carry the iron up those planks. The man who is in front will probably spill a little iron on the planks: this will become chilled and sometimes your feet will slip. It is thus very dangerous.

Q.—Have you ever known accidents to happen? A.—I cannot say that I have.

Q.—Whose duty is it to remove those obstacles on the gangway? A.—It is the place of the foreman who has general charge of the shop to see that the men have proper facilities for carrying iron and that the gangway is kept clear of obstacles.

Q.—Have you any other information that would be of benefit to the Commission in connection with the moulding trade? A.—I would like to see a proper system of apprenticeship established in the city so far as the foundries are concerned. Another thing I would like to see is the shops properly lighted. In some shops in winter there is no light except torches which do not throw a good light, and now that the electric light plant is in the city, it would be a good thing if all the shops got in the electric light. It is a very good light in the foundry, and steam does not affect it so much as it does other lights. I would like also to see piece-work abolished entirely, because a man who works by the piece, works a great deal harder than a man working by day work, and as a general rule he is an old man, when he should be a young man, if he follows piece-work. A man who has been 20 or 25 years at piece work is pretty well played out.

Q.—Would not the abolition of piece work be beneficial as regards the trade itself? A.—If piece work was abolished it would raise the standard of the men both physically and morally. If it were stopped a good many of the young fellows who are not moulders at all, but who are earning considerable money by working in the foundries, would not be employed. In their place good steady moulders, well acquainted with the trade, would be employed, and there would not be so many complaints about men having sore heads, which I see Mr. Ives brought before the Commission.

Q.—Generally speaking, are the moulders addicted to drink, and in the habit of becoming intoxicated? A.—No; I could not say they are. I think they are about as steady as any other class of workmen in the country.

Q.—Do you think the moulders would take advantage of bath rooms and wash rooms if they were established in connection with the foundries? A.—Yes; I think they would, because I worked in a foundry where we had a bath house and a room where we could change our clothes and keep our outdoor clothes clean, so that when we left the shop we looked respectable. We have not this convenience here.

Q.—Is it difficult sometimes to procure good moulders in Montreal? A.—No; it is not. If the bosses want good moulders they can always get them, but they don't want good moulders, but rather good hands to work at machines. Those employers who have been complaining so much about the lack of good men are those who have

been manufacturing inferior moulders in Montreal, and they have done this for many years—one of those employers is Mr. Ives.

Q.—Would the formation of a labor bureau for the whole Dominion be of advantage to the trade generally? A.—I think it would; I approve of it.

Q.—Has immigration, to your knowledge, affected the moulding trade in Montreal? A.—Yes; it has to a certain extent. The Grand Trunk Company sent to England for some moulders and brought them out under contract. They had to work one year before the contract was finished. Moulders in Montreal who had homes and families were thrown out of work, and those fellows took their place.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Did any of them settle down here? A.—Some are here still; some went away when the contract expired, and I think some left before the contract expired.

Q.—Did you ever learn the terms of their agreement—how much wages, under the scale, they were working on? A.—I don't know, I could not answer that question, but I know some of them worked for less.

Q.—Were they good men? A.—Yes; good men.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Were they brought out here under misrepresentations? A.—According to their statement they were. They said that a representative of the Grand Trunk went there, to Crew, where they were working, and told them it was a new shop. They asked if there was any trouble in the shop. They said there was no trouble only that they had French Canadians working there, and they wanted to get rid of them, and get English speaking men, as they were better mechanics.

Q.—Do you know any moulders who have been blacklisted? A.—I know of a couple in Montreal—I don't happen to be one of the blacklisted ones myself—but a great many found difficulty in getting employment after the trouble here, some were one year idle. When men were working in another shop they were paid off and they were not told why they were paid off. The bosses simply told them they had nothing more for them to do.

JOHN IRVINE, Moulder, Montreal, called and sworn :—

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—You are a moulder, I understand. A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Have you ever worked in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you belong to the Benevolent Insurance concern? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that fund beneficial to the workingmen? A.—No; I consider it is a fraud, the whole lot of it, on workingmen.

Q.—How is that? A.—When a man goes there to work, the second day after being there he is taken in front of a doctor, and he is examined by the doctor, and if he does not pass he is discharged, and is not allowed to work. I guess it is because they cannot reap any more benefit from that man they discharge him.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—What brings you to the conclusion that it is because they cannot reap any more benefit from that man that they discharge him? A.—Because I know that a man worked in the shop, alongside of me, and did as good a day's work as any average man in proper health could do. I have known of other cases of men who went in and were condemned by the doctor, and a few days afterwards they came back and

got to work again. Whether they are insured or not I cannot say. Laboring men have to pay the same as the highest paid mechanic, 60 or 70 cents a month.

Q.—Is not the pay according to what you are rated on in the insurance? A.—I understand not.

Q.—You can take a small amount or a large amount? A.—Yes; that is the lowest amount I am giving you, 60 or 70 cents a month.

Q.—No matter whether you are a laboring man or a mechanic, it is according to the amount you are rated for and paid on? A.—There are two or three different classes.

Q.—No matter who you are, so long as you are a member of the society, you must pay the same as anyone else. Is that so? A.—Yes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you get medical attendance when you are ill? A.—Yes.

Q.—Does that payment come out of the funds, or is it an extra payment? A.—It comes out of the fund.

Q.—Is that also conducted on the basis of the principal? A.—I guess so.

Q.—Have you heard the evidence of the other witnesses in your trade? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you approve of that evidence? A.—The whole of it.

Q.—Have you anything to add to what has already been stated by them? A.—No; I would be giving almost the very same evidence, and giving nothing fresh on those other points.

Q.—Are apprentices compelled to join this fund in connection with the Grand Trunk shops? A.—Everyone that is employed in them.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—Were you one of those men who were brought out on contract, by the Grand Trunk Company from England? A.—No; I was one of those who was there at the time they were brought out, or rather, I was one of those who went out on strike at the time.

CHARLES ANDERSON, Moulder, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—How long have you worked at the moulding trade? A.—I have been at the trade about 26 or 27 years.

Q.—Do you count yourself a skilled workman? A.—I pass as such.

Q.—At what branch of the trade do you work? A.—At machinery and general work.

Q.—Have you heard the evidence of the previous witness in regard to that branch of the trade? A.—I heard a couple of them.

Q.—What do you think of that evidence? A.—I think their evidence quite correct, what I heard of it.

Q.—What kind of a shop do you work in? A.—It is a very good shop where I am working now.

Q.—Are the conveniences good? A.—They are good.

Q.—You have nothing then to complain about in that direction? A.—Not where I am working now.

Q.—Have you anything to offer, anything different from that which has already been stated by the different witnesses in your trade? A.—I heard the previous witness remark about imported labor at the time of the strike we had in the city, and I happened to be one of the parties on strike at the time. The foreman imported 12 moulders from England, and brought them here on us. The only excuse they had

was not that there was a strike on, but that they were at present employing French Canadians, and they wanted old country men to work in the shop.

Q.—You want the Commission to understand then, that the men were brought out under false pretences? A.—Yes. We have some of those men in town yet, and they can come here and say so for themselves.

Q.—Have you any grievances you would like to make known to the Commission? A.—The only grievance I have to speak about is the apprentice system. I would like to see apprentices bound for a certain number of years, so as to get their trade properly, and not be outcasts among moulders after their time is up.

Q.—You would approve then of a proper indenture system where the master would be bound to teach the boy his trade, as well as the boy to be bound to learn it? A.—Yes.

Q.—You were talking about a strike; what means would you propose in order to settle strikes? A.—In regard to settling strikes, that is moulders' strikes, I would like to see moulders settle them themselves. They know better how to handle the matter than those of any other trades; it would not do for shoemakers or tailors to come in and settle it for them.

Q.—Would they not like the masters to have something to say? A.—Oh, yes; they would have all they wanted to say in regard to it.

Q.—Do you approve of arbitration? A.—Yes; in a certain strike in this city. They got printers, tailors, and shoemakers, to arbitrate in a moulders' strike. That was not fair. What did they know about the moulding trade?

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Are you paid regularly? A.—I am where I am working.

Q.—What are your wages? A.—My wages at present are \$2.25 a day.

Q.—Do you work day work? A.—Yes.

WILLIAM SAGGERTON, Marble Cutter, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What are the wages generally paid to marble cutters? A.—The rate is from about \$1.50 to \$1.75 a day.

Q.—What is the number of hours that marble cutters work? A.—Ten hours in summer, and eight and a-half hours in winter.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Is that ten hours pay in winter or eight and a-half hours pay for eight and a-half hours work? A.—It is eight and a-half hours pay.

Q.—That is, you are paid in proportion? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How are you paid, weekly or fortnightly? A.—We are paid fortnightly.

Q.—Would you prefer to be paid weekly? A.—Well yes, it would be better than fortnightly.

No. Q.—Have you ever made any demand to that effect on your employers? A.—

Q.—Are many laborers employed in your trade? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the rate of pay they receive? A.—About \$1.10 or \$1.15 a day.

Q.—Are they called upon to do part of the work that should be done by skilled labor? A.—No.

Q.—Are there many apprentices in your trade? A.—Yes; there is a lot. There

have been about 12 since I went into the shop. They have all run away and left the boss except two, who have remained.

Q.—Why did they leave? A.—Because the boss will be damning them or kicking or hitting them with a stick, or firing stones at them. When you are working he would come, and fire a stone at you or hit you with a stick.

Q.—Are any of the apprentices wounded? A.—No; I remember one young fellow about 15 who got a black mark on his body.

Q.—Did the apprentices finish their time in other shops? A.—I could not say as to that—they are all in the United States.

Q.—Do the apprentices in other shops finish their time, as a rule? A.—It is supposed to be the rule. I have finished my time in Reid's.

Q.—What is the pay of apprentices? A.—\$1.50 per week the first year, \$1.75 per week the second year, \$2.25 the third year, \$3.00 the fourth year, and \$4.00 the fifth year.

Q.—Do you know any shops, without giving names, where women are employed polishing marble? A.—I could not say whether they are, but I hear they are.

Q.—You do not know it personally? A.—No; I have never seen them.

Q.—Has immigration affected the labor and wages of marble polishers? A.—Yes; immigrants do. They work for less money than what marble polishers should get.

Q.—Were those marble polishers or laborers who worked at polishing? A.—They were brought in for laboring men, but they go on polishing marble and they work for less money.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the workshops? A.—They are pretty cold the best part of them.

By MR. WALSH:—

Q.—You mean cold in the winter? A.—Yes.

Q.—And airy in summer? A.—Yes; middling, in the shop where I served my time.

Q.—Are the floors generally wet in the polishing shops? A.—Yes, they are.

Q.—Have the men rubber boots or anything of that kind to protect them against the wet in those shops? A.—They have not unless they fetch them from home.

Q.—Do they use them? A.—Some do and some do not.

Q.—How long have you been working at the trade? A.—I served five years and six months at it.

Q.—In this city? A.—Yes.

Q.—What wages do efficient men in your trade get? A.—From about \$1.50 to \$1.75 a day.

Q.—What do letterers get? A.—There is one man who gets \$1.75 a day.

Q.—Is that the highest wages paid? A.—That is the highest wages that I know of.

Q.—Is that man able to cut scrolls and do ornamental work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Ornamental marble work of any kind? A.—Yes.

Q.—And you say he receives \$1.75 a day? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many men are employed in your establishment? A.—At that time there were 60 or 70 men.

Q.—That is the highest wages paid to any of them? A.—Yes.

Q.—And a man who is supposed to be an ordinary hand—what does he get? A.—He gets from \$1.25 to \$1.50

Q.—Did you go into that shop as a regular apprentice? A.—Yes.

Q.—How long did you serve as an apprentice? A.—Five years and six months.

Q.—Were you regularly indentured as an apprentice? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you work out your full time? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you been working since? A.—Yes.

Q.—How long since you were out of time? A.—Since last April.

Q.—Do the employers ever keep any of your money back when paying you?
A.—No.

Q.—Were you away from your work any time? A.—Yes; three weeks and three days when I was sick with the small-pox.

Q.—Did you get anything at all from your employer when you were away sick? A.—No; I had to give double time for the time I lost. I had to work two days for a day lost during my sickness. I had to go seven weeks for three weeks, three days.

Q.—Did you not get any pay for those three weeks and three days? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Were you not paid at the same rate for those seven weeks as you would have been paid during the regular time of your apprenticeship? A.—I did not get any pay for the time I was sick, for the three weeks and three days, and I had to put in afterwards double time for that time I had lost.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you mean you worked seven weeks and did not get any pay? A.—When I started to work I got paid; but on finishing my time he made me work for that time I had lost. If you lose one day you have to put in two days in order to finish your time.

Q.—Do any of your men get more than \$1.75 a day? A.—Yes, there is one I think who does.

Q.—What does he get? A.—\$2.25 a day.

Q.—What does he do specially that enables him to obtain that rate? A.—He is supposed to be a kind of foreman. He draws out the marble and all the work and hands it over to us to do, boys and men.

EDWARD CLINE, Marble Polisher, Montreal called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have heard the evidence of the former witness concerning the marble polishing business? A.—I have. In regard to marble cutting I know a little about that also, because we generally work together, that is, marble polishers and marble cutters; so we know each other's business. We work in the same apartment.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—How long have you been working at the marble business? A.—I have been, off and on, for thirteen years.

Q.—Have you served a regular apprenticeship to it? A.—I did not to marble cutting, I served my time at polishing and stopped at that, but did not take in marble cutting.

Q.—Are you aware of any females in the city engaged in polishing marble?
A.—I am.

Q.—Are there many? A.—There are about seven just now, there were at one time seventeen in one shop.

Q.—You know something about polishing marble; do you think it is fit work for women? A.—It is not, decidedly not, fit work for women, for the reason that it is too laborious for them. It is too injurious to them as well,—it is also injurious. The poisonous stuff that is used is certainly most injurious.

Q.—And then polishers are always in the wet, I believe—the floor is wet con-

tinually? A.—No; a good polisher will never wet himself, and if he takes precautions he can keep himself dry, especially at furniture work, but with marble work he is bound to be wet in spite of all he can do, which is detrimental to his health.

Q.—At what class of work are you mostly employed? A.—At marble work, I have been employed a great deal on furniture work. In this city it is almost all furniture work.

Q.—Is marble cutting, as a general rule, considered a healthy occupation? A.—Marble cutting, as general rule, to a man of weak constitution, that is, a man weak in the lungs, is not a good trade for him to take, because it is injurious to such a man.

Q.—Are there many marble cutting shops in this city? A.—About four that are of any consequence, but there are a couple of more small places employing about six hands.

Q.—What work is specially done in your establishment? A.—In the last place I worked we did marble work, statuary work, and all kinds of colored marble polishing.

Q.—How are the people paid in your establishment, what are the general wages for the different classes of work? A.—Marble cutters are paid at the rate of about \$1.40 or \$1.35 in the winter, up to \$1.75 a day; and in the summer, a good marble cutter, a good hand will get from \$1.75 to \$1.85. There is one man who gets \$2.25 or thereabouts a day, but he is a sculptor, a man who can go to work and take a piece of marble in the block, and make a likeness from life, and so forth. But there is no such thing as men employed at cutting, and various branches of piece work getting more than \$10.00 or \$11.00 per week, winter or summer, \$11.00 is the highest to my knowledge.

Q.—Even if he is able to follow the scroll marks laid down for him? A.—It makes no difference—scroll work is not so difficult as some other kinds of work. Marble polishers are paid at the rate of ninety-nine cents a day to \$1.10 a day. They suffer considerably from emigration, for the reason that there are men taken from the wharves of the ship companies during the summer and brought into the shop, and good men are consequently forced to seek employment in the United States, where the wages are much higher. The pay in the United States for marble polishers is from \$2.25 to \$2.50 a day, while here, we work for \$1.10 or ninety-nine cents a day.

Q.—And those laboring men who are employed are put on polishing when they come into the shops? A.—Yes; they are put at polishing, a good polisher being compelled to show them their business when they enter the shop. If you do not do so, or refuse to do so, you are discharged, or you would be if it came to the knowledge of the boss.

Q.—What number of hours a day do you work? A.—Ten hours in the summer and eight and three-quarters in the winter. In the winter the hour is deducted—so much taken off on the 1st of November, and it is increased again on the 1st of April. I should like to make a statement, and it is this: a marble dealer appears to have stated here that marble cutters receive \$2.50 per day. The statement was made in order to deceive and mislead the public, for there is no such thing as marble cutters receiving that rate of wages.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Will you please state the difference in the rate of wages paid as between the United States and Canada? A.—The difference is between 50 cents, \$1.25, and \$1.75 per day.

By Mr. CLARKE:—

Q.—Would it not be possible for the firm to be paying a man \$2.50 a day, and you not know of it? A.—No; I don't think so. If it was that I was new in the business, it might be, but having had 13 years experience I think it is not.

Q.—I asked if it would not be possible for an employer to pay \$2.50 a day to a hand and you not know of it? A.—I am not disputing that an employer pays \$2.50, but he is a sculptor, and a similar man is paid in other places \$4 or \$5 a day.

Q.—You said it was not so? A.—In my first statement I did not refer to sculptors, but to marble cutters.

Q.—Is it not possible for a marble cutter in this city to be paid wages as high as \$2.50 a day and you not know of it? A.—Certainly it is possible.

E. WILLS, Marble Polisher, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have heard the evidence of the last two witnesses who have spoken in regard to the marble business? A.—I have.

Q.—Have you anything to communicate or modify in regard to their evidence, in connection with your trade? A.—There has been a slight error in regard to marble polishers pay. It varies from 90 cents a day to \$1.20 or \$1.25; it is pretty hard squeezing to get \$1.20 or \$1.25.

Q.—Did you ever know of any marble polisher having higher pay than that? A.—I did not.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the shop in which you work? A.—The sanitary condition of the shop in which I work was pretty poor; the shop was most uncomfortable, and very cold in the winter. It was almost impossible to work for one, two or three hours in the morning, and if it was a winter day the shop would be full of smoke. I have seen men with handkerchiefs before their mouths in order to keep the smoke from going down their throats.

Q.—Where did the smoke come from? A.—From a forge in the shop, for sharpening granite cutter's tools.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Was not that a bad thing for the marble to have smoke in the shop? A.—I don't know about it, but it was very bad for the men.

Q.—I should think that the employer himself should see for his own interest that there was no smoke in the shop? A.—It was not stopped while I was in the shop, that is two years ago.

Q.—Have you anything to add to the testimony of the other witnesses? A.—I have nothing to add more than I would like to say that immigration effects the trade disastrously in Montreal the same as it does all other trades; the labor market being glutted with cheap imported labor from the old country. Most people who interfere with us are laboring men.

Q.—You get no marble cutters out then? A.—There are some marble cutters who come out, but they are generally cheap laboring men who come from the old country.

Q.—Do you know of women who are marble polishers? A.—I have never worked in a shop with women, but I have heard that there are a couple in town who are so employed.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Were you born in this country or are you the son of an immigrant? A.—I was born in England; I have been out here ten or fifteen years.

JOHN MURPHY, Marble Polisher, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Have you heard the testimony of the former witnesses with regard to the marble business? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you fully endorse what they have said? A.—I do.

Q.—Have you any special statement to add to what has already been stated? A.—None except about female labor. I think it tends to lower the wages men polishers receive, and I believe it has lowered them, because women, as a rule, work cheaper than men do. They will average about \$3 or \$4 a week—that is about the most they will get.

Q.—Do you know women to do that work in Montreal? A.—Yes; I worked in one shop where they were—I believe there are only a couple in this country who work at it.

Q.—Do you believe it is fit work for women? A.—No; I believe not. I think it is very injurious to them.

Q.—Have you anything to add to the testimony of the other witnesses who have spoken in regard to the marble business? A.—No; except in regard to the unfair system carried on in Mr. Reid's works during the winter time in cutting down wages and time from ten hours a day to nine hours, during the winter, and it is the 15th of April and sometimes May before we get an advance. We work ten hours a day for nine hours pay from 15th February to 15th April.

Q.—Do you work during that period ten hours a day? A.—Yes; they work ten hours a day and do it at the winter rate.

Q.—Do they not get the same rate paid in summer for working those number of hours? A.—The men work ten hours a day at the winter rate from the middle of February to the middle of April.

Q.—Do you get paid regularly? A.—Yes; once a fortnight.

(Translation.)

OSIRIS BIBEAU, Printer, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You live at No. 56½ Montcalm street, Montreal, do you not? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—For how many years have you lived there? A.—It will be three years on the 1st May.

Q.—Have you always paid the same rent? A.—No; for two years I paid six dollars per month.

Q.—The two first years? A.—Yes; and this last year I am paying seven dollars.

Q.—How much water tax did you pay during the first year? A.—Thirteen dollars and fifty cents with the tax for the water closets.

Q.—You say that you paid six dollars of rent for the two first years; did you then pay thirteen dollars and fifty cents, for water with the water closets? A.—I did not pay thirteen dollars and fifty cents the two first years. I paid it only the first year, the second year, I sub-let a portion of the lodging at two dollars and a-half per month.

Q.—In that case how much did you pay for your water the second year? A.—By the directory or otherwise the Corporation found out that there were two families in this lodging and they sent two accounts for water, one for each. They sent me one for twelve dollars and the sub-tenant got one for five dollars.

Q.—Thus you paid seventeen dollars for water in a lodging rented at six dollars a month? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you ever protest against this tax? A.—I did protest, and had a great deal of trouble with it, inasmuch as I am not up to the ways of public offices, and I was sent about from one official to another. I succeeded at length in getting a rebate of seventy-five cents. The people did not seem to believe me when I told them anything; but if I offered to give them proof they would not have it. They declared that they believed me; but, on the other hand, I saw very well that it did not look like it.

Q.—Did you show the assessors a receipt? A.—Yes; I offered to show them the lease, and they told me that it was not necessary. But I showed them a receipt, and, on the strength of that, they allowed me a reduction of seventy-five cents.

Q.—The third year, how much water tax did you pay? A.—It increased still a little more. The reduction was not mentioned, and it was eight dollars again for me, though I have no water closets; and for my sub-tenant it was five dollars and sixty-five cents.

Q.—You are quite sure that you are not mistaken? The matter stands as you put it? A.—I have the account here if you want to see it.

Q.—Your sub-tenant paid five dollars and sixty-five cents for a lodging of two and a half dollars a month? A.—Yes; I do not know whether he pays it still, but that was the amount of his bill.

Q.—Do you not know that for a thirty dollars lodging, its water tax is only \$5? Your subtenant did not protest on being charged five dollars and sixty-five cents?

A.—I know nothing about the prices; but I know that the charge seemed to me exorbitant, in the light of what I had myself paid. Before that I had a lodging for which I paid \$5 a month, and in which I gave only six or seven dollars for water. That was the reason that I thought the tax rather high for a rental of one dollar more.

Q.—Have you had a supplementary stop cock supplied to the room sublet by you? A.—No.

Q.—The two families are then supplied by the same stop cock? A.—Yes. My neighbour pays six dollars a month of rent and the first year he paid a little less than I did.

(Translation.)

HENRI LAPIERRE, Moulder, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—For how long a time have you been a moulder, here at Montreal? A.—For some seventeen or eighteen years.

Q.—Do you work by the day or by the piece? A.—By the day at the present time.

Q.—Has it happened, to your knowledge, that the wages of the men were lowered when they were paid? A.—In the shop where I worked before going to the place where I am now, that is at Mr. Ives', I never had a single correct payment the whole four months that I stopped there.

Q.—Did you complain, and what was the result of your complaint? A.—I did complain, and the result was that every Monday following pay day I had to lose a couple of hours in the attempt to snatch the trifle which was kept from me. But it was all useless, and, on the last payment which I drew, which was two years ago last New Years day, three dollars were kept back from me. They paid us on the Monday night, New Years day fell on the Saturday, and they made us wait until the Monday night after New Years day, then they told me to come on the Tuesday

with my book to balance the accounts. I returned on the Tuesday with my book, and the account balanced between him and me. I was then told there was a difference of two dollars and a half in my favor; and when I asked to have them given me, he said that he had only one dollar and a half about him, but that on the next pay day he would give me the balance. He took three half dollars and gave them to me. I then went to the shop where I am working now, and as I knew that it would serve no good purpose to quarrel about that remaining dollar, I gave the whole matter up. In the same shop there was work on the arms of sewing machines. The superintendent was a man named Baldon or Baldwin. And one day the foreman sent for me and told me that my work was not well done. He knew nothing at all about the trades of moulder or caster, but he took my work and threw it from him the length of his arm. Then I took one of these pieces of work and went to show it to Mr. Ives himself. Mr. Ives said that he would settle it, but I have never been able to get anything. They always arrange matters sufficiently among themselves that one can get nothing.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition, as a rule, of the shops in Montreal? A.—They are all pretty much alike, as concerns gas and smoke, in the shops that I know.

Q.—How are the water closets in some of these shops? A.—Where I am there is no reason for complaint. Where I was before, at Mr. Ives', I worked beside the closets that stood on the same level, that is, the water closets themselves, and the other apartment with the seat. There was a partition between.

Q.—Is the machinery in good order, such as the cranes and other appliances for raising weights? A.—To the best of my knowledge, yes; although accidents may have happened.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are we to understand that your wages were regularly lowered for four months? A.—Yes; from 25 to 30 cents on every payment during four months: I was short from about the beginning of the month of September until New Year's day.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Well; at the last, did you lose these amounts? A.—Yes. I could not get the discount; and I was told that it was on the discount. There was a labouring man who kept the discount, and sometimes we could get the discount out of him,—from his books; we would go to his desk, take his book and examine it and on pay day we would go to Mr. Baldwin, and he would say "its for the discount and the work is bad." My own work was marked every day.

Q.—Are you charged the discount when the man who employs you says that the work is not right? A.—No; our work alone is discounted, that is to say the work is set aside and we are not paid for it.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are you of the same opinion as the last witness that piece work exhausts a man? A.—Yes.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Have the moulders, as a body, ever attempted to abolish piece work, in the shops? A.—Not to my knowledge, but there is much question of it, just now.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Have you ever worked as a moulder in the United States? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do labourers take the place of moulders in ordinary work in any of the shops of Montreal? A.—On the hand wheel of the sewing machines; when I was working at Mr. Ives' there came a labourer from the river side who worked for a whole winter starting machines. All that kind of work is done by machinery.

Q.—Are you aware from practical knowledge whether these labourers are competent to do such work? A.—No, sir. They are employed solely to exempt the bosses from paying the right prices.

Q.—That is the reason they employ these labourers for this kind of work? A.—Yes. It was because Mr. Guertin asked a price which was not too high for such work, and they did not wish to give it to him; so they took a labourer and put him on the work.

Q.—Have you any information which you can give to the Commission other than that which they have asked from you? A.—No; all that I should have said is that there was a little smoke in the shop where I work, at Mr. Parker's; and they asked that means should be taken to prevent it. He complied with our request.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that moulders have been sick on account of the bad ventilation in the shop? A.—I could not say if it was because that; but there was a Mr. Charbonneau who was very sick. I know that he has been subject to bronchitis for several years. No doubt the gas and the smoke had something to do with it; but he did not complain of it himself; he did not complain that it was caused by that.

(Translation.)

22nd February, 1888.

JOSEPHINE DURAND, Employee of the Hudon Cotton Factory, at Hochelaga, aged thirty years, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—You never perceived anything having an immoral character, in the Hudon Factory? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you ever see these young persons, not married, in such a condition that they ought not to be allowed to associate with the young? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you ever hear any indecent language which the men used towards the girls? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you know whether they take all the precautions that are required in order to protect the morality of the employees. A.—Yes, sir.

(Translation.)

LEONCE MARTIN, employed in the St. Anne Cotton Factory, (23 years of age), sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What is the general character of the hands employed in the St. Anne Mill? A.—I do not know them all, but all those that I know are a very good set.

Q.—How many hands are there in the department where you work? A.—I cannot say.

Q.—In the room where you work, are there not men, women and girls employed in the same line? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long have you been working in that hall? A.—Only three months.

Q.—During the time that you have been working in that factory, have you ever noticed anything immoral going on among the hands? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Have you never noticed the condition in which certain young women, or

certain unmarried girls, were found to be, and if their condition was such that they ought not to remain in the factory? A.—No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you know Pierre Pleau? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you know Gilbert Garand? A.—No, sir.

Q.—You do not know if these people have worked in the St. Anne Cotton Factory or not? A.—No, sir.

Q.—What is the height of the water closets separating the men from the women?
A.—About six feet.

Q.—When the work is over, do the whole of you—young men and young women—leave together? A.—Yes, sir.

By MR. CARSON :—

Q.—You have been working only three months in the St. Anne Factory? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Where did you work before those three months? A.—At the Hochelaga Cotton Mills.

Q.—What you have just said about the St. Anne Factory applies also to the other mills? A.—Yes.

(Translation.)

DAME CLARISSE GAMACHE, employed at the St. Anne Cotton Factory (39 years) sworn.

By MR. HEAKES :—

Q.—How long have you worked in that factory? A.—A year and a-half.

Q.—In what department do you work? A.—In the weaving room.

Q.—How many employees are there in that department? A.—I cannot say exactly, but about 40.

Q.—Are there any men employed in that department? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What is the conduct of the employees of this department towards one another? A.—They conduct themselves very well.

Q.—Have you ever heard indecent conversations or bad language among the employees of that room? A.—Occasionally.

Q.—How many times did this happen? A.—Sometimes twice a day; sometimes more; sometimes less. I never amuse myself with them.

Q.—Was such language addressed by the men to the women or by the women to the men? A.—Often among themselves—the girls, the women and the men.

By MR. GIBSON :—

Q.—When the foreman heard, it did he put a stop to such language? A.—Yes, sir.

By MR. HEAKES :—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that there have been bad or reprehensible acts committed in the factory? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that there have been persons not married, in such a condition as they ought not to have been in; and if so, how many times? A.—Yes, sir; I have worked in two factories and have seen two or three in the two factories,

Q.—In each? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Outside of these three or four cases, do you know of immoral things among the employees? A.—No, sir.

Q.—How do you find that the conduct, morally speaking, of the employees of the factory compares with the conduct of persons in a more elevated position; that is to say is their conduct as good as that of persons whose condition is much higher? A.—Yes,

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—How long is it since the women of whom you speak, who were in an interesting condition, were in the factory before you were aware of it? A.—Well, they had worked there several years.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—They worked there several years before this happened? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Some years after also? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—In going to, or returning from the water closets, have you heard improper language? A.—No, sir.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you ever seen boys and girls or men, or women, throw anything over the water closet partition and tease one another generally? A.—No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—According to you, the behaviour of the boys and girls in these factories is rather better than the usual run of conduct between boys and girls? A.—Yes, sir.

(Translation.)

ADELINE MARTIN, employed in the St. Anne Cotton Factory, (forty-one years), sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How long have you worked in that factory? A.—For the last three months.

Q.—Do you work in the same department as the two witnesses who have just been heard? A.—Yes; sir.

Q.—Can you corroborate the testimony which they have just given? A.—No, sir.

Q.—In what respect do you differ in opinion with them? A.—They have seen things happen which I have not seen.

Q.—In what respect? A.—In respect to good behaviour.

Q.—Well, what is the general behavior of the hands according to you? A.—According to me, when I am busy at my work, I pay no attention to what other are doing. I do my work. Then, again, I saw nothing wrong done at the St Anne factory during my stay there.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Have you ever seen unmarried girls in the condition spoken of a moment ago by the other witnesses? A.—No, sir.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Have you worked in the Hochelaga factory? A.—Yes; sir, at the Hochelaga Cotton Mill.

Q.—While working in one or the other of these factories, has it ever happened to you to see girls and boys together, either in the building or around the building, in such conditions that you were justified in suspecting something was going on, or something wrong had already happened? A.—No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Did you pay any fines there? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you ever hear it said that there were girls who complained of having to pay heavy fines, while others working for less than themselves, paid none at all? A.—I have no knowledge of this. As for myself, I was fined for work ill-done.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Are there several boys and girls working in the same department with yourself? A.—Yes, sir, there are several.

Q.—Do they all know how to read and write? A.—I do not know whether they can all read and write, not having questioned any of them on that point.

Q.—Do you know whether there are any who can read and write? A.—There must be some.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How long did you work in the Hudon Mills, before working in the Ste. Anne Mills? A.—Seven years.

Q.—Is it a customary thing to take working people from the Ste. Anne factory over to the Hudon factory? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do all the hands of the Ste. Anne Mills come from the Hudon factory? A.—I could tell you nothing on that head. I went out into the country and on coming back from the country, I could not get my place again in the Hudon factory and I got one in the Ste. Anne.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you come here to give evidence of your own free will, or have you come at the request of other parties? A.—I was asked to come.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Who asked you to come here? A.—The second boss.

Q.—Do you know if people have been brought from the Saguenay to work in the mills? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—So far as you know, how many were thus brought? A.—I could not say how many; but I know that several were made to come.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Young men and young women? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—With their parents? A.—Some with their parents, and others alone.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you know whether these people earn the same wages as those working at the Hochelaga? A.—I do not know.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Did you see any of these people coming from the Saguenay last year? A.—No, sir.

Q.—You have just said that you were fined for work badly done—was this for weaving badly done? A.—For poor work.

Q.—Were you employed to weave? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What flaws were there in the pieces? A.—There were breaks, the cotton was not good. The cotton was even bad in places. This was now and again, and it was not very bad. At other times, it was very bad.

Q.—By cotton you mean the thread? A.—Yes; pieces of cotton.

Q.—But was the thread good? A.—Yes; the thread was good, and the fault lay with me in that I wove the cotton badly. Then of course, the cotton was pronounced bad, and I was fined.

Q.—All you have to do is to watch the frame; the shuttle is propelled by the machine? A.—Yes, sir; and then the work is sometimes good, and sometimes bad.

Q.—How can the work ever be bad, when the shuttle is worked by the machine? A.—Sometimes there is want of due attention.

Q.—But why does the work turn out badly at all? A.—Sometimes that depends on the cotton, and at other times it depends on the machinery.

Q.—And the thread is defective, sometimes? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—When the thread is defective is a fine levied on you? A.—Sometimes.

By Mr. CLARKE :

Q.—When fines were imposed on you, were you of opinion that they were just or that they were unfair? A.—Whenever I brought my work, there were times that I found it not well made; but at other times it did not depend on me. Of course, I did not like to be fined.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—When the thread is good and the machine works well, the weaving goes on pretty much of itself, does it not? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—All you have to do is to look at it going? A.—Yes.

Q.—When the thread is bad, or the machinery out of gear there are breaks?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And then it is that you are obliged to watch your frame for the purpose of mending the thread? A.—Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—We have heard you speak of the Saguenay people. In what do they differ from other people like you or me? Are they not people like ourselves? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—They are not inferior to us? A.—I never associated with the Saguenay people; I never was friendly with them.

Q.—But, at all events, from outward looks, you saw no difference in them? A.—No, sir; there is no difference—they are folks just like ourselves.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Why are you not friendly with them? Why did you have no intercourse with them? A.—Because I am not in the habit of mingling with other people. I stop at home.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you believe that you have had to pay fines for marks and flaws for which you were not responsible? A.—I am going to tell you how that is. When I first

entered the factory I was made to sign a paper that if I did not do good work I should be fined. I did sign, and when I made bad work I was fined. They showed me that my work was badly done. Sometimes it was my fault; at other times it was the fault of the cotton.

Q.—And when it was the fault of the machinery, you were fined all the same?
A.—Well, sometimes. I complained that the fault was not with me, and then I was not fined; but other times, again, I was fined, and still it was no fault of mine.

(Translation.)

FLORINA LACOSTE, formerly employed in the McDonald Tobacco Factory, of Montreal, twelve years of age, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

- Q.—How old are you? A.—Twelve years.
Q.—Are you still employed at the McDonald factory? A.—No, sir.
Q.—Were you sent away, or did you leave of your own will. A.—Yes, sir; I was sent away.
Q.—When were you sent away? A.—One week ago.
Q.—How many years or months did you work at the McDonalds? A.—One year.
Q.—At what hour in the morning did you go to the factory? A.—At seven o'clock.
Q.—At what hour did you leave in the evening? A.—At six o'clock.
Q.—At what hour did you take your dinner? A.—At noon; sometimes at half past twelve.
Q.—At what hour do you resume your work? A.—At one o'clock
Q.—When you began your dinner at half-past twelve, did you return to work at one o'clock. A.—Yes, sir.
Q.—Did you take your dinner in the factory during the dinner hour? A.—Yes, sir.
Q.—Where did you eat? A.—In the factory.
Q.—In the workshop itself? A.—Not where we worked, but a little further off.
Q.—Had you any chairs and tables at your dinner? A.—No; we sat down on the floor.
Q.—Has it ever happened to you, sometimes, to work later than six o'clock?
A.—Sometimes later, and sometimes earlier.
Q.—What was the latest hour at which you worked? A.—A quarter past six.
Q.—Never later? A.—No, sir.
Q.—How much did you earn a week? A.—Two dollars; sometimes \$2.25.
Q.—Were you paid by the week? A.—Yes, sir; every Saturday.
Q.—But were you paid by the job, or did you get \$2 a week regularly? A.—Sometimes; when we turned out more work we got more money.
Q.—Have you ever paid fines? A.—Sometimes; those who did not keep still were fined. There were some who fought in the shop, and they were fined.
Q.—Did you yourself ever pay a fine? A.—No, sir.
Q.—Were you ever beaten? A.—No, sir.
Q.—Can you read and write? A.—I cannot either read or write very well.
Q.—Were there other girls dismissed at the same time as yourself? A.—Yes; there were five or six young girls dismissed at the same time as I.

(Translation.)

MARIA ETHIER, formerly employed in the McDonald Tobacco Factory, of Montreal, ten years of age, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

- Q.—You have worked, Miss, at the McDonald Tobacco Factory? A.—Yes, sir.
 Q.—Since when have you ceased working there? A.—Since the first week of the month of February, on a Saturday.
 Q.—Did you leave of your own accord, or was it the authorities of the factory who told you to go? A.—It was the factory people who told me to go.
 Q.—Do you know why? A.—No, sir.
 Q.—How long a time did you work at the factory? A.—Eight days.
 Q.—You worked only one week? A.—Eight days.
 Q.—You did not work last year? A.—No, sir.
 Q.—At what hour of the morning did you go to work? A.—At seven o'clock.
 Q.—At what hour did you leave the factory? A.—I do not remember.
 Q.—Can you read and write? A.—Yes, sir, but not very well.

By Mr. CLARKE:—

- Q.—Were there other children sent away at the same time as yourself? A.—I do not know.

(Translation.)

ADÉLAIDE DAGENAIS, employed at the St. Anne Cotton Factory (twenty-three years of age) sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

- Q.—How long have you been working there? A.—For the last four years.
 Q.—During those four years, how many young unmarried persons did you see in such a state that it was not fitting they should associate with the others? A.—I cannot tell you that; inasmuch as I pay no attention to what is going on.
 Q.—Have you ever seen any in that condition? A.—We cannot judge others; sometimes we do not know; sometimes it may be something else different from what we suspect.
 Q.—Have you ever noticed anything unbecoming, taking place among the employees of the Mill or of the Factory? A.—Things do happen sometimes which are certainly not becoming.
 Q.—Did this happen often? A.—I could not tell you exactly. I did not pay attention.

By Mr. WALSH:—

- Q.—When did these things take place? Was it during the hours of work, inside the factory or going out of it? A.—When there is an evil to be done, it is not done within the factory. Within the factory the foreman watches closely enough.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

- Q.—In what department do you work? A.—I worked in the spinning room, and now I am in the weaving room.
 Q.—Have you ever paid fines? A.—Yes.
 Q.—Many? A.—The least I ever paid was forty-five cents.

Q.—At the one time? A.—In one month; that is to say, on the one payment.
 Q.—What was it for? A.—Sometimes my work was not very well done; I did not find it ill; but they found it below the mark.

Q.—Do you think that you have been made to pay fines which should not have been levied on you? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—When the thread of the shuttle on your loom breaks away does the loom stop? A.—Yes.

Q.—Then, whether you watch well or whether you do not watch at all, the loom stops and there can be no breaks? A.—Yes, sir. When there are breaks, when the loom stops of itself it is because the filling breaks; but the loom does not stop on account of these flaws, we ourselves have to stop it.

Q.—Have you had any of these flaws brought about by bad thread? A.—Sometimes there is a thread which breaks and no attention is paid to it. That makes a flaw. Sometimes, too, time is wanting, and the work goes wrong any how.

Q.—Why have you not the time? Have you several looms to attend to at the same time? A.—Four.

Q.—Then the thread may break in one loom whilst you are looking at another? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you pay the fine for this? A.—Yes.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—Are you obliged to work four looms at a time? A.—We could make nothing if we did not run four looms at a time. I have already managed five.

Q.—But are you called on to work four looms? A.—The working of four looms is a rule for the girls.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Have you ever heard any questions or any words in the factory which led you to believe that something immoral was going on among the employees? A.—Yes, sir;

Q.—Did you hear the foreman conducted himself badly with the female employees of the establishment? A.—Not while I worked there.

Q.—Are you aware that certain working women do not pay as many fines as others? A.—All the hands are not equally fined.

Q.—But for the same hands, are there not some who are favoured, that is to say that are less fined than others? A.—I think not.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you know Pierre Pleau? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And Gilbert Garand? A.—I know some Garands; but am not acquainted with their first names.

Q.—You would know him when you saw him; but you do not know his name? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Is Pierre Pleau foreman in your department? A.—No, sir.

(Translation.)

DAME HENRIETTE LAROUCHÉ, employed in the Hudon Cotton Factory, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How long have you been working in this factory? A.—Five years.

Q.—Have you been constantly employed for these five years? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What is the character, and reputation of the working women, since you have been employed there, according to the best of your knowledge? A.—I never noticed anything. I never saw any wrong done.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—Have you ever paid any fines? A.—I work there by the day.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—In what department? A.—In the cloth room.

Q.—Have you any looms to manage? A.—No, sir. I “tackle” the cotton, I inspect the cotton, I do all that kind of work.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Are you married? A.—I am a widow.

Q.—Have you a family? A.—Yes, sir, I have five children.

Q.—Have you daughters? A.—I have two daughters, and three sons.

Q.—Would you place your daughters among young women who were in the family way? A.—We are obliged to do it when it is necessary to earn their livelihood. We take work wherever we find it.

Q.—Do you think that it is according to religion to employ those girls with those who are honest? A.—It would be better to make those girls retire. It is not often that there are such, but anyhow the thing happens sometimes.

Q.—How many times has it happened to your knowledge? A.—To my knowledge, twice to the one party.

Q.—The party who was twice guilty, still continues to be employed? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long has she been there? A.—Several years already.

Q.—Is she there still? A.—She still works there, but she is now married.

Q.—Do your children work in the cotton factory? A.—I have two who work there—a girl of nineteen years, and a boy of sixteen years.

Translation.

CORDELIA TELMOSSE, employed in the Hudon Cotton Factory (20 years) sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—For how long have you worked there? A.—Since the month of September, 1887.

Q.—Can you tell us if, to your knowledge, anything happened which was not proper in the factory, since you have been working there? A.—No, sir.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—Have you heard what the witnesses who have given their testimony have said? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you corroborate what those girls have said? A.—There are things which I cannot corroborate.

Q.—In what do you differ? A.—Because some of them have seen what I did not see. For my part, I never saw anything bad.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Were the girls who have been here to give their testimony, sent by the employees, your associates or were they sent here by the superintendent of the factory?
A.—I cannot tell you for all of them; but I know that, for myself, the first "boss" came to me, and asked me to sign my name to come here as a witness of what I had seen happen in the factory.

Q.—You admit that you have not come here as representing or as having been sent by the employees? A.—No, sir.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Did the employees express a wish, among themselves, to send some one here to represent them? A.—No, sir.

Q.—In what department do you work? A.—In the spinning room.

Q.—Have you paid fines? A.—No, sir; never.

Q.—Do you work by the week or the day? A.—By the day.

Q.—By the piece or by the week? A.—By the week.

Q.—How much do you earn per week? A.—\$4 per week.

Q.—Are there any very young children who work in your department? A.—Yes, sir; there are some who are quite young.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest thereabouts? A.—I could not say, but I think that there are some not above twelve years of age even if they are that old.

Q.—What do they do? A.—They take away the spindles to replace them by others.

Q.—Is this fatiguing work? A.—I could not say, I never did it.

MRS. KANE, Operative in the Card Room, Hochelaga, Cotton Mills, called and sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—In which of the mills belonging to the company do you work? A.—In the Hochelaga Cotton Mills.

Q.—Can you tell us what is the conduct of the operatives towards one another in the mill? A.—I never saw anything wrong.

Q.—Have you ever heard them using indecent or immoral language? A.—No.

Q.—Do you know if there is any rule in the mill that would prohibit the use of improper language? A.—No.

Q.—There is no such rule? A.—No.

Q.—Have you ever seen anything about the mill that was improper? A.—No.

By Mr. CARSON:

Q.—Did you ever work in any other mill besides this mill? A.—No, not here.

Q.—Have you ever worked in Canada or the United States? A.—In the United States.

Q.—Do you consider the mills here, so far as morality is concerned, are as good in their standing, as other mills in which you have worked? A.—Yes.

Q.—Could any immoral action take place among the employees without you knowing it? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you ever seen anything that would lead you to suspect that anything improper was carried on? A.—No.

Q.—Have you ever been fined in this mill? A.—Yes; for bad work.

Q.—Was that fine unjustly imposed? A.—No.

Q.—What was the fine for? A.—It was for making single.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—How do the wages in Montreal compare with the wages in the United States? A.—Something the same—just the same.

Q.—Have you to pay any more to live here than you have to live over there, in the United States? A.—No; just the same.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Are you Canadian born? A.—No; I am English, I was born in England.

Q.—Did you go to the United States first, and then come here? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any family? A.—No.

Q.—You are all alone? A.—I am a widow.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Did you come here because you thought you could do better here than in the United States? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Did you pay many fines in that factory? A.—Not very many; only when I made bad work.

Q.—Is that bad work your fault, or was it due to the bad state of the machinery? A.—It was my own fault.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Did you have to pay many fines when you were working in the United States? A.—No; I never paid any fines there.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Did your work ever turn out bad in the United States? A.—Yes; several times.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—How long have you been working at these Mills? A.—For two years.

Mrs. JULIA DUBOIS, Carder, Hochelaga Cotton Mills, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How long have you worked at the mill? A.—Seven years.

Q.—During the time you have been engaged in the mill, have you ever seen any improper conduct on the part of the employees? A.—No; I have not.

Q.—Have you seen anything to complain of? A.—No. All I complain of is what has been put in the newspapers. The mill hands are more decent than the one who put that statement in the papers.

Q.—You think that the morality of the people compares favorably with the people outside of the mill? A.—Yes. I think that the best thing they can do is to look outside rather than inside of the factory. There is more doing outside than inside the mill, because there are not enough police around—that is what they should do.

MRS. MATILDA HINGSTON, Weaver, Hochelaga Cotton Mills, Montreal called and sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How long have you been at the Hochelaga Cotton Mills? A.—Six years on the fourth of last November.

Q.—Have you ever seen anything improper in the conduct of the people working with you? A.—No.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—How old are you now? A.—Twenty-two years.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Did you ever pay any fines? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you ever pay any fines for using paper with which to curl your hair? A.—No.

Q.—Do you know any body in the factory who did? A.—No; I do not.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Did you ever hear any improper language used in any way? A.—No.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Were you asked to come here? A.—No; I came here of my own accord to defend myself here.

(Translation.)

J. BTE. LABELLE, M.P., Manager of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, of Montreal. sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Between what parts do your Company's boats ply? A.—Between Toronto and the Saguenay.

Q.—How many boats does your Company own? A.—Twenty-six.

Q.—Into how many classes do you divide the parties employed on these boats? A.—We have, first, the superior officers at headquarters. On board the boats, we have the captains, the pilots and the pilot seconds, the first and second engineers—and in some boats we have three engineers—the stewards, the waiters, the stokers and the deck-hands.

Q.—The persons whom you designate as deck-hands (*matelots*) are they employed on deck? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How much do they generally earn a month? A.—That depends on circumstances. In Ontario, we pay them from \$20 to \$25 a month, because the season is shorter. In the Province of Quebec and the Lower St. Lawrence, we pay them from \$16 to \$20 a month according to the boats.

Q.—How long does the season last in Ontario? A.—Four months only.

Q.—In the Province of Quebec how long is the season? A.—The season is about six months and a-half to seven months; but the men have a chance to work even longer. At Sorel, for instance, they have seven or eight months; because they are employed for about one month after navigation, in dismantling the boats.

Q.—Those who do not work at Sorel, have they other employment from the Company after the season is over? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do those who work in Ontario find employment with the Company when the season is over? A.—No.

Q.—Do you pay anything to the men when they are not working for the Company? A.—No.

Q.—On your boats are there licenses taken for the sale of liquors? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Under whose authority are they issued? A.—They are issued in the Province of Quebec, by the Government of Quebec, and, in the Province of Ontario, by the Government of Ontario.

Q.—In the case of a boat plying between one Province, and another, are liquors sold under the one license? A.—No; we are obliged to take two licenses for the western steamers.

Q.—How many pilots are there on each boat? A.—In the West we employ one first pilot, one second and a fourth wheelman.

Q.—Is it required that the wheelmen should know the channels? A.—Not absolutely necessary, but they are there to learn the route. The first and thesecond pilots are always there.

Q.—Are there any among the deckhands who are property owners? A.—Yes; especially at Sorel. I do not know much about them in the West, but at Sorel I know a great many who own property.

Q.—Did they make the money, with which they bought these properties, in the service of the company? A.—Yes; for the seven-eighths of those whom I know. Several have been travelling for the Company these thirty years that I have been with them.

Q.—What inspection is made of these boats by Government officers? A.—The Dominion Government has two inspectors for each season; a boiler and machinery inspector and a hull inspector.

Q.—At what intervals do these inspections take place? A.—They must be made every twelve months. The certificate which we get is good for twelve months.

Q.—Is there an inspection of the engines apart from the boilers? A.—There is an inspection of the engines and of the boilers; but it is made by the same inspector.

Q.—Is the inspection of hulls as severe as that of the boilers? A.—It is very, very severe.

Q.—How often are the hulls inspected? A.—Likewise each year. Once in every twelve months, and in the event of an accident happening to a boat, if it should sink or run aground, the inspector must come to visit the boat, because it is our duty to have an inspection of that boat.

Q.—What certificate is required on the part of engineers? A.—There is a Board of Inspectors appointed by the Dominion of Canada, and the engineers are held to pass their examination before this Board. If they are found competent, they are placed in the first, second and third classes.

Q.—Would you accept a Government certificate as sufficiently establishing the capacity of these employees? A.—Yes, sir. Besides, we cannot engage an engineer unless he have this certificate.

Q.—But do you look upon it as sufficient? A.—Yes.

Q.—Who regulates the limit in the number of passengers which each boat is allowed to carry? A.—The hull inspector.

Q.—What is the number of passengers allowed on a boat in proportion to its tonnage? A.—The inspector first makes his visit, and ascertains in what condition the life boats are, and how many of them we have on hand. He measures these boats to determine how many passengers they can carry, and after that we are obliged to have other life preservers, and he hands in a certificate stating the number of passengers that the boat can carry according to its tonnage, always taking into account the quality of the life preservers, and the life boats which we have on board.

Q.—Is the inspection of life boats, and life preservers as thorough as that of boilers and hulls? A.—Yes, sir; the wooden life preservers which we have, must

have certain dimensions, which I do not now recall, and the cork preservers must carry a certain weight in the water, that must float with a certain weight.

Q.—Precautions are, of course, taken to make sure that this life preserving apparatus supposed to be made of cork, is really made of cork? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are the life boats hung in such a manner as to be readily set afloat in case of need? A.—Yes, sir; that is well attended to.

Q.—Does the inspector make an examination of these boats and of the gear by which they are hung? A.—Yes, sir. The inspector is obliged to see to this, and the captain is obliged, in obedience to his engagement with the company, to see to it at the same time as the inspector.

Q.—What means do you resort to, to put out a fire in case of a conflagration? A.—We have hose long enough to cover the boat twice over. We are obliged to have two separate pumps propelled by the engine and one or two other pumps worked by hand; but, at all events, if there is no steam on, we make use of arms and hands.

Q.—Could the pumps be worked by steam if the boat were stationary at the quay, provided there was a head of steam? A.—Certainly. I had forgotten to say that we have the fire drill, which is carried on in this way: all the men are assigned to the pumps, and all the men are assigned to their boats in case of fire. Once a week, which generally falls on Sunday, they are obliged to let down the life boats to ascertain whether they work well, and do not take water; but, furthermore, when they reach land, and have their steam up, they play the hose on board to see if all is well. All that is done once a week.

Q.—Are there any of your boats engaged on Sunday excursions? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do they start early in the morning, or do they start only after the hours of church service? A.—We have the St. Helen's Island crossing, where we go over in the morning to carry the people living there to mass on this side. We have other boats that go on excursions, but we make as few of these as possible. Then we go to Isle Grosbois; but it is only in the afternoon.

Q.—Do passengers on these excursions behave as well as on week day trips? A.—Yes; they behave just as well, because, first, we keep no liquors at all on these boats, and we have always one or two special constables accompanying these excursions, for the maintenance of order.

Q.—What means are taken to provide that they do not sell liquor on these Sunday excursions? A.—Each boat has a captain; and he receives very strict orders, as do also the crew, and the police on board, to see that liquor is not sold on board these boats.

Q.—Have you yourself had complaints that they sold liquor on Sunday on these excursions? A.—Not I indeed; I have heard it said in the city.

Q.—But not on board your boats? A.—They are never allowed to sell liquor on Sunday.

Q.—In every case, are not the orders of the Company very strict? A.—Yes, sir.

By MR. WALSH:—

Q.—Have you anything to do with the loading of the boats? A.—Yes; it is the crew that load and unload the boats.

Q.—Do you ever take inflammable material on board the boats? A.—Well, we are guided in that respect by the insurance companies. There is powder, for instance, which we may not ship, and other such like things. Orders are given by us not to receive inflammable goods.

Q.—Do you take on hay, straw, and other articles which easily catch fire; and do you, at the same time, make use of coal oil lamps? A.—Yes; we take on hay, but we do not take on straw, that I know of. We have made the experiment of trying to burn pressed hay, and we have not succeeded in doing so, even with the help of several matches. Anyhow, the boats upon which hay is carried are boats that run during the day generally. But, if it is at night, we leave no lamp about for fear of danger.

Q.—Was it ever represented to you that the cargoes of your boats were too heavy?
 A.—No; not that I know of. Some passengers might have found sometimes that the boats were blocked up, although the weight was not enough to sink the boats. But I myself, have been navigating these thirty years, and since I have been in the service of the company, have never seen the boats so loaded that there was the least danger.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do the ferry boats crossing over to St. Helen's Island, sometimes carry more passengers than are allowed by law? A.—Well, the law allows us to carry 1,000 passengers on board the Berthier. We have never counted them, but I don't think there was ever that number, as 1,000 persons are a lot of people. We have gates to stop the rush to the boat when the crowd is too great. The hands on board and the captain are acquainted with this fact, and when they find that there are passengers sufficient, they have the gates closed.

Q.—Are you aware that one of the boats of the Company was obliged to take refuge at Longeuil, because there was too great a number of passengers on board? A.—It was not on account of that. It was a society which went on an excursion, and they ascertained that there were not more than 600 or 700 passengers on board. This was further established by the number of tickets sold. Unfortunately for themselves—and this boat is inspected to carry 1,200 persons—what caused the panic was the fall of a child into the River. Everybody rushed to the side of the boat, and, naturally, she bent over, for a boat is not a quay. Then they rushed to the other side, and on the other side the same thing happened. Then they went back to the first side, and it was thus that the panic took place. The same boat has carried to St. Anne de Beaupré 1,150 persons. We were obliged to count them. We have been caught in the Baie St. Croix during storms, and never was there a word of murmuring from anybody on board of that boat who was afraid.

Q.—Are there any captains or seconds in the service of the Company who have not the required ticket of qualification? A.—No; not one. We are obliged to exact that certificate.

Q.—Are you aware that orders have been given to make repairs on the lifeboats or in the salvage apparatus, and that the boat left the port before these orders were executed? A.—I know nothing about it, but the thing may have happened. However, I am not aware of it.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—How many hours of rest have the deck hands between Montreal and Quebec? A.—That varies. At night each one is obliged to take his watch. That is, we have fourteen men of a crew, and they are obliged to take the watch three by three. They divide the time, and arrange matters among themselves, so as to do the service in from three to four hours. Even so, I do not see how the men can sleep less than six or seven hours, even during the shortest nights.

Q.—In the event of an accident the men who work at loading and unloading the vessels can they lower the boats into the water, and row? A.—Yes; undoubtedly, and they are not the only ones. There are all the stokers, the waiters, the officials on board, who are obliged to be on board. They all learn how to row.

Q.—Do you mean to say that all the waiters are able to row the boats? A.—It is possible that there are several of the waiters who are not able to row, but out of sixty waiters there are always enough.

Q.—Do you not think that if these men were not drilled to that business, they would only stand in the way of others, in case of accident? A.—I know that very well; but the boats are managed by men who are trained once a week to teach them how to row. Once a week. They are men who are taken from among the stokers and the deckhands.

Q.—Have you machinery shops? A.—Yes; at Sorel we have machinery shops.

Q.—What wages are paid the men in this shop? A.—We employ men who work during the summer; and we pay them in that shop from \$1 to \$1.50 a day. That is for the mechanics. For the men who are up in the trade.

Q.—Are there any apprentices in that establishment? A.—No; they are stokers or helpers rather.

Q.—Are they employed only during the summer? A.—They are employed in winter. In summer we employ them on our boats, and in winter in our shops.

Q.—How much do these helpers get? A.—That varies, from 80 cents, 90 cents to \$1.10 per day according to their skill.

Q.—How many hours do they work in summer? A.—During the summer, on board of the boat, there is no set hour; and there is hardly anybody in our shop during the summer.

Q.—Some of these helpers must be better than some of the workmen themselves in the shop? A.—Yes; there are some as able and even abler, you see they do not understand this thing very well. With us a stoker goes to our shop to learn the trade of engineer. If he has not the means to go to Montreal to serve his time on small wages, he serves as stoker for some time in our shop, and at the end of several years he can go and get his engineer's certificate, having, in the mean time, earned enough to keep himself and his family, and at the end of a certain other time he will get his \$80 to \$100 a month.

Q.—How many men do you employ at Sorel in your shop? A.—There are very few men there, because we generally have our work done in other shops. We have not there what may be called a finishing shop.

Q.—Are there several of your men at Sorel who are land holders? A.—Yes, sir; there are several whom I know, among the stokers and among the deckhands, that is among those whose wages are the lowest.

Q.—What is the cost of a good workingman's house at Sorel? A.—You can buy a good workingman's house at Sorel for \$300 and pay it on time.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do your people at Sorel live respectably? A.—Yes; very respectably, and very well.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG—

Q.—How much could these men lay aside after supplying the wants of their families, their wives and their children, and paying current expenses? A.—As to that I could not say; but I believe that it depends as much on the woman as the man. Thus, I saw on the boat which I commanded, two men with three children each one lived comfortably in his own house, and the other was a tenant living miserably. I do not know whether that depended on the man or on the woman in this particular case, but he lived wretchedly.

Q.—What were the wages of these men of whom you have just spoken? A.—They made \$30 a month in summer; but, at present, they make something over and above that, and thus have not only their wages, as we allowed them to let their beds, on board of the boats, to second class passengers. They make from 25 to 30 cents a night by that. Then, during the winter, we employ these men always in preference to strangers.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Is it not true that a great number even of laboring men, at Sorel, are property owners? A.—Yes, sir; I know a great many. There is perhaps no other place in the country where there are so many.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—What is the value of land there? A.—That is according to the locality, but

in such parts as are too far from the market as, for instance, what is called St. Joseph, you can buy a fine lot for \$75 on time.

Q.—Do you know what is the price of the four-pound loaf at Sorel? A.—I could not say. It is some time since I bought any.

Q.—What is the price of beef-steak at Sorel? A.—You can get good beef at Sorel, on the market days, at from 3 to 4 cents a pound, buying by the quarter; as for steaks, the price is from 8 to 9 cents.

Q.—Are there many workmen at Sorel who buy much by the quarter? A.—I do not know many, but I do know workingmen, noted for their saving ways, who buy their flour by the barrel here, at Montreal, for their winter use.

By THE CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—The workingmen of Sorel do not live mainly on beef-steak, do they? A.—No, sir; they live on good pork and mutton. They live well.

JAMES MCCREADY, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you employ many hands in your establishment? A.—Yes; I employ over 300.

Q.—What class of boots and shoes do you manufacture? A.—All classes.

Q.—Do you employ many women in your establishment? A.—About one-quarter of the employees are women.

Q.—Are any of those hands young girls? A.—There may be a few girls—there are a few young girls, perhaps eight or ten in the factory, but none are under fourteen years, and they are just used for fixing little pieces of leather together.

Q.—What wages would a young girl earn? A.—The youngest would get \$1.50 per week, and from that amount the wages are increased as the girls get more useful.

Q.—How much wages will you allow them when they work by the piece? A.—I could not say.

Q.—What wages will a girl earn after she has been four or five years with you? A.—Do you mean women in the fitting room?

Q.—Yes. A.—They average \$4.00 a week, some earn as high as \$7.00 per week.

Q.—Do they work by the piece or by the week? A.—They work by the piece.

Q.—Take stitchers, the women who work sewing machines; what wages do they earn? A.—Those are the ones I speak of.

Q.—Are they paid so much per pair? A.—They are paid by the dozen or by the case.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Take the most skilled men who work machines; what do they earn? A.—They earn about \$12.00 per week.

Q.—I mean skilled men not including foremen? A.—Yes; they earn about \$12.00 per week.

Q.—Do you employ any unskilled men? A.—No. We may employ beginners but they must have some skill; we cannot take men right off the street into our business.

Q.—What will cutters earn in your establishment? A.—They will earn from \$7.00 to \$10.00 per week; I suppose the average will be about \$8.50 per week.

Q.—Do any of your boys attend night schools so as to obtain technical instruction? A.—I could not say as to that.

Q.—Do you know anything about such schools? A.—No; I do not.

Q.—How many stories are there in your factory? A.—There are five stories.

- Q.—How many flights of stairs are there to each story? A.—One flight.
- Q.—How wide are those stairs? A.—I could not say as to that; they are full width, I suppose five or six feet.
- Q.—Are the stairs straight or winding? A.—The stairs are perfectly straight.
- Q.—Then are they straight from one floor to another? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Have you any fire escapes? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Are they outside of the building? A.—They are first class iron fire escapes, and there are other means of safety in case of an accident occurring in the building.
- Q.—Do the outside doors of your factory open inwards or outwards? A.—I cannot say exactly, inwards I think.
- Q.—Are they locked at any time during the day? A.—No; they are not.
- Q.—Do you fine any of the employees in your establishment? A.—No.
- Q.—Do you make any deductions from their wages on account of bad work? A.—No. Bad work would not be accepted from them by the foreman—but we do not make any deduction on that account.
- Q.—Do you throw the bad work back on their hands? A.—We make them finish it in proper shape so as to make it marketable.
- Q.—Have you ever thrown work back on their hands and compelled the hands to take it and pay for it? A.—No.
- Q.—Have you separate conveniences for males and females in your factory? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Is the sanitary condition of your factory good? A.—Perfectly I think.
- Q.—How long is it since the inspector visited it? A.—He visits it every few months; he was there only a few days ago I think—he visits it often.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

- Q.—How are those conveniences for males and females separated; A.—By a partition running from the floor to the ceiling.
- Q.—Are they in the same room? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Is the entrance to those conveniences in view of both men and women? A.—Yes.
- Q.—The only division is a wooden partition? A.—That is all.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

- Q.—How much per hundred do you pay for sewing buttons on shoes? A.—I could not say. I am not manager in our factory. If you want to get those details Mr. Smith is the man to call for, he has charge of them, he is my partner.
- Q.—Are good boot and shoe fitters scarce in Montreal? A.—I think so; I think they can always get employment. At the same time, we get all we need.
- Q.—Do they receive as much wages in Montreal as people in a similar line of business do in the cities in Ontario? A.—I could not say.
- Q.—Are there many wholesales in Montreal who send goods to wholesales in Toronto and Hamilton? A.—I do not think so.
- Q.—Are there any? A.—Yes.
- Q.—You think there are some? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Do you get work done outside your shop? A.—We get some fitting done outside. We also run a factory under the name of J. Latour & Co., which makes our turn work.
- Q.—Are those parties who work at their homes immediately responsible to you, or to sub-contractors? A.—I do not think we have many working for us in their own homes; we have a factory outside that is run by a contractor. We give goods to him and he is responsible to us; his employees are responsible to him. When I am speaking about people working in our factory, I refer to those working under our own roof. We have also a factory in St. Henri, but we do not know anything about it?
- Q.—And yet you own the factory? A.—We run it.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You are not able to speak of the details connected with your establishment, I suppose? A.—Certainly not.

Q.—But you know enough to be able to carry on business, and to compete with Toronto? A.—We try to do so.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—How is it that manufacturers in Ontario can come down here and buy goods cheaper than they can manufacture them in western Canada? A.—That is a question which it is pretty hard to answer. We who are in the business consider that they come down and buy goods considerably at less than cost.

Q.—How do they do that? A.—I could not say; they manage to do it.

Q.—Is it because boots and shoes are manufactured cheaper down here? A.—I believe boots and shoes can be manufactured cheaper here than they can in Ontario.

Q.—How is that? A.—Labor is cheaper.

Q.—Do you know of any manufacturers in Ontario who send their leather down here and have it manufactured into boots and shoes, and returned, this being done at a cheaper rate than they can manufacture the goods themselves? A.—I do not know.

Q.—Do you know if any paper is used in the manufacture of boots and shoes? A.—I do not know.

By the Chairman :—

Q.—Not in the Province of Quebec? A.—I do not know.

Q.—You never heard of it being done in the Province of Quebec? A.—I have heard of stuff being used called leather board—there is some little paper used in the manufacture of it.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Do you use that for soles? A.—No.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Are you able to compete with Ontario manufacturers. A.—I think I have answered that question by saying we have done so for the last twenty years.

Q.—Would you believe the statement of Warden Massie of the Central Prison, Toronto, when he says, under oath, that Montreal and Quebec were the only two places that can make boots and shoes cheaper than he can make them in the Central Prison? A.—If he says that under oath, I would not like to contradict him. I am not acquainted with the gentleman any way.

Q.—Are there any boots manufactured in Montreal for Toronto, and the Toronto stamp put upon them? A.—I believe there are. Our fitting room, where all the girls work, with the exception of a few, is separated from the rest of the factory by a wooden partition, and is fitted up with water closets, wash basins, etc., especially for them.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Do you know whether other manufacturers in Montreal pay as high wages as you do? A.—I suppose we all pay about the same rate.

A. H. SIMMS, Shirt and Collar Maker, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Are there a large number of people employed in this industry in Montreal?

A.—Yes; quite a number.

- Q.—Are they mostly women? A.—They are mostly women.
- Q.—For collars, do you employ men or women? A.—Men.
- Q.—For all other occupations do you employ women? A.—No; our ironers are principally men.
- Q.—Do you employ many girls in your establishment? A.—Yes; we do.
- Q.—What is the age of the youngest girl you employ? A.—We have two in our factory who are going on fifteen, they are fourteen now.
- Q.—Do you say these are the youngest you have? A.—Yes.
- A.—At what are the girls generally able to work, when they go to work first? A.—It depends on the department. We have operators and trimmers. An operator earns as high as \$11.00 per week; we have operators in our place earning on an average \$11.00 a week. It is all piece work. If a girl is clever, she can make \$6.00 a week quite easily. They go to work at eight o'clock, but we do not close the door till a quarter past eight. They work till twelve, and again from one to six, and they are generally out of the building at six. We have no night work.
- Q.—That is, they work nine hours a day? A.—Not nine hours, because they are very seldom there till a quarter past eight in the morning, at which time we close the door. Then, I say, we close down at twelve o'clock, and they are always ready at twelve to go out.
- Q.—Do they have a full hour at noon? A.—Yes; we allow them ten minutes to come and go on; if it is a stormy morning we allow them half an hour.
- Q.—What do you give the girls when they begin to work? A.—Just what they earn. If we want operators, we take an experienced hand, and pay her, and she will teach half a dozen hands. They commence and will earn \$1.50, \$2.00 or \$3.00 a week. I was looking over the pay list to-day, and I find that we are paying our operatives over \$3.00 a week, that list covered two months and a half.
- Q.—Have you button hole machines? A.—Yes.
- Q.—What will operatives earn at the button hole machine? A.—They will earn \$7.00 to \$11.00 a week.
- Q.—How much do you pay per hundred for making button holes? A.—It depends on the class of goods; for ladies work we pay less than for men—I think the price is one cent a dozen.
- Q.—For button holes on men's shirts? A.—Yes; on the collars and cuffs.
- Q.—Have you any women in the laundry department of your establishment? A.—Yes; our laundry is run wholly by steam. They attend to machines. We have a foreman and three women.
- Q.—What do the women earn? A.—They get, I think, \$1.00 or \$1.25 a day.
- Q.—It is pretty hard work is it not? A.—No; not with machines. All they have to do is to put the shirts and collars into the machines, and the machines are started. For any hard work there is an engineer, and assistant engineer to do it, work such as lifting or anything like that.
- Q.—Are any women employed at ironing? A.—Yes.
- Q.—What do they earn? A.—They will earn from \$6.00 to about \$8.00, the lowest one is about \$4.50 per week. Those girls do not work up till six o'clock at night; they are not steadily employed.
- Q.—Do they work by the piece? A.—Yes; they all work by the piece.
- Q.—How much do they get for ironing one hundred shirts? A.—They receive from fifty to sixty cents.
- Q.—Is that according to the article? A.—It is according to weight.
- Q.—Is it not according to the polish they put on it? A.—No.
- Q.—What do the men ironers receive? A.—The same as women, but they get the heavy work to do. The women are principally on woollen shirts which do not require to be polished.
- Q.—How many stories are there in your factory? A.—I think there are four stories.

Q.—How many flights of stairs are there to each? A.—One in each building and I have four buildings.

Q.—Are there lateral connections between the buildings? A.—There are arches. I started in one building, and took in the next building, and so on, and made arches between each floor.

Q.—On each floor? A.—Yes; I think on each floor.

Q.—If a fire were to break out in your establishment could the employees run from one building to another and escape in that way? A.—Yes. We have all those connected except the first floor. There are two ways of getting down, two separate staircases on all the floors, except the last one, where they have to go down one staircase. We have a staircase from the top boarded off with thin boards so that the foreman could by jumping on it break through it. We take the precaution of having Babcocks and hand grenades and so on for fire protection. I might say that in our place we have a superior class of girls; it is nice, neat work and the girls are principally the daughters of mechanics or the daughters of people in reduced circumstances; they are people of the higher class of help, in such factories.

Q.—How many can sign their own names? A.—I think almost every one can write and read—they are of the higher order of work people.

Q.—Do you fine any of your employees for bad work or for any other reason? A.—When a girl is learning we overlook mistakes, but afterwards when the foreman finds that the girls are not careful he will fine them.

Q.—What has the amount of fines been in your establishment for the past year? A.—I could not say for last year. I spoke to my book-keeper about the matter and asked him about the last month, and he told me that the amount of fines was \$3.00 or \$4.00.

Q.—What percentage would that be on the total you paid for wages the last month? A.—We pay from \$7,000 so \$8,000 a month—something like that for wages.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is all your work done on the premises? A.—Not altogether, the principal part of it is done there.

Q.—What class of work do you do outside of your factory? A.—Making up the shirts. We take the different parts of a shirt such as the bands, cuffs and collars, everything is put together and the button holes made and then we give it to the farmers in the country and we employ them to stitch up the seams.

Q.—How much do they get per dozen for sewing seams on shirts? A.—It depends on the kind of shirts.

Q.—Take ordinary woolen shirts? A.—We do not manufacture them.

Q.—Take fine white shirts? A.—They get from 60 cents up to a \$1.50 a dozen. Of course, the principal part of the shirt is made for them—all the hard work on the shirt is done; what they consider the hard work is made; the collar, the neck bands, the whole of the front and the body, and all they have to do is to stitch the seams together and put on the buttons.

Q.—Is all the work in your factory piece work? A.—The principal part of it is.

Q.—How much per dozen do the girls earn on the shirts before they go to the farmers? A.—It depends on what they are working on. They get so much for trimming, so much for running, and so much for stitching. One girl makes neck bands, another cuffs, another fronts, and others different parts.

Q.—Have any of your girls ever made a shirt throughout? A.—No; we never do that.

Q.—What is the lowest amount that a good skilled woman makes in your factory on shirts? A.—We have some very skilled ones, and some not so skillful, but the lowest amount is \$3.00 per week—that is apprentices.

Q.—That will be for a week's work? A.—Yes.

Q.—And what will be the amount above that, and also the highest sums paid?

A.—About \$6.00 or \$7.00 per week, up to \$10.00 or \$11.00. Starchers make as high as \$11.50 a week, and the lowest is \$4.50.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you find a great difference among the girls, one as compared with another? A.—We may take on half a dozen learners, and two or three of the girls in three months will be better operators, and earn more, than girls who have been there three or four years.

Q.—When they have worked at your establishment for some time they become more skillful? A.—Yes. We have two sisters working there on the same work, and one will earn, in the week, nearly double what the other does.

Q.—You do not believe, then, in uniformity of pay to work people? A.—I believe in people being paid for what they can earn, and that is why we put them on piece work. Before that we paid them \$3.00 or \$4.00 a week. All the machines are kept in order and run at the expense of the concern; the hands have not to pay for any wear or tear on the machinery we supply.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—How many button holes will a young woman make in one hour? A.—It depends on how smart she is.

Q.—Take an ordinary hand on ordinary work? A.—I have not figured that out. The foreman could answer that question.

Q.—Would she be able to make 200? A.—A girl can do, I think, about 60 dozen of work in a day. That you can multiply by three. There are twenty-four button holes to the dozen, and there are sixty dozen. It is machine work, and the girl feeds the machine. It is a D 10 Wheeler and Wilson.

Q.—Do you say they receive one cent per hundred? A.—It depends whether the machine is a Singer or a Wheeler and Wilson. We pay from three-quarters of a cent a dozen up to four cents a dozen.

Q.—Is cutting done by hand or by machinery? A.—All by hand. We have separate conveniences for the hands. There is a closet on each floor for the girls. The men are kept in a different building altogether from the women, and each floor has its own wash place, and so on.

DANIEL MURPHY, saddler, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are many men employed in this industry in Montreal? A.—We generally keep ten or twelve men.

Q.—What wages will they earn at your trade? A.—The average wages is about \$8.00 a week.

Q.—What length of time do they serve at the trade? A.—Three years.

Q.—Do they become competent within three years? A.—In such places as mine they will, or I should say that men keeping such a shop as mine is. In a great many shops they do not become competent.

Q.—Is there a scarcity or a surplus of help in your trade? A.—There is a surplus.

Q.—Do many saddlers come into Montreal from abroad? A.—There are quite a number this winter looking for employment.

Q.—From what parts do they come? A.—A good many have come from around Montreal.

Q.—Do any of them come from foreign countries? A.—There have been a few.

Q.—From what country do they come? A.—A few come from the United

States, some came from the old country last summer—a few hands came from there.

Q.—Do you take any apprentices in your shop? A.—We generally keep one or two.

Q.—What do you pay an apprentice? A.—We generally take them and give them a few dollars a month the first year, and \$4.00 a month the second.

Q.—Do you know if saddlery work is done in the Reformatory? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that work sold at a lower price than regular work made in the shops? A.—It is generally sold cheaper.

Q.—Does such Reformatory work compete with the work of Montreal shops? A.—Yes; considerably.

Q.—Is the work at the Reformatory as good as that made in city shops? A.—It is not so durable.

Q.—You never had a Reformatory contract? A.—No.

Q.—Do you think if the Reformatory work in your line of business were abolished it would be the means of increasing the wages of the workmen in the city? A.—I do not know that it would increase their wages. It would prevent apprentices and men coming out of the Reformatory, without knowing their business, from injuring good mechanics. Incapable men, who know nothing, come out of the Reformatory.

Q.—Have you had in your shop apprentices who have come out of the Reformatory? A.—Yes, several.

Q.—What is your opinion in regard to them; do they work well? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are harness makers in Montreal graded? A.—Yes.

Q.—Into how many grades are the men divided? A.—We do not particularly give them a grade: we pay them generally according to the work they can do.

Q.—What will be the wages of a first class harness maker? A.—He will earn from \$12 to \$15 a week.

Q.—And what will be the wages of a third class, if they go that low? A.—His wages will be from \$5 to \$6 a week.

Q.—What class of work will those third class men be employed on? A.—You would have to keep them helping, they could not finish anything.

Q.—And repairing? A.—Yes; but they are not fit to repair for they have to be under the superintendence of a good man.

Q.—Do you make collars? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is collar making worth? A.—They work by piece work. We get the filling done outside.

Q.—You could not tell us what the average earnings of a collar maker would be? A.—He would make \$4 a day if he were a good hand.

Q.—Are there many men who work in saddlery establishments here who are such good men? A.—There are few good men.

Q.—What would be the earnings of a man making saddles? A.—What kind of saddles do you refer to, riding or harness?

Q.—Riding? A.—There is only one who is working on them—they are generally imported.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Are all the saddles used, imported? A.—The principle part of them are.

Q.—Are there not men in Montreal who are capable of making them if they had the trade here? A.—We could get men who would do it.

Q.—Is it not strange that we should import all the riding saddles? A.—There are quite a number of people in the city who will buy anything English in preference to anything manufactured in this country. They look for English goods.

Q.—They had better go then and live in England? A.—It would be better for the country if some of them went there.

EDWARD N. HENEY, wholesale dealer and manufacturer of carriages and saddlery, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How many Reformatory boys are employed at this work? A.—We employ about 50.

Q.—Do they all work in the same department? A.—No. They work in various departments.

Q.—What do you pay for the services of those boys? A.—We pay 15 cts. a day for a day of seven and a half hours.

Q.—Do you know whether the whole of this money is retained by the persons in charge of the Reformatory or whether any is given to the boys? A.—It is sometimes given to the boys when they are leaving—the Brothers give them a suit of clothes when they are leaving, which, I think, they pay for out of the money received from the work of the boys under contract.

Q.—Do you know whether any specified portion of the money goes to the boys or do the Brothers give them a certain amount, as it were, out of their charity? A.—I could not say.

Q.—For how long a time do the boys generally work for you? A.—They work about seven and a half hours a day.

Q.—I mean for what length of time, how many years? A.—From one to five years.

Q.—If a boy works for you only one year, I suppose he cannot learn very much of the trade? A.—If they are smart boys they become good workers. We are glad to employ them ourselves.

Q.—Do you employ any of the boys after their term of years has expired? A.—We do, very frequently.

Q.—They are as free to come and go, I suppose, as other boys? A.—Yes, we have a number of them in our shop now.

Q.—What is the term for which an apprentice at this business in outside shops, usually serves? A.—Three years.

Q.—Will a Reformatory boy, if he is a good intelligent boy, become an expert workman in three years? A.—He will.

Q.—Then if they remain with you five years you have practically in your service a mechanic for 15 cts. a day? A.—The service of a second class mechanic, the same as of a boy who has just finished his trade. But there are very, very few who remain that time.

Q.—What rent do you pay for your shop? A.—We pay for rent and power \$960 a year.

Q.—How much for the heating of your shop? A.—That includes heating.

Q.—Do you pay any taxes? A.—Yes.

Q.—On what do you pay taxes? A.—We pay a water tax and the business tax on the rental of the building.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You do not pay taxes on the building itself? A.—I think not. We occupy the back portion of the building and so the taxes would be very little anyway.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you know how many hours instruction during the day those boys receive? A.—In some departments they are constantly instructed. We employ the very best mechanics we can get as instructors.

Q.—How many hours of instruction outside of the shop do they get, that is instruction in education? A.—I could not say. They get a certain amount every day, a certain time.

Q.—Are the boys ever punished? A.—Not by our employees.

Q.—Are they ever punished by yourselves? A.—No. They are always in charge of one of the Brothers.

Q.—How many men do you employ in the harness shop? A.—In the harness shop we employ from 40 to 50.

Q.—How many do you employ in the wagon shop? A.—We employ about 25.

Q.—How many in the blacksmith shop? A.—The carriage shop includes the blacksmith shop. There are four departments.

Q.—Do you use any of those boys as helpers to blacksmiths? A.—We do.

Q.—How many do you employ at blacksmithing? A.—About six or eight.

Q.—Are the boys willing workers? A.—They are as willing as boys of the same class are who work outside.

Q.—Do they work with the same cheerfulness as boys who are outside? A.—They are quite as cheerful.

Q.—How do the boys look, do they appear to be well fed and well taken care of? A.—They do. We know they are well fed and well taken care of. I very frequently go through the establishment myself and see how things are managed. I consider the institution is managed in a first-class manner. There is always a Brother with the boys; they are never left alone for a moment, and if there is a bad character he cannot corrupt the better ones.

Q.—Do those boys talk together or do you compel silence? A.—They are not allowed to talk.

Q.—There is no conversation allowed except what is necessary to carry on the work? A.—No; not during working hours. There are hours for recreation; there is a base ball club in connection with the institution and there is a skating rink in winter.

Q.—Do those boys talk together or do you compel silence? A.—They are not allowed to talk.

Q.—There is no conversation allowed except what is necessary to carry on the work? A.—No; not during working hours. There are hours for recreation; there is a base ball club in connection with the institution and there is a skating rink in winter.

Q.—Do those boys talk together or do you compel silence? A.—They are not allowed to talk.

Q.—There is no conversation allowed except what is necessary to carry on the work? A.—No; not during working hours. There are hours for recreation; there is a base ball club in connection with the institution and there is a skating rink in winter.

Q.—Do those boys talk together or do you compel silence? A.—They are not allowed to talk.

Q.—There is no conversation allowed except what is necessary to carry on the work? A.—No; not during working hours. There are hours for recreation; there is a base ball club in connection with the institution and there is a skating rink in winter.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Perhaps they are made too comfortable? A.—I think they are more comfortable than when they are at home; at all events that is the case with many of them.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are the mechanics you employ first-class hands? A.—They are; the best we can get.

Q.—Are they paid by the week or by the piece? A.—They are paid by the week in the carriage shop, and in the harness shop they are paid by the piece.

Q.—In regard to the hands who work in the harness shop by the piece; how much wages do they obtain during the week on an average? A.—By the piece they earn from \$10 to \$18 a week, that is good men.

Q.—Are the \$10 a week men the lowest? A.—That is about the lowest amount they will earn by the piece.

Q.—How many men will earn \$18 a week? A.—Perhaps twenty-five per cent of the men will do that.

Q.—Do I understand then that the majority will earn \$10 a week? A.—Yes; by the piece. We employ them more frequently by the week than by the piece.

Q.—How many hours do they work by the piece? A.—Ten hours a day.

Q.—The same number of hours as by the week? A.—Yes; the same number of hours as by the week.

Q.—What is the average wages per week you pay in the carriage shop to journeymen? A.—The average is \$9.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What rent would you pay for like accommodation, as regards room, heat and power, if you had to obtain it outside in another part of the city? A.—We might pay \$300 or \$400 a year more. I desire to say that we manufacture riding

saddles and sell more of them than we do of imported saddles. Further, we make them quite as good as any imported saddle.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you manufacture those in prison? A.—No; outside.

THOMAS J. BALDON, Pay Master at Ives & Co., Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—You are engaged, I believe, as timekeeper at Ives & Co.? A.—I am superintendent and pay master.

Q.—You are pay master too? A.—Yes.

Q.—It was stated here last night that for four months one man was docked about 25 cents every pay day; will you explain that matter? A.—For what purpose?

Q.—He was docked from his earnings so much? A.—Of course, every man in our employ gets the whole amount to which he is entitled. Between two and three years ago we commenced a benefit society, not exclusively a benefit society, but an insurance scheme, and we started to compel every man in our employ to go into it and pay 25 cents as an accident insurance. We found it did not work, and we consequently dropped it, although at present any man who wants to be insured can be insured by paying 25 cents a fortnight, for which he will receive, in case of accident, \$5.00 a week during the time he is laid up on account of accident.

Q.—Now you say it is voluntary on the part of the men to join it or not? A.—Yes; entirely so.

Q.—You have some men who do insure voluntarily? A.—Yes; quite a number.

Q.—You say, that apart from 25 cents, you pay the men everything due them? A.—Certainly.

Q.—What are the ages of your moulders—do you know any man of sixty or upwards? A.—I know men over fifty-five who are moulders.

Q.—Are they in good health? A.—Yes.

Q.—With the signs of life? A.—Yes; and able to do a day's work.

Q.—What are the wages you pay to a good moulder? A.—The highest wages we pay is \$2.50 a day; we have only one man at that rate. We have not a man in the place to whom we pay less than \$1.00 a day. I produce a pay book which I shall be glad for the members of the Commission to inspect.

Q.—You say that no man in your establishment is paid less than \$1.00 a day? A.—No man.

Q.—Do any laborers do any work that moulders might do? A.—Yes. We have laborers who do work that moulders might do; we have men working on a certain class of work that we have offered to the moulders, and which has been refused by them, or, perhaps, they work on it for one day or two days, and then leave it. As we found that we could not get moulders to do the work, we put laborers on who have been working for \$1.00 a day, and in three or four months' time they have been able to earn up to \$1.90 a day. I had a man at \$1.90 a day who twelve months ago was only getting \$1.00 a day. He earned \$1.90 a day. I repeat that the moulders have refused to do that work.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—What reason did they give for refusing to work? A.—That it was too hard work.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you any boys in your establishment? A.—We have boys.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest boy? A.—Fourteen years. We may have one or two boys a little over fourteen, but that is about the age, I think these are all about sixteen.

Q.—Are the boys of fourteen put to any hard work? A.—No.

Q.—They do not carry anything very heavy? A.—No; they are employed in light hardware work, such as egg beaters, and so on.

Q.—There were complaints made, I think, in regard to your place, about the men being obliged to remain out in the cold weather, and they were liable to catch cold, at pay time? A.—That is their own fault. We can pay off the men in about three minutes. I have tried paying inside, and the simple reason that we had to stop, was that the men would crowd in, and there was no chance of paying them. It would take half an hour instead of five minutes to pay. They would not take their turns, but every man would crowd into the room. I had an arrangement made so that the men would pass in one way and out another.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You say that if the men had come by turns they could have been paid without going out of doors? A.—Yes; they could come through the shop and out to the street, home.

Q.—When you pay them out of doors you must be out of doors yourself? A.—Yes; I am the worst off. I stand upon the steps of the office, and I can pay them in five minutes if they come.

Q.—Still you would rather pay them in the office? A.—Yes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you invariably pay the men? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you ever ordered them out of the office and used abusive language to them? A.—No. I never use abusive language to them.

Q.—Have you ever ordered them out of the office? A.—Yes; and I will tell you why: I could not get them to be orderly in the office, and I have said, "If you will not keep quiet you will have to go outside, and I will pay you outside."

Q.—Were the men, on that occasion, wet with perspiration after casting—that is when you told them to go outside? A.—No. They may have been; if so, it was their own fault. When I get through paying the men that are there I take the money to any men who do not want to come out. I take it to them in the shop.

Q.—What is the object of having laboring men do the work that properly belongs to the moulding trade? A.—I do not know there is any work that properly belongs to the moulding trade.

Q.—You have stated that there is certain work that moulders refuse to do? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know the reason why they refused to do it? A.—That is their business.

Q.—Was it on account of their not receiving enough money for it? A.—No. They get more money for it here than they do in the United States.

Q.—Tell us the nature of this moulding on which you put laboring men? A.—We have several kinds of work.

Q.—Do you put them on moulding in connection with moulding machines? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will a laboring man do that kind of moulding properly, that is moulding for sewing machines? A.—If he does it to our satisfaction it is done properly. Here is a man who was a policeman; he received \$17.70 in the fortnight. In the fortnight before, he earned \$23.05.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—How long has the man been working at the moulding trade? A.—About five or six years. The week before that he earned \$10.30; the week before, \$9.90; the week before, \$11.95; another week, \$10. Moreover, he does not work every day. That is the amount of pay he drew; and, as I have said, he did not work every day.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Is the moulding shop well ventilated? A.—I was in a shop yesterday that was a better building than ours, and yet I would rather work in our shop than in the one I was in.

Q.—That is not saying, however, that your shop is well ventilated. How is the room; is it ventilated, or is there a great deal of dust? A.—There is a certain amount of dust there as there will be in every mill room.

Q.—Is there any smoke in the casting? A.—Smoke from what?

Q.—From the fires in the shop? A.—Yes; there is a certain amount of smoke there, but a man will often go and start a fire there without orders.

Q.—Is there any stove without a stove pipe? A.—We have fires there without stove pipes, as I have said, and the men will light them themselves without any authority, and, in fact, I have had to check men for doing that.

Q.—Are they supposed to be lighted when there are no stove pipes attached to them? A.—Yes.

Q.—Does it not stand to reason that the smoke does go into the shop? A.—Certainly the smoke goes into the shop.

Q.—How are the water closets in the shop? A.—There is water running through them all the time.

Q.—Is it not an open water vault near the furnace—is it not an open water closet like a trough? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think it is in a proper sanitary condition? A.—Yes. There is water running through it all the time.

Q.—How near is the drinking water to the water closet? A.—It is close by.

Q.—How close do you call that? A.—It is about eight feet away.

Q.—Is the drinking water tap attached to the boards of the water closet? A.—It is attached to the boards of the enclosure. You will find that in every house in Montreal.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—Is it true that the moulding room is so cold that the men, when they are standing with their face to the stove, are very hot, while their backs are at the same time freezing? A.—I do not think so.

Q.—Do you think it is safe to the health of the moulders to have a shop with such a temperature? A.—We never had the sand frozen once this winter, and it has been as cold weather as ever before.

Q.—Would it be possible to make a good casting if the sand was frozen? A.—No.

JAMES G. WOLGER, second overseer in the weaving room, Hochelaga Cotton Mills, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How long have you been in the employ of the Hochelaga Cotton Mill Co.? A.—Four years.

Q.—Have you always been overseer during the four years? A.—I have been second overseer in the weaving room there for four years.

Q.—Can you tell us what is the general condition of the factory? A.—Yes. In what respect do you mean?

Q.—I mean in regard to its general condition as a factory for people to work in? A.—The general condition, as one to work in, is very good indeed. It is as good as any other mill I ever worked in, and I have worked in mills for forty years, and been overseer in various mills in the United States for twenty years.

Q.—Do you consider a mill is in a very good condition when there are no separate conveniences for men and women? A.—No, I cannot say I do, in that respect; still there are many mills of that kind. It would perhaps be as well if there were separate conveniences, but there is a partition running from the floor to the ceiling.

Q.—Are the doors of those conveniences in the same room? A.—Yes.
Q.—Do you consider a factory in a good condition that has not separate entrances for males and females? A.—For the water closets do you mean?

Q.—Yes, and for the mill itself? A.—I have never seen any cotton mills with separate entrances for males and females. I have to see the first one yet in my life.

Q.—As a rule, are the employees in this mill of good moral character? A.—They are as good as any others in any mill I have ever worked in, and I can say for one, that I can work in the Hochelaga Cotton Mills and be just as good a Christian perhaps, as any man in Montreal, and I consider we have just as good people in the mill, and girls just as virtuous as anywhere else. I would not look with complacency on anything that was immoral. I have a girl and son there and I would not allow them to remain there a moment if I thought anything occurred that would tend to contaminate them and make bad characters of them; far from it.

Q.—Have you ever seen anything indecent or immoral during the years you have occupied the present position in your factory? A.—I never have.

Q.—Have you ever seen unmarried women working in the factory whose condition rendered them unfit for young people to work with? A.—I have; but it has been in cases where they have actually begged for work, and remained longer on that account, than they would have, on account of their poverty.

Q.—Has that frequently occurred? A.—Not very frequently, very seldom.

Q.—Has there been sufficient of it do you think to give other operatives a bad name with the public? A.—We had an instance there a few weeks ago of a girl who came from the United States.

Q.—Tell us if there has been sufficient of that kind of thing to lead the public to suppose that it is carried on to any great extent? A.—I would not suppose so.

Q.—What is the general language of the operatives used in addressing one another? A.—It is very good so far as I hear.

Q.—Have you ever heard anything indecent? A.—No.

Q.—Have you ever heard anyone cursing or swearing? A.—No.

Q.—Have you any knowledge of St. Anne Mill? A.—Very little.

Q.—You cannot speak as to the condition of the work people employed there? A.—No.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—In regard to the females you saw in that state, how long had they been employed in the factory? A.—A very short time, five or six weeks; they were in that state when they came.

Q.—Do you know why they came to reside in Montreal? A.—We had one who came from Lowell, Massachussets.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—How many were in that state in your factory? A.—I have not seen three or four since I have been there.

Q.—Do you mean that three or four came from Lowell? A.—One came from Lowell.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do the young girls and boys use the same convenience that men and women use? A.—Yes.

Q.—There is no attempt to separate the sexes among the children? A.—No. I think that the reports in the newspapers reflected on me and on my family, and certainly I would not allow my children to work in the factory if such an amount of immorality was practised as is represented in the newspapers.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Could immorality be practised in the mill without your knowledge? A.—Certainly it could.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—As a father of a family, would you think it proper to have a daughter of yours associating and working with girls in the family way? A.—They do not associate with them.

Q.—I mean as their daily associates, because they would be working together? A.—I beg leave to say——

Q.—You will answer the question as I put it, and answer it in your own way. A.—I would not think it had a very good influence of course.

Q.—Would you employ such a girl in your own house as a domestic servant? A.—I would not.

Q.—Do the directors of your company visit the mill, from story to story, very often in the year? A.—I have seen them in there several times.

Q.—Do they visit the whole building, and how often a year do they visit it? A.—I cannot tell you whether they visit the whole building or not. I know they come into the weaving room.

Q.—That is all you know? A.—Yes.

Q.—In the absence of the directors—and you say you have not seen them except in the weaving room—who is responsible for the conduct of the factory? A.—I suppose the manager is.

Q.—Who is the manager? What is his name? A.—Mr. James Jackson is the present manager; Mr. Whitehead was the manager.

Q.—You have stated to us, that some of those girls were put in at their own request. We have heard from Mr. Jackson, that when he found that girls of that kind were in the factory he fired them out—or some expression of that kind he used—or most of them at all events. A.—Mr. Shannon must always send them out when he finds them.

Q.—How is it that those girls were put in without Mr. Jackson knowing it? A.—I hire help sometimes. They come in and plead poverty, and in case I can do so I set them to work. The overseers do so. Sometimes we find out the condition of the girls.

Q.—How do you explain the fact that the girls in the family way were admitted to the factory, at their request, and that at the same time your superintendent has stated that when he found out that such girls were in the employ of the Company he fired them out? A.—We did not know they were in that condition. I simply hired them at their request.

Q.—I am asking you how you explain this, that you say those girls were engaged at their request, and the same time Mr. Jackson states that when he found that such girls were employed he turned them out? How do you explain that? A.—He may have ordered some out without it coming to my knowledge. There are people discharged, and I know nothing about it.

Q.—Do you follow boys and girls when they go out of the factory at night, when they are dismissed at night? A.—I am generally the last one out.

Q.—You do not know how those conduct themselves who have gone out before you? A.—They are going out when I am sometimes.

Q.—You have stated you are the last one out; if you are the last man out how can you tell in regard to the conduct of those who have gone out before you? A.—I am the last man out of the room.

Q.—As you say you are the last man out, how can you tell us of the conduct of those who went out first? A.—I could not tell anything about it.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—How long were the girls you noticed in that way in the factory before you noticed it? A.—Some two or three weeks.

Q.—Had you the power to discharge them? A.—No, I had not the authority to discharge them. The overseers discharged them.

Q.—Did you inform the overseer? A.—Yes.

Q.—How long afterwards was it that they were discharged? A.—They were discharged right away.

Q.—Was it understood that they were discharged for that reason? A.—The gentleman told them what they were discharged for.

Q.—Was it understood by you that they were discharged for that reason? A.—

Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—When a girl complains of the foreman, to whom must she appeal for redress? A.—She can appeal to the manager for redress.

Q.—Is there not a Mr. Cook who has something to do with discharging them? A.—No; he is at the other mill.

Q.—Have you ever heard of any appeal to the manager, or to the directors, and as to what they have done in the case? A.—No.

Q.—Are you aware that directors have, on any single occasion, interfered in any complaint made, it having been made in the mill? A.—No.

Q.—Never? A.—No.

Q.—Then can you tell us, so far as you are concerned, what the directors do about the establishment? A.—I could not.

Q.—Then so far as you are concerned, it is the same thing as if there were no directors in your work, in the mill? A.—So far as I am concerned, I do not know anything about it.

Q.—So far as you are concerned, it does not appear that the directors make any difference whatever? A.—Not to me, that I know of.

Q.—None in regard to your work? A.—No.

Q.—Then, so far as the working of the mill is concerned, it is carried on by the superintendent, and no one else? A.—By the superintendent and overseer.

Q.—And without the directors appearing in it, so far as you are concerned? A.—Apparently so, of course.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Outside of those three or four cases you have mentioned, have you ever seen anything in the mill of an immoral character? A.—No.

Q.—Is every care taken to prevent any immorality among the employees at the mill? A.—I take every opportunity I can to prevent it, but I have never seen anything of the kind.

(Translation.)

EVANGELISTE MAJOR, Carriage Maker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How many years have you worked, as a carriage maker at Montreal? A.—
For the last fourteen years.

Q.—How many hands do you employ? A.—I have nineteen.

Q.—Have you any apprentices? A.—I have three.

Q.—Are your apprentices engaged by contract? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Have you ever engaged apprentices by contract? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Have you any objection to that? A.—No; I have no objection. I some-
times wanted to have a written agreement with some of them, but they preferred
not having any.

Q.—How long must an apprentice serve before becoming a journeyman? A.—
There are certain lines, such as the forge, where an apprentice must serve four or five
years.

Q.—For the wood work, how long should he serve? A.—For the wood work
he may have to serve four years as well.

Q.—As a general rule, do the apprentices engaged in your factory, finish their
time with the same employer? A.—I have never seen any with us who finished their
time.

Q.—Is it customary in all the shops that the apprentices do not finish their time?
A.—Yes; formerly, we did finish our time. When I served my apprenticeship I
finished my time, because the apprentices lodged and boarded with their employers.
To-day, the apprentices are on a level with the journeymen, they work from seven in
the morning till six in the evening, but, in my time, we worked from five o'clock to
nine o'clock.

Q.—Do you believe that, if this system were followed to-day, better journeymen
would be turned out at the end of the apprenticeship? A.—Yes; certainly.

Q.—Would you be in favor of returning to that ancient method? A.—Speak-
ing generally, I think it would be the best plan for apprentices. In that way, we
should have good mechanics, coming out of their apprenticeship.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How, think you, would the family—the father, and the mother, like that, at
the present time? A.—I do not know, I have no idea.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you find that, in general, too many apprentices are employed in a shop?
A.—Not to my knowledge, here in Montreal.

Q.—What is the average wages paid to men working at the forge? A.—That
goes according to the ability of the workingman. There are some who make \$15.00
others \$11.00, and others are as low as \$8.00.

Q.—Is that by the week? A.—Yes; that is by the week.

Q.—Are the helpers paid by the employers? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are there blacksmiths who work by the piece in your trade? A.—I think
there are some at Mr. Roy's.

Q.—But you have none at your place? A.—No; not with us.

Q.—How do the hands employed at wood work do their work; is it by the piece
or by the day? A.—I have them working both by the day, and by the piece.

Q.—How much do these men who work by the piece make, on an average,
in one week? A.—I have had men who made \$12.00 in four days, that is, \$3.00 a
day.

Q.—How many hours do they work every day? A.—The one I just spoke of

worked from half past seven in the morning, until five o'clock in the afternoon, thus making about nine hours.

Q.—Did he do a special work? A.—It was work in the usual business of the shop.

Q.—How do you pay your men—by the week? A.—Yes; by the week.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—On what day do you pay them? A.—On Saturday.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—In your manufactory, I believe, that when a man works by the piece, and has a certain number of days to work, he turns out a certain portion of a carriage which takes him several days? A.—Some of them are long.

Q.—How much do you pay such men; do you pay them when their work is done? A.—There are some who ask for money on Saturdays, and they are given what they want. There are others who wait till the job is finished.

Q.—Does it not frequently happen that men working by the piece cannot go on with their work for the want of material? A.—Yes; I rather think that may happen sometimes, because it would require a capital of \$50,000 to make the employer keep twenty-five men continually going, without sometimes having to wait. But, oftentimes, too, the men themselves lose more time by talking in the shop than on account of delay in the routine of the shop.

Q.—Do you know whether there is carriage making at the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Does the work turned out at the Reformatory enter into direct competition with work done in the city? A.—Yes; with work done in the shops.

Q.—Could you give an example of this; a comparison of the prices of goods sent out from the Reformatory with the prices of goods manufactured in the city factories? A.—Yes; I can give you an idea of it. In the first place, for a piece of work in buggies, done at the Reformatory, they will sell you the body of a buggy, painted and varnished, for \$5; and, in the shops, for the same work by the regular hands, I have paid as much as \$12 dollars for the wood work alone.

Q.—For what kind of carriage body? A.—The piano box.

Q.—What is the quality of these piano boxes turned out at the Reformatory? A.—From what I have seen in vehicles which I repaired at my own place, they were of commonest stuff.

Q.—And still these vehicles go into competition with such piano boxes as you can manufacture? A.—Yes. But it is not specially for the piano box; there are also all the one-seated buggies which enter into competition.

Q.—To what do you attribute the low prices of the articles turned out at the Reformatory? A.—I cannot directly say whether it is on account of the children employed there, or because the expenses are almost nothing at the Reformatory. Whatever the reason may be, I do not know what it is.

Q.—At all events, you feel the result of the competition? A.—Yes; on the other hand, we have the owner at the Reformatory—the one who supplies the money for the manufacture of carriages, a tradesman who retails, and buys goods at low prices. Then he puts these together for the profits while he sells us goods not put together. After what I have seen, and what I could understand, they realize the same profits on buggies manufactured at the Reformatory, as on the pieces of work sold by carriage makers.

Q.—Are there any carriages imported from the United States to Montreal? A.—Very few.

Q.—Can you compete in prices with the United States? Or do the vehicles made at Montreal suit better the climate and the roads of Montreal? A.—We make our vehicles so that they can stand more wear and tear.

Q.—Do you do any business outside of Montreal? A.—No, sir; that is, we do not do much. The trade is small.

Q.—Have you ever had, in your shop, young men who came out of the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How many years, on an average, had they served in the carriage factory of the Reformatory? A.—I do not know how long they served, but I know that they served a certain time. They called themselves journeymen from the apprenticeship that they had made there.

Q.—Is that long since? A.—I think it was about two years last spring.

Q.—Did they know their trade? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Could they earn their livelihood? A.—I had one at \$5 a week, and another at \$4; and I thought they were overpaid.

Q.—How much do you think that an apprentice, who had served his time in a shop in the city, might have earned, at the same age, as these boys that you speak of? A.—If a lad is pretty well started in his trade, he can make from \$6.00 to \$7.00 a week, after having served his time.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—When you say that you would like to return to the former system of apprenticeship, do you mean to say that young men should work from five o'clock in the morning till seven o'clock in the evening? A.—No. That is too much for a young man. I did that work myself, and I know that is too heavy.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—To whom are the goods made at the Reformatory sold? A.—I have seen much of these goods in Montreal, but do not know to whom they are sold.

Q.—Are these goods sold throughout the Dominion? A.—I do not know. I have heard it said that some goods were sent to Huntingdon, and that they stopped there without being sold.

(Translation.)

FRANÇOIS PIGEON, Saddle Maker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How many years have you been a saddle maker in Montreal? A.—For the last twenty-six years.

Q.—Have you ever worked at the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir; I have worked twice at the Reformatory.

Q.—How long is it since you worked at the Reformatory? A.—The first time I worked there for nearly two years, and I worked again last summer.

Q.—You are still there? A.—No; I left there on Saturday. The first time I was foreman, and the second time also. I mean to say that I was foreman in the store, and afterwards I was sent there with the same men that I had in the store, and they did not keep their promise.

Q.—You left on Saturday? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Of your own accord? A.—No. That is, I had engaged with the boss from last spring, dating for one year. I was to have left for the United States. I was employed in the back of the store as foreman. It was I who had started the machinery. I advertised in the United States. Then I went to Guelph, in Ontario, with goods, and I carried off four first prizes in my line, and one in saddles, after I had put all the machinery in order.

Q.—Why did you leave on Saturday? A.—I left because the boss had engaged

me for one year, and the foreman wanted to make me work by the piece. I told him that I had nothing to do with him; that the boss had sent me there with my men, and that he had nothing else but to keep the time.

Q.—Were you working by the week before that? A.—Yes; I was working by the week. I was engaged for one year.

Q.—And you were unwilling to take work by the piece? A.—No.

Q.—Then you left, and your agreement was broken? A.—I left because I would not work by the piece.

Q.—Now, will you tell us whether the apprentices learn their trade at the Reformatory? A.—No; they do not learn it at all.

Q.—While you worked at the Reformatory what was the term of service of the young lads—that is, how many years had they been there? A.—I could not tell you the time they had been there, but there were apprentices who had been there for three or four years, and others for five years.

Q.—Did they know their trade as apprentices who had served their time in the city factories, for three, four or five years? A.—No; they learn nothing except one branch, and even that they know very little about.

Q.—What branch do they learn? A.—They learn only how to quilt and even that they do not learn, because the man who teaches them knows nothing about it himself.

Q.—Do they quilt by hand or by machinery? A.—They quilt both by hand and by machinery.

Q.—Do you think that an apprentice who has served three, four or five years at the Reformatory, and who is set free, can earn his livelihood on leaving? A.—No, sir.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What kind of work is generally given the boys at the Reformatory? A.—They are given one kind of work only—that is, that of quilting. They have some other sort of heavy work, but it does not amount to anything. In two days a man who is skillful can learn that.

Q.—Are they taught cutting? A.—No, sir. They are taught only what I have told you.

Q.—Do they make any repairs at the Reformatory? A.—No, sir.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What are the average wages of saddle makers at Montreal? A.—That varies. There are different prices in different shops. The prices are from \$4, \$5, up to \$10, some have \$12 and others \$15 a week. I know of no one else but myself who gets \$15 in his branch.

Q.—Are those who make \$15 the foremen? A.—Yes; they kept me as foreman.

Q.—What do those workmen do who only make four or five dollars a week? A.—All they do is to quilt like the apprentices.

Q.—You do not regard them as journeymen knowing their trade? A.—No, sir. They are very scarce here in Montreal, the men who know their trade.

Q.—Workmen in Montreal, who are reputed able, can they make saddles and harness? A.—A workman who is skillful should be able to do all that is set before him in the way of harness making.

Q.—What cause do you assign for the scarcity of able workingmen in Montreal? A.—Yes; that comes of their not being properly taught in the shops where they work. If the foremen knew their trade and taught the apprentices rightly, the latter would know better how to work. There is a large number who have no trade and they cannot well teach the apprentices.

Q.—Do you think that if the employers took the trouble of teaching workingmen their trade and to make good mechanics of them, we should be able to manufacture goods here which we are obliged to import to-day? A.—Certainly, if the

men learned their trade we should have good artisans, and men would not be forced to go to the United States.

Q.—Have you been to the United States? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How many years were you in the United States? A.—I was eight years at one time, and one year and a-half at New York.

Q.—Is that long ago? A.—No; it is not yet three years since I came back from Chicago.

Q.—How much are the good workmen paid in the United States? A.—The prices are \$12, \$15, \$18 and \$20 a week.

Q.—Do you believe that a man of your ability, making \$15 a week here in Montreal, is not as good as a man earning \$20 in the United States? A.—I do not see why he should not be so.

Q.—Do you live as well in Montreal with \$15 as you live in the United States for \$20? A.—Yes; I can live just as well. One can live in finer style when he has more money, but rents are, at present, not higher in the United States than here and one is better treated in the American Territory than he is in this country.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Has a good workman any trouble in getting work here in Montreal? A.—Yes; there is trouble in the shops on account of customers. There are very few shops that can pay the wages of a good mechanic. Furthermore, if there is any way of driving them out it is done.

Q.—Why? A.—Because they are afraid that these men may open shops for themselves and thus do them harm.

(Translation).

JEAN BAPTISTE BLANCHET, Blacksmith of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Where are you working? A.—At the Reformatory School.

Q.—How many blacksmiths are engaged there? A.—There are three working at the fire.

Q.—I speak of the men, not of the apprentices? A.—I think we are seven.

Q.—How many apprentices are there? A.—I could not tell exactly how many there are. I think there are thirteen or fourteen.

Q.—Will you tell us what work the apprentices do? Do they work at the fire? A.—They do all sorts of work.

Q.—Do they work at the fire? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Are there any pains taken to teach these lads the trade? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you believe, from what you know of those working with you, that they are able to make their living, after leaving the school? A.—Not all.

Q.—Does that depend on the superior intelligence and industry of some over others? A.—Yes, it depends on that.

Q.—Are pains taken to teach them their trade? A.—Those who want to learn can do so; they get teaching enough.

Q.—Is the work hard for their age? A.—No, sir.

Q.—What wages do you make? A.—One dollar a day.

Q.—Are the children working in the shop taught to forge, or are they taught only to set? A.—Only to ———

Q.—They are not blacksmiths then? A.—No; they are only finishing smiths.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are any of these boys made use of to help in the forge? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—As helps to the smith? A.—Yes, sir.

By MR. GIBSON:—

Q.—How can they be taught the blacksmiths trade, if they are not allowed to work at the fire? A.—I cannot say that they are taught the blacksmiths trade. They are only finishers.

Q.—They are taught only to be helpers? A.—Yes; to help in finishing carriages.

(Translation.)

JOSEPH PARENT, Carriage Upholsterer, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are upholsterers employed, in a regular manner, in carriage factories, or do they work by the piece in the factories? A.—There are some who work by the piece, others by the day.

Q.—What are the average wages paid in Montreal, to upholsterers working by the day? A.—As for myself, I have earned twenty-five to thirty-five dollars a week, but, at the present time, when we make fifteen dollars a week, it is as much as we can get with the system of apprentices, and, futhermore, on account of the Reformatory.

Q.—How many years ago was it that you earned from twenty-five to thirty-five dollars a week? A.—That is five years ago.

Q.—Since then, the wages have gone down? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What are your working hours? A.—Ten hours when we work by the day.

Q.—Do the men who work by the piece make heavier weeks than those who work by the day? A.—Certainly; I earned the wages which I just mentioned to you, and, at present, I make only thirteen dollars and a-half a week.

Q.—But, at present, if you worked by the piece, would you make more? A.—I should make a little more.

Q.—Would you be obliged to work more than ten hours a day in order to make thirteen dollars and a-half a week? A.—I would earn the same wages as usual.

Q.—You say there are too many apprentices—could you tell, thereabouts, how many carriage upholsterers there are in Montreal, and how many apprentices there are, to the best of your knowledge? A.—I can answer, I think, for the apprentices; there are, to the best of my knowledge, at least ten. That is not many, indeed, but you see, carriage upholsterers are scarce.

Q.—How many upholsterers are there? A.—We are about forty or fifty in number. I do not even know if we are that many, and I put the figure as high as possible.

Q.—Are you of opinion that ten apprentices could stand in the way of work done by forty men? A.—Yes; certainly, because I count them all together—the apprentices and the journeymen. They are forty in all.

Q.—How many apprentices are there in the forty? A.—In the forty, I tell you that there are about ten apprentices, who stand in our way; there are others who do us no harm. Those who do us injury are those who have no board to pay, and have no clothing to pay, because their parents have means to dress them, and provided they cover their expenses, they are all right, but for us it is a matter of injury.

Q.—Do they get lower wages than others? A.—Certainly; those apprentices do not get much, because they work almost for nothing and that is what spoils our prices.

Q.—Do apprentices, as a general rule, learn their trade in the upholstery shops?
A.—No, sir.

Q.—Why? Are they not taught? A.—There is no agreement drawn up in writing, and they leave as soon as they are skilful enough to undertake a job, they go and spoil the prices, and there is no more about it.

Q.—In your opinion, how many years must one serve to become a good journey-man upholsterer? A.—Four years.

Q.—Did you serve your four years, yourself? A.—No, sir; I did not serve any time at all.

Q.—How then did you learn your trade? A.—I learned it by the points which my comrades gave me. I was alone and had no kindred, and my comrades sacrificed their good will to teach me the trade.

Q.—At the end of how many years were you able to earn your living as journey-man upholsterer? How long did you learn or serve? A.—I am fifteen years in the trade, and have been earning fair wages for the past nine years.

Q.—So that you served about six years of apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you worked at the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you think that the young people learn the trade there? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Then they are not treated otherwise than in the other shops, as you have just said that an apprentice does not learn the trade in the other factories?
A.—The trade is learned in the other shops because there is a certain written covenant whereby four years of apprenticeship must be given; but in the Reformatory some are there only for one year, others for two years, others for three years; and if they are made to work at the upholsterers' trade and they have served only one year, they cannot know their trade at the end of that year.

Q.—Have you any other points to give the Commission? A.—No.

(Translation.)

February 22nd, 1888.

EMILE BRUNET, of Montreal, carriage upholsterer, sworn:—

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have been in the trade for many years, have you not? A.—For forty-six years.

Q.—You have heard the evidence of the preceding witness? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Is there anything in his statements concerning the trade, you would like to contradict, or have you anything further to add? A.—As to first-class workmen, there are only seven or eight; as for common work, I know nothing of it.

Q.—These men know their trade as well as any other workmen? A.—Among upholsterers, some know their trade, and some do not know it.

Q.—I am speaking of first-class workmen? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you worked in the United State? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Is it long since? A.—About ten years ago, or may be more.

Q.—When did you work in the United States? A.—I work there in eighteen hundred and seventy-four.

Q.—Do you know, as a fact, whether upholsterers' wages are higher in the United States than they are in Montreal? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—What is the average of wages paid to able workmen here? A.—Some work by the piece, and some by the day.

Q.—Those that work by the day? A.—Working by the day, they earn about two dollars a day.

- Q.—Did they earn more than that a few years ago? A.—Not that I remember.
- Q.—Do those that work by the piece, earn more than that, in some weeks, when there is work? A.—Yes, the hours are longer.
- Q.—How are, men by the piece, paid? Are they paid when their job is finished? A.—Not always.
- Q.—Is not that one of the chief causes of complaint of the working upholsterers? A.—Many complain of it.
- Q.—Your pieces of work, generally take a long time to do, do they not? A.—Yes, Sir.
- Q.—And the general demand is to have the piece paid for as soon as it is done? A.—Yes, we expect to be paid.
- Q.—Is it the general rule not to pay immediately, or is that the exception? A.—It is the exception.
- Q.—Do working upholsterers, generally speaking, prefer to work by the piece or by the day? A.—They nearly always prefer to work by the piece. It is the custom.
- Q.—Do good workmen have constant employment? A.—Yes, Sir.
- Sir, I speak of first-class work.
- Q.—If I am not mistaken, they are even sought after, are they not? A.—Yes, Sir; I speak of first-class work.
- Q.—First-class upholsterers do not remain in one particular shop, do they; they go about from shop to shop as they find work? A.—No; they remain in shops. Some have one or two shops.
- Q.—In your opinion, are upholsterers being taught in such a way as to become first-class journeymen when their apprenticeship is finished? A.—They are scarce enough. The reason is, that there are too few apprentices with good workmen.
- Q.—Did you, yourself, serve your time? A.—Yes, Sir.
- Q.—How many years did you serve? A.—Eight years.
- Q.—Do you not believe that those eight years you served are just the reason why you became a good workman? A.—During three or four of those years I did next to nothing, and the five other years I worked.
- Q.—Were you engaged for eight years by contract? A.—No, sir.
- Q.—For how long a time were you engaged? Do you remember? A.—Till I was twenty-one.
- Q.—Is there anything you would suggest to the Commission in regard to your trade? A.—I would like to have the goods used in making carriages and which are not manufactured here, imported free of duty.
- Q.—What goods are those? A.—Cloth and several kinds of leather.
- Q.—Could these goods not be manufactured in Canada? A.—It would not pay. There are English and French moroccos which are not made in Canada.
- Q.—Do you not know that morocco is manufactured in Montreal? A.—Not kid morocco, we cannot compete with the United States in the goods we have here.
- Q.—But that does not interfere with the manufacture of carriages, in this sense that, imported carriages must pay at least as high duties as would be paid on imported goods? A.—The imported goods are better, and the carriages also.
- Q.—That is not my question, I say that the duties now levied on morocco, and on cloths should not interfere with the manufacture of carriages in Montreal, since every carriage upholstered in cloth or morocco would likewise pay duties if they were imported into Montreal? A.—No; not in that case.
- Q.—Where do you procure your morocco? A.—Some comes from London and some from Paris.
- Q.—You are of opinion that apprentices should serve four years, and you would be in favor of binding them by contract? A.—Yes.
- Q.—And what would you do if they were to leave? A.—If they could not be caught, we would let them go.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Is it not a fact that the greater number of apprentices run away? A.—
They do not run away at the present time, for they are not bound.

Q.—But those that are bound? A.—I do not know of any that are bound at the present time.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—They are taken into the shops to help, and when they want to leave they do so? A.—Yes.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Do you use much morocco in upholstering? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What sort of vehicle do you upholster with morocco? A.—They are what are called “Landaus” and “Coupés.”

Q.—Are these carriages for private families? A.—Yes, sir.

(Translation.)

HENRI LAMOUREUX, labourer, of Montreal, sworn :

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—What work are you doing? A.—I shovel coal for the cars of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Q.—Is that very hard work? A.—It is even harder work than that which is done on board of the ships, or on the wharves, in summer.

Q.—Can you tell us what wages a labourer makes at that work? A.—One dollar and twenty-five cents a day.

Q.—Are you ever obliged to work at night? A.—Often.

Q.—How much more do you get for night work than you do for day work? A.—I have worked there since last spring and in the course of the summer. When we worked at night, we always had our time and a half, except one hour that they took off from the night.

Q.—You receive the same price for night work, in winter as in summer? A.—No; not at the present time, because at present we are obliged to work from six o'clock in the morning until seven o'clock at night, and keep steadily at work, and we are paid only ten hours' wages.

Q.—Have you a regular quantity of coal that you must shovel during the day? A.—Not always a regular quantity, because it often happens that we are short of cars, and we are obliged to wait, and it often happens that we must load cars continuously. The only time we have to lose is when the cars are being shifted from their platforms. The regular rule is that two men must load four cars, during one day; two cars during a half day—twenty two cars.

Q.—Are you paid for the time that the cars take to switch? A.—Yes.

Q.—While the cars are switching have you a shelter to go to? A.—In the event of rain, we can always take shelter at the beginning of a shower, but at the end of the rain, we are worse off for shelter than if we were outside, because the place where we stand is a simple rough platform.

Q.—Is it required that the men shall work at night whether they like it or not? A.—In certain cases, when they are hard pushed for time, they require us to work at night, and threaten to dismiss the men, if they refuse to work. Something of this kind happened last fall. A young man, after doing his work during the whole

day, and after working in coals that were in flames, in the midst of smoke and gas, was sent away, in the evening, for refusing to work.

Q.—How is the time kept—is it by men employed in the yard? A.—In the morning, when we go in, they hand us a blank cheque, with a number on it, and the same number is entered in the time book. The party charged to keep the time, at the least thing that happens in regard to the time of some of the men who come in or are absent, gets all mixed up, and, besides, the party is too old to understand what he is doing.

Q.—Have you suffered from this state of things? A.—I have already suffered and I know men, who have their place steady, who do no overtime, and whose time it is the simplest thing to keep, who have had five dollars a month kept back from them—although the money was returned to them afterwards.

Q.—Are the men paid in full? Or, if not, what is the proportion of their wages that is kept back. A.—A fortnight's pay is kept in arrear. I would like to observe to the Commission that there are men working in our own department, who are obliged to work on a stretch of thirteen hours, that is to say, from six o'clock in the evening until seven o'clock in the morning, and who receive nothing extra for it.

Q.—How much do they get for the night? A.—They get the same price as we do, one dollar and twenty-five cents.

Q.—Are men, who have work during the day, bound to work the following night? A.—Yes, sir; in rushing times. The men who are obliged to keep their places steady, work eleven hours, because during their dinner hours they are obliged to stay there, as they eat their dinner on the spot.

Q.—Have you known any men who have worked more than twenty-four hours consecutively—that is, who have worked. A.—We have done twenty-four hour's work. And as for me, I have worked since yesterday morning until six o'clock this evening.

Q.—That makes 36 hours? A.—Yes; I had my dinner hours, and that made 30 hours of work.

Q.—You got no extra pay for that? A.—No extra pay, in the course of the winter. It is not as in the other departments, where the men are in the habit of being paid extra. I would also observe that we have a foreman. When two men have worked to load 80 tons of coal, in one day, he went the length of saying that two men, by working a little harder, could reach the fifth car, and thus load 100 tons.

Q.—Is that the same foreman whom you had from yesterday morning until this evening, or do the foremen change about? A.—No; the foremen do not change.

Q.—Do the foremen stop on the ground the whole time or do they go and take some hours of rest? A.—The foreman does not remain with us during the night, because we are driven by work, and the work must be done, or we are reported the next morning.

Q.—Does the foreman go to bed? A.—Yes, sir; he goes to bed.

WILLIAM KEYS, Machinist, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How long have you worked at the trade of machinist? A.—About fifteen years.

Q.—In the City of Montreal? A.—Most part of that time in the City of Montreal and some part in other places.

Q.—Can you give us an idea as to what the earnings of a machinist in Montreal are? A.—I would say the average pay would be about \$10 a week.

Q.—Do machinists get pretty steady employment? A.—They get pretty steady employment.

Q.—Is there any difficulty in getting skilled machinists? A.—I guess it is a difficult matter just now; they do not require many skilled mechanics nowadays.

Q.—Has the condition of the trade so altered that men do not need to be so skilled now as formerly? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know if the working men of Montreal have any difficulty in obtaining their pay? A.—Yes; I have had some difficulty myself.

Q.—Will you please tell under what circumstances that difficulty occurred? A.—There is one particular case I remember, I did some work for a gentleman in the city. I fitted up a mine for him at Templeton up near Ottawa—I prepared his machinery and he refused to pay me for what work I did here. I had him brought before the Recorder's Court; but he only paid me for the work I had done for him at Templeton and I gave him a receipt. He made up the receipt himself stating: "Received from so and so the sum of so much for work done and services rendered at Templeton." I afterwards sued him in Court for the work I had done in Montreal. When the case came before the Recorder's Court and when he came into the witness box he denied that he owed me anything and he produced the receipt, and the words "and in Montreal" were added to the receipt, this having been done in the meantime. The gentleman was standing in the witness box, when I held the receipt up and asked if he could swear that all the words were put there when I signed it, he stated distinctly that he thought I was a dangerous man and that he had added those words after he left my office. Notwithstanding that, the case was dismissed.

Q.—Did you ever get your money for the work done? A.—I did. I instructed a lawyer to have a warrant issued for his arrest for forgery. Instead of issuing a warrant a private hearing took place at which the gentleman who sat on the bench at the time was present—and some years ago I did not have enough money to push a criminal case, which my lawyer told me would cost \$100. I could not find the money and so the case was finally settled rather than have it go any further.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Did you get all your money? A.—Yes; I got it all.

Q.—Did you lose the costs? A.—No; they were only too glad to pay the whole thing when they saw I was determined to push it.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you ever seen much of an immoral nature in factories? A.—I have seen something immoral there on several occasions.

Q.—To what extent do you think immorality prevails in factories? A.—To a considerable extent. There is only one case I remember particularly. There was a closet used by both males and females. I saw a man go in there once and leave the door unfastened and when he was there a young woman opened the door to go in. I thought that was very immoral.

Q.—Do you know if the girl had any knowledge of the man being there? A.—I feel pretty sure she did not.

Q.—Did she go in? A.—No; she slammed the door when she saw he was there.

Q.—Are there factories in Montreal where the conveniences are used promiscuously by men and women? A.—There are quite a number. I understand they have been changed recently; that is, a good many have been changed.

Q.—Generally speaking, what is the sanitary condition of the workshops in Montreal? A.—In foundries, and blacksmith shops, and boiler shops, I might say it is very bad. In blacksmith shops, foundries and boiler shops, there is a considerable amount of gas. There is very poor ventilation, especially in winter time, and very poor heating arrangements. A man, to work there, must have an overcoat on him

all the time in many of those places. In the foundries I might state that they use stoves without stove pipes.

Q.—Are those stoves for heating the foundry? A.—For heating the foundry. Of course they have to get some heat in order to prevent the sand from freezing.

Q.—Do you know what they burn in those stoves? A.—They burn coke and coal.

Q.—Did you ever see any truck system in Montreal? A.—I did. I worked in one shop where, if we chose, we could take groceries, or boots and shoes, and I believe whisky even, if we wanted to get it.

Q.—Were the men compelled to take those orders? A.—They could not get their money very well. The boss never paid regularly; in fact, he never had a pay day, and some of the men had to take them.

Q.—Do you know anything of that kind to exist to-day in the city? A.—I do not know of any, but there is nothing to prevent it.

Q.—What has been the increase in house rent during the last ten years, taking houses in which mechanics live? A.—I should say the increase has been twenty or twenty-five per cent.

Q.—Have the wages of the men increased in proportion to the increased cost of living in that respect? A.—No. If the wages have increased it has been very little; but I do not think they have increased at all.

Q.—Have you any suggestion you would like to give this Commission on the question of house rent? Have you any remedy to propose for the existing state of affairs? A.—I would suggest that the land pay taxes for its full value, so that the land now held for speculative purposes would be built on, and the supply would more than equal the demand, I presume. Landlords would have to come down a little, or at least stay where they are as regards rent. However, there might be a more speedy way; if the people were to adopt a plan of campaign similar to that in Ireland, we might have rents reduced quickly.

Q.—Is there much land held in Montreal for speculative purposes? A.—There is lots of vacant land; I presume it is held for speculative purposes. I know there is a great deal held for that purpose.

Q.—What can land suitable for mechanics houses be bought for in the district where mechanics reside? A.—Mechanics reside in different parts of the city. In some places, I suppose, it could be bought for from 30 to 40 cents, and in other places from \$2 to \$3 a foot. In the extreme outskirts of the city it might be bought much cheaper.

Q.—Do you think if the land was taxed to its full value it would stop the increase in rent? A.—Yes; I think so; because people having lands would be compelled to build.

Q.—Do you belong to any labor organization? A.—I do.

Q.—Do you know anything of blacklisting or boycotting in Montreal? A.—Yes; I have had a little experience in that line myself.

Q.—Will you tell us about it, and state what it was? A.—I presume it was from being a Knight of Labor. The time I suffered most was at the time of the local election in October, 1876. I was running a little business here then, which I am running yet, and my customers, who were manufacturers, left me severely alone. One firm in particular, Ames, Holden & Co., did so. Mr. Holden stated to my partner that if he had known that Keys was Keys of the Knights of Labor he never would have given him a job: "However, you can never have any more now."

Q.—Do you know if that feeling exists to any extent among employers in Montreal? A.—I believe it does to a considerable extent. Of course there are employers who do not make any distinction for what a man may be or what he may think.

Q.—Do you think labor organizations are injurious to laborers? A.—No; I do not; quite the reverse.

Q.—What benefit accrues to workingmen through organization? A.—It educates them in many cases. The Knights of Labor have done more in the cause of tem-

perance than any temperance society I know of. It is an organization that teaches men to be just as between man and man.

Q.—Do you know anything of the opinions of the workmen of Montreal in regard to the establishment of a Bureau of Labor statistics for the Dominion? A.—I do.

Q.—Will you please tell us what the general opinion is in regard to that question? A.—The general opinion is, that we should have a Bureau of Labor Statistics, established.

Q.—Are you sufficiently acquainted with the feelings of the workmen of Montreal to be able to give an opinion on the question of arbitration for the settlement of disputes between capital and labor? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you give us your views, please? A.—The working men of Montreal would be most happy to have all disputes settled by arbitration rather than have strikes.

Q.—Have you any particular suggestion to make in regard to the form which the arbitration should assume? A.—Well, I have no particular suggestion. There are several theories put forward, but we are of the opinion,—at least, I am of the opinion that the arbitrators should be appointed when necessary and not be employed permanently.

Q.—Would you make arbitration compulsory in case of dispute between labor and capital? A.—I would.

Q.—Do you think mechanics in your trade would take advantage of schools of education? A.—Yes; I believe they would.

Q.—Have you any suggestion to offer that would be of benefit to the Commission in regard to these different questions? A.—I intended to get some statistics in regard to the number of accidents that have occurred in the docks in Montreal, and Quebec; but on this matter I would refer the Commission to the Government at Ottawa. They have statistics there, but we have never heard of them in public. There is a bad state of affairs on the docks of Montreal, especially. That arises from incompetent men being employed, and not being of sufficient strength to do the work, and this is the principal cause of the accidents that have occurred on our dock. I have worked along those docks for sometime myself, in connection with repairing steam boilers and engines, and other machinery, and I know exactly how the matter stands. I think if the Commission would get the reports from Ottawa, they would be of great importance.

Q.—Do you know of any accident occurring voluntarily on the part of the men? A.—I never heard of any. I do not think a man would be so foolish as to have an accident happen voluntarily.

Q.—Do you know if the majority of the accidents that have occurred are caused by carelessness on the part of the men, or by neglect of the employers to provide proper apparatus and gearing? A.—It is through neglect to provide proper safeguards; there is no such thing as a proper safeguard, worth speaking of, in the factories, or, in fact, in any place where machinery is used, and there is no place where machinery is used, where the most dangerous parts cannot be protected, and that at a very low cost.

Q.—Can you tell us if there is any great desire on the part of the workmen to have a good Factory Act in the Province of Quebec? A.—Workingmen in Montreal have been talking of that for some years, and have been agitating in that direction, so they must have a strong desire for it.

(Translation.)

22nd February, 1888.

ADOLPHE CLÉMENT DIT LARIVIÈRE, of Montreal, Carriage Maker, sworn.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—How many employees have you? A.—We employ fifty persons in the carriage factory. We have a mill where we employ fifteen persons. Then I have an interest in another firm called Larivière & Dubé, where we employ twenty-three persons.

Q.—Do you do all the work required in the manufacture of vehicles? A.—Yes; we do all the work from beginning to end.

Q.—What class of vehicles do you mostly make? A.—First-class. We also make country carts.

Q.—Have you machines for turning spokes? A.—We have a quantity of machinery, but none specially for wheels.

Q.—Whence do you procure material for wheels? A.—We buy that in the shops here from Messrs. Fabre & Co. and Faucher & Sons.

Q.—Do you know whether the goods you buy in the shops here are of Canadian manufacture, or whether they are brought from the United States? A.—Some come from St. Catharines, Ontario, and from different other parts of Ontario, and some come from the United States.

Q.—What wages do you pay your men? A.—From \$7 to \$16 per week. Some even earn \$25 per week.

Q.—At what special kind of work do the men earn the highest wages? A.—The foremen in the different departments, for there are foremen in each department. After them, it is the turner, who turns by the piece.

Q.—To whom do you pay the highest wages, to the carriage-makers proper, or to the upholsterers? A.—It is all the same. The best workmen in each branch of the work get the same prices, according to their ability.

Q.—Taking all together, the more and the less able, what is the average? A.—About \$12 per week.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—What do you pay painters? A.—From \$7 to \$15.

Q.—And upholsterers? A.—Upholsterers earn from \$16 to \$18.

Q.—And now the blacksmiths? A.—The same as the painters, from \$7 to \$15.

Q.—How much do you give those who work in wood? A.—The blacksmiths earn from \$13 to \$15, and their assistants, such as the hammerers, earn from \$7 to \$8. The prices are the same for those that work in wood, from \$7 to \$16.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Is any of your work done by the piece? A.—The upholsterers work by the piece. The other workmen all work by the day.

Q.—How much a day can a good upholsterer earn? A.—About three dollars a day.

Q.—Have you many men in your employ who can earn that? A.—We have not many upholsterers, but in different branches there are a number that earn that much.

Q.—Were you, at any time, a contractor for Reformatory work? A.—For two years I had one branch of my business there.

Q.—How many children from the Reformatory were in your employ? A.—About twelve.

Q.—How much were they paid? A.—I don't know what were their wages, but we paid the Brothers fifteen cents a day for each child.

Q.—Did you, as a rule, find these children clever at their work? A.—Very few of them. Among twelve children, there were about three good.

Q.—Did you find having these children pay you? A.—No. The great advantage of having our establishment there was having the building. The rent was low. The building was heated, and we paid only \$10 per month.

Q.—You did not find employing the children profitable? A.—These young fellows are put there for three or four years. Those who are good, who work well, work only for two or three years; for they often get a reprieve of their sentence, which varies from one year to one year and a half, and that is for the good ones. It is the bad ones who get no reprieve.

Q.—The bad remain, and the good ones leave? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you think that work done by these Reformatory boys influences wages outside in any way, that is to say, do they, in any way, affect the wages of workmen? A.—Certainly they do, some kinds of work. For us it did not make much difference, there were only some kinds of work at which they worked; but certain persons have work done there, and they can sell much cheaper than others. It remains to be seen whether they make a profit or not.

Q.—Is the work that comes from there generally good work? A.—Well, we had nearly all our men there, for these young people work only seven and a half hours a day, and if we had a journeyman blacksmith there he would require an assistant who could work ten hours a day; so we were obliged to hire an assistant for each blacksmith, and these young fellows worked at other jobs.

Q.—But is work that comes from there as good as that done elsewhere? A.—The work cannot be as good as that done by good journeymen, because something we do not see will always slip in.

Q.—Where do you find the best market for your vehicles? A.—In Montreal. We sell some in Upper Canada, in Ontario, but the greater part of our business is done in Montreal.

Q.—Whence do you procure the best material for your business? A.—In the United States. We find the best goods in New Haven, Conn.

Q.—Is there no market in Canada where you can procure these goods? A.—Yes, for certain things; but certain goods, what we call finishings, are not made in Canada.

Q.—Do you use much iron? A.—Not a great quantity. The work is more than the iron itself.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Have the men to whom you pay \$3 a day, work all the year round? A.—Yes, sir; the same thing all the year round.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do these men work by the piece? A.—They sometimes work by the piece, and sometimes by the day, but only in wood. Upholsterers always work by the piece.

Q.—How do you pay your men who work by the piece, when they finish the work or on the ordinary pay-days? A.—When they finish their work, and some times, when the work is long, we advance them something on account.

Q.—Are they men whom you employ constantly, or do they only come in to your shop to do jobs? A.—In our shop we employ no one from outside.

Q.—When do you pay your men? A.—Every Monday.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you import many springs from the United States? A.—No, sir. We make the most of our springs ourselves. Those we do not make, we have made here in Montreal.

Q.—Are they equal to American springs? A.—Yes; quite as good.

CAPTAIN A. GOULET, Montreal, called and sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You are captain on a steamer, I believe? A.—I am owner, and captain, and engineer.

Q.—Running on the Ottawa? A.—Yes; to Duchesne Lake.

Q.—Are you aware that boats that have been declared unsafe for passengers have been used for tug boats? A.—The general rule is that when a boat is not fit for passengers, she is turned into a tow boat.

Q.—You are speaking in regard to boats on the Ottawa? A.—All over.

Q.—In those cases the hull has been condemned? A.—Yes; it is the hull that is condemned. I know of no case during my twenty-five years' experience where a boat was condemned as regards her machinery; it is always her hull.

Q.—Have the captains certificates on those boats? A.—Yes.

Q.—And the engineers? A.—A boat over 150 tons has to have a certificated engineer, but on all our inland rivers it is very hard to get a boat over that tonnage.

Q.—So the engineers on those tug boats are not obliged to have certificates? A.—On all the Ottawa I don't know of a tow boat that according to law is required to have a certificated engineer.

Q.—Have they certificated engineers? A.—Some of them, and some have not; they are not obliged to have them.

Q.—In your opinion, should they have them? A.—I think so. I hold that if the life of a passenger should be protected by the captain and engineer being obliged to take out certificates, the life of a crew ought to be equally protected.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Does your boat carry passengers? A.—No.

Q.—What trade is she engaged in, generally? A.—Towing logs and rafts.

Q.—Has your boat been inspected? A.—Yes.

Q.—When? A.—Every year. As a steamboat man, and as an engineer, I have no fault to find with the steamboat inspection, so far as the boiler and machinery is concerned; I believe it is all that is required.

Q.—Has the hull been inspected as well? A.—No.

Q.—They are not inspected, I understand? A.—No.

Q.—Do you think that is right—that the boiler and machinery should be inspected and not the hull? A.—I think it is wrong. The one ought to be inspected as much as the other.

Q.—Have you known of any accident having occurred on the Ottawa River? A.—No, I cannot say that I have, nor an accident from a boiler either. Still, the point is this: you inspect the boiler and machinery, and yet you do not inspect the hull, unless it is a passenger boat. I maintain that if it is right to inspect passenger boats, in order to protect the passengers, that the lives of the crews on board tug boats equally require protection. I cannot understand why the government should protect the life of a man in one case and not in another.

Q.—I suppose your employment is in the night as well as in the day? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many are on board of your steamer? A.—From eight to twelve, I have two boys; on the other boat I have only six.

Q.—What wages do your men get? A.—The deck hands and firemen receive \$20 a month and grub.

Q.—Are you engineer yourself? A.—I have an engineer.

Q.—Is it fair to ask you what his wages are? A.—The engineer I have is a young man who is under my instructions, and I employ him the year round, and I give him as such \$32 a month and grub—that is in the winter when he is doing nothing as well as in the summer.

Q.—Are you a competent engineer yourself? A.—Yes; I served my time.

Q.—Have you a certificate? A.—Yes. That young man is under my instructions, and I am the Chief Engineer.

Q.—You do not know of any accidents that have occurred upon the Ottawa in connection with tow boats? A.—None except a steamboat burning.

Q.—You have no idea what the law is in regard to the carrying of passengers? A.—They allow the boats to carry so many passengers, according to their tonnage.

Q.—Do you know if that limit is ever exceeded? A.—No, I do not.

Q.—Is there a large trade up and down the Ottawa in passengers? A.—Not much since the railways were built. The railways killed the trade. It is more now of a towing trade.

Q.—Are tow-boats, as a general rule, in good condition so far as you can possibly find them with regard to where the men take rest or sleep? A.—As a general rule I never heard any complaints on the Ottawa.

Q.—Are the hands fed well? A.—Pretty well. I don't know of any boat on the Ottawa, except at the height of land, where they cannot get it, where they don't take fresh beef in at every point they come to. We could not get men if we did not do that.

Q.—Those are the general wages you have stated? A.—Yes, the general wages.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—In regard to the barges on the Ottawa River and the engaging of them; are they engaged by the month or by the trip? A.—A captain generally takes his cargo at so much a thousand feet, or something like that, and he hires his men at so much a month.

Q.—Those men help to load and unload the barges? A.—Yes; that is one of the conditions, as a general rule.

Q.—Have you known on the Ottawa River cases, in which the firemen have taken the place of practical engineers on tug-boats? A.—That is where the trouble comes in, and where I think the law is at fault. The law requires that an engineer, a young man, should go and serve his trade, but before doing so he must have a certain amount of education; and he has to serve five years as a machinist in a shop. When he comes out he must obtain two years' experience at very low wages, and so it is only after spending about twelve years' time and a lot of money that he is allowed to take a position on a first-class passenger boat, and before doing that, he has to practice on a tow-boat. When he goes to hire he has to take low wages, something like the wages of a fireman, and if he does not choose to do so he has to go back to the fire-hole. Thus it is that the engineer on a steamboat has not the same chance of rising in a few years as he should have.

Q.—Have you ever known boilers to be blown up through over-pressure caused by a too heavy head of steam, or is it, in more cases, due to shortness of water? A.—I believe, after about 27 years' experience, that there is not an accident that has happened to boilers but that there has been a criminal cause. I believe there is not one boiler out of 25 that does not blow up for want of water. Practical engineers, after they have made investigations, come to the conclusion that the explosion is due to want of water. That is the general rule; as I have said, I don't know one case out of 25 that would prove an exception.

Q.—These accidents, then, occur through incompetent men? A.—That is just where it comes in.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you know any vessel engaged in the towing or river business that is unfit for service? A.—That would be going into some private matter if I named individuals.

Q.—I don't want you to name anyone. I just ask you whether such a fact is within your knowledge? A.—I will not name any individuals or boats, but I know

a few boats whose hulls are such, that, if I was hull inspector, they would never run. As regards machinery, I know none to be in that condition.

23 February, 1888.

HENRY HARVEY, of the City of Montreal, Journalist, one of the editors of the *Trade Review*, sworn :

By MR. HEAKES :—

Q.—Have you ever paid any attention to the social and moral state of the children of this town? A.—Yes; frequently.

Q.—What has most frequently attracted your attention? A.—What has most frequently attracted my attention, in this connection more especially, is the folly and danger of allowing children under the age of twelve years to be admitted into these shows—amusements such as some of our theatres afford. I have had occasion, the last three or four weeks, to notice more particularly one place where there is both afternoon and evening performances; where they come out from the matinee, as it is called, about five o'clock in the evening, and I have seen over one hundred children, of all ages and both sexes, principally children under the age of twelve years coming alone, without having any grown up person, father, mother, sister, or brother in charge of them, and I think it is worth while to draw the attention of this official body to it. These places have caused more trouble, in my opinion, than all the dime novels. For instance, young boys frequently, on leaving school, in passing these shows are attracted by the music, and the pictures on the play bills, or advertisements, to spend their money there, more times than not, unknown to their parents. In reading dime novels they do that at home, consequently, attending these places is worse for them than reading dime novels.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Have you ever noticed the play bills posted about the City of Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—And what do you think of them? A.—In my opinion, they are generally very immoral pictures; not fit for any person's eyes to fall upon.

Q.—And do you not think they are liable to induce some boys, men and women, to patronize these beastly shows? A.—Yes, I do. Now, when I speak of children, I am speaking of children of all classes, both rich and poor. I have met them coming out of these places, and I have recognized some amongst them, and I am sure that their mothers and fathers would be very sorry to see them there. I know that I would be very sorry, if I had a son of mine, of that age, to see him there.

Q.—Do you not think young boys are tempted to rob their employers for the purpose of attending these so-called theatrical performances? A.—Yes; I have no hesitation in saying, in many instances, the amount of money is pilfered, in order to get means to go to these places.

By MR. WALSH :—

Q.—Have you known of any personally? A.—No, I have not; but instances have been reported in the public press.

By MR. FREED :—

Q.—Are these exhibitions themselves of a character which children should not attend? A.—Yes; in some instances, I may say, mostly always. Supposing they are not indecent, they have other objectionable features. They always have the villain vividly portrayed before them, and which frequently, if not always conveys a

very bad impression to their minds, in my opinion. Then again, the nude manner in which they dress in these places is not fit for much older persons to witness, much less children.

Q.—You mean to say what might pass un-noticed among grown up people would not pass un-noticed before children. A.—Exactly. The performers are certainly not decently clad.

Q.—You hold that a performance that is unfit for children to attend, is not fit for grown people? A.—That is just what I think, not that they have any effect on grown up people, but they do have a bad effect upon the youth of our cities.

Q.—You think that children are not so well able to resist temptation as grown up people? A.—Exactly. The thing is there, and if a child is susceptible to bad influences it has an effect when the influence is there.

Q.—What would you propose in such a case? A.—Would you propose a censorship of the stage? A.—Yes. Or any government control over the children either Municipal, Provincial or Federal.

Q.—You would also prevent children under a certain age from attending these performances without their parents or guardians? A.—Yes.

Q.—And would you prevent the proprietors of these shows from admitting children under a certain age without a proper guardian. A.—Decidedly I would, and I do not think it expedient to hold these shows during school hours. The afternoon performances commence at two o'clock generally. I wish to say that I am not speaking particularly of one theatre, but generally of all these classes of shows.

Q.—Most of these places of amusement are open every day during the afternoon, and it not only has a tendency to draw the scholars away from the schools, but it also has a tendency to cause a boy to absent himself from his proper employment, and if he is in the habit of attending these places the strong probability is (if he cannot get the money from home to attend these amusements) he will surely get the money somewhere, to go.

Q.—Do you know boys to absent themselves from their employment in order to attend these places? A.—I do not; It is only a matter of opinion.

Q.—Do you know of any boys having stolen money to attend these places? A.—I do not. Only from common report, and from the newspapers.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—But you have heard of such cases, and from what you have seen, you have good reason for believing what you have heard to be true? A.—Exactly, and that is my reason for appearing before you.

February 24th, 1888.

LILIAN WEST CAMP, of the City of Montreal, Operator, in the employ of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, sworn.

I am in the employ of the Bell Telephone Company, at its head office, St. James street.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—You are engaged in the Exchange? A.—Yes.

Q.—There are a considerable number of young ladies engaged there, I suppose? A.—Quite a number.

Q.—What are the hours of work? A.—For full time operators, nine hours; half time operators, five hours.

Q.—Do they all receive the same rate of pay—that is the full time operators? A.—Yes.

- Q.—What are the wages paid? A.—Twenty dollars a month.
- Q.—How many hours a day do they work? A.—Nine hours.
- Q.—And the half time operators, how long do they work? A.—Five hours.
- Q.—What wages do they receive? A.—Twelve dollars a month.
- Q.—When there is a vacancy they are promoted to be full time operators, I suppose. A.—Yes.
- Q.—Do you ever work at night? A.—No.
- Q.—Have you sufficient time at noon to get your luncheon? A.—Oh, yes; we get an hour at noon. I wish to correct myself. I do not work at night, except occasionally on Sundays until nine in the evening.
- Q.—Is that voluntary or compulsory? A.—We are expected to do it.
- Q.—Is it one or a number of special persons, or do you all take it in turns? A.—We take it in turns.
- Q.—Do you get any extra rate of pay for Sunday? A.—Yes.
- Q.—More than you do for the same work on other days? A.—Yes; for Sunday work we get a quarter more than the regular day's pay.

By Mr. WALSH:—

- Q.—How much do you receive for working on Sundays? A.—We are paid at the rate of two dollars a day.
- Q.—Is the office a comfortable place? A.—Yes; very.
- Q.—Do you suffer any evil effects owing to the length of time you have to work there. A.—No; I cannot say I do.
- Q.—Do you know any young ladies working there who have been sick by reason of the number of hours they have had to work? Have they suffered from any injurious effects to their health or otherwise? A.—I have not heard of any.
- Q.—How long have you been employed by this company? A.—Seven or eight years.
- Q.—Is there not somebody engaged there to attend to the business at night? A.—We have young men for night work after nine o'clock.
- Q.—None of the young ladies attend there at night? A.—Not later than nine o'clock.
- Q.—And that is the latest hour the young ladies work? A.—Yes.

JOHN W. GROSE, of the City of Montreal, Chairman of the Board of Assessors of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

- Q.—I understand you wish to make some explanations to the Commission with regard to the valuation of certain properties? A.—Yes; with regard to property number thirty-three to thirty-nine DeSalaberry street. The complaint appears to be that the Assessors in this instance—which is taken as a representative case amongst others—I understand, increased the rentals on the tenants without increasing the valuation on the proprietor. The reason in this particular case of the rentals being raised from twenty-four to fifty per cent which appears to be the pith of the complaint, was that in eighteen hundred and eighty-two (1882) the tenants were paying according to their own representation, two dollars and a-quarter per month. In eighteen hundred and eighty-three (1883) in consequence of some additions to these two tenements, which were marked by myself in pencil on the map at the time, and which I showed to the Chairman—that was done in May or June, eighteen hundred and eighty-three, in pencil—the tenants were then paying four dollars and a-half a month, and the rentals were advanced from twenty-four to fifty per cent. This addition was of a kind which the Assessors do not consider made any permanent en-

hancement to the value of the property, and as the total rentals were only a little over a gross of ten per cent they did not think it necessary on such a property to increase the value on account of the rentals, and there were no other reasons for doing so.

Q.—Am I to understand that when a proprietor builds on his land, that increases the value of the land? A.—Very often it does, and at other times it makes it of less value, perhaps not very often.

Q.—Do you think that when a proprietor builds so that the property brings no revenue, it decreases the property in value? A.—Very frequently it decreases the saleable value of the property.

Q.—In this special case, did it diminish the saleable value of the property? A.—In this case I think any one going to purchase a property would rather not have these back premises, because he would be going to re-build, and these would not pay to be removed. We have many proofs of this frequently, in which vacant lots will sell for more than a lot alongside, of exactly the same size, with an old building upon it.

Q.—Then cases may occur when a proprietor in order to diminish the amount of his taxes has nothing else to do but to build? A.—No; certainly not. That is special pleading, I do not admit that. If what you want is to arrive at the truth, I shall be very pleased to answer questions, but if you want to catch me, I have nothing to say. What I say is known to real-estate owners, and I know that what I say is true. Now this particular property, I was going on to say, is an old dilapidated house, that when I was born, perhaps, was the residence of one of the first citizens of this town. The front house was a good stone house but is now incapable of alteration to make it available for its present situation, and consequently is rented at a very much lower rate than it would be if situated elsewhere. You perhaps would not believe that the tenements at the back, rent for as much as the front house, simply because the people do not wish to go into the front premises where the floors are worn out and the house was originally built for another class of people, and therefore you frequently find smaller tenements rent before such square stone front tenements, simply because they are more adapted to the wants of the people.

By MR. FREED:—

Q.—By how much were the whole of the water taxes increased to which you refer. A.—In that yard I think those were the only two.

Q.—It was increased one hundred per cent, from six hundred and eighty dollars to seven hundred and eighty dollars. A.—That is the actual amount of rent payable.

Q.—In five or six years how much has it increased. A.—Up to last year it increased to nine hundred and ten, that would be an increase of two hundred and thirty dollars.

Q.—Did the tenants use more water? A.—No, certainly not. That was in consequence of the natural increase in lots. Of course you are aware that from eighteen hundred and seventy-eight to eighteen hundred and eight-two we suffered a great deal from the depression of real-estate, in fact our City here (without talking politics) was going to ruin, and since that, rentals have increased considerably. The Assessors did not recognise that an advance in real-estate in one year or two years, necessarily makes the property of more value in that year or years. We wait until we see something like a permanent increase in rentals and we then put on ten or fifteen per cent in value.

Q.—You do not wait until you see a permanent increase before you increase the water rate on the tenant? A.—We find out how much rent he pays and we equalize them as near as possible. We do not always get the truth told us, I could give you several examples of this. One particularly related by one of our assistants, who was for the first time employed down in the east end although—I may say—this practice of withholding information from the Assessors is not confined to the poor people. I

am sorry to say the rich are as much to blame in this respect as the poor. This clerk went up stairs in a tenement house for the first time, when he came down he said that he found it very curious "what is the matter Mr. Morin said I" "Well" he said "That lady there pays six dollars a month for the same accomodation that the other lady pays three dollars and fifty cents a month for." I said "I am not at all surprised to hear that Mr. Morin," and I am very sorry to tell you that this time the English woman told the truth and the French woman told a lie, although sometimes we find it to be the opposite. I know I may be trifling with your time, gentlemen, but I merely mention this in order to show you the difficulties that we have to contend with, in fixing proper rentals.

Q.—You say that you do not consider an increase in rentals for one or two years sufficient to change the value of the property? A.—We do not consider it changes the value, permanently, for the Assessors to make an advance.

Q.—Do you think that a property, the rental of which you increase every year, for six years would be increased permanently in value? A.—Properties of this kind I do not think it would; ordinarily speaking, this is a very exceptional property.

Q.—The De Salaberry property here mentioned has constantly increased in rental from eighteen hundred and eighty-two to eighteen hundred and eighty-seven? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you not consider that a permanent increase? A.—Yes, in rental. If you wish to ask me if I consider the property to be of more value now than in eighteen hundred and eighty three, I say I do not.

Q.—Is not the selling value of properties in accordance with what they bring? A.—It depends entirely upon the kind of property.

Q.—In this special case? A.—Certainly not, and I will tell you why. This is an old house going down in value every year, and there will be an end to its bringing any rental at all.

Q.—You say these front premises are diminishing in value every year? A.—Yes.

Q.—Why do you not decrease the rent value of this property in your estimates? A.—Because we consider the additions which he is making at the back, make up for the depression in front, the fact of the matter is, the proprietor consequently knows how to keep up his rental, and in order to make up for the depression of his rental—he has got a little yard, and he is continually adding something in his yard—he is trying to use his ground to the best advantage.

Q.—But according to your statement, as he goes on making additions on the land behind, the property diminishes in value? A.—That is a speculation. I cannot say. Hitherto I consider it has been.

Q.—Please look at the valuation roll of eighteen hundred and eighty-two? A.—Yes.

Q.—You see that number three (lodgings) were rented at forty dollars? A.—Yes.

Q.—Please look at the valuation roll of eighteen hundred and eighty-seven? A.—Yes.

Q.—You see that number three there realizes one hundred dollars? A.—No, it realizes fifty dollars.

Q.—And the next, fifty dollars? A.—Fifty dollars each, instead of forty dollars each.

Q.—No. Number three, fifty dollars? A.—Yes; fifty dollars each.

Q.—In eighteen hundred and eighty-two, there was only one. A.—That is a mistake.

Q.—This is in the rear? A.—Yes; very possibly he may have put another structure in the yard.

Q.—It did not decrease the value of the property? A.—Certainly not.

Q.—When you make an assessment Roll, it is to establish the water rate? A.—Yes.

Q.—It is only the water rate? A.—The rental is established for the water rate, and the assessment for the value.

Q.—You do both at the same time? A.—Yes,

Q.—When you assess a house rented by the party who sub-lets a part to another family, do you assess for the principal tenant, or both? A.—I, personally, always ask this question, "Does your sub-tenant wish to have his vote." If the sub-tenant says "No; I do not care anything about the vote," I assess the whole to one party. If the sub-tenant, or his wife, says that he wishes to have his vote, I assess both parties in order to franchise the sub-tenant.

Q.—How did you do before the Statute Labor Tax was abolished? A.—The same way.

Q.—Is it not to your knowledge that before the Statute Labor Tax was abolished, the sub-tenant had no right to vote, whether he paid his Statute Labor Tax or not? A.—We did not know but that he was going to pay his Statute Labor Tax, consequently we asked every person. I am only speaking for myself, personally. I personally, and invariably asked the question. Some men are very particular about their vote, and others would as soon not have it as have it, but it is our duty to ask the question.

Q.—What you then asked was in accordance with the rules established for the assessment of property? A.—Well, it was, perhaps, in accordance with an arbitrary rule established for our own guidance. I took what I thought to be a common sense view. I knew very well he would have to pay for the water, and I knew that I could do so without any injury to the city. I knew that if he wished to have his franchise, and to exercise it as a citizen, I was bound to put him down as a tenant.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You wanted to extend the franchise; you wanted to give every man his right? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you know the rule or the law governing water rates of tenants, and sub-tenants. A.—I know no difference between tenants and sub-tenants.

Q.—Do you think that a sub-tenant should pay the same water rate as the principal tenant? A.—I thought so until this afternoon. I have had my attention called to a by-law this afternoon, which I did not know of before, which I am sure, as far as practice is concerned, is obsolete, and has been obsolete for fifteen years at all events, by which I see the rule which we assessors should have gone by, but which I have never gone by, nor my confreres.

Q.—The law of water rates, since such water rates have been fixed, is, that the principal tenant has to pay the water rate according to his rental, and a sub-tenant pays one-third? A.—That appears to be the law. I am not sure whether it has been repealed or not. I have had no time to look into it since my attention has been drawn to it. I have seen the by-law. I am not sure whether it has been repealed. I was surprised to hear of it, because it has never been acted upon, and in that case a sub-tenant is disfranchised; but, of course, we should act according to the law, whether it is right or wrong. Whether it is for the best or for the worst.

Q.—I do not see that you have anything to do with the franchise? A.—Yes; we have. We make out the voter's list, and we have got to see that every man who is entitled to one has his name down on the list. Our part of the business is to make him pay the water.

Q.—Do you believe that if the water rates of sub-tenants had been fixed according to law, many sub-tenants who paid the full rates would have paid only one-third? A.—I would like you to qualify the word "many."

Q.—Well every one? A.—Certainly, there are some who have paid more than they should have paid. There is no question about it, but they are very few.

Q.—Then you admit that the water rates have not been fixed according to law ?
 A.—Yes ; certainly according to law.

Q.—But some have not been fixed according to law ? A.—The water rates in some very few instances, have not been fixed according to law. I do not think many. There are six or seven thousand voters in the district I am in, and I do not think there are ten such.

Q.—What districts ? A.—St. Ann's Ward, St. Louis' Ward, West Ward, and St. Jean Baptiste Ward.

Q.—Do you mean to say that in those sections that you have mentioned there are not more than ten sub-tenants ? A.—I mean to say there are not ten that have been brought to my notice as sub-tenants. You know that there are a great many sub-tenants that I do not hear of. I found that out in taking the census. In houses where we thought there was only one family, we found, by the census returns, there were two, three, and even four families. When we proceed to visit properties, for the purpose of making the assessment, we are not always informed how many families are under one roof.

WM. C. McDONALD, Tobacco Manufacturer, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—How many hands do you employ ? A.—Between ten and eleven hundred.

Q.—How many of these are men ? A.—There are about five hundred males and about five hundred and fifty females. About that.

Q.—Among the males, how many are men and how many are boys ? A.—I am not prepared to state. I do not know that.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—On the average ? A.—I could not guess at all. I only know these figures, that I have mentioned, from curiosity. I inquired last week, and they took down the numbers.

Q.—I suppose the foreman or superintendent could give us information on this point ? A.—Not unless he was required specially to do so. It would be necessary for him to go through the factory and take down all the ages. All the ages would have to be specified.

Q.—Could you send your foreman or superintendent here with a statement of the number of men, boys, women, girls and children, and the ages of the youngest ones employed in the factory ? A.—Yes ; as nearly as possible. You could not get them to acknowledge being under ten years of age. They may be only ten years of age when they say they are twelve, and twelve years of age when they say they are fourteen. It is a very hard thing to say.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you not take in your factory children under twelve years of age ? A.—Not knowingly. We are very greatly deceived about the children. A person can deceive and make misstatements about the ages of children ; and I may say they are sometimes brought in surreptitiously under age by those occupying benches—earlier ages than we allow them to come in at—and it is a very difficult subject to have to do with.

Q.—At what time do the persons employed in your factory come there to begin work ? A.—They begin work at seven in the morning. The working hours are from seven in the morning to six at night, with an hour intermission for dinner.

Q.—Do they sometimes work later than six in the evening ? A.—Very rarely.

Q.—What is the latest hour they work, to your knowledge ? A.—In the ship-

ping department they may, when very much pressed, I think, work up till nine or ten o'clock at night; but it is a very rare occurrence.

Q.—In delivering goods? A.—No, in preparing them for delivery.

Q.—Do you employ any children in that department? A.—No, none.

Q.—In the shops proper up to what time do they work? A.—I have not known particularly anything about this for many years. Since I moved into the new works I had plenty of room—that is during the last ten years—and I do not know if they work after six o'clock at night. I do not really remember.

Q.—Are you familiar with the work details of the work in the factory? A.—To a certain extent. I do not attend so closely to it as I used to do, but I understand the whole of the operation thoroughly.

Q.—Do you impose fines on the employees? A.—Yes. Under certain circumstances.

Q.—Have you rules concerning such fines posted up in the work shops? A.—No, I have no rules posted in the establishment.

Q.—How do the employees know the amount of fines imposed on them. A.—That is done by the overseer. The name is written on a board together with the amount of the fine and the reason for it. It is there before six or seven hundred people; and the fines and any wages that have not been called for—small sums left over. These fines and accumulations are sent to the General Hospital every year.

Q.—Do you know the amount of fines imposed during the last year? A.—No, I do not know. I think they vary in different years from one hundred and fifty dollars to three hundred dollars.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What is the amount of money paid out in wages? A.—It is over two hundred thousand dollars.

Q.—That is without counting in clerks or salesmen? A.—Yes; the workmen only. I would say two hundred thousand dollars per annum.

Q.—What are the salaries paid to the different hands? A.—The wages of boys will vary from one dollar and fifty cents to five dollars per week.

Q.—What are the ages of these boys? A.—Twelve is about the lowest—that will give you from twelve to eighteen as near as I can tell you.

Q.—How are the men paid? A.—From six dollars to seven dollars and a half, and some eight dollars and a half a week.

Q.—Are you in the habit of reducing salaries by thirty seven and a half per cent in the winter? A.—No. No stated thirty seven and a half per cent. The wages are reduced every fall and raised during the spring, so as to make an average.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Do you reduce the price of tobacco at the same time? A.—That depends upon the cost of material. Sometimes it is reduced and sometimes it is raised.

Q.—But it is not raised and reduced with the wages? A.—No.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you ever heard that the price of tobacco is reduced in the fall of the year? A.—No; not by any means, not with any regularity. It is not governed by the rise and fall of wages, but by the supply and demand.

Q.—Sometimes, I suppose, you are obliged to buy tobacco dear and sell it cheap? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it the general thing to reduce the salaries in the fall? A.—For thirty years I have done it. It is a general habit of the country—in this part of the country at any rate.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you reduce the working hours or do they remain the same? A.—There may be a little reduction when the work is light.

Q.—Why is it reduced? A.—Because of the superabundance of labour at that time, and in the spring it has to be raised. It is a remarkable commodity.

Q.—When you say salaries are raised in the spring you mean that they are raised to the same point that they were, before they were reduced in the fall? A.—For the last three years they have been more each spring.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Your business is governed according to the supply and demand I suppose?

A.—Yes; it just depends upon the supply and demand. If labor is scarce we have to raise the money in order to get the people.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Does not the cost of living, to working people, increase during the winter. Do they not have to pay much larger sums in the winter than in the summer season?

A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—Is it not a hardship to them to have their wages reduced at the time they need it more than in summer? A.—That will depend upon how they provide for rainy days. When they have good wages they should save for the short period.

Q.—Have you told us what the average earnings are of the women in your factory? A.—Women and girls earn from two dollars and fifty cents to three dollars and seventy-five cents per week—that is those who work by the day. Those who work by the piece, some of them, those who have benches will make perhaps from five dollars to fourteen or fifteen dollars according to their ability.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you employ more hands in winter than in summer? A.—I cannot say that we generally do. It runs to a pretty near even average. I think they are a little scarcer in summer. They crowd in very much in winter, and we have to thin them out, and keep them down in numbers in winter. That is the reason we have to part with some of them. These bench hands will bring them in, and we have to send them out again, and that is the reason. They bring in more than we wish to have, and for that reason we have got to thin them out.

Q.—The reason is this: you employ workmen, and they employ others under them? A.—Yes. Our bench hands employ stumpers, and stringers, and coverers.

Q.—Do you reduce the wages of the sub-bench hands? A.—Yes; they are reduced.

Q.—Do the sub-contractors, or bench hands, themselves reduce the salaries of those they employ, in order to preserve the same salaries for themselves? A.—Certainly; they are reduced in the fall and raised in the spring.

Q.—Do you know if your sub-contractors fix matters in such a way as to always have the same salary for themselves, both in winter and summer? A.—I do not know.

Q.—Have you sub-contractors in all departments? A.—No; only in one room.

Q.—How many sub-contractors do you employ in that room? A.—I think about one hundred and eighty. One hundred and eighty-three is the number by the last list I have.

Q.—Sub-contractors of benches? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many persons do these men employ under themselves? How many persons are subject to their orders? A.—Sometimes three and sometimes four.

Q.—So that these sub-contractors would be employing more than half of the men employed in your factory? A.—Well, I have never made a calculation. I do not

know what number. If the superintendent comes here, I will have him bring that information.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you any competition in this province, or the Dominion? A.—Oh yes; it is no open trade.

Q.—Are you liable to competition from the United States? A.—Well, we can scarcely call it competition. There is a certain amount imported, but there is a little competition. It is very small.

Q.—Could you fix your wages otherwise than by that competition, or could you pay certain wages without reference to other factories? A.—I have to follow the course of the labour market, and if I pay more wages than other competitors, I have that much disadvantage, and in the course of years I may dry up. I have to have sufficient business ability to run my factory, which, I need hardly explain, is run solely on business principles.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—You think you are doing the best you can for the people employed by you? A.—Yes; it is a matter of supply and demand.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Who gets the benefit of the reduction on your tobacco, the smoker or the dealer? A.—That is a very difficult question for me to answer.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You do not work for charity? A.—I do not, sir. I am in business for the purpose of business.

Q.—For the purpose of making money? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Can you compete with the manufacturers of Ontario? A.—Yes. I pay the same wages and work the same number of hours.

Q.—If you did pay the same wages and work your hands the same number of hours, the presumption is you would make the same profit? A.—Yes.

Q.—A manufacturer in Hamilton testified before this Commission that he works his hands nine hours a day. Could you afford to manufacture tobacco and allow your hands to work only nine hours a day? If one manufacturer can afford to do that, cannot another? A.—I do not say that.

Q.—If this same manufacturer can afford to pay higher wages than you are paying, and still make a profit, what would be the natural presumption in your case? A.—Well, I should think that question hardly requires an answer.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have just stated, in answer to the Chairman, that you were forced to follow the labour market? A.—Yes, to keep my business healthy.

Q.—When you feel that the labour market is low, are you forced to reduce the wages of your employees in order to compete with your conferees? A.—That might be the case, or it might not be the case. Sometimes there is an exceedingly keen competition, and sometimes goods are sold at a loss, no matter how the wage market is.

Q.—Can you tell whether the price of tobacco is lower now than it was last spring? A.—No, it is higher now.

Q.—The selling price? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you mean to say your own prices are higher now than they were last spring? A.—Yes.

Q.—And your salaries are lower now than they were last spring—the salaries you pay? A.—Yes; but the cost of raw material in some cases is fifty per cent higher, and in other cases again it is fifty per cent higher than it was last spring, and as a matter of fact I am selling some tobacco here to-day for less money than the material cost me to bring it in from the United States to-day, and sell it, without the cost of manufacturing at all. Such is the condition of trade.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Then you say the rate of wages will rise towards the spring? A.—It always rises towards spring, when the demand for labour has increased.

Q.—Then, those engaged in the manufacture of tobacco, like other people, go to the wall, do they not, sometimes? A.—Yes; I have seen about twenty go to the wall since I have come into the business.

Q.—How long is that? A.—Since thirty years.

Q.—There was a great crash among tobacco manufacturers in Canada some years ago, and the weak went to the wall? A.—Yes.

Q.—Would not some manufacturers very seriously be affected if the price of tobacco were to fall? A.—Yes; both wholesale and retail.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Have you thought anything of a system of prices profits; the employees sharing in the profits of your work. A.—The money that I pay these men; two hundred thousand dollars is part of the profits per annum.

Q.—Yes; but outside of that. I suppose you have given it some thought? A.—I have, and I have really been very desirous to do it, but cannot see how it is going to be brought about with any degree of safety to the capitalist.

Q.—Do you make any division among them of any sums of money. A.—I sometimes give a bonus, but that is a matter of choice.

Q.—Is that generally distributed among your superintendent and foremen?

A.—No; it is just as I choose. I have no partners in the business, so that I may be generous sometimes—when I can afford it.

DOUGLAS RUTHERFORD, of the city of Montreal, Builder, sworn.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—What is your occupation? A.—Carpenter and builder.

Q.—Have you been very long in the business? A.—About 22 years.

Q.—What kind of contracts do you generally take, do you take contracts all round for stone, carpentering, plastering, and all round? A.—Not usually.

Q.—What particular branch do you devote yourself to? A.—Carpentering and joiner work.

Q.—How many men do you usually employ? A.—From 35 to 55.

Q.—Have you found your trade as general thing good of late years? A.—Yes.

Q.—Has it increased any or decreased of late years? A.—In what respect?

Q.—I mean with regard to the general occupation of men; with regard to the number of men you employ? A.—Our trade is expanding—the trade of the city is expanding.

Q.—What rate of wages do you generally pay? Have you one set of wages, or do you pay your hands according to their ability? A.—We have set wages for each man for the time being.

Q.—What is the highest you pay? A.—Twenty-one cents an hour.

Q.—Are those supposed to be ordinary journeymen, or extra journeymen, or extraordinary journeymen? A.—They are skilled joiners.

Q.—Able to go through a house and do anything? A.—Yes; under our supervision.

Q.—I suppose you have a foreman, or several foremen? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it a fair question to ask you, what is the pay of the foreman? What do you pay your foreman? A.—Sometimes we do not pay the foreman any more than the journeyman. We have good ordinary journeymen and foremen at the same wages, but different grades.

Q.—What are the average wages of your journeymen without going into particulars of those who are looked upon as very skilled mechanics? A.—That is a very difficult question to answer.

Q.—What are the lowest wages you pay? A.—The lowest are one dollar and fifty cents a day. These are not journeymen.

Q.—What are they? A.—I do not know. I would call them carpenters assistants. They call themselves carpenters. We do not. They call themselves carpenters because they do not know any better.

Q.—Do you find a lack of skilled mechanics in the carpentering business of this city? A.—We do.

Q.—Can you attribute that to any cause? Are not the wages high enough to induce good workmen to come here? A.—I do not know that that is the sole cause. That of course may be partially the cause, but the real trouble is I think, that we are not manufacturing mechanics now. We are not raising them from boys,—that is apprentices to journeymen.

Q.—Will you explain if you please what your mean by that answer? A.—What I mean is that we do not as a rule have apprentices.

Q.—Well from your judgment tell us the reason for not having apprentices, why the trade does not have apprentices trained properly so that when they become men they can perform the work? A.—Well, sir, if we tried to raise workmen from apprentices we would have about the same result as at present, if we tried to raise them from apprentices to journeymen. They have not and will not remain with us long enough to learn their business thoroughly. They will not remain and fulfil their agreement, but before their time is up they run away west, or go to the States.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you ever indenture them? A.—No; it is of no use because after they have remained with you a time they will go away to the other side of the line, and it is just the same to the employer whether he takes apprentices or not.

Q.—Are there a sufficient number of apprentices to learn the rudiments of their craft and make responsible carpenters, in the community? A.—No; we have tried it and failed for many years in spite of all our efforts we have been unsuccessful with apprentices. We have had all the trouble and they had all the profit, and so we have had to give it up.

Q.—Have you had any trouble with your ordinary hands? A.—We never had any trouble.

Q.—Have you had any strikes among your men? A.—Well in eighteen hundred and sixty-six there was a political strike in Montreal. It appears that some persons tried to advise the men to strike for a twenty-five per cent advance, got ten cents and took it if you called it twenty-five per cent rise, but if you offered them fifteen per cent and did not call it twenty-five per cent they would not work for you. The result was our trade got partially destroyed. Many men had to leave and go to the States, and many of these never returned. That was about the only result the strike had. The men who got the ten per cent advance returned to their work.

Q.—Are there many of those remaining here now? A.—I believe there are, but I do not know it as a fact.

Q.—Are the prospects of the trade good in Montreal at the present time, or to look forward to? A.—I should say except for any untoward consequence that might

arise in the interval the prospects are good—provided nothing happens to destroy these prospects.

Q.—Is the class of work done in your craft in Montreal generally good? A.—Comparatively. It is much better than it was in Montreal many years ago. Probably it is not so good as in some other parts of the world.

Q.—Do your specifications and plans call for first-class work, that is in the real acceptation of the word? Do your plans and specifications call for first-class work, or do they simply require you to put up such buildings as just have a face to them, or are they thoroughly built according to plans and specifications? A.—My own business only permits me to deal with those houses that are thoroughly built.

Q.—But from your own knowledge, do you know of any other class of work? A.—I cannot say. There may be in the east end of the city, but I cannot say. My business is in the better class of houses.

Q.—Have any of your men worked with you for a length of time? A.—Yes; a considerable time.

Q.—Do you know of any who have saved money and acquired property? A.—Speaking generally, there is quite a large proportion who have got their own houses.

Q.—When you speak of them owning their own houses, will you please state what might be the price of the house you have reference to? A.—Well, I cannot tell you exactly, as I probably may never have seen any of these houses; but I understand that quite a number occupy their own houses as proprietor and tenant. Some I know own the houses they live, and own others which they left.

Q.—Do you know if they are actual owners of these houses, or are they encumbered? A.—From my knowledge, I would say that they are built in such a way as would enable them all to build them without encumbrances.

Q.—Have you any information or recommendation that you could give us with regard to trades generally, or what would benefit the condition of both employer and employed—from your experience in the length of time you have been a resident of Montreal? A.—No; nothing. We have never had any difficulty with the workmen in the way of strikes, and personally my opinion is not worth much on that ground. We have had no trouble, and we were always able to rectify any little difficulty that might occur. We have never had any deputations wait upon us; the man comes himself if he has a grievance, and we talk over the matter with him. In some cases they have left, and in other cases they remain. We agreed to differ. The greater number of our men would not change shops for a difference of five cents in the wages. We have tried to regulate each man's wages according to the value of his work; and the wages are so well regulated in our shop that we have no difficulty. We have men who receive all the way from \$1.50 to \$2.00 a day at the present time, with variations of five cents between those two points. This system works well. We find that when one man is receiving less than another he always wants to get up to him. At the same time, they all seem to recognize that they are paid a fair rate of wages. We have never had any trouble with our men.

Q.—Am I to understand from your remarks about apprentices that you have no hope for the bringing about of such a law, or custom, as will oblige apprentices to be regularly bound, and obliged to serve their time, and that the masters will also be obliged to take care, and to see that they are brought up to know their trade properly? A.—I was always of the opinion that an apprentice should be regularly bound, but I have had my eyes opened, here, to the folly of attempting it, both financially and otherwise. I have had my eyes opened to the uselessness of this, and with one boy in particular that I brought up. I may say, he was a burden to his father, who was a poor man, and requested me to give him a fair wage so that he could keep himself, and at the same time learn his trade. He served half his time, and as soon as he began to be of a little use he left for the States. That was the worst case with which I have had to deal. As a boy, I would not bind him, and it was no use our intending to do so, in the absence of nothing to hold him to his word.

Q.—Do you think, as a general rule, that boys run away to the States, or Upper Canada, before they have learned their trade? A.—Yes; they leave for the United States, and seldom turn up again; and I am sorry to say I do not see any proper system by which an apprentice can be bound—I do not expect to see any apprentices bound until this country is annexed to the States, which, however, I should be very sorry to see, for I am not an annexationist. In the mean time, I do not see any hope for having any properly bound apprentices. As soon as they are able to use their tools with some degree of proficiency they usually leave Montreal and cross the Lines, and set themselves out as first class mechanics.

Q.—In cases of any difficulty between masters and employees, what course or plan would you advise or take with regard to the settlement of the difficulty? A.—In my own business, wherever arbitration could be had, I would always agree to it, and would be willing to have it.

Q.—What kind of form of arbitration would you recommend? A.—That might depend greatly upon what there might be to arbitrate upon. I should say two or three masters, should they require a board of arbitration; that is quite a sufficient number, I think.

Q.—Would you consider it necessary to have enforced, or compulsory arbitration? A.—Provided that all parties were desirous of arriving at a settlement, there would be no need for having any arbitration.

Q.—Well, at first sight, that appears to be quite right, if one or both the parties would look at it in that light, which would be for the public good. Our object is to get experienced men, like yourself, to come up here and give their opinions, and we do this for the purpose of knowing in future what ought to be recommended, and what should not be recommended, and it is for men like you, who have no difficulties with your men, who are in a position to speak without prejudice to give information on this subject. You are in a far better position to give evidence than others who have difficulties with their men, because their judgment may be warped. A.—I shall be glad to give all the information I can to the Commission. I, for one, would be in favor of arbitration. There is one thing I would like to say. Before I came here I took the trouble to look up the number of men now in my employ. I did this in answer to one of the questions on the printed slip, which you have circulated, about having men some little time in my employment. It tends to show that if employers and employees wish to do what is right they can easily agree. Now, in eighteen hundred and sixty-seven, I broke through the rule of reducing the pay of my workmen in the winter time and raising it up again in the spring. And I may say we have sometimes asked the men whether they would not prefer to be paid by the hour, and they have refused. We commenced it then and have never stopped it. I think we were the first to begin that, and in the course of two or three years it became quite customary. I find by this list that one of our workmen commenced with us in eighteen hundred and sixty-nine. Another commenced with us in May, eighteen hundred and seventy-one; another in July, eighteen hundred and seventy-one; another in September, eighteen hundred and seventy-one; another in November, eighteen hundred and seventy-one; another in June, eighteen hundred and seventy-two, and another in January, eighteen hundred and seventy-four, and are now with us. The others came later. These last seven men have been with us ever since.

Q.—That is a very fair record. That is very satisfactory. A.—I have had men come back that have been away 9, 10 and 11 years, some in the United States and others in different places. At no time have I had trouble with my men. They have asked an advance of wages and been refused as the times would not admit of it, and they have told me they would not leave for five or ten cents a day advance. When the right time comes and I find that I can increase the men's wages without request on their part I do so, and by that system we have avoided strikes and difficulties of all sorts. I have had no quarrels with my men in all that time. I do not know that we are "soft" employers exactly, because if men do not do what

is right we will not keep them, but if they do what is right we keep them as long as we can. As a rule men are very anxious to come back and as far as I am concerned I settle my own difficulties, and have not to go to labor organizations to decide them.

Q.—How do you propose to increase the ranks of skilled mechanics? A.—We are trying to do it. If a man will not do it himself by being regularly apprenticed, we must try and do it for him.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—What do you mean by saying you are trying to do it? A.—Well, I say this, the apprentices leave for various reasons. The business has been re-arranged, so to speak, of late years. The business carried on to-day is not the same business as it was at the time when I was apprenticed. At the time that I speak of a boy had to learn his trade thoroughly. Now, by the introduction of machinery, we can in one twelfth the time get certain matter that we otherwise would have had to wait for. Now we can dispense with that particular kind of manual labor, what they have been doing of late years is to take inferior men. They select from them men likely to become workmen and they keep them and train them into skilled mechanics as we treat the Canadians who cannot speak English. Now, some of these do quite important work.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Do you think mechanics of twenty years ago were better mechanics than those of to-day? A.—I do. I am of the opinion that when I was a mechanic we were compelled to keep more closely to our trade than they do at present. There are good mechanics in the city, and I know of some to-day, but you cannot get trained men to-day. I have some trained men to-day, as I have shown you, since eighteen hundred and sixty-nine. I have trained these men and I have got others to help them.

Q.—What is the reason that you cannot get such good men as twenty years ago? A.—I do not know the reason, unless it is that a boy is not honest enough to serve out his time.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you think that education is a benefit to trades generally? Education, as you are aware, is a great deal more advanced than it was in our early days. Do you think there has been a corresponding increase in the adaptability and aptitude of men in the same ratio, as education has become more extended? A.—I feel that there has not. My experience is that boys do not take advantage of the means placed before them so much as they did when I was an apprentice. I know that we (my firm) had some boys, and we paid the expenses for them to attend the Mechanics' Institute, and we invited them to the library and the classes. We paid their fees as apprentices, and but very few attended. We gave them drawing boards, and lent them books. They went around to the Institute and took a book out of the library occasionally, but did not attend the classes.

Q.—Do you know that the School of Technical Knowledge here now is being taken advantage of? A.—Yes; I believe it is, and likely to be more so.

Q.—Do you believe the Schools of Technical Knowledge likely to improve a man in your line—in the line of a carpenter and joiner? A.—My own impression is that it is not a benefit to the carpenter and joiner trade to the extent that appears on the surface. What I mean is that a great many gentlemen's sons, who are not carpenters and joiners, attend these schools, and quite a number who ought to attend do not attend—those who might become mechanics. It is not always those who wish to learn the joiner's trade who wish to attend these classes, many who go there would not learn a trade. We have had gentlemen's sons as apprentices, but these men do not help our trade very much.

Q.—But it does not do any harm to any of these men to acquire knowledge of that sort? They might be better able to appreciate first-class work when they see it? A.—Well, generally those who learn a little think they know a great deal. They attend these classes for a season and then they go off and think they know all about the general business.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—What are the hours of labor? A.—The hours of labor in our shop, are from seven to six.

Q.—Could you tell us what is the highest and lowest rate of wages for inside hands? A.—We pay our men according to their ability. The lowest wages we pay carpenters is one dollar and fifty cents, and the highest, twenty-one cents an hour, or two dollars and ten cents a day.

Q.—Can you give an average of what the inside hands are getting? A.—No; it is very hard to do that, but I can give you the amount earned by these men I have mentioned, because I have got their wages marked down. It just depends upon the number of men you employ. The wages of a man might probably be low and they might be high. The lowest is paid ten cents an hour, and the highest about two dollars a day, and between these two points.

Q.—Can you give the rate for bench hands and outside hands? A.—Bench hands and outside hands receive the same pay.

Q.—Is that the rule, that outside hands have the same wages as bench hands? A.—I do not speak of the rule. I say that each man in our employ is paid according to his work, so that each man thinks he gets the right wage. They are paid according to the rates in the city.

Q.—Can you give us the rate of wages in the city of Montreal, as compared with other cities? A.—No; I do not know the wages in other parts of Canada.

Q.—What is the rate of wages paid apprentices in Montreal? A.—I could not say, I have not any.

Q.—Have you an employers' association here? A.—I do not belong to any.

ALBERT D. NELSON, of the firm of H. A. Nelson & Sons, Wholesale Dealers in Fancy Goods, Woodenware, etc., Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—You are also a manufacturer? A.—Yes.

Q.—What class of goods do you manufacture in Montreal or elsewhere? A.—None in Montreal. In Toronto, brooms and whisks.

Q.—No brushes? A.—No.

Q.—Are these all corn brooms? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you manufacture them entirely? A.—No; we do not manufacture the handles nor the wire.

Q.—Do you manufacture them elsewhere or do you buy them made? A.—We manufacture all the brooms we sell, but we do not manufacture the handles nor the wire.

Q.—You buy the handles, and the wire, and the corn, and you manufacture the brooms after you get these materials? A.—Yes.

Q.—Where is your broom manufactory? A.—At the Central Prison, Toronto.

Q.—How many convicts or prisoners are employed by you in this industry? A.—That I cannot say.

Q.—Do you know how many free labourers you employ there? A.—Yes; I should fancy there are four, but I am not positive. I should fancy there are four just now to direct the men.

- Q.—Your foremen are also the instructors? A.—Yes.
- Q.—During what period do the convicts serve? A.—I think there are none that serve for more than eighteen months. I would not be positive what would be the shortest time, but I think it is thirty days.
- Q.—What do you pay for this labour? A.—That I cannot say. That is in the charge of my brother in Toronto, who manages the business. I do not know what it is now. It is a contract rate, and it is open for anyone to see. I could not tell you.
- Q.—Are your prices for goods higher or lower or equal to the prices paid for like qualities of goods made by you before you had this present contract? A.—About the same, barring the difference in the price of corn. Of course that makes a difference in the price of the broom. The broom corn comes from the United States.
- Q.—Can you sell to manufacturers a like article and yet employ free labour? A.—No; I would not be able to do so.
- Q.—Did you formerly have a manufactory in Montreal? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Is that running now? A.—No.
- Q.—How many men did you employ in this manufactory in Montreal? A.—It would vary from thirty to fifty.
- Q.—You closed this manufactory in Montreal after you received the present contract in Toronto? A.—Yes, shortly after.
- Q.—What would be the ages of these convicts employed by you? A.—I should fancy they are all men? I should fancy so; I do not know of any boys.
- Q.—Where do you sell your goods? A.—All the way from British Columbia to Prince-Edward Island.
- Q.—Do you export any to foreign countries? A.—Very seldom.
- Q.—Would it be possible to export these goods in large quantities to foreign countries at a reduction of the price at which you are forced to sell them in Canada? A.—Yes; during the summer—during the season of navigation.
- Q.—If you were able to have this prison labour at a somewhat lower rate than you now get it for, or for the longer terms that such men are incarcerated in prison, could you find a market for all you could make with this prison labour in foreign countries? A.—I doubt whether we could. Probably if we tried it, it would be a loss. We are selling low enough now without any profits.
- Q.—I think you have misunderstood my question. If you had cheaper labour than you have now could you afford to sell at a lower rate than you now do if you could find a market for all the prison labourers in this country? A.—I should think so if we visited these countries.
- Q.—That might be a possible solution of the question as to the employment of prison labour? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Your contract with the Provincial authorities is near its termination? A.—I believe so, at least I think it is a year from the first of March.
- Q.—Have you any idea whether it will or will not be renewed? A.—It will not be renewed.
- Q.—Do any prisoners acquire considerable skill at broom making? A.—Yes; if they have sufficient time given them, if they choose to serve sufficient time.
- Q.—What time is necessary to acquire a sufficient skill to be a journeyman? A.—Six months. If he has a willingness to mind, it is sufficient to make him an efficient broom maker.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

- Q.—Do you teach a man all branches of broom making in prison? A.—Yes.
- Q.—As soon as he becomes efficient in one branch or part you put him on to another? A.—It is all done at the one time.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

- Q.—You say your contract will expire a year from now. Is it voluntary on the part of your firm to withdraw from that contract? A.—Yes. Well, the Ontario Gov-

ernment has passed a rule that no prison contract will be left to any person after the present term has expired.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Does the price paid by you for prison labor rise and fall in accordance with the supply of prison labor? A.—No; there is no change in price. If the prison is full we pay the same price as if it were comparatively empty. We take so many a day. If they cannot give us the number, we may lose; and on other occasions they are offered to us. If we do want them, and cannot get them, it is a loss; and if we get more than we ask, it is a gain.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are there any broom makers in Montreal? A.—There are three, I believe.

Q.—Do you think you could manufacture as cheaply in Montreal with free labor? Could you manufacture as cheaply as by prison labor? A.—I think we did so in Montreal. I do not know now; the cost may have gone up. I do not know.

By Mr. KERWIN:—

Q.—Do you pay insurance for the building you occupy in the Central Prison? A.—We pay insurance, I believe, on our own goods. I cannot say whether they asked us for insurance. They may have insured the shop as well as the stock.

FELIX CASEY, Builder and Contractor, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—You are in the building trade? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you connected with Mr. Rutherford, in business here? A.—Yes.

Q.—You have heard his statement in regard to the trade in Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—From your point of view or experience, have you anything to add to that? A.—No; I do not think I could say anything on the subject beyond what he said.

Q.—Have you formed any idea yourself with regard to this apprenticeship business? A.—Well, I would like to see every boy become an apprentice and thoroughly bound. I believe in the thing if it was carried out; and I do not believe we will ever have thorough mechanics until it is done.

Q.—Do you think that this is one of the reasons why good mechanics are not so plentiful as in former days? A.—Certainly; it must have some influence in the matter.

Q.—That they are not apprenticed is it your opinion that the introduction of machinery has something to do with it? A.—Well, we have not as much work to do in the shop as we used to. A portion is done by machinery.

Q.—From your experience, do you think the introduction of machinery has been a benefit or otherwise to the trade generally? A.—I think it has been a benefit.

Q.—Do you think that we would have all the improvements in the building trade, do you think we would have all the improvements in our advanced state of education were it not for the use of machinery? A.—No; I should not think we would.

Q.—Is it your opinion that that work could be done as it is now, were it not for the introduction of machinery? A.—It could not be done as cheaply, nor for the same money as quickly, without the introduction of machinery.

Q.—There was a very high feeling against machinery when it was introduced for the making of doors and sashes? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you recollect, before the introduction of machinery, what was the class of work turned out? A.—Well, it was a plainer class of work.

Q.—Was it inferior to hand-made work that you could do with the hand at that time? A.—Perhaps. I do not know that it was as good as machinery. I do not know that it was as good as we have now. I cannot say exactly. I consider that the machine can turn up mouldings, better than you can turn them up by hand, and that the circular saw can turn out better work than the hand saw.

Q.—At the present time, do you think the part that the machine takes in the work would be done better by hand? A.—No; I do not.

Q.—And you think then from your experience in the matter, that machinery has not been what has been generally claimed for it—that is, has been ruinous to the different trades? A.—I think that it has been a great benefit to the workmen in the building line. Of course, it deprives a certain class of work at the first, but to the maker it is a benefit.

Q.—Did it increase the amount of work? A.—Yes. Well, it afforded facilities we did not have before, and the workmen took advantage of it.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Can you tell if the question of wages in Montreal enters into the field with skilled labor? Is that the reason why skilled labor is so scarce? A.—Well, I believe that a good man can make more money in other places.

Q.—If wages were equal, say with cities within an easy reach of the men living in Montreal, would men leave Montreal as much as they do? A.—I should say a great many would not leave Montreal if they could do as well as elsewhere; especially men with large families.

Q.—Supposing, for instance, the same wages were paid in Montreal as in Toronto, do you think that men would be more contented? A.—I think they would be glad to remain where they were reared, if they got the same living.

Q.—You cannot give any comparison between this city and other cities, as to the scale of wages? A.—No; I never worked anywhere else.

HENRY BENJAMIN, quarry owner, of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—What is your business, sir? A.—I am a quarry owner and stone dealer?

Q.—Do you do much in your business? A.—I have not sold very largely, but I have been prospecting in the business for these fifteen years past.

Q.—Do you make a specialty of any kind of stone, or do you furnish or investigate concerning stones generally? A.—I am well acquainted with the trade generally.

Q.—Do you supply to people? Do you own a quarry? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you run it on your own account? A.—Yes. I have limestone quarries near St. Johns and marble quarries near Philipsburg.

Q.—Any others? A.—No; these are the only ones I am working.

Q.—What kind of stone do you quarry? A.—At St. Johns I work ordinary gray limestone, similar to Montreal limestone, and at Philipsburg marbles.

Q.—What kind of marbles? A.—From white to black; every variety—white, variegated and colored, up to black.

Q.—And do you find uses for these various colors? A.—The quarries are not well developed. They require more machinery and plant. From those I have fairly developed I have only been supplying building stone.

Q.—Is the business improving? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any samples? A.—Not here; but there is the Church of Notre Dame de Lourdes, on St. Catherine street, in this city. The interior and the exterior also is built of material furnished by me. The material for the interior is marble,

and for the exterior stone and marble. That black marble of which I speak takes a high degree of polish, and is quite equal to the Italian in my opinion. In fact, there are beds of this stone three miles from here, near Montreal. The foundations of the new Small-Pox Hospital are built of black marble; I mean the new one in course of erection this last year. The overlying limestone beds are marbles.

Q.—Then you cannot speak particularly with regard to any other marble besides those of which samples are contained in this church? A.—Not as far as actually showing them; but as far back as 1851 Sir William Logan took samples from these quarries at Philipsburg to England, and obtained for the Province of Quebec the gold medal for the extent and variety of its marbles. The gold medal is to be seen in the Geological Museum in Ottawa.

Q.—There has not been any company of men brought together for the development of these marbles, so far, I suppose? A.—No. It is very hard to develop them.

Q.—Do you think if a company was formed for developing them, and if samples of these marbles were judiciously distributed, do you think these quarries would be taken advantage of more than they are by builders? A.—Yes. I have had samples polished and sent to England for the purpose of seeing if an export trade could be done, and I am very satisfied it can be done. You see, in Italy and other countries they take the marbles from above ground on the mountains. Here we have to take them out of the ground by the ordinary process of quarrying.

Q.—Is it your experience that the marble we have will stand our climate better than the Italian marble? A.—Yes; it is very natural that the stone of the country will stand better than an imported stone. The Italian marble is only used for interior decoration.

Q.—And it does not stand the frost so well? A.—No.

Q.—This industry is capable of great developments, I presume? A.—Yes; the development of the stone trade is neglected. It is as bad as any in the country. I have heard persons remark that it was impossible to get good marbles, and have not believed that the marbles I have alluded to, in the church of Notre Dame de Lourdes, are marbles, until they more closely inspected them. They believed they were composed of wood, not marble. I have known some of the principle marble men take it for granted that the interior work of that church was wood.

JONATHAN K. WARD, of the City and District of Montreal, Lumber Merchant and Manufacturer, sworn:

By MR. HEAKES:—

Q.—Can you tell us anything about the system of fining in the mills at Magog in this Province? A.—I was asked to come here and testify to the amount of fines of the St. Henry Mills. I am not prepared to say anything on that point, because I am not generally posted. I think you would get it better by asking the Manager, or the Secretary.

Q.—Are you the President? A.—No.

Q.—Would the President be able to give it? A.—I think so. There is a Secretary to give it. I communicated with him through the telephone.

Q.—Can you speak as to the system of fines imposed at the Coaticooke Mill, and the amount of fines, and what they are for? A.—The amount of fines paid—it is a small mill, comparatively—is —\$40,000 a year. The amount of fines, as nearly as I can learn, not having the books in the city to refer to, would not average, probably, more than \$50 a year, and we have adopted a system there—whether general or not in other mills, I cannot say—of giving a premium over their wages for good work, diligence and punctuality, which have taken about half the fines back. At Magog we have no works for making cloth. We print only at present. We are, however, putting up a

mill for the purpose of making our own cloth. Hitherto we have bought our own cloth. Our employees are young boys, young women and men. Several are high priced men. Our printers receive \$25 a week, simply as printers. Our color mixers receive \$32 a week; our dyer receives \$30 a week. These are very high priced men. We pay all the way up, from a dollar and a quarter a day. Our laborers around the mill get a dollar and a quarter a day.

Q.—Are the patterns or designs made in Magog—are they executed in Canada?
A.—We make our own rollers for putting the patterns into the cloth on the ground. The patterns are very few. Originally we imported the patterns from England and France, but of late we have had original designs of our own. All the rollers are made on the ground. I was going to say there, with reference to the cotton trade generally, the idea has got abroad very generally that the cotton trade is a very lucrative one, and that the proprietors of cotton mills are all cotton lords. I wish to disabuse the mind of the public on that point, because of twenty-two cotton mills in Canada, spread over the country from Halifax to the confines of Ontario, very few have paid a dividend for the past five years. The public forget the cost of material and other expenses to the investors, and the rate of wages paid to the operators.

Q.—Is that not due to a certain extent to the manufacturers themselves who began to manufacture the same quality and class of goods? A.—The same character of goods. That was so to a large extent ten years ago: when the Valleyfield Mills made white goods, two other mills started, and the competition was so keen that now that mill does not make white goods. It makes all colored goods.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have any considerable number of investors in these manufacturing companies been obliged to sell their stock? A.—As a rule, the stock has not changed hands.

Q.—But those who sold, sold with a loss? A.—Yes. I might say I know of one mill, which has been running six years, which never paid a dollar in consequence of the Manufacturers' Association, or combine if you like to call it, who handled some of the mills. They were unable to declare a reasonable dividend on their capital invested; and a great many, as I said before, have paid no dividend to the stockholders for several years past.

GEORGE A. MOONEY, of the City of Montreal, Tanner, sworn.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—I suppose your trade is general? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many hands do you employ? A.—About fifty.

Q.—What kind of leather do you produce—the best of course? A.—Yes; light leathers for uppers for boots and shoes. No heavy leather at all. We get calf and sheep skins.

Q.—No kips? A.—No; that is out of our line.

Q.—Do you produce any of those very fine dressed sheep skins? A.—Yes; we produce all sorts of fine kids for uppers.

Q.—There was a kind of leather that used to be produced some time ago, I do not know whether you produce it now. It was called "muggadore"? A.—No; we do not. I do not know what kind it was. Was it a heavy or oily leather—and porous?

Q.—Yes. A.—No; we do not produce it. The trade wants a highly polished leather. We do not do anything in the heavy leathers now.

Q.—What wages do you pay? A.—Three dollars a week up to three dollars a day.

Q.—In your tanning business what kind of bark do you generally use? A.—In our line we mostly use sumac and japonica, and if we had to use bark it would be extract of hemlock.

Q.—Do you find a ready market for all your produce here? A.—Yes; a fair market.

Q.—Where do you find a market for your goods? A.—All in Canada. Toronto, Quebec, Montreal, London, and most of the towns and cities throughout Canada.

Q.—Are there many of these tanneries in Montreal? A.—There are two.

Q.—Do they produce sole leather? A.—No—that is, it is not produced in the city, they find it best to take the hides where the bark is, rather than bring the bark to the hides.

Q.—Where do you take the sole leather to be tanned? A.—Messrs Shaw Bros.; they have tanneries all over the country.

Q.—Is your business generally a healthy business? A.—Yes; it is supposed to be a very healthy business.

Q.—Is your place well ventilated? A.—Yes; our place extends from one street to another and the ventilation extends right through it.

Q.—Are you aware that heavy smells sometimes prevail by reason of the different processes in dressing these skins, which required a great deal of ventilation of the premises to take off this effluvia? A.—Yes; our premises are exceedingly well ventilated.

Q.—Do you employ any girls? A.—Yes; we employ six or seven girls at the lathe.

Q.—What is their business. A.—At the finishing machines, for holding the skins before the “blazing” machine.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you employ any boys? A.—Very few.

Q.—How many? A.—Eighteen or nineteen.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Are you able to produce an article equal to the American or English manufacturers? A.—Yes; we are quite capable of doing that. We have all the machinery that a United States factory can have.

Q.—Are the sales here as good—the prices? A.—I do not know that.

Q.—At any rate, you sell at remunerative prices? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is the leather trade on the increase or otherwise? A.—Yes; I think it is still on the increase, this year it is a little duller than usual.

Q.—Is there sufficient manufactured here to supply the demand? A.—No; I think not.

Q.—Where do you get the balance from? A.—From Toronto, Quebec, Port Hope—tanneries in those places.

Q.—You are able to procure sufficient for the wants of the manufacturers over the whole Dominion? A.—Yes.

Q.—And you think it is from Canadian markets they are supplied? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do they import any from the United States? A.—Yes; they import some, and I think they import some from England and Germany; the finer classes, a small part of the trade.

Q.—Do they import English or French manufactured skins? A.—Not now.

Q.—Do you think for our own requirements we produce everything that is sufficient? A.—Yes; I think our own market is sufficient enough. We have all we can do to place goods properly.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You do not impose fines? A.—No.

Q.—Do you not impose fines when they are late in the morning? A.—Not at all; we are not troubled with anything like that. They are very punctual.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Have you any trouble with your employees? A.—We have had no labour troubles.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What are your hours of work? A.—We work from seven until six, taking in half an hour for dinner, and on Saturdays ten minutes at noon, and we leave off on Saturdays at half past two; that is the proposition that was made to the men, amongst others, and they accepted that, preferring to get away at half past two on Saturday.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Have you apprentices at your trade? A.—No; they come in and work at the business, and as they are able, and willing, they gradually fall into it.

ARTHUR W. SHORT, of the City and District of Montreal, Journalist, editor of *The Canadian Workman*.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you any statement that you would like to make, or any information you would desire to lay before the Commission, in the form of a statement, or do you desire to be questioned? A.—I propose to give my evidence in a short statement, and, knowing that your time is valuable, I wish to make it as brief as possible, giving a few statistics in proof of the existence of the abuses of which I complain. First, as to the question to the levying of water rates in the city. You have had some evidence on this point before, and of further evidence would tend to place the matter in a clearer light before you. An improvement should be made in the mode of collecting water rates. At any rate, the best means should be taken to levy the water rate on the property, rather than on the tenant. This is shown from the report of the City Treasurer, and from the statements of the City Assessors themselves. From these statements, there can be no question that the workingman is made to pay heavily for water which he does not use, and not only that, but for water used by his richer and more fortunate fellow citizens. Even the servants of the city are compelled to admit that the water rates would be better levied on the property. One great injustice is, that the principal expense falls on the poor, under the present system. During the last 20 years, according to the report, the tenants have been paying for a large amount of water they did not use, to this extent:—for sewers, rinks, street sprinkling, and fires. They paid to the extent of \$56,800 for public fountains and parks, about \$30,000, making a total of \$86,800; and then for repairs to pipes, and the supplying of hydrants at fires, \$327,383, and then for arrears and discount on the collection, and so forth, \$287,334, making a grand total of \$1,301,517, during the last 20 years, of money which the tenants, and of course a large number, therefore, of the poorer classes of Montreal, have paid for water which they did not use in any way, that is \$55,000 a year levied for this purpose alone. Then, there is a large difference between the water rates levied upon the poorer tenants and that levied on the better classes of property. Now, in the West End—there are some houses on Drummond and Dorchester streets—I have statistics of a number of them, and will just give one or two principal instances, where property has been valued and rentals have been fixed for the purposes of taxation by the City Assessors. No. 175 Dorchester street, is valued at \$6,500, the City Assessors have given the rental as \$450. At No. 99 Drummond street, there is a

property valued at \$8,000, and it is the same rental (\$450). Then, there are a number of properties, ranging from \$13,000, whose rentals only vary \$100, as assessed by the City Assessors. It will thus be seen that properties varying from \$6,000 to \$9,000 in value are placed as being worth the same rent, \$450 per annum, while houses valued at from \$5,000 to \$5,500 are placed at \$800 rental only. On Dorchester street there is a terrace called Edgehill Avenue. There are four houses erected almost equally well, and are good values in their way. The rent of all is fixed at \$800 per annum, although the properties are valued at \$13,000, \$14,000, \$16,000 and \$18,000 respectively. Although there is a difference of 40 per cent in the market value, it makes no difference in the assessment for rent, on which assessment the water tax is based. One point, a striking contrast, the most striking of all to citizens, is to be found on the books of the Corporation in this regard: No. 845 Dorchester street is the residence of Mr. George Washington Stephens; it consists of a house and grounds, and is appraised at a value of \$75,000, and it is assessed at a rental only of \$1,000. The property is valued at less than a quarter per cent of the market value. It is the cheapest house in Montreal, is occupied by one of the wealthiest citizens, and pays the least assessment of any. Of course it is owned by the tenant. Then in the east end of the city there are some houses in Matthew Alley valued at \$700, \$600 and \$500 each, and they are assessed at a rental of \$160 and \$180 per annum. While the assessed rental of the house on Dorchester street is only one and a half, the value of the \$500 house, at least the rental, is 23 per cent on the value of the property. That is the highest revenue-producing property in Montreal. The house valued at \$700 is assessed 40 per cent. less than the one worth \$600 in the same alley; and the \$600 house pays \$100 less than the one valued at \$500. These occupy the same area, and yet are appraised as having local valuations varying from \$80 to \$160, which is interesting, being a difference of from 16 to 33 per cent, and of course this is probably owing to some of the houses being occupied by landlords or owners.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Then the rate of assessment cannot be equal? A.—It is not equal; it varies considerably all over the city.

Q.—It would appear thus that the owner of the property is more easily dealt with than the tenant? A.—Yes; that appears to be the case. To put the contrast more strikingly before you of the assessment of the property on Matthew Alley and Mr. George Washington Stephens' property: His residence, No. 845 Dorchester street, is valued at \$75,000; the houses on Matthew Alley, Nos. 355 to 341, are valued at \$500. The rent of Mr. George Washington Stephens' house, which is valued by the Assessors at \$75,000, is \$1,000, and the houses on Matthew Alley, which according to the assessment are valued at \$500 each, is \$160. According to the assessment, the water rate of Mr. George Washington Stephens' house is put down at \$85.75, and the water rate of the house on Matthew Alley at \$23. The percentage of rent paid on the Dorchester street mansion of Mr. George Washington Stephens is one and a half, and on the tenement in Matthew Alley 32. The percentage of water rate paid by the house on Dorchester street is seven and one eighth, and the percentage of water rate paid by the tenement on Matthew Alley 16 per cent. Thus you will see that Mr. George Washington Stephens, who lives in his house—a house valued at \$75,000 by the assessors, pays only a percentage of one and a-half rental, and seven eighths per cent water tax, while the poor man living in a shanty valued at \$500 pays a percentage of thirty-two, and a water rate of fifteen per cent. You see the difference not only in rent assessed on the house, but also in the water rate assessed on the rent. Again you will see that if Mr. George Washington Stephens did the same as the poor man who lives in Matthew Alley, he would pay \$3,600 instead of \$85.75 for his water, and then again, if the tenant on Matthew Alley paid the same as Mr. George Washington Stephens, he would pay only 58 cents instead of \$23.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—He would use water in the same proportion? A.—He would have to pay much more as he would be in a larger house, and consequently use more. I think it should be charged on the property. As to the registering of water by meter I may say that people who have had large experience with the meter system in gauging the amount of gas used, think that it is a bad system to introduce—you cannot depend on the meter. I think the best way is to levy the water rate on the property, and only levy sufficient to pay the running expenses of the water system.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—I do not think the water rates were introduced for the purpose of profit, but for the benefit of the community? A.—I am of the same opinion, but still the poor man pays for the rich man's water. We have too, in this city a system which has very largely to do with the question as between landlord and tenant, and the house question so far as it refers to the condition of the working classes here. The city is generally in a very unsanitary condition. It is the universal custom in this city for tenants to lease a house for one year. They cannot get any landlord to lease a house for a less period in the spring of the year. They take the house in February, as a general rule. They sign the lease in February, and go in and occupy it in the following May. So that they undertake to lease a house for twelve months, three months before taking possession of it. Then the tenant usually has to pay the lawyers expenses for drawing up the lease. And if he wants to move can only move in May and must pick the house three months before that. Now one of the principal evils of the tenement property in this city is that working men's dwellings are very unsanitary, and a tenant in taking a house in February takes a house with back yard and everything covered up with snow, and he cannot see what the sanitary condition of the house or the surroundings are. Probably, when ready to go into the house, he finds a cesspool within three feet of the back door, and this, of course, was hid, at the time he took the house, with the snow of the winter season. Although as I have said he took the house in February, he does not go into it until the following May. Then all classes of tenants living in the neighborhood go out, and he moves into an unhealthy residence permeated by noxious vapours, and all the rest of it, and he is obliged to remain there for the next twelve months.

Q.—Is not the landlord obliged to put the roof in tenantable order? A.—Well, I suppose there may be a law here the same as in England, to oblige the landlord to keep it in order, but I know some houses where it is not, but it all depends on the way the lease is drawn up. Very often a lease is signed by which the tenant does the repairing. That is usually the case, and then if, say a man is working at the Cotton Mills, say at Hochelaga, and he is thrown out of work there, and the nearest Cotton Mill where he can get work at his old occupation, be away in St. Henri several miles away; he has leased a house for twelve months, is thrown out of work, and has to travel that distance, or pay his rent and board in the other end of the city—a thing altogether out of the question. This calls for a little more business enterprise, and the building up of property. The creating of a little competition in real estate among the landlords, would make rents cheaper, and houses more acceptable and yet allow them to realize a respectable profit out of the working classes.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—So from your point of view the sanitary condition of the poorer class of houses is not good for the working classes? A.—It is not. It is very bad, very deplorable indeed. The Montreal Star of November the 22nd last, describes one house that I saw myself on Eleanor Street. The report, after stating the fact that this is one of the many "nests of contagion" in the city of Montreal, continues: "Within a radius of 100 yards on Ottawa, McCord and Eleanor streets or rather in yards back of these streets, there are three rows of houses, rickety, propped up facing dirty sheds and germ breeding closets, and in many of these houses sickness reigns supreme."

At the rear of 214 Ottawa Street is a yard, that in winter is comparatively scentless, but which in summer, so the lodgers around it say, reeks with the smell of offal. Eight families live in the houses in this yard, at the rate of four dollars a month for the lower parts, and a little more for the palaces above. Feeling his way to the extreme end of the yard the reporter knocked at the door of the lower tenement, and was admitted into a house consisting of two rooms, in which a family of four are accommodated. In one corner sat a child, once as rosy as an apple, but now pallid and with brilliant eyes. She was just recovering from a severe attack of diphtheria for which she had been treated at the hospital, and her voice was gone. The father himself is on the verge of illness, and the mother is worn with fatigue, for the couch upon which the sick girl had at first lain had only just been vacated by her brother, who had been rescued from typhoid fever by the assiduous care of doctor and mother.

In front of the house twelve closets are ranged, and at one side separated by a board fence, is a stable. From the occupants of this house it was learned, that there have been some fifteen cases of diphtheria and typhoid fever recently in that locality. The twelve closets are used by the inmates of this row of houses, and by those of a row on McCord Street, or twelve families in all. Under the houses about fourteen loads of rubbish from cellars of grocery stores on McCord Street, consisting, so it is said, of old fish and other foul smelling matters, were recently dumped. When it rains the smell from this stuff is overpowering. The first doctor who was called in to treat the little boy, refused to do so while his parents remained in that locality, as he said it would be almost useless; the second physician was no more hopeful, but promised to do his best. Eleanor Street, despite its royal name, has on it houses by no means palatial. On entering a yard here the first series of houses seem wholesome enough, and contain no sickness, but continuing a little further a row of tumble down sheds, at least such is what the ordinary citizen would call them, greets the eye. Bricks have been taken from the walls and replaced by wood, through the cracks in which the wind of winter must whistle cruelly, in this row there are at present two cases of typhoid fever, and three of diphtheria. Facing these houses is a serious of sheds each containing a closet usually in a most filthy condition, and emitting such a stench that a peep in at the door of the shed sufficed the reporter. A call was made upon the family in which there was diphtheria. Here there were three rooms neatly furnished, but the air was full of a heavy, musty smell, as from rotting timber. In one corner of the room lay a bright looking child, which a day or two since had been almost given up by the doctor. A lad was in the same room suffering from the same malady, but so far recovered as to be up and about. Poor chap! He was used to diphtheria, having had it four times. In another room lay still another child, also on the road to recovery, and also intimate with the disease. The ceilings of the room were discoloured with the water that is said by the tenants to pour in during wet weather. Down stairs another family of about eight, were house cleaning, and here also the house was heavy with the same bad smell, added to by a perceptible dampness. The cellar door was opened, and the hole below, not three feet deep, revealed the source of the dampness. The floods had been there; it is said that is one of the first houses to be flooded when the flood comes. There is no drainage whatever. The rental of these houses is six dollars per month for the lower flats, and seven for the upper flats. Every family in this row has had a case of sickness during the past year. The health officers could find employment there."

Towards the end of last summer I went about a good deal among the tenement property in Griffintown, and in fact, commenced a series of articles on the sanitary condition of the City. About the first one I published brought a threatened libel suit of ten thousand dollars, and under pressure I was obliged to compromise and drop the matter but the main facts of the case were not questioned, and another paper the *Star* took up the same facts. They were threatened with a libel suit, and apologised at once. This property—in fact all around Griffintown, properties are in a most unsanitary condition, the privies are four feet from the house outside the back

door. They are mostly cesspools, and they stand in a row just close to the back doors or front doors where the tenements are in the yard.

Q.—Your system of drainage appears to be very bad indeed. No wonder there is so much sickness. A.—Our system of drainage is the very worst in the world. The statistics of the City Surveyor which I will refer to in a few moments, prove that, as also the report regarding these houses on Eleanor Street, where there were fourteen or fifteen cases of diphtheria and typhoid fever in one immediate locality, in a very short space of time.

Q.—What part of the city is that? A.—Griffintown, on Ottawa Street. It is a large yard and looks very nice to go into, and to outward appearance strikes you at first glance, as a nice neighbourhood, and pretty comfortable for the working man with small means. But when you come to look around you, and notice the smell pervading the neighbourhood, you are soon led to know of what class it is. Then there is a yard at the top of College street, where there are no sinks or drains of any kind in the houses. There are a number of houses in the yard. I counted them at the time, but I have lost my notes and cannot give them. Then there is Drake's yard—houses where the workmen live and where there are no drains in the houses, and where the people living in the upper tenements have to come out on to the galleries, and have to throw all their slops into a wooden pipe to descend or go down into the sewer. There is one drain in the middle of the yard, and a small cesspool in front of each door.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Where is the sanitary inspector? A.—We have a paid sanitary inspector, but he has not full powers, and perhaps cannot do what he would. However this system has continued up to the present time, and that is my reason for laying those facts before you, as well as to draw attention to the high rents paid by the poorer classes. Just now rents are going up by leaps and bounds. Of course there are no small cottage properties such as I have seen in England for the poorer classes. I have jotted down a few figures regarding this class of houses which have come under my notice. In Point St. Charles for instance, house rent has been raised here from three to six dollars on the whole of Sebastopol street; at ninety four Chenneville street, for a house of three rooms, the rent has been raised from seven to eight dollars; at one hundred and sixty-six Cadieux street, the rent has risen from nine to eleven dollars per month—the rent of this house has been for a few years past nine dollars per month. It is to be eleven on the first of May next. On St. Hypolite street, corner of Roy street, there are eight tenements the rent of which has been raised from nine to thirteen dollars per month. At number thirty-three, the taxes have been put on. At number nineteen Alexander street, where the rent was seven dollars per month for five years past it is now ten dollars and taxes. At number one hundred and twenty-eight Nazareth street for the last four years, the rent was seven and a half dollars a month; it is now raised to eight. This is a house of three rooms. Another house in the same street—one up stairs and another down—five rooms, the rent has been raised to ten dollars per month, it has been nine dollars per month for the past three years. On Richmond street a house which was twelve and a half dollars per month now pays twelve dollars and fifty cents per month and taxes, which will make it about thirteen dollars and some odd cents per month. The house number thirty-eight, Vitre Street, consisting of eight rooms was fifteen dollars a month, and it is now being raised to nineteen dollars. No one knows what the difficulty is of getting a house in the city here except anyone who has had experience. I have not had much experience in that way but I have heard people who have. Others have complained to me that it is almost impossible to get one, and quite approved of getting one in February and sign the lease. In the East End no houses are let to any one with children. That rule is almost universal.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—This is a strange part of the country, they want the world to go on, and to

have no children? A.—The landlords, I suppose, think children will damage the property, and expect to get those who have no children. Now, with regard to the drainage. This pamphlet that I have here, is the latest report of the City Surveyor. This is the latest return of the City Surveyor, Mr. St. George, for 1885. I would imagine, however, that this year very little improvements will be made. I desire to call attention to one or two points, and I will be brief. On one very important street in the city, Lagauchetière Street, and I may here say that on almost all the streets, we have sewers of various descriptions and sizes, and in some instances, in places, no sewer at all. Sometimes brick abuts against wood, and that against tile drains, and they are all of different sizes, and where they abut one against the other you may easily imagine the sewer is liable to become blocked with filth. However, on Lagauchetière Street, from Shaw Street to Papineau Road, there is no sewer; from Papineau Road to Saint Adolphe Street it is a wooden sewer; from Saint Adolphe Street to Visitation Street it is a brick sewer; then, from Visitation Street to Wolfe Street it is a brick sewer, (all these are 3×2); then, from Wolfe Street to Campeau Street it is a two foot brick sewer; from Campeau Street to the west of Saint André Street there is no sewer; from the west of Saint André to Labelle Street it is wood; on Saint Hubert Street it is brick (3×2); from Saint Hubert to Labelle Street it is a two foot brick drain; from Labelle Street to Berri Street there is no sewer; from the west of Berri Street to Saint Elizabeth Street it is brick; from Saint Elizabeth Street to German Street there is no sewer; from German Street, westwards, brick, (no dimensions given); from west of Saint Constant Street to Saint Dominique Street, and Saint Dominique Street, westwards, it is brick, (3×2); from Saint Lawrence Street to Saint Charles Boromé Street there is no sewer; from Saint Charles Boromé Street to the east of Saint Urbain Street it is brick, (3×2); from Saint Urbain Street to Coté Street there is no sewer; from Coté Street to the east of Chenneville Street there is a sewer, (two feet), presumably wood, (the description is not mentioned); from Chenneville Street to Bleury Street there is no sewer; from Bleury Street, a distance west, it is of brick, (two feet); then east to Saint Alexander Street it is built of wood; from Saint Alexander Street to Saint Radegonde Street it is brick, (two feet); from Saint Radegonde Street to Sainte Geneviève Street there is no sewer; from Sainte Geneviève Street to Sainte Monique Street there is a sewer of some description, (presumably wood); and from thence to Sainte Marguerite Street, the end of Lagauchetière Street it is brick (3×2).

Q.—Have you a City Engineer here? A.—There is a City Engineer.

Q.—Is it he that lays down any observation as to the line of the sewer? A.—No; the fault is the sewers are made by contract—by contractors.

Q.—I mean is the line of sewer regularly laid down on the map by the City Engineer? A.—So far as I know, no plan is adopted for making sewers. The usual custom as regards house drains has been to put the sewer down, any kind of a sewer to suit the pockets of the proprietors, and then the proprietor runs it into the nearest street sewer he can find. The principal number of these private drains are wood.

Q.—Then probably there are drains lying in the road absolutely lost to-day? A.—Yes; probably they are all rotted away. There is very little doubt of it at all.

Q.—You describe a very bad state of affairs? A.—It is a bad state of affairs, even taking this report.

Q.—It would be an interesting study to follow up these things? A.—Yes; I should like to see a map shewing all this. Many questions have been asked of witnesses appearing before this Commission as to the difference between wages in Toronto and wages in Montreal. I may just say with regard to my experience in the matter, although I never worked at any trade in Montreal (I did in Toronto) I have taken some interests in the trades of Montreal, and I know something about them, probably. I believe machinists are better paid here than in Toronto, but in the building trades they are paid far worse here in Montreal than in Toronto. They obtain far lower wages here.

Q.—By how much per cent? A.—By thirty per cent. My knowledge is particularly with regard to carpenters and joiners and pattern makers.

(Translation.)

PIERRE HUBERT MORIN, Assessor, of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have taken cognizance of a letter of Mr. O. Bibaud, 56½ Montcalm St.?
A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Will you tell us at what rate the rental was assessed in 1887? A.—\$110.

Q.—But the No. 56½ alone? A.—No. 56½ alone was assessed at \$70.

Q.—No. 56½ comprises two lodgings, does it not? A.—It comprises one lodging of two flats; but one of these is sub-let.

Q.—The two flats were rented by the same man? A.—By the same man.

Q.—What is the amount of the assessment of the two stories for 1887? A.—\$110.

Q.—You said, or at least the other assessors said, that the rentals were determined by the deeds. Am I right in thinking so? A.—Generally so. As much as it can be done.

Q.—Mr. Bibaud has fyled before the Commission, under oath, three receipts, showing that instead of his rental being \$110, it was only \$72 a year. Here are the receipts. (The witness takes cognizance of the receipt produced.) A.—If Mr. Bibault had come the first year (1885), and had proved this to the Assessors, that he paid only six dollars a month, he would have got what he looked for.

Q.—Mr. Bibaud has deposed that he went to see you, yourself, and, after laying his claim before you, he obtained a rebate of only 75c.? A.—This was in 1886. In the year 1885 he laid no claim before me.

Q.—Mr. Bibault has declared, under oath, that in 1885, as well as in 1886 and 1887, he paid only \$6 of rent a month? A.—He must have made this declaration in 1886, inasmuch as he obtained his reduction that year; but not in 1885, for there is no entry to that effect in the book of that year.

Q.—Still, in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six, the year in which he laid his claim before you—a fact which you admit—his rental was raised to \$90 instead of \$72? A.—Yes, sir; on that head I would observe that we are not bound to follow what is given out to us as the amount of rental. Even if Mr. Bibaud had proved that his rent was only \$6 per month, if we determined that it was worth \$8, we had the right to put him down at \$8, on a footing with his neighbours.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are you in the habit of determining the water tax according to a rental lower than that declared to you by the tenant? A.—Generally speaking, when we see that the tenant gives us the real amount of the rental, we make him a little reduction.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Is it set down in clause 72, of Act 37, Vict., Cap. 51, (amended in 1875), “that the assessors shall specify and include in the assessment roll the *bona fide* rental of such property.” If I really pay \$6 a month, can you assess me higher? A.—If we think the property is worth more. I understand by *bona fide* in the Act, “where there is no favour.”

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You establish no relation between the value of the rental and the value of the property? A.—No; not always.

Q.—A property of the same class, which fetches much, and property of a like class, which fetches little, are the same thing? A.—A property which fetches more, is judged to be worth more, but there are exceptions.

Q.—Do you think that the property on Salaberry Street, which fetched \$910 in 1887, should not have paid dearer in 1887 than in 1882, when it was valued only at \$688? A.—I believe that, in 1882, that property had been assessed too high. This is the reason that we have not deemed it fitting to raise it since.

Q.—Do you think that if the clause imposing only one-third of the water tax on every sub-tenant were applied, there would be a large number of families paying less for water than they do now? A.—I have not gone into that question. I may remark, however, in this connection, that we have not a direct control of the collection. We are bound to take down the rental as it is given us, register it in the book, and then it is the Treasurer's business to collect afterward according to law. Our sole business is to take down the rental from the parties. We have nothing to do with the restrictions, or the privileges of sub-tenants.

SAMUEL WILLIAM WELLS, of the City of Montreal, Superintendent to Mr. Wm. McDonald, Tobacco Manufacturer, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Can you give the number of men, women and children employed in Mr. McDonald's factory? A.—I have the number of males and females, but not of the men, women and children classed separately.

Q.—Can you first give the number of the men, comprising all male persons over and above fifteen years of age? A.—Well, there are about 500 males, and 550 females, and, I suppose, there might be, perhaps, 200 children out of that.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Divided equally between boys and girls? A.—About equally.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest boy employed there? A.—None are supposed to be employed under twelve years of age; that is the rule of the establishment.

Q.—If there are children under twelve years of age, you must have been deceived when the age was given? A.—Yes; certainly,

Q.—What is the age of the youngest girl employed there? A.—Well, twelve is the limit, and I do not know of any younger than that.

Q.—Do you know that by law girls are not allowed to be employed in factories until they are fourteen years of age? A.—No; I have never seen the law.

Q.—Have you never seen the Factory Act? A.—No; I have never seen the Factory Act.

Q.—Well, it is time that you should. I would advise you to look it up and read it carefully. Its provisions might be enforced any day,

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—I would draw your attention to the Factory Act, the first and second clauses, Section Nine, Chap. Thirty-two (32), eighteen hundred and eighty-five (1885), Quebec, which reads as follows: "1st. No male child aged less than twelve years, and no female child aged less than fourteen years, can be employed in any factory.

"2nd. Except, as hereinafter provided, a child between the ages of twelve and fourteen years shall not be employed in any factory unless the employer of such child has in his possession, and produces when thereto requested by the Inspector, either a certificate signed by the parent, tutor, or other person, having the legal custody or

"control over such child, in which certificate the person signing it shall state the date thereof, the age of such child at the said date, and the birth place of such child, or in case there is not in the Province of Quebec anyone having the legal custody or control of such child, the written opinion of a physician that such child is not less than twelve years of age." It is not enforced yet, but it is sanctioned by law, and, as the Chairman has just informed you, it may be enforced any day. A.—Up to today we were not aware of any such provision.

Q.—That is the reason it is communicated to you—for your information. At the beginning of the month you sent away some of the children that were working in your factory, did you not? A.—Yes; because we were getting to much work done—we were getting too large a stock on hand.

Q.—Was it not because you found out they were too young? A.—No.

Q.—How many did you send away? A.—I think there were some fifteen or sixteen; I think that was the number.

Q.—Did you send away others besides those children, at that time? A.—No.

Q.—Do you mean to say that you sent these fifteen or sixteen children away from your factory simply because you had no work for them? Do you mean to say you sent this small number of children away out of a total number of eleven hundred employees? A.—That is the first batch. There are a good many more who will have to go away. They were taken away from one kind of work, and another kind of work will have to furnish its quota, as well as this particular kind of work on which they were engaged. Our work is very slack at the present time. This last fortnight we stopped working one whole day, and then again for half a day. Fifteen had to leave because there was no work for them to do. We were obliged to let them go on account of the amount of work done—on account of the stock we have on hand.

Q.—What are their hours of labor? A.—From half-past seven in the morning to twenty minutes to twelve, when they go to dinner. At one o'clock they return and work until twenty minutes to six. The usual day hands work from seven to twelve, when they go to their dinner. They commence again at one, and work until six. As I have just told you, the others go twenty minutes before the usual time hands, both at noon and evening; and they are allowed half an hour in the morning also.

Q.—Do you mean to say that children do not go at the same hour as adults—the grown-up people? A.—They all go in, that is the piece-hands, any time up to half-past seven; they go in half-an-hour later than time-hands.

Q.—That is both children and adults who work in that room? A.—That is all that do the work that is done in that room. The time-hands commence in the factory at seven o'clock in the morning.

Q.—Are there children among the weekly hands? A.—There is a number of them.

Q.—Are they obliged to commence work at seven o'clock in the morning? A.—They come in at seven o'clock.

Q.—At what time do they leave? A.—They leave at six o'clock. The time-hands commence at seven o'clock in the morning and leave at six in the evening.

Q.—Children and all? A.—Yes.

Q.—When you are pressed with work, do your hands work later than six o'clock? A.—Well, in one of the rooms sometimes we do.

Q.—Only in one room? A.—Well, one room specially.

Q.—Are there in that room children working? A.—No; there are no children working there.

Q.—Do the children never work later than six o'clock in the evening in the factory? A.—Well, they may work until ten minutes or a quarter past six sometimes.

Q.—Never later than that? A.—Not that I am aware of.

Q.—Can they work there later without you knowing it? A.—Not that I am aware of. In that room there are a great many hands, and to save a crush when

the hands are leaving the factory, they are sometimes kept behind until the others have left, and sometimes they are let out before the others, so that they may be out and away before the time-hands come out; but it sometimes happens, as I have said, that instead of being let out first they are let out last, and that makes a difference of perhaps half-an-hour. That is the only overtime they do, when they do not get out at the exact hour.

Q.—What is the wages paid to men, women and children who work by the week? A.—Boys are paid from one dollar and fifty cents to five dollars and fifty cents a week. The men are paid from six dollars to eight dollars and eight dollars and fifty cents per week, and the women are paid from about one dollar and fifty cents to four dollars and a quarter per week.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you mean women over sixteen years of age? A.—No; that refers to children and all females—that is during the winter.

Q.—What is the difference between summer and winter wages? A.—Well, it is not the same difference every year.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—For the last year what would be the difference? A.—Those who are getting seven dollars and fifty cents per week this winter were paid nine dollars last summer; those getting four dollars and fifty cents were paid last summer four dollars and seventy-five cents. Others had fifty cents taken off.

Q.—What reduction would there be on the childrens' wages? A.—Some were not reduced at all.

Q.—What reduction was made in the childrens' wages that were reduced? A.—Anything that was reduced was perhaps reduced twenty-five cents.

Q.—How many men have you got earning eight dollars a week, who earned nine dollars a week last summer? A.—I suppose there would be perhaps fifteen to twenty.

Q.—That is out of the five hundred men you employ? A.—Well, of course, I do not know anything about the men who are working piece work. Of course we have not five hundred men working day work. I suppose of men and boys working day work, there are perhaps a couple of hundred and perhaps a little more.

Q.—Is it not a fact that during last summer nearly the whole of your men working by day work were receiving only seven dollars and fifty cents a week? A.—Well, that would be at very common laboring work—at seven dollars and fifty cents a week. Old hands get more than that. We train our hands, and the trained hands were up to nine dollars a week.

Q.—Is the factory closed during a certain period of the year? A.—It is closed at the New Year to repair up.

Q.—For how long is it closed? A.—Generally a fortnight. If we stop at all we cannot begin again in less than a fortnight, and the Government calls upon us on the first of July—that is to say the Government compels us to take stock on the first of July. This is done by the order of the Government.

Q.—How many weeks do you estimate the time lost in one year by the men? A.—Well, it is generally computed to be four weeks.

Q.—Does it not sometimes reach eight weeks in the year? A.—I never knew it.

Q.—How much do you pay your men working by the piece? A.—Well, they are paid by the hundred pounds. For different kinds of work they receive different rates of pay.

Q.—These men are obliged to pay the men they employ under them? A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—Do you fix yourselves the salaries that they have to pay to the men helping them? A.—No.

Q.—Who pays the men employed by your sub-contractors? A.—Well, they are not sub-contractors; we have only got an account with the head of the bench.

Q.—The head of the bench pays his men as he thinks proper? A.—Not as he thinks proper.

Q.—He pays them what he likes—on making a bargain with them he pays them what he likes? A.—Yes.

Q.—You do not interfere in the contract between the benchman and his men? A.—No; except so far as if he does not pay his hands, we step in—if it is reported to us.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Then you consider yourselves responsible for the salary of these men? A.—No; we step in and see that he does pay them. We give him a little moral suasion.

Q.—That is, if he does not pay his men, you turn him off. A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Can a benchman employ whoever he pleases, or does he get them accepted by the factory? A.—They have to get everyone they bring in passed by the superintendent—they must be approved of—but of course sometimes they steal them up.

Q.—When you find out that sometimes a benchman has brought others into the factory without your knowledge, what do you do? A.—Well, it depends a great deal on who is brought in. He might be fined or discharged.

Q.—That is the only control you have over them? A.—Yes.

Q.—You either fine them, discharge them, or let them alone? A.—They are never let alone, if found out. That is the only way we can have control over the hands.

Q.—So that those men who employ other men are obliged to employ those who are approved of by the factory? A.—Yes.

Q.—That is they cannot be accepted unless approved of by the superintendent? A.—No.

Q.—Do you consider that the men who work for the benchmen are employees of the benchman or of the factory? A.—Well, we have got to see that they keep order in the place.

Q.—What I wish to know is, if a benchman does not pay his men does the factory pay them. Supposing that a benchman's assistant's wages are due to-night, and the benchman does not pay him, would the factory pay that party? A.—That is a point that never came up. That has to be decided.

Q.—As a matter of principle, do you think the factory would be forced to pay the sum? A.—I cannot answer that. That is out of my province.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—That question has not been decided yet? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that men, women and children who have been employed by bench-men were not paid? A.—Well they (the bench-men) have tried to get out of it, I know, but they have always been forced to pay them, as far as I am aware.

Q.—Are persons employed by bench-men paid as regularly by the bench-men, as you pay the benchmen themselves? A.—Yes; as far as I am aware of.

Q.—Are fines imposed in Mr. McDonald's factory? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any rules for the imposition of these fines? A.—We have not any printed rules. The overseer, as a rule, imposes them.

Q.—How are the fines imposed if you have not got any printed rules? A.—

The overseer as a rule imposes them. There are certain well defined rules, principles or rules, which, if the hands overstep, they are punished by a fine.

Q.—What are those rules? A.—Well there is a variety of things for which fines are imposed, such as for not keeping from quarrelling, creating a noise, destroying material, and bad work, and as I said before taking in hands without authority.

Q.—How can an employee in the factory know these several rules, principles or varieties of rules? A.—Well they are not fined without a caution.

Q.—Could a man, woman or child working in the factory have a fine to pay in the evening after being employed there all day without receiving any notification of it—having been employed since the morning could any man, woman or child working in the factory, have a fine imposed upon them in the evening without having been cautioned? A.—No.

Q.—How many foremen have you imposing fines in the factory? A.—Oh; every foreman has got to keep order, and I think we have got some ten or twelve foremen?

Q.—Do you say it is the foremen or superintendent who impose fines? A.—It is the overseers of the different rooms.

Q.—Are the operatives entitled to appeal to the superintendent? A.—Oh yes; and not only to the superintendent but the proprietor.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that operatives have appealed to the superintendent or to Mr. McDonald? A.—Oh yes; quite a number of times.

Q.—What was the amount of fines imposed upon the operatives in Mr. McDonald's factory last year? A.—Seventy-one dollars.

Q.—For the whole year? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you mean to say there was no other deductions? A.—These are the only fines, the only deductions that were made.

Q.—Do you impose fines in the press room? A.—Sometimes.

Q.—For what causes? A.—The usual infraction of the rules of discipline.

Q.—Have you imposed fines for accidents to the machinery? A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—Can you give us a few instances? A.—Well, if a man broke a pair of glasses he has got to pay for it. If he takes, say a plug of tobacco he has got to pay for it. If the property of Mr. McDonald was injured by accident, he is not considered to blame, but if it was done willfully he would have to pay for it.

Q.—Have you imposed fines occurring to the machinery while men were working and for which they were not responsible? A.—No; I know of no one who has been fined who was not responsible.

Q.—Have you imposed fines for machinery which was impaired from working, and which was deteriorated while in operation? A.—Oh, no, all these things are suitably provided for by the proprietor.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—There are no other means of correction for boys and girls besides fining them? A.—No.

Q.—You do not beat them? A.—No.

Q.—Do you provide separate closets for the sexes? A.—Yes.

Q.—How are they separated? A.—By stone or brick walls, and by different doors.

Q.—All these closets are in view of both men and women? A.—Yes; they are in one of the rooms.

Q.—Are the doors of your factory kept locked during the day? A.—There are no locks on them except on the front door.

Q.—Does it open outwards or inwards? A.—It opens outwards.

Q.—Have you any fire escapes? A.—We have a tower twenty feet square.

Q.—Is that outside the building? A.—It is inside the building.

Q.—Is that the only means of escape from one story to another? A.—Yes; it is a big stairway, but it is not fire proof.

Q.—The stairs in this tower are they separate stairs or do they wind round?
A.—I suppose they are eight or ten feet long.

Q.—Are the doors of this factory always kept locked? A.—No.

Q.—It has an entrance door facing the main thoroughfare? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you know how many children can read and write among those in the employ of Mr. McDonald's Tobacco Factory? A.—No; I do not know that. About the only question we put to them, if they are very young, is that if they have taken their first communion, and I suppose that necessitates a knowledge of both.

By Mr. KERWIN :—

Q.—Have you any objection to employ any person belonging to a labour organization of any kind? A.—No, sir; we have no objection whatever.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you allow your operatives to chew tobacco in the factory? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know that children take advantage of this authorization to chew tobacco in the factory? A.—Some of them do.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—And you don't prevent them? A.—We could not prevent them.

Q.—Do you impose a fine upon children found chewing tobacco? A.—No.

Q.—Nor on finding them spitting tobacco juice? A.—Well, in some cases we do, if they are found out.

Q.—Have you seen children ill-treated in the factory? A.—No; I cannot say I ever did, except among themselves, and there would be a little quarrelling, but not otherwise.

Q.—Have you seen adults strike children in the factory? A.—I never saw it, but I have heard of it.

Q.—And what do you do? A.—The man doing it is discharged.

Q.—Did you send away several? A.—There has been more than one sent away for that reason, but not recently.

Q.—When was the last one sent away for that reason? A.—I could not say; inside, perhaps, two or three years.

Q.—Was the foreman an ordinary working man? A.—Yes; an ordinary working man.

Q.—Do your foremen know what would happen to them if they struck a child?
A.—No. No foreman ever did strike a child.

Q.—Does he know he would be dismissed? A.—I suppose so. He would know what we would do with him for imposing upon anyone weaker than himself.

ABRAHAM EPHRAIM, of the City of Montreal, Tailor. sworn :—

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—What kind of tailoring do you do? A.—Coats.

Q.—Do you work for wholesale houses? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you work by the piece or by the week? A.—By the week.

Q.—How much do you get paid for a week's work? A.—Fifteen dollars.

Q.—Do you work at home? A.—I have got a brother here and I work for him.

- Q.—Do you work at home in your own house ? A.—No.
 Q.—Does your brother work for a wholesale Clothier ? A.—Yes.
 Q.—Is there anyone else working for him except you ? A.—He keeps nine girls and one man, and me.
 Q.—How much does he pay the girls ? A.—I have not anything to do with the girls.

ISAAC GOLD, of the City of Montreal, Tailor, sworn :—
 I am thirty years of age.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

- Q.—What kind of clothing do you manufacture ? A.—I manufacture for the wholesale trade.
 Q.—Do you manufacture for the wholesale establishments here ? A.—Yes.
 Q.—What clothes or clothing do you make up ? A.—Coats.
 Q.—Do you work at home at your own house ? A.—Yes.
 Q.—Do you employ others to help you ? A.—Yes.
 Q.—How many do you employ at home ? A.—Nine hands.
 Q.—Are these men or women ? A.—They are six women and two men.
 Q.—How much do you get for each coat ? A.—There are different kinds of coats. For some I get one dollar, and for others I get one dollar and a half.
 Q.—Do you pay your help by the piece or by the day, or by the week ? A.—By the week.
 Q.—How much do you pay the women who help you ? A.—Different prices. Some five dollars for sewing and some three dollars.
 Q.—How much do you pay the men ? A.—Nine dollars, six dollars, and seven dollars per week ; different prices.
 Q.—How long do you require these women to work each day ? A.—Ten hours.
 Q.—Do you keep them constantly employed ? A.—Yes.
 Q.—Have you any children ? A.—Yes.
 Q.—Working for you ? A.—No.
 Q.—How many coats can the women make in a week ? A.—I cannot tell.
 Q.—You do not know how many they do make ? A.—No.
 Q.—How many coats can a man make in a week ? A.—I cannot tell. We take a lot together and we cannot tell.
 Q.—How many coats can the whole of you make in a week ? A.—Fifty, sixty, seventy or seventy-five. It is different work according to the quality and the character of the coats.
 Q.—Taking medium cloth how many could you make up in a week ? A.—About sixty.
 Q.—And you get one dollar and a half a piece for them ? A.—No.
 Q.—One dollar a piece ? A.—Yes ; for some of them.

By Mr. HELBRÖNNER :—

- Q.—Do you get work done outside of Montreal ? A.—No.

JACOB JULIUS ROSEN, of the City of Montreal, sworn :—
 I am a button hole maker. I make button holes by machinery.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

- Q.—Do you make button holes for the manufacturers ? A.—Yes.

- Q.—Do you make them for wholesale clothiers? A.—Yes.
- Q.—How much a hundred do they pay you? A.—They pay me seventy cents, eighty cents, one dollar, and one dollar and a half.
- Q.—How many button holes can you make in a day? A.—Six hundred, seven hundred, eight hundred, nine hundred or a thousand holes. That is myself, and I keep workmen, besides boys.
- Q.—How old are those boys who are with you, are they over twenty? A.—No.
- Q.—Are they over eighteen? A.—Yes.
- Q.—How much a hundred do you pay them? A.—They are all working by the week, and receive from \$7 to \$13 dollars.
- Q.—How many of these boys have you? A.—Eight.
- Q.—And will each one make a thousand button holes? A.—It depends upon the kind of work. The average number would be seven to eight hundred.
- Q.—How large is the room you work in—is it nearly as large as this room? A.—Yes.

JOSEPH MYERS, of the city of Montreal, Tailor, sworn :

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

- Q.—Do you keep a store or a workshop? A.—I keep a store and a workshop. I do extra work for the wholesale trade.
- Q.—Are you busy at the present time? A.—At the present time I am a little slack.
- Q.—How many hands do you employ? A.—I employ twelve girls and three men. I have a large workroom.
- Q.—Do you have these people at work in a house that is well ventilated? A.—Yes; it is as large as this room.
- Q.—What class of clothing do you make up? A.—Men's cloth overcoats, and frock coats of different kinds, and men's clothing.
- Q.—What do you get for making up coats? A.—One dollar; one dollar and twenty-five cents; and one dollar and fifty cents.
- Q.—And for overcoats? A.—The same.
- Q.—Do these girls work by the day or by the week? A.—By the week.
- Q.—How much a week do you pay these girls. A.—I pay them three dollars, four dollars, four dollars and fifty cents; to five dollars and fifty cents and eight dollars.
- Q.—How many will earn four dollars a week? A.—Five only.
- Q.—And how many of them will earn five dollars a week. A.—Three of them.
- Q.—How many of them will earn eight dollars a week? A.—Only one.
- Q.—Do the men work by the week too? A.—Yes.
- Q.—How much can they earn? A.—Ten dollars; nine dollars and six dollars.
- Q.—Do you find that any of these girls ever spoil work? A.—No; they do not spoil it. They rip out the stitches and do it over again.
- Q.—How long do they work in summer? A.—In summer ten hours.
- Q.—And what hours do they work in winter? A.—Nine hours, and sometimes nine and a half hours.
- Q.—Is the room a warm one? A.—Yes; it is heated by the same stove that heats the shop.
- Q.—Is this fire the same in summer as it is in winter? A.—No; there is no fire in the stove in summer. I have an extra stove to heat the irons which does not give out any heat through the house.
- Q.—Do you have young girls working for you? A.—No; I have no young girls working for me at all.
- Q.—What is the age of the youngest? A.—From eighteen to twenty.

ISRAEL SOLOMON, of the City of Montreal, Tailor, sworn :

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you work for wholesale clothiers ? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you employ others to work for you ? A.—Yes ; I have myself, my father, and two girls.

Q.—How do you employ them ? A.—By the week.

Q.—How large is the room that you work in ? A.—There are three rooms, with plenty of air and light.

Q.—What kind of clothing is it you make ? A.—Overcoats.

Q.—How much a week do you pay these girls ? A.—Three dollars a week ; in summer, four dollars a week.

Q.—Do they work at the machine ? A.—No ; they work by hand. They just do "filling." I run the machine myself.

Q.—How long do they work ? A.—From seven in the morning until six at night.

Q.—The clothing trade is a very busy one in Montreal, is it not ? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you busy now ? A.—No ; there is not much doing.

Q.—How much do you get for a coat ? A.—All the way from one dollar up to one dollar and seventy-five cents.

Q.—You do not know the price of pants and vests ? A.—I do not make them.

JEREMIAH MAHONEY, of the City and District of Montreal, Cooper, sworn :—

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—You work in Montreal ? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are there many coopers working in this city ? A.—At present, there are about one hundred and fifty.

Q.—What are made here, principally ? A.—Flour and Sugar barrels.

Q.—Are they made by hand ? A.—Well, not by hand altogether. They are mostly done by machinery. We are making sugar barrels at present. Very few flour barrels are made now, compared with former years, bags being used in preference.

Q.—How many men are employed in making sugar barrels in Montreal. A.—Well, generally speaking, no coopers are required now.

Q.—What class of men are they then who make sugar barrels ? A.—It is done this way : the foreman gives them the material, and machinery is got now so perfect that anybody can make the hoops and drive them on.

Q.—These are not skilled workmen, then ? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you know what pay they get ? A.—There are different prices. They work by the piece at the machine. They do not want a cooper—they do not want a cooper who has served his time and knows his trade. There is a foreman following the men up, for they can make coopers of their own now by superintending.

Q.—What barrels are made by hand ? A.—Very few are now made by hand.

Q.—Are flour barrels made by machinery ? A.—Yes ; they can be made by machinery.

Q.—Are they skilled men who make flour barrels by hand ? A.—By hand, they are.

Q.—Do you know what they earn ? A.—Of late, our prices are down considerably. They make \$1.75 if they get plenty of work—that is, \$1.75 per day.

Q.—How many hours a day do they work ? A.—Well, the day is ten hours.

Q.—Do they work more than ten hours a day ? A.—No.

- Q.—Do you make any spirit barrels? A.—Yes; of small size—from five and a half gallons to seven gallons and twenty gallons.
- Q.—Are they altogether made by hand? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Can they be made by machinery? A.—There are none made here at present by machinery.
- Q.—It requires men of considerable skill to make these barrels? A.—Yes.
- Q.—They have to serve their time to it? A.—Yes.
- Q.—What do they earn? A.—One fifty to two dollars a day.
- Q.—How many hours do they work a day? A.—Nine or ten.
- Q.—Are many apprentices learning the trade? A.—Very few. I may say none, the last eight or ten years.
- Q.—Are any beer casks made here? A.—No; there are none made here. The men in the brewery make them.
- Q.—Has machinery interfered with the making of barrels of late years? A.—Yes. That is the cause of all our grievances.
- Q.—Are there many men at the work? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Are the number decreasing? A.—Yes. At the time they were made by hand, there were 300 coopers in the city.
- Q.—Is the like true of other parts of Canada? A.—Yes; I believe it has affected them.
- Q.—Did you ever work outside of Montreal? A.—No.
- Q.—Do coopers seek work in other trades or callings? A.—Oh yes. Lots leave the business and they turn to anything they can get.
- Q.—I suppose the result, then, of turning out work by machinery will be that it will make practical coopers leave the business? A.—Yes. Well, the way is that it (machinery) makes them cheaper than we can make them by hand, apparently.
- Q.—They make them cheaper by machinery than by hand? A.—Yes; so they think.
- Q.—In former years you had to make your own hoops? A.—We used to have to shave them and turn them ourselves, and now, by the use of machinery, they not only turn out the barrels, but also get the material ready. The man simply nails the hoops on. The result is now a-days, by the aid of machinery, a man can make a "cooper" of himself in a few weeks.
- Q.—Could you make barrels cheaper by machinery than you can make them by hand? A.—Well, the fact is machinery does not get them out cheaper than we used to do by hand.
- Q.—What is the reason that machinery cannot get them out cheaper than you can get them out by hand? A.—At one time we used to get ten cents, and they were good strong barrels. Now, we can afford to make them by hand at four and a half and five cents. We have made them at that. At the present time they make them at five and a half cents to six cents.
- Q.—How much can you make in a day? A.—There are different classes of men, the same as in other trades, but the average man will get \$1.75 to \$1.80.
- Q.—Have you anything to add to what you have already stated? A.—Well, I would like to bring to the notice of the management of these concerns that if they take into consideration the wear and tear on the machines, and the extra expenses necessary upon producing them by machinery, and the insurance, small items, and so forth, and the outside expenses; if they consider this, I mean compare it with the hand labor, they will come to the conclusion that hand labor can compete with machinery. That is, taking into consideration all the expenses in making barrels by machinery; the parties can get barrels delivered to them if made by hand as in making them by machinery at the present prices—that is, at five and a half to six cents each. There is certainly no use of speaking to the foremen, because they would not listen to it, but if the management of these concerns took stock and looked into the business a little, they would see the difference.

(Translation.)

DELPHIS LEMAY, tanner, of the City of Montreal, sworn :—

By Mr. HELBRONNER :

Q.—You are a tanner? A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you been a tanner in Montreal? A.—It is six years since I have been here, only I have not worked at my trade all that time.

Q.—On an average, what are the wages which tanners earn? A.—\$4, \$5, \$6, \$7, \$8, even up to \$9.

Q.—Those who make \$4, are they really mechanics, or only helpers? A.—I could not say whether these people have served an apprenticeship or not; but in the trade there is much easy work to be done. To do it, all a man requires is good will.

Q.—How many hours do you work a day? A.—Ten hours.

Q.—Saturdays also? A.—Always ten hours. In certain shops they close at four o'clock in the afternoon, but they make up for this the balance of the week by working a quarter of an hour more every day.

Q.—Are your shops in a healthy condition? A.—More or less.

Q.—The one that you work in, is it wholesome? A.—It is passably so.

Q.—Is not the temperature too cold in winter for work? A.—Sometimes it is too cold, from the fact that we always work in cold water, and sometimes, chiefly on Monday mornings, the basins near the door are covered with ice, and we are obliged to break the ice in order to take out the skins.

Q.—Are there a great number of apprentices in your trade? A.—There are some young men.

Q.—Are there many? A.—Sometimes.

Q.—Do you find that there are too many for the number of hands employed? A.—There are always too many.

Q.—Do you think that this large number of apprentices employed has the tendency of lowering the wages? A.—Generally so.

Q.—Are they made to do the work which ought to be done by the men? A.—Sometimes.

Q.—How old are those whom you call children? A.—I have known them nine years old.

Q.—Since when? A.—In the last three years.

Q.—Do you know at the present time of tanneries employing children nine years of age? A.—For the present I could not say.

Q.—To your knowledge, which is the youngest child actually employed in the tannery? A.—I could not speak for the present time, inasmuch as where I work there are no children.

Q.—Are fines imposed in your trade? A.—Not where I work; but in places where I have worked the men were fined.

Q.—What sort of fines? For what reason were they imposed? A.—Some times when a man lost his time, or in certain places if he did not arrive five minutes before the hour, and then he found the door locked.

Q.—Five minutes before or after the hour? A.—Before.

Q.—What was the fine imposed? A.—Twenty-five cents to fifty cents; that depended. If the thing occurred too often, the man was charged.

Q.—In the factories where these fines were imposed, at what hour were you bound to turn up? A.—At seven o'clock in the morning.

Q.—And the door was locked at five minutes to seven? A.—Yes.

Q.—If you came at seven, was the door opened to let you in? A.—The door was not opened in those places.

Q.—In the shops where the door was opened, you were let in and then made to

pay a fine? A.—No, not for the first time; but we were let in with a strict warning that this should not happen again.

Q.—Did it happen that you were fined a second time? A.—Yes, sometimes.

Q.—The hour of beginning work in the shops of which you speak was seven o'clock? A.—Yes; seven o'clock in the morning.

Q.—And if you turned up at one minute less than seven you were fined? A.—I beg pardon. The door was closed, and we were not allowed in. We lost time, and by the fact of losing time we were put on fine. Then the door was opened between seven and five minutes past seven, and so soon as the door was opened we could go in.

Q.—Now, what I want to know from you is this—you began the day at seven o'clock? A.—At seven o'clock.

Q.—The door was closed at five minutes to seven and was not opened again till seven o'clock or five minutes past seven, so if you turned up at one minute before seven to begin the day, you found the door shut? A.—It was too late then because we had to change clothes to work in, and we usually arrive a little before to be ready to begin work at seven o'clock.

Q.—When you entered into that shop, were you warned that you had to get there at seven o'clock or at five minutes to seven o'clock? A.—I was warned about nothing.

Q.—Is machinery used in your trade? A.—Lots of machinery.

Q.—This machinery is used to work and finish the leather? A.—Yes; and there are machines to clean it; to take off the fur and others for fleshing, that is for taking off the flesh or the meat that sticks to the hide.

Q.—Is it long since that machinery was introduced in the tannery? A.—Ever since I know anything about it.

(Translation.)

EDMOND CHAPUT, Baker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are a baker workman? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Can you tell us how many working bakers there are in the city? A.—About 400, I should say.

Q.—Are there any children employed in bakeries? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Are there apprentices? A.—There are apprentices; mostly young men of sixteen years of age upwards.

Q.—Do you know whether these young people are engaged by contract? A.—No, sir; they are not.

Q.—What are the wages of working bakers in Montreal? A.—There is a certain class of bakers paying \$12 a week to journeymen, and \$15 to foremen. There is another class that pays their foremen \$6, \$8 and \$10.

Q.—What makes this difference of wages? A.—It is the ambition of bosses that makes the difference of wages.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Is it the ambition of having better men? A.—It's the ambition of having their bread made at a lower price, in order to run opposition to others.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What are the hours of work? A.—The hours of work are not settled. In some places the men work ten hours, and fifteen hours, and some go to eighteen hours.

Q.—Is it possible, in your trade, to settle the working hours? A.—No; it is not easy to settle the hours.

Q.—That depends on time and the quality of the leaven, does it not? A.—We are very much under the influence of temperature.

Q.—Do you think it would be better, as well for the employers as for the men, to pay the latter by the piece? A.—I think it would be best for both sides.

Q.—What would you set down as a good average of work for a baker? A.—I consider that a hundred loaves would be a good day's work for a man.

Q.—A hundred loaves of what quality? A.—Of no matter what quality. All the qualities take up the same time.

Q.—The home made bread of six pounds and the white bread of four pounds, do they take the same time? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you believe that if the employers based these salaries on a quantity of one hundred loaves a day for one man, that both the parties would be the better of it? A.—Certainly.

Q.—The good workman would earn a reasonable wage, and the employer would also reap a benefit? A.—Yes; those who insist upon eighteen hours of work have at present the advantage over those who require more reasonable hours.

Q.—Could you tell me what a baker would like to have at present per man for the making of one hundred loaves a day? A.—They would be satisfied with the prices of those who actually pay the highest rates—\$12 or \$15; that is to say \$12 for the making of 600 loaves a week.

Q.—You work on Sundays now? A.—Yes.

Q.—At what hour do you commence to work on Sundays? A.—Generally there is one man to every shop who begins work on Sunday about eleven o'clock in the forenoon and in some shops they commence about seven o'clock on Monday morning.

Q.—Do you believe that it would be possible to do away with this Sunday work? A.—It would be very easy.

Q.—How would you go about it? A.—My plan would be first to leave the bread on Saturday for distribution to customers on Monday, and afterwards beginning on Monday morning at seven o'clock we could deliver bread at eleven o'clock and the one who has two ovens can keep on supplying bread from hour to hour up to six o'clock.

Q.—Thus by suppressing Sunday work you do away at the same time with night work by working on Monday morning? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is there a strong desire among working bakers to get rid of night work? A.—Yes. We are all slaves on account of it.

Q.—At what hour do you begin night work? A.—In the shops where the leaven men begin at eleven o'clock, the other men go in at five o'clock in the evening.

Q.—When the oven men begin work at three o'clock, at what hour, generally speaking, do they quit work the next morning? A.—That depends. When they work twelve hours they finish at five o'clock in the morning. When they have to work more, they finish so much the later. With fifteen hours they go three hours later, and with eighteen hours they still go three hours later.

Q.—Does it often happen that you work eighteen hours? A.—Pretty often; but not as a general thing. There are people reasonable enough not to exact this, but there are others whom we must leave if he will not bend to their demands.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do those who make you work for eighteen hours make you work during the whole duration of those eighteen hours? A.—There are places where they must work all the time. In bakeries where there are two ovens and five or six men, we have not the time even to take a mouthful. I myself have been twelve hours without being able to take a bite.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You could not eat of your own bread? A.—On such occasions, generally we keep a piece of bread beside us and nibble at it.

Q.—Do the working bakers complain that the number of apprentices is too great? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do these apprentices often take the place of men? A.—Yes; always. The men give as much bread, with an apprentice, as with a journeyman. This is why the bosses are anxious to have apprentices. It is not the apprentice, however, who does the work, but it is the journeymen who suffers.

Q.—What measures would you take to obviate this? A.—The right way would be to regulate, by law, the time that apprentices should serve in the same shop, and determine a certain number of loaves to be turned out by the apprentice.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the bakeries in which you have worked? A.—It is bad, as a general rule, especially in respect of ventilation. There is not enough.

Q.—Is it generally in cellars that you work? A.—No; not much in cellars, but the steam, issuing from the oven, is very hard on the eyes, and we are obliged to open the doors, and, through opening the doors, we sometimes contract a bad cold and inflammation of the lungs.

Q.—Do you know of any bakers having lost their sight through this work? A.—I know several who have suffered very much from their eyes, and I know one who lost his sight.

Q.—That one still works sometimes in the shop, I believe? A.—Yes; sometimes.

Q.—Are there bakeries in which the privies are kept? A.—I know of none.

Q.—Are there men obliged, by the nature of their work, to go out of the oven room and into the open air during this season? A.—Yes, there is one man in each shop who is obliged to split wood at the end of his day's work. I know of one shop only, in Montreal, where they do not split wood. After working all night, at a temperature of ninety degrees, that man must go out in the snow.

Q.—Are you aware that, among such men, there are some who have contracted fatal diseases? A.—I have heard it said, but I know of none. I, myself, have been very seriously ill, through being exposed in this manner.

Q.—Are these shops in which the bosses oblige these men, who knead the dough, to do other work, of a cleanliness little in accord with the work of these men? A.—Yes; there are certain shops where this is done.

Q.—Is machinery employed in your bakery? A.—I know of three shops where it is used.

Q.—What has been the effect of machinery on the workingmen's wages? A.—I have worked in a shop where there was machinery. It had no effect; it did no harm to the men.

Q.—You have no objection to the use of machinery? A.—No; provided that it is not carried too far.

Q.—This machinery, I believe, does the heaviest part of the work,—the work that is most fatiguing? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do a great number of journeymen bakers come into this city at a certain season of the year? A.—Yes; a great number.

Q.—Is this at a fixed period of the year? A.—They come at all times; but more generally in spring.

Q.—This leads in a great measure to the lowering of wages? A.—Yes.

Q.—These men come to spend a certain time here and then go off, and they come to take the place of men who work the whole year in Montreal? A.—Yes; they take, rather, the place of the men at lower wages.

Q.—Have you ever worked outside of Montreal? A.—I have worked, but not for long. Only a couple of months, and that was about twenty years ago.

Q.—Are you aware, from your knowledge of the trade, whether in other cities of

Canada work is done on Sunday and at night? A.—I am told that at Quebec they work as we do here on Sundays and at night, and I am told also that at Toronto they work during the day, and do not work on Sunday.

Q.—Have you any suggestions to make to the Commission? A.—I did not state a while ago, how many loaves might be given to the apprentices to make. I judge that, for the first year of an apprentice, we might put down twenty-five loaves. The second year fifty, the third seventy-five, to be turned out by the apprentice in his day's work.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—At the present time, how much is the four pound loaf sold for in Montreal? A.—I think that it is worth fourteen cents. That is, those who pay the highest wages sell this white bread at fourteen cents; but there are all sorts of prices. But, as I said before, those who do not pay wages, do so for the sake of opposition to others.

Q.—How much does the four pound loaf retail for in Montreal? A.—Fourteen cents.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—To grocers or to customers? A.—To customers.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What is the retail price of the six pound home-made loaf in Montreal? A.—Sixteen cents. Some sell it for more and others for less; but this is the average price.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you know the co-operative body? A.—Yes; I do know it.

Q.—Have you worked there? A.—No; I have not worked there.

Q.—You do not know whether they pay their men the same prices as the other bakers? A.—I mean to say that they do not pay their men the same prices; but pay them less.

Q.—This co-operative society is not a co-operative society founded by working men? A.—No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—It is set down here (city by-law Chap. 8 of the city of Montreal), that the home-made loaf shall be made of good and sound flour, and the white bread of good sound and fine flour. Is the flour always good? A.—Generally, where I work it is good.

Q.—But, as a rule? A.—I think it is not always very good, because, in certain shops they sell the bread so cheap that all cannot be good.

Q.—But in the months of July and August, do they not sometimes make use of sour flour? A.—Sometimes, yes.

Q.—Does the city inspector ever visit your shop? A.—I am not aware that he has come into the shop where I work.

Q.—Is there a bread inspector? A.—I do not think that there is one.

Q.—Do you not know that, by the City Council by-laws of Montreal, there should be one? A.—I mean to say that there should be one; but I have never seen one myself.

Q.—Do you know whether alum is much used to whiten the bread? A.—I do not think it is made use of at present. I have been told that it was employed before my time.

Q.—When the bread falls into crumbs as it is cut, what is that owing to? A.—That depends on the leaven being too strong.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—The Chap. 8 of the by-law of the city of Montreal says, that home-made bread shall be made of the flour of good and sound wheat, and the white bread of good, sound and fine flour. Do they use anything else in the fabrication of bread besides flour? A.—Potatoes are used.

Q.—What is the proportion of potatoes and flour that is used? A.—I cannot tell exactly; I have never calculated.

24th February, 1888.

JAS. F. SCRIVER, Manager and Secretary of the Montreal Gas Company, sworn :

By Mr. FREED :

Q.—Do you employ many hands? A.—We do.

Q.—Are those skilled or unskilled workmen? A.—They are skilled workmen, mostly.

Q.—What do the skilled workmen earn when they work for the company. A.—Our wages average from one dollar and twenty-five cents a day, to two dollars and seventy-five cents a day.

Q.—How many hours do they work? A.—Our ordinary men work ten hours a day, and our stokers twelve hours a day, but they have only seven hours labor out of the twelve. It is just twelve hours that they are required to remain in the works. They are not required to remain in all the time—they can come in and out during the hours of labor. They are not obliged to go out; but they can go out to dinner and supper if they like.

Q.—At the same time they are obliged to remain the twelve hours? A.—Yes.

Q.—What do your laborers get? A.—Our laborers receive one dollar and twenty-five cents a day at the present time.

Q.—Do you employ any young people? A.—No.

Q.—Do you employ the people who light the street lamps? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many hours a day do they work? A.—Well, it takes somewhere about one and a-half hours to light the lamps, and one hour to put them out, on each man's round.

Q.—What do they receive? A.—They receive about one dollar and twenty-five cents a day.

Q.—Do they have anything to do during the day in cleaning the lamps? A.—They are responsible for the cleanliness of the lamps, &c.; but two hours a day will do that.

Q.—Are they responsible to you for the rest of the time? A.—No.

Q.—Can they follow any other employment in their spare time if they please? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do they have to report to the office every day? A.—At ten or eleven o'clock in the morning they are obliged to meet and report.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Do you make altogether coal gas, or do you also make water gas? A.—We make altogether coal gas.

Q.—You mix no water with it? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Did you not have some difficulty last year with your stokers? A.—We had a little difficulty in the spring with them. About the first of May.

Q.—Was this difficulty settled by arbitration? A.—No; we settled that difficulty with our own men.

Q.—Without the intervention of any outside person? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Where do you get your coal? A.—We get it from Cape-Breton. We have got it from there for some years.

Q.—Have you used coal from the old country? A.—We have, yes.

Q.—How does the Canadian coal compare with the coal received from the old country? A.—Favorably.

Q.—For your purpose? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is the coke remaining after the manufacture of gas, from Canadian coal, as favorable as coke remaining after the manufacture of gas from coal imported from the old country? A.—It is not quite so good.

Q.—The other by-products, do you save them? A.—We do.

Q.—Are the by-products of Canadian coal, when used, as valuable as the by-products of coal from the old country—ammonia water, etc.? A.—About the same.

Q.—And the tar? A.—The tar also is about the same. Perhaps the tar is somewhat in favor of the English coal—a little—but not to any extent. We do not place any value, one way or the other; besides that, we do not take the tar into consideration, because it is so near the same, we do not take it into consideration at all.

Q.—If there is anything in favor of the one coal, more than the other, it is in favor of the English coal? A.—Yes.

Q.—There are no other by-products which would make any difference in value between the two coals? A.—No.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Which is the best coal for illuminating purposes? A.—The illuminating power of the English coal is a little better than that of Cape Breton. Its light is slightly in its favor.

Q.—Do you know anything in the by-products of the Cape Breton coal that would go to make up for it? A.—Yes; and the Canadian coal is cheaper. There is a duty on English coal now which makes it almost prohibitory—I may say prohibitory.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you supply the meters? A.—It is optional whether we supply them.

Q.—What do you charge for meters? A.—50 cents a quarter; \$2 a year.

Q.—Do you find any difficulty in maintaining a supply of gas to the city? A.—The frost sometimes affects our pipes. We do not use any artificial means to thaw the gas pipes any more than other gas works.

Q.—What do you mean by artificial means? Some engine to drive the air from the pipes? A.—Yes. We do not use any.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Any information you can give us with regard to the gas supply of the City and that will be of service to the citizens generally to know, as well as the Commissioners, we shall be glad to hear from you? A.—I will answer any question that you wish to put to me, but I cannot volunteer any information.

Q.—You have nothing further to add? A.—No.

JOHN JAMES MCGILL, Montreal, Manager of the Canadian Rubber Company, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—How many hands do you employ? A.—Between eight hundred and fifty and nine hundred.

Q.—How are they divided as to males and females. There are about five hundred women, and the balance are men.

Q.—Do you employ several children? A.—Well, they are not exactly children. We have about twenty-four boys and girls. They range in age perhaps from fourteen up.

Q.—And the boys are about the same age? A.—Yes; of course, it is difficult to take their age, we simply ask their parents their ages, and if their parents say they are old enough, we employ them.

Q.—You do not think you employ any under fourteen years of age? A.—No; I do not think so.

Q.—What are the hours of labour? A.—Seven to six. That is when the factory is running full time.

Q.—How much time is allowed for dinner? A.—One hour.

Q.—Does it sometimes occur that work is prolonged after six? A.—Yes; in the fall we have to work later, generally until eight o'clock.

Q.—Does it occur that they work after eight o'clock? A.—Yes; sometimes they work till twelve.

Q.—And the children are obliged to remain in the factory until night? A.—Oh, no.

Q.—How long are the children made to stay? A.—They are not made to stay over their ten hours, unless they have work to do. If they do not wish to remain we do not request them to stay, but they are willing to do it. The girls are working piece work, and there are a number of boys who have to remain to give out the work.

Q.—As a matter of fact, are there children who work as late as eight o'clock, and as late as midnight. Have you had any work until eight o'clock? A.—Yes; we have had.

Q.—Have you had any work after eight o'clock? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—When they work till eight o'clock, or after, do you remain in the factory? A.—No; I am not there after six thirty, or seven o'clock.

Q.—So you cannot say, to your knowledge, if children remain there until midnight or not. A.—I can say, pretty positively, that they do not remain until midnight, because I am given the list of names in the morning, and I do not get the names of any children. A boy of fifteen might, but no children.

Q.—When the employees remain until midnight, are they forced to come the next morning at seven o'clock, as on ordinary days? A.—Yes; they are expected to be there. You will please remember that working until midnight would be a very rare occurrence; that might not be six times in the year.

Q.—Does it occur that work until midnight has lasted for six or seven days? A.—No; we do not have perhaps more than two nights running, and then we change them (the hands).

Q.—How are the employees paid? A.—They are paid by the piece for the usual day's work.

Q.—Those who work after six o'clock, are they piece-work hands or are they day hands? A.—They are both.

Q.—When the day hands work after six o'clock, are they paid extra? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the average salary to day hands? A.—The men earn from one to two dollars a day. They average perhaps a little over one dollar and twenty-five cents per day.

Q.—And for night hours are they paid the same ratio as for day work?
A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you not consider that night labor should be paid for at a higher rate than day labor? A.—No, I do not think so.

Q.—At what time do you tell the employees that they will have to work of an evening after six o'clock. A.—We let them know the day before or the morning before. We notify them a day before.

Q.—Has it not occurred in your factory that the doors have been closed at six o'clock, and the employees kept there, without being previously informed that they would be kept there until eight o'clock. A.—We except piece-workers. Piece-workers are obliged to finish their work. If a man or woman working on piece work has not finished their work, they stop and complete it. It will sometimes happen that a man or woman working on piece-work will not arrive in the morning until ten o'clock. There is so much work apportioned out for the day, and should an employee be three hours late in arriving at the factory in the morning, they are willing to make it up at night, and thus finish their day. This is only expected when we are pushed.

Q.—But if a girl comes at seven in the morning, and has not finished her work at six o'clock at night, is she forced to remain? A.—She is not forced to remain.

Q.—Has it not occurred that the doors of the factory have been closed at six o'clock, and that the girls have been forced to remain until eight o'clock, in order to finish their work. A.—No. There is no closing of the doors, and a girl can walk out if she chooses at any time.

Q.—Who has the option of discharging them? A.—It is my option to discharge them. We do not close the doors. They can walk out after hours if they like; there is no locking of the doors at the factory, whatever.

Q.—Do you distribute your piece work in such a manner that the employees can leave by six o'clock? A.—We generally do, except there is a rush in the fall when we generally give them a little more than those who finish at six o'clock—the time hands—but they are not obliged to take it.

Q.—Have you sent away young girls because they are not willing to work after six o'clock at night? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—What are the prices paid to persons working on piece work? A.—They vary. There is a different price for every kind of shoe.

Q.—They are paid for the number of shoes they make? A.—They are paid so much for so many. There is a different price for every kind of shoe. There are over one hundred varieties, and there are very few at the same price in making.

Q.—What are the average wages that a girl can make in ten hours work? A.—A small average would be about four dollars a week.

Q.—What is the smallest salary paid to a girl working on piece work? A.—As far as I can judge, I should say about two dollars a week. That is, a girl who is just learning the work, and as she acquires more skill she can do more work.

Q.—What time do you finish work on Saturdays? A.—Five o'clock, and the hands are paid for ten hours that day. That is when running full time.

Q.—How often are the salaries paid? A.—They are paid once a week. The hands leave one week's pay in the hands of the company; that is paid the next week.

Q.—Do your employees sign engagements? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Have you separate conveniences for men and women? A.—Yes. We find our employees every convenience.

Q.—If a girl makes a bad shoe, does she have to pay for it? A.—No; she loses her time. She does not lose the price paid for that shoe.

Q.—Is she charged anything for the material spoiled? A.—No.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—What is the highest wages that a female can earn in your employ? A.—Nine dollars a week.

Q.—She has got to work pretty hard for that? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do many go up to that? A.—No; only some of the most skilled hands in that department of work.

By Mr. HELBRONNER—

Q.—How many hours do they work for that? A.—One and a quarter each day.

Q.—That is to say, they work eleven hours a day? Q.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—And they are much more skilled and have to work harder? A.—Yes.

ANDREW F. GAULT, of the City and District of Montreal, Merchant, President of the Hochelaga Manufacturing Company, a witness who has been already examined, re-appears and testifies as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: I regret that I have been unable to comply with the wishes of the Commission, and produce a detailed statement of the fines imposed in the mill at Saint Anne, and the mill at Hochelaga, which I promised to do, if possible, when under examination, as owing to the extent of the business, and the manner in which the books and pay sheets are necessarily kept, it would involve the perusal of a list of somewhere in the neighborhood of 90,000 names. I can, however, state that for the five years ending the 31st of December last, the total fines in the Hochelaga Mill \$6,009.61, and in the Saint Anne Mill \$2,279.07. The wages paid during the same period in both mills was \$1,220,440.18. In order to afford you the fullest information possible under the circumstances, I have asked Mr. Shannon, the pay-master of the mills, who is now present, to accompany me, and he is quite willing to answer any questions you may put to him, to the best of his ability.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How is it that the fines levied or imposed at the Saint Anne Mill are so much larger in proportion than the fines imposed at the Hochelaga Mill? A.—I cannot account for it. There may be greater efficiency at the Hochelaga Mill.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do I understand you to say, sir, that the information you have just afforded is all the information you can give us with regard to the fines imposed in these two mills? A.—Yes. and it is for that reason that Mr. Shannon is now present. He is far better posted on this subject than I can be, and is fully authorized to give you all the information he possibly can.

PATRICK C. SHANNON, of the City and District of Montreal; Paymaster in the office of the Hocehlaga Cotton Mills Company, sworn.

In accordance with the request of the President of the Hochelaga Cotton Mills Company, Mr. Andrew F. Gault, I have gone over the pay rolls of the mills at St. Anne and the Hudon Mills at Hochelaga both known as the Hochelaga Manufacturing Company, and as a result I produce the following statement:—

St. Anne's Mills:—Fines imposed for the five years ending the 31st of December, 1887, \$2279.07.

Hudson Mills:—Fines imposed for the five years ending the 31st of December, 1887, \$6,009.61.

Wages paid in both mills for the same period \$1,220,440.18.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—You produce this as being a correct statement? A.—I produce this as being a correct statement. The task is such a difficult one, and embraces such a number of years, and so many thousand individual names that it would be almost impossible to give a detailed statement, and it certainly could not be given without very great labor, and the loss of a large amount of time.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Why cannot the Company give a detailed statement as requested by the Commission? A.—Because of the extent and difficulty of the work. The accounts of employees are kept in both factories in this way:—The overseer of each room keeps an account, and he hands it in to me every week before pay day. We enter that upon the pay roll, and the parties are paid therefrom.

Q.—You do not enter in your books the number of days each employee works when he leaves before finishing the two week's notice, as required? A.—We do that in the overseer's time book.

Q.—Do you not require the time-keeper to give the number of days, and the amount of salary paid to each employee when leaving the factory? A.—He is not obliged to do so unless it exceeds twelve day's work.

Q.—Do you mean to say that a man dying on the eleventh day of the two week's his family could not get the amount of his salary? A.—Certainly he would get it—they would get it—and even in the case of sickness the party would get the pay.

Q.—The factory would pay him? A.—Yes. The foreman would give an account of what is due to him, and he would not be marked as "Left without notice."

Q.—How could the foreman know that he had left without notice? A.—If he has any doubt about it, he will not mark him as "Left without notice." Unless the man is actually gone—unless he has no doubt about it, he does not mark it so, in his returns to the office.

Q.—Then it all depends upon the doubt which may be in the foreman's mind, as to the absence of an employee? A.—Well, it is only in some cases the amount of time is not returned. In others it is returned, and in others there is the remark "Left without notice."

Q.—Since you cannot give the amount of money confiscated, can you give the number of days? A.—Where the overseer does not give the number of days?

Q.—Yes. A.—We could, on looking over one hundred thousand names for five years back.

Q.—Then there are cases where the superintendent or time-keeper give the number of days and not the amounts due? And there are other cases where he does not give the number of days? A.—There are such cases.

Q.—How can the directors have knowledge of the number of days of work done in the factory during the year? A.—They can of the wages. I do not know of the number of days. I do not know that that interests them.

Q.—The salary, as you indicated, cannot show the directors the number of days of labor? A.—No; but it shows the amount paid for wages.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You say the number of days is not down there? A.—Yes; but we make no total of the days. We do of the money. When the overseer returns the number of days and the amount, we make an exact copy of his book. If he does not, it is left out.

Q.—When he only gives the number of days, what do you do? A.—We give them

Q.—Without any remark, you mean? A.—Yes. Well, then we ascertain the principal amount, and carry that out. If the number of days is stated without any rate of pay, or without any explanation, we go to the overseer and assign it, and it is for him to say what he means, to give an explanation, and we enter that in.

Q.—Do you enter that in your books? A.—We enter that in our books or pay-roll. That is, as far as possible, a copy of the overseer's time book.

Q.—You enter the number of days in the pay-roll? A.—Yes.

Q.—And when the foreman gives the wages without the number of days of work, you make out your account or return of so much wages without giving the number of days work done which the amount is presumed to represent? A.—I think we would insist on having the number of days.

Q.—Then, all the days' wages are entered in the book? A.—Except in some cases, when four or five may leave without notice. In others it is.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—If an employee, working by the piece, after having finished his work, left before the two weeks had expired, would he forfeit the pay that he had so far earned? A.—I have never known of such a case, and I have been in the factory upwards of five or six years. In the first place, I am not in a position to answer. I cannot say exactly. I have not known anyone to be in such a position. I have never known of such an instance since I have been there.

Q.—How would it be, according to the rules of the Company? A.—We could not hold a man according to the rules, to do that.

Q.—You say, no, you could not? A.—Oh, no; we would not keep a man four days waiting for work without giving him his pay.

Q.—Please take communication of rule No. 1 of the Hochelaga Cotton Company which reads as follows:—"The following rule, among others, forms part of the contract between the employee receiving this pay, and the Company. Two weeks' notice is required from all persons wishing to leave the employ of the Company. Any person leaving without giving such notice, and without working the two following weeks, after giving notice, will not be entitled to wages due them at that time," and say if that notice is required from all persons, those working by piece work as well as those working by day work. This notice reads that every person must give notice of his intention to leave, and that without giving this two weeks' notice he must forfeit two weeks' pay? A.—That is the rule requiring notice.

Q.—Men doing piece work are obliged to give two weeks' notice? A.—Men working piece work are obliged to give two weeks' notice.

Q.—If the Company had no work to give these men, would they force them to remain two weeks' without working? A.—I think they would be paid off within that date anyway.

Q.—You are not asked whether you think the Company did, would, or will do it, but if such a case can occur? A.—I cannot conceive of the thing occurring.

Q.—May it not occur? A.—Should one of the engines break down, it might require two weeks to repair it.

Q.—But if the engine was to break, would you make them wait until you had repaired it? A.—I think if the engine was stopped, any person in the employ of the Company would have a right to demand their pay, and go elsewhere.

Q.—You are not asked your opinion. You are not asked what you think, but you are asked what you would do in such a case? A.—This is what I would do. It would pay off every one in such a case. If the engine was stopped, and it was not possible start up again.

Q.—Then, your men are engaged to remain with you two weeks, even if offered a larger salary elsewhere? A.—Undoubtedly.

Q.—You say the men are engaged towards the Company, but that the Company

are not engaged towards the men? A.—They have the same right to two weeks' notice, the same as we exact from them.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—If you discharged a man without notice, would you give him the amount of pay actually due at that time? A.—I have known the case of an overseer who received his twelve days' pay.

Q.—Can you say if it was done in the case of any other person? A.—I could not say. If a person left without any loss or trouble to the Company, the Company would not wish to keep anything back.

Q.—You do, then, exact a penalty? A.—It is usual.

Q.—It is usual to exact a penalty when the parties leave without notice? A.—Yes; it is so provided, because the Company sustains a loss by every person that leaves without giving notice, and allowing the Company a sufficient time to find persons to fill their places.

Q.—What loss does the Company sustain? A.—I cannot say as to the loss they sustain. I am not aware what contracts they have on hand. But I know that the machinery is run whether all the operators are at their places or not.

Q.—Would the loss sustained by the Company usually be equal to two weeks' pay of the person leaving without notice? A.—Well, it is hard to say the definite amount of loss when an employee leaves in that way.

Q.—Is it usual for you to have to wait for some time for some people to fill their places? Is that usual or not usual? A.—If it is the summer season, it is not so easy to fill their places.

Q.—And is the winter the same as the summer? A.—In the winter we could get people to work for us then, but they might not be used to the work, and would require training.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—What would be the effect if a considerable number of operators were to suddenly leave without notice? Q.—The effect would be to stop the mill.

Q.—It would be very much the same as a strike for the time being? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have you closed your mills at all, this season? A.—What do you refer to?

Q.—Have you closed your mills—have you shut down at all during this season? A.—There was a shut-down for a couple of weeks in the weaving room this year, in the St. Anne's mill, and there was a shut-down of about four weeks four or five years ago, but there was no strike.

Q.—How long before the shut-down did you give notice to your employees? A.—I could not say that, at the moment.

Q.—Who can give information as to that? A.—Well, that is under the charge of the Superintendent.

Q.—Would you be able to tell us the number of cases in which the salaries had been confiscated where the employee had been working for any considerable time for the Company? A.—Well, in looking at the names, of course, we could not very well. It would be hard to pick them out, in order to know whether they were old employees or new ones. That would be very hard in the case of old employees; the number of days, and the amount due, is not always stated.

Q.—Would it be a matter of difficulty to give the number of persons of all classes who have left the mills, with the amount due at the time of leaving, without reference to price or class of work done by them? A.—It would be a task that would involve the looking over of ninety thousand names.

COLIN McARTHUR, of the City of Montreal, Manufacturer, a member of the firm of Colin McArthur & Co., proprietors of the Montreal Wall Paper Factory, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How many hands do you employ in the manufacture of wall paper? A.—From 50 to 60.

Q.—Do you make the paper as well as do the printing? A.—No.

Q.—What class of help do you employ in preparing that wall paper? A.—There are two or three businesses in connection with the manufacturing of wall paper. There is machine printing, block printing, and block cutting. That is preparing the blocks for the printing. It is like three separate businesses.

Q.—The block cutting would be a separate business altogether, would it not? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many hands do you employ in the block cutting? A.—About seven.

Q.—What wages do they earn, what are the average wages for the work? A.—

Q.—\$14 to \$22.50 a week, according to ability, and the length of years they have been in the business.

Q.—What are the hours they work a day? A.—Ten hours is their working day.

Q.—At block printing, how many are engaged at that? A.—Two men and four boys.

Q.—What are the ages of these boys? A.—The youngest of them would be thirteen.

Q.—What would be the earnings of these men, the block printers? A.—One is earning \$14, and the other \$20.

Q.—And the boys? A.—An average of three dollars a week.

Q.—How many are engaged at ordinary printing? A.—About 40 altogether.

Q.—How many of these would be boys? A.—Thirty of them.

Q.—And the youngest of them? A.—We endeavor to have none under 14.

Q.—Your rule is to employ none under 14? A.—Yes; and we keep to it.

Q.—Do you sometimes get deceived in the ages of the boys? A.—Yes; no farther back than yesterday, a boy was brought to me, stating to be 14 years of age, but he looked to me to be more like 12, so I did not take him.

Q.—What do these boys earn in a week? A.—The smallest earns \$1.50. They earn all the way up to \$10.

Q.—Those who earn \$10 are practical young men, I suppose? A.—Yes; apprentices, ready to take charge of a machine in the event of another being started.

Q.—Do they work day or piece work? A.—They work all day work.

Q.—Do your boys take charge of machines? A.—No.

Q.—Do you employ females? A.—No.

Q.—Do you manufacture all classes of wall paper? A.—Yes; all classes.

Q.—Is it considered a healthy business for boys to be at? A.—Yes; I have been at the business thirty-five years, and our colour mixer, I think, has been at it for 25 years. He is a much stouter man than I am, and they all look healthy.

Q.—Is the factory healthy? A.—Yes; there is no better in Montreal.

Q.—Are the sanitary arrangements good? A.—Yes.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you produce much goods in a year? A.—Yes; we manufacture considerable—about 160,000 dollars in Montreal, for my part.

Q.—Do you manufacture all that is sold in the place? A.—No; very far from it.

Q.—Is much English or American paper imported here already made? A.—There is a very fair proportion of American paper imported at the present time, so much, so that our branch house is idle.

Q.—Where do you get your designs? A.—We get them principally in New-York and Philadelphia, but if we pick up a good design in Montreal, we, of course,

purchase it. I have a designer in the States who designs patterns, but there is a great objection to having designs all made by the one man. There is always a similarity. I might say that it is like twenty or thirty different letters written by the same person all in the same hand-writing, so we have to avoid purchasing many designs from the one person. There are always some indications of a similarity of design. For instance, I have seen a designer who could not get up anything without a vase in it, showing his distinctive feature.

Q.—Is the coloring and printing in the paper as good as the same class of work and material produced in the United States? A.—I think so. When I started the industry here, we could not get the color here, but since the industry has been started in the Province, so that our factory uses as much paper as would keep a paper mill going, that is with one machine.

Q.—And is the paper as good as the papers of a similar class and price in the United States? A.—In some respects, it is better, and in others not quite so good, but we cannot produce goods as cheaply as they can be produced in the United States, as our demand is not so great.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—Are the boys you employ regularly indentured? A.—No; we just take a boy and keep him so long as he suits. The workmen get such high wages and the boys are so well paid, that they are all anxious to obtain a higher position and stay constantly with us.

Q.—Would it not be better if these boys were indentured? A.—It would be better for us, but it is always difficult thing. They do not like to be tied down in this country. In Scotland, I had all the apprentices indentured.

Q.—And I suppose you would prefer that system then? A.—Yes. The system under the Factory Act in Scotland, is just as good as one could possibly make it.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—You say you cannot manufacture as cheaply in Canada as in the United States. Why is that? A.—Because we have simply less to manufacture, and the fashions change with the times, so that we have continually to change our patterns and manufacture. We have not merely to change our colors, but our silk and rollers. Our material costs the same for putting out 500 pieces, as it does for 5,000.

Q.—Do you pay the same rate of wages as are paid in the United States? A.—Exactly.

Q.—And you pay as high a price for your own material? A.—Yes.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—If you had a sufficient market here for your paper—is that, if there was no other means of supplying the market—would you be able to furnish sufficient for the market here, of yourself? A.—I believe we could.

Q.—If your market was extended more than it is—if you had a larger field in which to sell your goods, do you think you could compete with the American market? A.—Certainly.

Q.—Is that the greatest difficulty you labor under? A.—Yes.

Q.—So much comes in from other countries? A.—Yes. We produce as good an article, and sell at the same prices for fine goods, but low priced goods we cannot sell at the same price.

JOHN BAILLIE, of the City of Montreal, Manager, sworn.
I am the Manager of the Oil Cloth Company.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:

- Q.—Do you employ a considerable number of hands? A.—Between seventy and eighty.
- Q.—How many are boys? A.—Three; all the rest are men.
- Q.—Do you employ any females? A.—No.
- Q.—Are the men skilled or unskilled? A.—Some are skilled and some are unskilled.
- Q.—What do the skilled men earn? A.—Between ten and fourteen dollars a week.
- Q.—How many hours a day do they work? A.—Ten hours.
- Q.—And the unskilled, what do they receive? A.—From six to eight dollars a week.
- A.—Is the work laborious? A.—No, I do not think so; I should not say so.
- Q.—Do you get your raw material in Canada or abroad? A.—Mostly abroad. They make a large variety of raw goods and material for oil cloths.
- Q.—Are all these classes of material brought from abroad? A.—No. For our table cloths we get the material in this country mostly.
- Q.—What are your floor cloths made of? A.—Jute canvas.
- Q.—Where do you get that? A.—In Scotland.
- Q.—Is there any made anywhere else? A.—Scotland is the only place that I know of.
- Q.—Are your patterns designed here? A.—No. We get them in the States.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

- Q.—Could you not get them in Canada? A.—I occasionally pick up a design here. I do not think we ever got a design until this year in Canada. A good designer gets a very high salary. The market is not sufficiently large here to enable us to pay one. I may say that there is a floor cloth designer in England who gets two thousand pounds sterling a year from one oil cloth factory.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

- Q.—Is your block-cutting all done in the States? A.—Yes; in the States and in England.
- Q.—Nobody can do that here? A.—We have occasionally done a little block-cutting, but it does not pay.
- Q.—What do the men earn who work on the frames and prepare the cloth for the printer? A.—We pay them from \$9 to \$10 a week.
- Q.—And hand printers, what do they earn? A.—That is piece-work. The printer has an assistant. He earns all the way from \$15 to \$25 a week.
- Q.—One man, you say? A.—The man and his assistant. The man runs the table, and hires his own assistant.
- Q.—Do you print by machinery? A.—Yes. Not only floor cloths, but other cloths.
- Q.—Are your men running these machines considered skilled men? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Do they belong to this country? A.—They are imported; they are Americans, mostly.
- Q.—What do their earnings average? A.—\$12 to \$14 a week.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

- Q.—Is your machinery well protected? A.—Yes. We have no dangerous machinery; I consider that we have not.
- Q.—Have you had any accidents in your factory? A.—Yes.

Q.—What class of accidents? A.—We have had no serious accidents except one about a year ago, when a man had his arm taken off. We have had no serious accident, that I know of, but that happen.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Did you obtain any designs by reason of the prizes offered by the Manufacturers' Association for designs? A.—I never heard of any prizes being offered for designs.

Q.—The offer did not produce any result to your knowledge in your line of business? A.—No. I may say here, like Mr. McArthur, we are in much the same position. We have to buy our designs from the various designers, so as to get an assortment.

ROSSELL C. FISHER, of the City of Montreal, Economist, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are an advocate of the city of Montreal? A.—Yes; I do not practice now.

Q.—You have paid some attention to the question of co-operative Supply and Share Associations? A.—Yes; and I have made a special study, for the last twenty years, of the labour question in Great Britain and in this country.

Q.—Perhaps you would prefer to make a statement before the Commission, in preference to being questioned at the outset? A.—Yes. First, I may say, the cause of the labor question, in this and other countries, is due to the conditions of modern industry, to the disparity of means in the literary, educational, and social improvement, and political status of the wage earning classes, with their improvement in mechanical education and technical efficiency. This question, so far as it is due to the condition of modern industry is in this country, barely the creature of legislation; in other words, under our peculiar circumstances and causes, we cannot have any large development of modern industry in Canada for many years to come. Low wages, for instance, in a country like this, appear to me to be principally due, directly, to the social causes which I have mentioned. For instance, the great desire of the wage earning classes to leave the country, and come into town for the social advantages which the latter furnishes them. In the towns their social advancement is more rapid than their wages and their ambition, and this, in turn, excites both their disappointment and discontent. I do not, however, believe that it is possible for legislation to bring about any direct improvement, or to have any direct effect in raising the wages of the wage earners. It may, however, indirectly, affect them as follows: for instance, the Factory Acts, which forbid the employment of children under a certain age, or for more than a certain time, would, naturally, have the effect of decreasing the supply of labor. Again, the Factory Acts, which constitute the working day to be a greater or less number of hours, may in some way, decrease the supply of labor, and in this way, they may, indirectly, have the effect of raising the true wages of the laborer. It appears to me that the excuse or justification for legislative interference in regard to the length of time which the laborer must work, is due to the conditions of the large modern industries. For instance, when a man works at an industry wherein his work is not directly affected by that of his fellow laborer, it is not a matter of public importance that the hours of his labor should be dictated by outside authority, but where the man is merely a part of the machinery, and where his labor cannot be suspended without interfering with the labor of a great number of other fellow workmen; then, there appears to me to be justification for interfering with his freedom of contract to work for longer or shorter hours, as the case may be. In regard to the advisability of interfering with child labor and the labor of women, I think it is justified on the principle that the law has a right to interfere with any man who is committing what is perceivably a wrong against

society by employing women and children under unhealthy conditions, or for too long hours, as necessarily injurious, not only to the child itself, but to the future population of the country, and, therefore, I think it should be forbidden by law. In the same way, I think that legislation can affect rents in such a manner as to indirectly affect wages. For instance, though I do not believe it is possible, to say that any body shall provide any house at any definite rate, it is quite possible to forbid any man to supply houses that are unhealthy, and to compel men to erect houses up to a certain point of decency, and healthfulness. Now, compelling landlords to supply houses of a certain standard of decency and healthfulness, compels them to ask higher rents than can be demanded for unhealthy and improper houses. This demand for higher rents, in turn, will directly affect the wages question, because if a man has to pay a very high rent, it affects his working at a particular industry in a particular place, for a particular wage. In this country, so far as I am aware, there has hardly been any effort made, at any rate in Montreal, at co-operation or private sharing. It appears to me the condition of our population and industries are too new to make it likely that any great move will be made in this direction for some time to come. In England, where distributive co-operation has made such enormous strides, it has been among a steady and long established population who were much more favorably placed than our mixed and rapidly changing population for carrying on any work which requires a long course of education, and long continued enthusiasm and pristine sustained efforts on the part of the originators and leaders. There is, at the present time, at Montreal, at least, one co-operative store which is carried along under the conditions that I have mentioned, namely, want of enthusiasm on the part of the population to be served by it, and a want and care in the appreciation which is to be gained by it. Industrial partnership or protective co-operation has been found to be much more difficult to offer to the world than is distributive co-operation, because large protective enterprises are very much more difficult to carry on, by men who are possessed of neither great capacity, or great capital. As the working class, or wage earning class, as a rule, only possess, in the smallest degree, both of these requisites, it is extremely natural they should stand a very poor chance in instituting any successful protective or co-operative effort. I may say, however, as bearing on the conditions of establishing private sharing enterprises before workmen are specially educated to appreciate its advantages, was illustrated here a year ago in a case which was remarkably favorable for carrying out this plan. One of the leading distributive, decorative, painting and glazing firms in this city wished to improve the condition of their workmen, and their efficiency, and promised them a bonus on the profits of the firm at the end of the year. The result was as follows: the last fortnight of the year, the wages were two hundred and seventy dollars. At the New Year, a bonus of fifty-seven and a half was paid, and at the end of the third fortnight, the wages earned, with exactly the same opportunities, amounted to two hundred and nineteen dollars. If you add the bonus and the wages, you will see that the workmen were idle just to the extent of the bonus. The third fortnight, without the bonus, the wages went back to the old figure, within two or three dollars. I need not say, under these circumstances, the firm were not greatly encouraged to grant bonuses, or to take into any sort of partnership their workmen. I may also say that last summer, under the exceptionally high wages prevalent in some of the building trades, —

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What tradesmen received exceptionally high wages last summer? A.—Bricklayers and stone masons.

Q.—What do you call exceptionally high wages? A.—A quarter of a dollar an hour.

Q.—Do you mean to say that is exceptionally high wages? A.—Such is my information.

Q.—Would you be surprised to hear that the pay of these tradesmen is below the

average of the pay of the same class in the West? A.—I could not say. But, to return to where I left off,—the result was, that under the circumstances, the men took a very large proportion of their time, or rather, were idle a very large proportion of their time.

Q.—Have you got statistics to show they were idle a large proportion of their time? A.—No.

Q.—Then, you do not know that they were or not? A.—No, I do not.

Q.—You have merely the assertion of their employer? A.—That is all; but the statement I am giving you about the painters and glaziers, is not theoretical. The figures are actual. The reason why, no doubt, wages in the same trade may differ in Montreal, for instance, and in Toronto, can only be explained by the fact that mechanics here are content with a lower standard of living than they are in the West. In my opinion, there is only one method of increasing the wages of the wage earning classes; that is, to decrease the cost of protection and increase the efficiency of the laborer. If any of you gentlemen would like to ask questions, I shall have pleasure in answering them.

By MR. GIBSON:—

Q.—How would you increase the efficiency of the laborer? A.—By two ways: education, in the first instance—technical education—either during apprenticeship or by public technical education. I believe, however, the shortening of the hours of labor, generally, would have a very favorable effect in the long run, though not immediately, in raising the social standard of the men.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Would not combination among the working men help them in obtaining a reasonable rate of wages? A.—I think it is very doubtful whether a combination among the workmen would help them permanently.

Q.—You are a lawyer, I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—How does the Law Society keep up its fees? A.—It keeps up its fees by an annual subscription, so far as the fees of the Society are concerned. The court fees are levied by a tax on the community.

Q.—Is it not compulsory for every lawyer to belong to the Law Society, before he can practice? A.—Yes.

Q.—The Law Society is practically a Trades Union? A.—There is no comparison between the two.

Q.—Do you think the lawyers would be able to keep up their fees to a certain figure, if they were not bound together in one Society to do so by certain rules? A.—The lawyers have certain fees given them by right (charter), but you are doubtless aware that one lawyer charges an amount three times as much as another lawyer may do.

Q.—But they cannot charge below a certain figure? A.—Certainly.

Q.—If working men were to combine together and agree upon a tariff or scale of wages, do you think it would help them any? A.—No.

Q.—Why not? A.—Because there is no comparison between a Law Society and a Trades Union. None whatever. The Law Society is as much in the interests of the public as of the members of the Bar.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—If I have a case in Court I am compelled to employ a lawyer, I am not allowed to plead my own case? A.—You are mistaken. You have the right to do so if you wish, but your interests will be better served by a lawyer than by yourself.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Is it not a fact that the tariff as we call it here—the tariff of fees, is a protection to the man who is sued? A.—Yes.

Q.—By which the lawyer is prevented from asking a man more than a certain sum, otherwise might he not, in some cases, be subjected to very heavy charges?
 A.—Certainly in default of any special agreement on the part of the parties, it, at all events, prevents the lawyer from bringing in an exceptional bill.

Q.—Now, suppose there was no tariff, and that an eminent legal firm here were to bring an action for even \$100, would not that firm be able to ask any sum it liked for its services? A.—Certainly.

Q.—And the party refusing would have to go to court in case he contested the fee? A.—Yes. In that case, I imagine, every man going to a lawyer would make his own bargain.

Q.—And in that respect, there is not much analogy in the two cases—between the legal profession and the Trades Unions of the industrial classes? A.—No, there is not.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—The one is protected and the other is not? A.—The one in that sense must be protected—that is the party to the suit.

Q.—And the legal profession is protected? A.—It is not so much the legal profession—the lawyer—as the party who loses the case. For instance, if I go to you to plead my case and we agree upon a fee of so much to be paid to you for your services—suppose I lose my case and the costs are against me, the other party's lawyer made no agreement with me, and he might come down with a bill extremely heavy. The scale of fees is as much for the protection of the litigant as the lawyer. If he charges beyond the tariff you can have his bill taxed and reduced to its proper figures. You can demand that his bill be taxed in any case.

Q.—So that in that case, both parties are protected. Both lawyer and client?
 A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is it not a fact that costs in cases for the collection of small debts are exceedingly heavy? A.—I cannot say, I am not practising now.

(Translation.)

LUDGER COUSINEAU, Builder of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Are you a general contractor? Do you work in masonry, etc.? A.—Yes; I am a general contractor.

Q.—How many men have you in your service? A.—That is variable, sometimes twenty-five and thirty. I also often give out sub-contracts.

Q.—Do you employ masons? A.—I do no mason work myself, I always give that to a sub-contractor.

Q.—As to yourself—what is your occupation? A.—A joiner and carpenter.

Q.—In general what wages do masons make here? A.—That depends. Last Summer they made \$2.50 a day or thereabouts.

Q.—Is this the general price or were there any who made more while others made less? A.—There were some who made more than that.

Q.—But were there any that made less? A.—I rather think not. Anyhow these are about the prices.

Q.—What are carpenters wages as a rule? A.—\$1.75, \$1.80 or thereabouts.

Q.—Are there any who made more or less than this? A.—There are some that I pay more and others less.

Q.—What are the wages of a good carpenter foreman? A.—They go up to \$2.50 or thereabouts.

Q.—And the bricklayers? A.—From \$3 to \$3.30.

Q.—Taking the last year as a standard is there more work done in stone or more work done in brick? A.—I know that, last year, there was very much work done both in stone and brick building.

Q.—But you cannot say which of the two predominated? A.—No.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—How much do bricklayers' laborers receive? A.—\$1.50 to \$1.75.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—What are the wages of stonecutters? A.—I do not know.

Q.—What are the wages of plasterers? A.—Last year, I think they were \$2 a day. They were paid, however, up to \$2.50, and the foremen got more than that.

Q.—Are the men engaged in the building of houses in general, taking in all the classes, that work in the building of houses—are these good workmen as a rule? A.—Yes. They are good workmen in general, although there are a certain number who do not understand joining and who are not up in carpentering. You cannot call these first-class hands.

Q.—Are the plasterers, here in Montreal, able to make their own moulds, cornices, centre pieces, etc.? A.—Centre pieces and all other ornaments are generally cast in special shops. The cornices are moulded in the shops because there are moulds especially for that.

Q.—As to such ornaments as capitols, the corners of capitols and the corners of doors—are there moulds to turn out these at once in the shop? A.—All these ornaments are cast in special shops, and the special shops make their own moulds as they require them.

Q.—Is there a difference in the amount of wages made to those who make the ornaments and the amount of wages paid to the men who make the ordinary plastering? A.—I do not know what wages these shops pay. I do not think there is any difference.

Q.—Were there many buildings run up during the last season? A.—Yes; last summer there were many. I think it was one of our busiest summers in the building line.

Q.—Is the outlook for the building of houses as good this coming year? A.—They do not appear so good as they were last year.

Q.—Are these plans among the architects of such nature as to enable you to tell the amount of work to be done next spring? A.—I believe that according to appearances, there will be work enough this year, but not so much as last year.

Q.—Are you of opinion that foreign immigration affects in any way the working classes of this city? A.—I do not think so.

By Mr. FREED.

Q.—What class of building are generally raised in Montreal? A.—That varies, but there are many stone and brick houses, and houses with stone fronts and sides, and rear of brick. As to the houses in the wards where the laboring classes generally live, the houses are of wood lined with brick.

Q.—Are they building many houses for the poorer classes which are rented at low rates? A.—At present it is the habit to build better houses than formerly and the rental is rather higher—\$6.00 to \$7.00 a month. These houses contain four or five lodgings.

Q.—Generally speaking in these lodgings how many rooms are there for each family? A.—Four or five rooms.

Q.—Are the sanitary conditions of these buildings better than than they used to be? A.—Yes; the drains are better than formerly.

Q.—Is each lodging directly connected with the sewers? A.—Generally the premises are connected with the sewers almost everywhere to-day.

Q.—Is the plumber work shielded by a suitable ventilation as these buildings of the lower grade? A.—My opinion is that all houses should have water closets, and ventilators to air these water closets.

Q.—But does not that exist? A.—No; generally speaking in the dwelling of the poorer classes the closets are out in the yard.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—And the new buildings? A.—Yes; even in the new buildings of to-day, the water closets are outside.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Do you think that the pipes which are introduced into houses such as they build to-day for the dwellings of working people afford sufficient protection for health, if they are not properly closed? A.—I think so. Health does not suffer from it because there are what are called cesspools which prevent the smell from coming through the grating or sinks.

Q.—These gratings or sinks are "S" shaped? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Is the ventilation so conducted that the gases can escape otherwise than by the dwelling? A.—The gases can escape through the cellars.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you think that the ventilation in these dwellings is as good as in the other parts of the country? A.—I think it is.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Have the working class generally bath-rooms in their houses? A.—In lodgings of \$12.00 for instance there are bath-rooms. The building of houses is much better than formerly. There has been improvement in every respect.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—In this system of sewerage, is the draught, if I may so express myself, sufficient to carry off all nauseous effluvia? A.—There are good sewers.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are carpenters and joiners in Montreal as skilful as they were some time ago? A.—They are at present more skilful than formerly.

Q.—We have been told here that it is a hard thing to get good workmen in those lines in Montreal. Is that the case? A.—I have had workingmen from abroad—mechanics from Europe—working for me, and I found that our own men were their superiors.

Q.—Is it possible to train a young man, a native of Canada, and to make of him a first-class workman? A.—We have Canadian workmen who certainly cannot be excelled anywhere in my opinion.

Q.—It has been said here that, on account of the bent of our young people, it was hard to keep them long enough to have them learn their trade, and that in consequence it was impossible to turn out first-class mechanics. Is that so? A.—It is rather a drawback with our apprentices to-day not to serve out their time, and thus become good workmen; but, on the other hand, these young people, even changing

from shop to shop, became good mechanics, for, while serving as journeymen, they finish by learning their trade.

Q.—Can you suggest a means of stopping apprentices from running from shop to shop before learning their trade? A.—It would be necessary to have a law forbidding a young man who is under engagement for two or three years to leave his work and not fill up his time.

Q.—You would then be in favor of a system of compulsory apprenticeship? A.—I think that there is already a law to that effect; but they contrive means of shirking it. They do not mind it, and when a young fellow makes up his mind to leave his work, he does so.

By Mr. HELBRONNER —

Q.—You belong to the Contractors Association? A.—Yes. I am one of its directors.

Q.—Did you not present a bill before the Quebec Parliament touching on the privileges of working men? A.—Yes. A bill of that kind was presented last year, but it was left on the table. It is to be brought forward again this year.

Q.—Could you tell me in a few words what it [was that you demanded? A.—We demanded that the landlord be responsible for the debts contracted by the contractor in the building of the house, and that not only in what relates to materials, but also the working man's wages, provided that he who supplied the materials or the working man filed his account within a certain interval which is, I think, fixed at thirty days. There is a certain clause which I do not recall.....The object of the bill is to eliminate from the trade a class of men who are not competent. It often happens that men who are not even in the trade undertake the building of houses and it is often they who bring trouble on the landlord.

Q.—It is a class of people who bring losses on the persons who supply the material and who dock the salaries of the working men? A.—It is especially that class of men who cannot reckon the costs and are thus a source of embarrassment for the landlords and workmen.

GEORGE DOUGLASS, of the City of Montreal, Laborer, sworn.

I am the caretaker of the Thistle Curling Rink, situate on St. Monique Street, in this city.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—During how large a portion of the year are you employed as caretaker of the Thistle Curling Rink? A.—From the twentieth of February until the middle of April.

Q.—Have you any employment at the rink in summer? A.—Not in the summer time at all. No; I live there all the summer.

Q.—Do you get any remuneration for the summer? A.—No.

Q.—What do persons in your position generally receive for the winter months? A.—One dollar a day, free quarters, fire and light, and water—everything found.

Q.—You get this the year round? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are your duties very arduous? A.—No; sometimes they may be and sometimes they are very easy.

Q.—Do you take care of the ice? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any responsibility over the curling stones and other property? A.—I have the whole charge of everything.

A.—I suppose you generally get some little present, and so on? A.—Oh yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You have been employed by the Allan Line? A.—Yes.

- Q.—What were you employed as? A.—Checker.
 Q.—Last summer? A.—No; last summer I was employed by the Canadian Pacific Railway.
 Q.—So that you were employed by the Allan Line in 1886? A.—Yes.
 Q.—Are the checkers on the Allan Line obliged to work at night? A.—Yes.
 Q.—Are they paid for night work? A.—No; they are not paid for night work.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

- Q.—How were you paid? A.—I was paid nine dollars a week.
 Q.—And the nine dollars you received for day work? A.—You get that for the week. It does not matter how long you work.
 Q.—How many hours are you supposed to work for a week—to constitute a week? A.—I do not know. I could not tell you that.
 Q.—When you made your engagement with the Allan Line, how much did you suppose, or how much did they tell you, you would have to work for the \$9? A.—I was not told.
 Q.—You did not make any agreement, except that you went there and that you got paid? A.—The first summer I got \$10.80 a week, and then this was reduced to \$9.00.
 Q.—Is it to your knowledge that several checkers work for several nights during the week without receiving extra pay? A.—Yes; they work some nights until twelve o'clock, and some nights until eight, and sometimes all night.
 Q.—When you work during the night, do you go to work at the same hour next morning? A.—Yes; seven o'clock.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

- Q.—The men, you say, begin to work at eight o'clock at night, and work until the next evening at six? A.—Yes. We used to work commencing the next morning at six, but that got out of practice, so they started at seven.
 Q.—What was this uninterrupted period during which you worked? A.—I worked like, say, from seven o'clock in the morning until ten o'clock to-morrow night. It depends upon the hatches; if you are put on, they generally keep you on that hatch; they do not wish to change; they do not like strangers.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

- Q.—You get your meal hours? A.—Yes.
 Q.—That was at this time that you speak of? A.—Yes.
 Q.—Two gangs of men work sometimes? A.—Yes; sometimes. When we were not busy we were relieved by another checker at about eleven o'clock at night.

By Mr. FREED:—

- Q.—Were there times during which you had nothing to do, and could rest? A.—Yes; many times during the day you could sometimes take a rest. When I took a rest it might be sometimes for two days, when no shipping was in.
 Q.—You would not do anything? A.—No; but of course you would have to be there.

By Mr. McLEAN:

- Q.—Were you obliged to work this number of hours? A.—Yes; we had to do it.
 Q.—Were you obliged to do it? A.—Yes.
 Q.—Checking goods is rather an important business? A.—Yes; ours is very important. If you made a mistake you would cause a great deal of confusion. If your iron or steel were not properly sorted, it would cause a great deal of labor.

Q.—A man being in this way from want of sleep, would it not cause him to be more liable to incur accident? A.—Well, you have always got to look out.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Is any percentage of wages kept off you? A.—No; there never was.

Q.—Were you insured? A.—No.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Did they ever ask you to insure? A.—No; none of the checkers are insured.

WILLIAM F. BORLAND, of the City of Montreal, General Superintendent of the North American Glass Company, sworn.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Has this company been long in existence? A.—About nine years.

Q.—Do you employ a great many hands? A.—Well, until January we employed about five hundred.

Q.—Why do you say until January? Is there any reason why you should lessen the number at this time of the year? A.—One of the furnaces has gone out. We were not in a condition to keep it going the season through.

Q.—How many furnaces are there on now? A.—Three.

Q.—How many hands do you employ now? A.—About four hundred, that is to the best of my recollection.

Q.—What particular class of work do you do here? A.—Well, nearly all lines in green glassware—insulators, fruit-jars, and so on; and in white glass, all kinds of bottles, lantern glasses, jars, lamps, goblets, tumblers, cruets; and in cut glass we manufacture any kind of goods. We are going to start or continue another industry this winter; a cutter (glass cutter) of Montreal has left, and we are keeping on his business.

Q.—This is your first year at that? A.—Yes.

Q.—How are you getting on with the cutting? A.—I could not say definitely. We only recently started it. We began since Christmas.

Q.—Have you the furnaces the other man had, or have you your own regulated for glass cutting? A.—Well, we had his removed from his property where he had them erected.

Q.—Do you find a ready market for all your manufactures? A.—No, there is not.

Q.—Where do you find your markets generally? A.—In Canada West. Of course, we sell a great deal in Montreal, but Western Canada is our largest market.

Q.—Do you send any down East at all? A.—Yes. We send our goods all over the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Q.—What markets do you send them to down East? A.—All through Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and as far West as British Columbia.

Q.—Have you any consignees down in Nova Scotia? A.—No.

Q.—Do you send any salesmen down there? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you find yourselves profitably employed? Has trade been good this last year? A.—We have no reason to complain. Business has been pretty fair.

Q.—What is the outlook for your business for the future? A.—Well, there have been one or two factories started up the last two or three years, and I think the market is not quite large enough to keep us all running full time.

Q.—What wages do you pay, sir? A.—Well, we pay all the way from about \$2.50 to \$43 a week.

Q.—What men do you pay forty three dollars a week to? How many? I know the class of men. A.—Well, that is what we call a shift, that is a gang. Three have not drawn less than forty dollars a week, and as high as forty-three dollars a week, each man, since November.

Q.—Well, these men, what is the average wages of the hands, those immediately connected with glass blowing? I do not mean the laborers. A.—Well, it depends a great deal on the glass blower himself. They run from two, four and five dollars a week up to, say, forty and forty-three dollars a week. They must be all pretty expert for their work, as such, for they cannot shirk it.

Q.—No; it requires that the men should know their trade. Have you any apprentices? A.—Well, we have apprentices making over eighteen dollars a week.

Q.—What system have you with these apprentices? A.—They sign articles of indenture to serve so many years; the first three at one half the wages of skilled workmen, and the fourth and fifth year, as the case may be, they receive two-thirds. The glass blowers have a price list the same as we have ourselves, and if they make an article an ounce heavier or lighter, they are paid proportionately.

Q.—Do you find many learning the trade? A.—All our apprentices remain with us.

Q.—Have they, in the main, been generally inclined to work out their apprenticeship faithfully? A.—Yes; they have done very well.

Q.—I suppose the wages paid, or given, is an incentive to remain? A.—It is.

Q.—Do you know any other occupation where they could earn that as apprentices? A.—I do not.

Q.—Is the work of these men very severe? A.—I do not think so.

Q.—Well, it looks so, at all events. A.—I have seen men some way in the neighborhood of eighty years of age, do as much work in a day as the youngest of them.

Q.—Do you make your own moulds and everything of that kind? A.—No; we import our moulds. We have a large machine shop, but we import our moulds.

Q.—You do not bore your own moulds out yourselves? A.—We have tried it, but found there are not good enough castings in Canada to make good moulds.

Q.—Are there not good workmen here? A.—The workmanship can be done here, but there is something in the iron that is not suitable. It is not so soft and malleable as in the States and England. I do not know of any reason why.

Q.—I saw, in other parts of Canada, the same kind of work, and the moulds are as perfect and clean as I ever saw? A.—Yes; and I can show you moulds from the States that you cannot make in Canada. The workmanship may be there, but the material is not. That has been our experience.

Q.—What number of these men would be considered as laboring men, that you have, employed by you? A.—Well, we have a class of men that take the ware out of the ovens, and others. Most of the bakers and batch mixers and so forth, I would classify as intelligent laborers. The packing room is looked over by an experienced packer. They (the packers) simply put the goods into the cases and these laborers have got to be intelligent men.

Q.—Do you make your own boxes? A.—We do; I think we are cutting somewhere in the neighborhood of some four thousand feet of lumber a day.

Q.—What class of lumber is it? A.—Pine lumber altogether.

Q.—Do you make your own crucibles? A.—We do. We make some of them. We do not make them all. We do not use crucibles only at two of the furnaces. In the other, we have got continuous tanks, and they are gas producing tanks at the same time.

Q.—Do you not think that you would be able to make all your own crucibles,—as well as the imported ones? A.—I think so. I do not see any reason why we should not.

Q.—Do you import the clay? A.—We do. We import the raw material. The raw material is pretty much all imported.

Q.—Then, there are special men for these things? Pot making is an important branch of the work, is it not? A.—Yes. Pot making is a branch of itself.

Q.—Have you men competent for this class of work? A.—Yes; we have not any just now, but we have had them.

Q.—Do you find the ones made by yourselves as good as those you import? A.—Well, I think we have hardly given them a fair trial, though in some instances they have proved to be as good as those we have imported.

Q.—Is the health of your men generally good? A.—Yes; I think so.

Q.—Is your place well ventilated from all fumes every where around? A.—It is well ventilated. Sometimes we cannot get enough ventilation, that is the warm weather, and in the winter it is pretty hard to close up all the cracks.

Q.—Is there good accommodation for the employees? A.—Yes; there is a large water-closet for them, the same as on the wharves, with a large iron trough, and it is well ventilated and water is kept running through it all the time. It is cleaned out every morning.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How many months a year do you run? A.—We run full time for ten months in the year. We shut down during the hot weather as is the custom in the trade.

Q.—How many hours a day do the blowers work? A.—They are supposed to work from seven in the morning to five in the afternoon with an interim of twenty minutes at ten o'clock in the morning; an hour for dinner, and ten to thirteen minutes at three o'clock. At five o'clock all the glass blowers and boys are done their work.

Q.—Do you do any night work? A.—Five nights a week. We do not work on Saturday night. There are a certain class of men working night and day—shearers and others. They change off. That is they work in shifts. Those that are working at night this week are not on night work, next week. Sometimes they are not working at night for two or three weeks, and at other times they work alternately week about.

Q.—How many boys are there out of the four hundred employees? A.—Some where in the neighborhood of one hundred and fifty.

Q.—What would be the ages of some of the youngest of them? A.—I think there are a few under twelve, there are not many, but I think the average age is fourteen.

Q.—Do you know that by law you are not allowed to employ any boy under twelve years of age? A.—No: I was not aware of it.

Q.—You had better make yourself acquainted with the provisions of the Factory Act, otherwise you may find the inspector visiting your works, and you may be called to account. Do you employ any boys at night? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you employ any females? A.—None at all.

Q.—In what capacity do you employ the boys? A.—We employ the boys in the grinding room. I do not know that I may call it a grinding room.

Q.—It is where you dress off the edges? Yes, we have a grinding room if I may so call it, where we dress off the edges.

Q.—Are there any boys employed in that room? A.—Yes.

Q.—What time do they leave work? A.—They leave a little before six o'clock.

Q.—Part of their duty is to wash globes and other articles with warm water and washing. At one thing they work one day, and the next day at the other thing.

Q.—What wages do the boys earn in a glass blowing factory? A.—Well the boys skip up rapidly. They earn three dollars a week on the average, and some of the boys earn from three to five dollars per week. Boys engaged in preparing goods for packing earn from three to three and a-half dollars a week.

Q.—Are these boys employed by the firm, or by the foreman? A.—By the

firm. Sometimes we run behind on lantern globes, and in such a case as that, we will give the work to one boy to do, and he will get some of the others in with him, and they will do that work in their overtime. That will happen two or three times during the season.

Q.—Is it a fact that the boys who work during the day time work also at night?
A.—No; they always work in shifts. If he has been working on night work this week, we give him a change the next week. When Saturday night comes, his night work is at an end for a full week. There is no work done on Sundays, very rarely, if at all, and it always optional whether they do it or not. It is of very rare occurrence.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—What coal do you use? A.—Lower Ports coal. Pictou coal from the Vale colliery and the Albion colliery—these different mines.

Q.—You get all these down there? A.—Altogether.

Q.—Do you find the Lower Ports coal answer your purpose? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you ever use American coal? A.—Yes.

Q.—The reason why I ask you is, we were informed at other places that parties had tried Lower Province coal, and that there was too much sulphur in it for them to use it. I would like to know if you have experienced any difficulty with the coal obtained in the Lower Provinces in your own particular business? A.—No. We are satisfied with the Lower Ports coal.

Q.—You consider that the Vale and Albion, and the other mines' coal is as good a coal as you can get? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Did you say you employed some children to work all night? A.—Yes.

Q.—What hours? A.—From six or seven o'clock at night until four in the morning; however, they are often done before that. That is the extreme limit.

Q.—Are there many of those children so employed by you under twelve years of age? A.—That I could not answer.

Q.—What does their work consist of? A.—Carrying in fruit jars after the blowers have made them.

Q.—Are they heavy ware? A.—They would weigh from eighteen to twenty ounces.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—To what proportion of men do you employ one apprentice? A.—We allow one apprentice to every fifteen journeymen blowers.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have you had workmen employed by you from abroad? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you had any difficulty with them? A.—Not more so than with the Americans in our employ. The Americans wanted a lesson, and we got Scotchmen and Frenchmen here, and when they saw that we could do without them they came to terms.

Q.—That is some years ago? A.—Yes.

Q.—Where do you get your force from now, as a general rule? A.—Chiefly from the States.

Q.—Have any men in this country become skilled in that matter? A.—Yes; I have several apprentices, I could not exactly say how many. I think I have five or six journeymen who have learned their trade here, and who are fully skilled.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Montreal people, who have been apprenticed to you? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—With reference to those that came here to live in Montreal, are they with you now? A.—Most of them have left; some are here, and some are in the States; some again came back from the States.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Do you know if any of your employees own their own dwellings? A.—There are a few.

Q.—You have stated here that some of your men received as high as \$42 and \$43 a week? A.—Yes; they have received as high as that.

Q.—Is that their own total personal earnings, or do they supply anything? A.—That is their own personal earnings. I suppose we pay out a year nearly \$130,000 in wages—from \$120,000 to \$130,000 in wages alone.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Those who get \$42 to \$43 a week, do they build or purchase houses for themselves? A.—No. I believe some of the men who get less wages own their own houses.

Q.—Do you find that the men who get the least wages are the most saving? A.—Yes.

ALEXANDER LUTTRELL, of the City and District of Montreal, Messenger, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:

Q.—Where are you employed? A.—I am at present employed as a messenger by Messrs H. & A. Allan.

Q.—Have you always been employed as a messenger? A.—No, I have not. I have been in the baking business and I have been on the Grand Trunk Railway.

Q.—In what capacity have you been employed in the Grand Trunk Railway? A.—I was brakeman and train baggage man.

Q.—How long did you run on the railway? A.—About three years.

Q.—And how long ago were you employed on the railway? A.—It is twenty years ago since I was employed on the Grand Trunk Railway—twenty-two years ago.

Q.—Do you know if the conditions of a brakeman's life have altered materially of late years? A.—Yes, I believe it has. It has changed for the better. If a man twenty years ago had been on the line ten years, he would receive the same wages as one who was only just taken on. The men were not classified then; they are now.

Q.—Do you consider the conditions of the life of a brakeman to be better now than it was then? A.—I could not say, but I believe they are better. A brakeman twenty years ago could make, by running extra, one day and a quarter going to Brockville, one day and a half going to Kingston, and two days going to Toronto, about \$38 a month. Now, I believe, he makes more, because he gets better pay. He does a great deal more mileage than he did twenty years ago, but he gets more.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How many days labour was he allowed for the respective trips? A.—One and a quarter to Brockville, one and a half to Kingston, and two days to Toronto. The longer you run the more you make.

Q.—There is always a possibility of their rising to be conductors? A.—I believe there is.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are the wages received at the present time better than when you were a brakeman? A.—Yes. I consider they are.

Q.—Are your hours at present as long as they would be running on a train? A.—Oh, no. Running on a train a brakeman would have to run very often. I have often been in three or four hours, and have then had to start right off again. Perhaps four hours out of the twenty-four is all that I would have for sleep; if you did not do that you would make nothing.

Q.—The oftener you ran the better your salary in the four weeks which constitute the month? A.—Yes.

Q.—What hours are you occupied as a messenger? A.—Well, I am occupied in various ways.

Q.—What hours are you occupied at the present time? A.—From eight o'clock in the morning to seven o'clock at night. We are paid by the hour, the more hours we make the better our salary is.

Q.—How much per hour does a messenger receive? A.—Twelve and a half cents to fifteen cents per hour.

Q.—Are you required to work at night as well as during the day? A.—When you are wanted.

Q.—How many hours have you worked consecutively at a time? A.—Well, it is just as the business is. Sometimes—I may say generally—it is twelve hours, and sometimes twelve, thirteen or fourteen hours.

Q.—Do you get extra pay for extra hours? A.—Yes. Extra pay is the rule.

Q.—Do the men prefer working extra hours? A.—Yes.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Would they prefer to make extra hours if they could make regular and fair wages by ten hours work? A.—I suppose they like to make as much as they can.

Q.—What do you mean by extra pay? Do you get the same rate of pay the more hours you make? A.—It is a better salary.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—It is merely one rate of pay for ordinary work, daily work and extra work—the same rate of pay per hour, no matter how long you work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know anything about the rules of the Grand Trunk Railway Company? A.—No; I do not. Not now.

Q.—You cannot give us any information as to the regulations? A.—Not now. I would like to say this; I know if they would only make an improvement to the foot-boards on the top of the cars it would be better for the men. They could be very much improved yet. The foot-boards are too narrow yet, and are not well supported.

Q.—What width do you suppose they should be? A.—I could not say exactly the width. I should say that would be close on two feet.

Q.—What width were they when you were on the line? A.—There was not a foot-board except on the tin roofed cars. I consider that they were just as well without the foot-boards, except the tin roofed cars.

Q.—Have you any suggestions to make with regard to these foot-boards for brakemen? A.—Well, I think they should be two feet wide, and composed of boards of such a thickness that there would be no spring in them. The foot-boards I saw on these tin roofed cars were very dangerous, they would spring with you, and if you the least over-balanced, you would fall from the car.

Q.—Is there any means you can suggest to prevent the brakemen from falling off the cars? A.—I think foot-boards should be made more solid, and there ought to be railings round the cars—something to catch hold of, because if you slip down you must go; there is nothing to prevent it.

Q.—Where would you put that rail? A.—Running along the length of the foot-board.

Q.—On the edge of the car? A.—On the edge of the car.

Q.—Did you consider the bell rope a source of any danger when you were a brakeman? A.—No; I did not, if care is taken.

Q.—Have you ever heard of an instance of a brakeman stepping on a bell rope? A.—Yes; I have.

Q.—Have you heard of them getting entangled so that he could not give the alarm by them? A.—Yes; I have known of them being entangled that way.

Q.—So that they would not give the alarm when you pulled them? A.—Yes.

Q.—Then, that being the case, if the bell rope would not work when required, is it not more a source of danger than otherwise? Would it not be better to be without it altogether than to depend upon it? A.—Yes.

Q.—You would be better without it altogether? A.—Yes.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—In running along the foot-board, did you ever slip? A.—No; I was prepared for it. In winter I generally wore mocassins, and the warmth of my feet would cause them to stick on the top of the car, and thus afford some sort of a foot-hold in the event of a jerk or jolt.

Q.—You took all necessary precautions? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you consider that brakemen generally do that? A.—I do not.

—

Translation.

MISS * * * , Dressmaker, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HEILBRONNER :—

Q.—You are engaged in a millinery shop? A.—Yes; as clerk.

Q.—What are the hours of work that you are called upon to do? A.—In the sale room, it is from 8 o'clock in the morning until 9 o'clock in the evening, and when there is a rush, we begin at 8 o'clock in the morning to knock off—well, that depends, at 10 o'clock to half-past 10; 11 o'clock to half-past 11.

Q.—When you are not busy, from one end of the year to the other, you close at 9 o'clock? A.—9 o'clock generally.

Q.—What are the hours of rest which you have during the day? A.—Two hours, one hour for dinner and one hour for tea.

Q.—Are you allowed to sit during the day? A.—Sometimes, if business allows.

Q.—What are the wages generally paid the lady clerks in shops? A.—\$3, \$4 to \$5, much depending on the season.

Q.—Then, they are not engaged by the year? A.—If one wants to be engaged by the year, she can get an engagement for one year.

Q.—Have you fixed wages or do they vary? A.—That depends on the conditions that are made. If conditions are made for a certain salary by the year, that salary is got.

Q.—In the shop where you work, there are dressmakers engaged? A.—Yes.

Q.—Up to what hour do they work? A.—From 8.30 in the morning till 6 o'clock in the evening, and in the busy season they work at night till 9 o'clock—the usual time.

Q.—Do they work later than 9 o'clock in the evening? A.—Sometimes, on Saturday evenings, till 11 o'clock or 11.30.

Q.—Have you any recollection of seeing anyone work till Sunday morning? A.—No.

Q.—When you are obliged to work till 10.30 or 11 o'clock at night do you receive higher wages? A.—No.

Q.—When you work till 11 o'clock at night, are you obliged to return the next morning, at the same hour, 8 o'clock? A.—Yes, indeed.

(Translation.)

Miss * * * , clerk in a dye shop, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—What are the hours of work in the shop where you are engaged? A.—From eight o'clock in the morning till nine o'clock at night and Saturdays till ten o'clock.

Q.—What are the wages which you receive? A.—Three dollars at present, but four dollars in the busy season.

Q.—In the busy season do you stop late at night? A.—We stop so long as there are customers in the shop.

Q.—You are alone in the shop? Is it simply an agency for the factory? A.—It is simply an agency and I am alone.

Friday, 24th February, 1888.

(Translation.)

FRANÇOIS LAINÉ, Leather Dresser, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You are a leather dresser? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you worked in Montreal for some time? A.—For two years.

Q.—What are the average wages you have received here? A.—The average wages here at Montreal are from \$5 to \$8.

Q.—For how many hours of labor? A.—Ten hours.

Q.—Do you work sometimes more than ten hours? A.—Yes; occasionally in the busy season, as in autumn, principally. We are obliged to put in a quarter or a half-day more. We are paid at the same rate.

Q.—Do they impose any fines upon you? A.—Yes, sir; and I have here a regulation that I obtained in a shop where I worked, which I will show you. I copied this regulation from one which was stuck up in a shop where I worked last winter, but from which I was expelled because I had spoken in the shop to a companion.

(Translation.)

RULES OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MESSRS. * * *

All persons entering our service are obliged to observe the following rules :—

All persons must leave one week's pay in arrear; and those working by the piece must also leave one week's pay in arrear, as security. All persons must likewise give

one week's notice before leaving our service, the said notice to be given to the book-keeper, receiving a card of acknowledgment of such notice, in default of which they will forfeit their week's arrears.

All persons arriving late will lose a quarter of an hour for each five minutes late.

All persons losing one day, without warning the foreman of their department, will be fined one-half day's pay.

The employees are expressly prohibited from cleaning or dressing themselves before the signal is given.

All persons spoiling a skin will pay the wholesale price of it.

It is expressly prohibited to talk, to smoke, sing or be absent without permission during working hours, under penalty of twenty-five cents.

Any person found throwing away waste, grease, or pushing another workman, will be discharged, and forfeit his money in arrear.

Q.—Every one who arrives late will lose a quarter of an hour for each five minutes? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do they at the same time make them work? A.—They work just the same. They finish at the same time as the others, but on pay day they have so much less.

Q.—If anyone arrives at ten minutes past seven, do they make them begin work at ten minutes past seven or at half-past seven? A.—At ten minutes past seven; but he loses a half-hour on his day.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Does this regulation which you have just given us, apply in the two tanneries at Montreal? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—I see further in this regulation, "Any person losing a day without notifying the foreman of his department, will be fined a half day's pay." Does that mean that you lose your day and a half-day besides? A.—Yes. Let us suppose that I am well in the evening leaving the factory, and that in the morning I find myself indisposed and cannot go to work, I lose my day and they take a half day from my wages.

Q.—Anyone who injures a skin, does he pay the full price? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—That is to say that it is an injury done during work? A.—Yes; it is in working fat skins at times. You must do so many skins per day, and then, to get ahead, you must rush your knives, and if you cut the skin, and they find it out, you pay for the whole skin.

Q.—But it is the fault of the workman? A.—It is the fault of the workman for lack of attention; but to complete his task he is obliged to do this, and the best workmen may occasionally have an accident.

Q.—What do they do with the skins? Do they give them to you? A.—No; I have not seen them given. On the contrary, in my own case, since I am working, I have only seen them charged.

Q.—It is expressly forbidden to speak, to smoke, to sing, to be absent from work without permission, under a penalty of 25 cents? Have you seen fines imposed? A.—Yes; I have seen them. Suppose one wishes to go to the closets; if permission is not asked from the foreman, if one is only absent five minutes, and, it is perceived, you have a fine of 25 cents to pay.

Q.—Have you seen this practiced? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do they charge anything for a glass of water? A.—I have not seen it done, because in the tanneries we take water from the hose, without moving from the place.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—"All men caught throwing cuttings and grease, or hustling, will be dismissed, and will lose back wages?" Have you seen that rule carried out? A.—Yes, I have; and it has happened to me. I wished to have, from the store, mittens to work in. The foreman told me that I could get them upstairs. I went upstairs and got the

mittens; but, returning, I met another man on the stairs who said to me: "You have got mittens?" I said "Yes." He said: "Show them to me then." And at this moment the foreman saw us talking. He paid me off and censured me, and I remained the whole winter without anything to do. He sent me off without any notice, whilst we are obliged to give notice to the shop.

Q.—Have you seen, in the factories where you have worked, men who were discharged and whose wages were kept over? Is it within your knowledge that men have lost any of their salary? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Have you anything else to state to the Commission? A.—Yes. The work in the tanneries is very painful. One must work in the water from morning till night, and in summer the smell is very strong. In winter, when it is very hot for those working in the shop, and when one is all over sweat, I have myself seen men sent out to shovel snow or wash the hides in the river.

Q.—Where do you wash the hides in the river? A.—In winter the water rises above the wharves, a hole is sunk in the ice, and there the hides are washed. To avoid using too much water, for which taxes are paid, the men in the shops are sent to wash the hides in the river.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Is that in the shop where you work to-day? A.—No; I no longer work in that shop. It was in the shop which I left.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—At what particular spot did you go to do this piece of work? A.—Almost in front of the jail.

Q.—At times, while washing these hides, have you seen policemen passing along? A.—They are seen very seldom along the river.

Q.—Did you go far out on the ice? A.—No. The water rises on the quays, and a hole was made in the quay. I myself once fell into the water, and then went to change my clothes, and they docked me of an hour for the time that I had gone to change after falling into the water.

Q.—No policeman ever told you that it was forbidden to wash the hides in the river? A.—I never saw any.

Q.—Do you judge that the tanning trade is a wholesome trade? A.—I notice that all the men, so to speak, when they reach their fortieth year, are almost always full of rheumatism, and many of them are obliged to give up.

Translation.

EDMOND CHANDIER, Cooper, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—How long have you been at the cooper trade? A.—Twenty-six years.

Q.—In Montreal? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long has machinery been brought into your trade? A.—So far as I can remember, in one factory, it was about fifteen or eighteen years ago, and in the other about ten or eleven years ago.

Q.—Are there only two cooperage factories in Montreal? A.—No, sir, but there are only two refineries. What I speak of has reference to the refineries.

Q.—This machinery turns out barrels that serve to hold only solid material, and not liquid? A.—Yes; it serves also for liquid.

Q.—You know all about this machinery, and how to work it? A.—To perfection.

Q.—Can you give us the price of barrels such as you turn out by machinery?
A.—For sugar barrels they cost about four cents apiece.

Q.—Do you mean, in saying four cents apiece, to speak of the manufacture without the cost of the wood? A.—The price of the manufacture without the wood, because the barrels ought to be worth, at least, twenty-five cents apiece.

Q.—How much do hand-made barrels or kegs cost? A.—As a general rule they cost about six cents apiece, but there are very few hand-made at present.

Q.—That means they cost two cents more than by machinery? A.—Yes.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Can you say anything as to the cost of the material? A.—That is difficult, inasmuch as puncheons are made privately.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is there no means, by dividing the work otherwise, to produce barrels by hand as well as by machine? A.—Something better.

Q.—If I understand you, it would be impossible to make barrels at less than four cents. A.—At six cents it could be better done by hand, than at four cents by machine.

Q.—Explain that to us? A.—I am the only cooper in Montreal who has this information. For this reason, I beg of you not to ask me for details. It is at the Refinery, and to one or two persons only that I can supply this information.

Q.—Your experience enables you to say that it is possible to make barrels more advantageously by hand than by machine? A.—Yes; the barrels for sugar and those for syrup.

Q.—Do the large companies pay as large salaries as the other shops? A.—No, sir.

Q.—What is the difference between the salaries? A.—The difference is that at Montreal for outsiders they pay \$2 per day and the large companies—that is to say the Refineries—only pay eight shillings per day.

Q.—But the work in the Refineries is it not more regular than that in the town shop? A.—Generally.

Q.—A man who earns \$2 in a town shop, is he not better off than he who only earns \$1.60 in the large refineries? A.—No, sir,

Q.—And that is on account of the strike? A.—Yes. In the shop, where five or six men are employed, they spend the summer at \$2 a day; that is to say 30 cents an hour; and in the Refineries they scarcely do less for at least seven or eight months, and the rest of the time if the weather is not too bad they still make from \$10 to \$12 a week.

Q.—Do the companies, or refineries, employ labourers to do coopers' work? A.—Yes, sir; they do.

Q.—I thought that coopering was a hard trade? A.—It is very hard to be a good cooper. The number of coopers is great; but the number of good coopers is very small.

Q.—These labourers scarcely do more than make ready the barrels put together for the machine instead of making the barrels themselves? A.—They prepare the barrels, setting them up ready to put the hoops on, and then those that put the hoops on are again labourers, so that it is the labourers that make the sugar barrels. It is also labourers who prepare the syrup casks for hooping.

Q.—How much are these people paid a day? A.—When they work by the day at \$1.10 and up to \$1.20. Those who hoop make \$10 to \$12 a week in sugar barrels.

EDWARD POLE, of the City and District of Montreal, sworn:—
I am manager of the Montreal Cash Bakery.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

- Q.—In what does this Montreal Cash Bakery differ from ordinary bakeries?
A.—By being formed under the “ Limited Liability Companies’ Act.”
- Q.—Is it composed of capitalists? A.—Yes.
- Q.—Are there any journeymen bakers in the company? A.—No. No journeymen bakers whatever. There is not a journeyman baker in the business. No journeyman baker has a share in the business.
- Q.—In what respect does it differ from other bakeries, whether private or individual bakeries? A.—It is composed of people who reap an advantage from profits derived from the baking of the bread, and so forth.
- Q.—Do you sell wholly for cash? A.—Not wholly for cash. We do not. We have some customers, such as charitable institutions. They send down to us sometimes and state that it would be more convenient for them to pay monthly accounts, and we give it to them.
- Q.—Do you employ a large number of hands? A.—Eight at present. We are establishing a large bakery which will begin in a month or so, and we hope to employ one hundred hands.
- Q.—What wages are you paying the bakers in Montreal? A.—The lowest we pay is eight dollars per week.
- Q.—Are they skilled bakers? A.—It is what we call third class hands. The best hands command twelve dollars a week. I wish to explain why we pay less than these master bakers in Montreal who know nothing about the business. They know nothing about the business, and consequently have to pay extra to their foremen. They always have to pay extra, because they do not know the business themselves. I know the business thoroughly, and get men for three or four dollars less than these so-called master-bakers, because I know how to show them what to do.
- Q.—What hours do the men work? A.—Our men seldom work more than nine hours—or ten hours at the most.
- Q.—To work ten hours, must they work all night? A.—Yes; all night. They will not work so long for me when I get my new place started. They begin at six o’clock at night and leave at four the next morning. In the baking business, as a rule, the men come on at six o’clock at night and leave at half-past four the next morning.
- Q.—What pay do you give to your day hands? A.—Eight dollars a week, sometimes less. We do not employ apprentices, or any but those thoroughly able to do their work at the board.
- Q.—You have no apprentices? A.—None at all.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

- Q.—You say you do not employ any boys? A.—No. No boys of any kind or description.
- Q.—How many hands do you pay more than eight dollars a week to? A.—We pay eight dollars a week to four. The others we pay \$10, \$11 and \$12 a week.
- Q.—Do you carry on any other business but baking? A.—No; we bake bread, biscuits and cakes.
- Q.—Can anybody become a shareholder in this bakery? A.—If there were any to sell, but there are none to sell. We have increased our capital from five thousand dollars to twenty thousand dollars, and we have plans now out for a new bakery. In fact, we have some of the leading men in Montreal interesting themselves in the matter. We are erecting a fine building of which this picture is a photograph. It is on the corner of Mountain Street, below the Methodist Church, near the St. Antoine market. Our object is to introduce a new system of baking. I believe

female labor may be used very judiciously. I believe women will prove to be cleaner bakers, and it will make them better wives and housekeepers.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—How many women do you employ in the bake-house now? A.—None. They will begin at the new building at day work.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do the customers share in the profits? A.—They do. They buy their bread cheaper.

Q.—Do you divide a dividend among the customers? A.—No. The advantage to the customers is that they get their bread four cents per loaf less than from the bakers.

Q.—Yours is not then a co-operative bakery? A.—Ours is a Limited Liability Company.

Q.—Then, it is not co-operative? A.—No; because the parties buying know nothing about it, outside the shareholders.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do you know of a Municipal regulation with regard to the use of flour, compelling bakers to use good flour in the making of bread? A.—No; only that we adhere to such a rule. I do not know of any bakery being inspected.

Q.—Do you know that using bad flour is contrary to the by-law? A.—It would be contrary to my principles. It might be bad, but I suppose some would not refuse to use it.

Q.—Have you seen the bread inspector? A.—Yes.

Q.—Does he go around visiting the bakeries? A.—Yes.

Q.—And he has not told you that you are following the law, or are not following the law? A.—No.

Q.—You know the distinction, I presume? I am speaking of the inspector, not of the policeman who weighs the bread to see that it is of just weight. A.—I have not seen him.

Q.—Do you know of any other inspector besides the one who ascertains that the bread is of correct weight? A.—I have not seen one yet besides the police who try the weight of the bread.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you know of any biscuit factories where women are employed? A.—Oh yes; I do in the old country.

Q.—Do you know of any here? A.—I know of biscuit factories—very few.

Q.—Do you know of any, where women are employed? A.—I do not.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—Would it be possible for bakers to alter the hours of working, so that people need not work at night? A.—I tried it, but people would not have the bread. They will have it new in the morning. We started—we commenced on Monday morning at four o'clock, and had to deliver the bread from one end of the city to the other, and the people said it was too stale.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Would you object to a law being made by which bakers should be prevented from working on Sunday night? A.—Yes; I would.

Q.—Would it not be better for the employees if the bread was baked in the day-time all through the week. A.—I believe it would be better for all parties if the night

work was entirely done away with, not only for the health of the bakers, but for the people. New bread just baked is not the best for the health.

Q.—Do you know of any other cities where night work is done away with?
A.—I have not been in any other city outside Montreal, in this country.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Is there a law for Sabbath observance in Montreal? A.—I cannot say anything about that; I do not know.

Q.—What do you charge for a four pound loaf? A.—A four pound brown loaf, fourteen cents. The bakers charge four cents more than we do for a four pound loaf; but I must explain how that is: I say they do not retail it as we do. They have to deliver the bread, and that is worth two cents a loaf more. I say that in justice to them. And then they do business on the credit system. We sell only for cash, with an exception in favor of charitable institutions.

Q.—And do they all go to your shop to buy the bread? A.—Oh, no; we deliver it at the same price to shareholders; but we charge one cent per loaf more than our retail prices when we sell it to other people.

Q.—Do you deliver it? A.—I have just said we do; and we charge one cent per loaf for so doing.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—If you deliver it for one cent per loaf more than you charge across the counter, why cannot other people deliver it at one cent more? A.—Well, they can if they like; but I may say that I suppose the reason they cannot do it is because they give such extended credit: and the reason that I started this bakery in this city was in the interests of the working classes of Montreal. They are being charged so much for other men's accounts—for the accounts of persons who never paid their bills—that I thought it would be a good idea to start a bakery in the interests of the working classes, and to sell only for cash, and let them receive the benefit of cash payment.

Q.—And you have made a saving in every way by dealing for cash? A.—Yes; we have lost nothing at all.

Q.—How long have you been in the business? A.—We have been in the business two years; and we have not lost a dollar.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—When you go into this new building, you intend to employ females? A.—Yes; and I believe they will be more cleanly, and that they will appreciate it. It will make them understand the business; and when they become wives and mothers they will not only know how to appreciate good bread, but how to make it. I intend also to teach them cooking. It is my intention that they should begin at seven o'clock in the morning. At twelve o'clock in the day they will be allowed an hour for dinner. Their dinner will be provided in the establishment, for which they will be charged the small sum of fifty cents per week; and each girl in the establishment will take her turn in assisting to cook the dinner. They will thus learn how to cook. And in order to still further interest them in their work, I intend to give prizes—some small inducement—to those who cook the best dinners during the week. The Montreal Cash Bakery has been so far a decided success, and I believe it will continue to be so; such at least is our intention.

(Translation.)

LOUIS WILFRID SICOTTE, Clerk of the Peace, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You have been considering the question of savings in schools and work-shops? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you give us your opinion and the statistics that you have obtained? A.—I have been considering the question of School Savings Banks for several years, as well as the working of Savings Banks in France. In eighteen hundred and eighty-six I obtained a charter establishing a School Savings Bank. The object of the charter which I obtained was the establishment of a Savings Bank in all the public schools, colleges, and convents in the Dominion, and, in addition, by the charter, it was allowed to establish Savings Banks in all concerns where there are workmen, clerks, servants, or any kind of employee whatever, (copies of the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 67, as well as of the Bank Prospectus, were here distributed among the Commission). The object that I had, as you will have already observed, by the observations that I have made, was that I desired that there should be commenced the teaching of economy in all the primary, as well as superior schools, and that this teaching should be extended among the working people, clerks and other employees, on their leaving school. I think it would be much more easy to establish economies among working people, particularly those who are generally very improvident, if their employers collected from them their savings at the end of the week, and then placed them in the banks. This kind of Savings Bank has been working in France since eighteen hundred and seventy-seven, in schools alone, and the results up to the present have been marvellous. I notice, by an article in *Le Petit Journal*, of Paris, that at the end of 1886, there were fifteen millions of francs of savings in the School Savings Banks, and that it was known the children in France have much less pocket money than the children here in this country. I, therefore, am of opinion, that it would be possible to effect considerable savings among children in this manner. A child who would commence at the age of seven years two sous per week, would find himself at twenty-one, with a capital of 100 francs, or \$20.

Q.—In France, are Savings Banks under the control of the Government, or are they private Companies? A.—I understand that, in France, savings are made in schools by means of the teachers, and are then deposited in the general Savings Bank.

Q.—The Savings Banks in France correspond to the Post Office Savings Banks here? A.—Yes; but in France Savings Banks can be established much more easily than here. In France it is sufficient to arrange with the Mayor, the Deputy and some others and start a bank working, while here it must have a capital. A Savings Bank cannot be established here without a capital of two millions of dollars, according to the Savings Bank Act. According to the charter which I secured, however, a capital of only two hundred thousand dollars was necessary.

Q.—What guarantee have these young depositors for their money? A.—The Act of Incorporation provides that the money which shall be deposited in these Savings Banks can only be employed upon debentures of the Provincial and Federal Governments as well as upon municipal debentures, as the directors may choose. The money cannot be otherwise employed. This is the reason why the Government agreed that the capital need be no more than \$200,000. They considered that, with guarantees offered by the charter to depositors, that their money should only be employed in a perfectly safe manner; that it was not necessary to have a very considerable amount of capital.

Q.—What I wish to know from you is this: what guarantee has the depositor that the money which he entrusts to his employer or teacher will be at once deposited in the bank? A.—As soon as the child or apprentice makes his deposit an entry ought to be made in his book. This book ought to be at once placed in the

Bank—at the principal offices of the Bank—where the entry is controlled, and the next day, or the day after, the book is returned to the depositor or the relatives of the depositor, in order that they may themselves see that the money has been placed in the Bank. Now, as a matter of course, as concerns the guarantees to be given by those who will act in the interests of the institution, as teacher or employer, they will be governed by the rules which the directors may adopt. It will be a question of making them give guarantees of good administration as well as to other employees.

Q.—The child is not empowered to withdraw his money himself? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is the Bank responsible to the child for the money which he has given to his master or which the workman gives to his employer? A.—The Bank ought, in my opinion, to be made responsible; that would be subject of by-law.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Besides, can the parent or teacher withdraw the money without the consent of the child? A.—No.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are the teachers or the masters, in whose hands the money has been deposited, responsible to the Bank? A.—Unquestionably, they are responsible to the Bank.

Q.—Have you studied the question of Freedmen's Savings Banks in the United States? A.—I have obtained different reports as to Savings Banks, Dime Savings Banks, etc.

Q.—Were not the Freedmen's Savings Banks established at the end of the war, to receive the savings of the enfranchised slaves? A.—No; I have not understood that. I concerned myself only with understanding how Dime Savings Banks worked in the United States, and how the Penny Savings Banks worked in England. All these Banks very much resemble each other.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you understood anything about these things in Montreal? A.—I understood that only one teacher, at Point St. Charles, had established a Penny Bank.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is there not a Penny Bank in the Boys' Home? A.—I have no knowledge of it.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do not the Savings Banks connected with the Post Office offer all the guarantees provided by your charter? A.—No; Post Office Banks are like other Banks. Depositors are obliged to go there to make their deposits; whereas, with the system of Savings Banks established under the charter, everything is done either at the school or at the factory, and it is by the care of the Bank afterwards that all the savings are collected and reported to the Bank, while the depositors have nothing to concern themselves about.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—The object which you seek is to impress economy upon the child or the workman at the time he receives his money? A.—The object which I propose, is to teach order and economy in the schools, and afterwards the workman, by the impulse which has thus been given, will continue to be economical and cultivate order. In this he will be aided by his employers, by those who ought, naturally, to be interested in him—his employers.

(Translation.)

ROCH DESJARDINS, Bailiff, of Montreal, sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—It was you who attended to the execution in the affair of Brunet against Greatorex? A.—Yes.

Q.—Were the costs ordinary costs? A.—They were the ordinary costs which I am always in the habit of claiming. I was taxed by Mr. Cherrier. There was also in this affair a guardian, which caused an increase of costs. This guardian was also taxed by Mr. Cherrier. I do not well remember if it was \$4 or \$6. It was in the record, and that disappeared. When there is a voluntary guardian, nothing extra is charged.

Q.—What was the amount of the sale? A.—\$29.20.

Q.—Do you swear that the effects sold, were sold at a reasonable price, and that they were worth no more than what they fetched? A.—They were worth no more. A child's perambulator sold for \$5, and I would not have given \$3 for it. The man had also some pictures, but these pictures were of no value to sell among Catholics, for he dwelt among a Catholic population. This depreciated them a little. The pictures were sold very cheap, and that was the only article, to my knowledge, which was sold cheap.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—Was there any furniture in the drawing-room? A.—No. There was a sofa, which went for \$7, and that is the price. I regret very much that my catalogue was lost, as I had set down therein, besides the effects sold, the prices for which these effects were sold. I remember only the prices of sale of the objects which I have mentioned above.

Q.—In what condition was the best sofa that was sold? A.—It was passable. It was sold for \$7, and that was the price.

Q.—Do you consider that \$7 is a good price for a sofa? A.—The sofa was sold for what it was worth. It was an old-fashioned sofa.

(Translation.)

LÉON DUGAS, employed in the office of the Circuit Court, Montreal, called to give explanation *in re* Brunet vs. Greatorex sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Mr. Greatorex was sued for five months' rent? A.—Yes. Judgment was obtained in this case on the 25th April, 1879. Judgment was rendered for \$37.50 for five months' rent. The costs in this case amounted to \$10.40. I should say the costs in the original action—the costs of the *saisie gagerie*. There had been a *saisie gagerie* to protect the rights of the proprietor. On the 12th May, 1879, an execution seizure—a writ of execution was taken to sell the property seized by virtue of this *saisie gagerie*, and the costs of the bailiff of the sale amounted, according to the report of the bailiff, to the sum of \$12.45.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Does that cover the costs of seizure? A.—No; the costs of the bailiff only were \$12.45. On the 23th December, an alias execution was taken; no costs were entailed except the Court stamp of 30 cents, and on the 18th January, 1886, a *saisie arrêt en mains tierce* was taken in the hands of the Canadian Rubber Company to seize

the salary of Mr. Grestorex, and the costs of this *saisie arrêt* were \$3.45. The *saisie arrêt* was for \$32.85. I ought to remark that the costs only amounted to this sum, because the action was settled before return was made. I have understood that the Canadian Rubber Company had undertaken to pay the plaintiff so much per week, and, upon this arrangement, they agreed to pay the costs which had already accrued.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How much did the sale of effects realize? A.—The sale of effects produced \$29.2 I omitted to state previously that there were sixty (60) cents to pay upon the execution.

Q.—How was information of this sale conveyed to the public? A.—In the ordinary manner. It was published by “La Compagnie d’Imprimerie Canadienne,” on the 14th May. It was published in the “Star,” and “Le Nouveau-Monde,” (Compagnie d’Imprimerie Canadienne). This was done at a cost of \$2 for the advertisements. That is covered by the \$12 and some cents of costs given previously.

Q.—How many days before the sale? A.—Eight days.

(Confidential.)

—, of the city and district of Montreal, journalist, sworn.
I am a member of the staff of *The Montreal Daily Witness*.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—We understand that you desire to make a statement before the Commission, with regard to certain business carried on in this city? A.—Yes. It is with regard to the Sewing Machine, Organ and Piano trade. The Sewing Machine, Organ and Piano trade in Montreal as operated upon the instalment plan is a big fraud upon the public. A Canadian Sewing Machine costs, to produce, from \$8 to \$10, \$12 and \$15. That machine is sold from \$50 to \$60, from that to \$30, and even \$85 on the instalment plan. The instalments range from \$3 to \$5 a month. A set of canvassers are first sent out in order to induce working men’s wives to buy a machine. In reality, they do not buy the machine, but are induced to sign a form of lease by the terms of which, without the intervention of a lawyer, this machine can be taken back again within any period of time, if the entire amount cannot be paid. If therefore by sickness, or death in the family, a poor woman is unable to pay the instalment when due, she loses all that she has paid upon the machine.

Q.—Can you supply us through the secretary of the Commission, with a copy of one of these leases. A.—I have not got one with me, but I will do so before the Commission leaves town. That is how the Sewing Machine trade on the instalment plan, is operated in this city. The same extortion is practised in the Piano and Organ trade. Canvassers are sent out to obtain the names of parties likely to take a machine. Competent men, responsible in connection with the firm, follow the canvasser and endeavour to get the machine, piano or organ placed. Very large profits, if I may use the term, are made. A machine that costs \$8 to manufacture is sold all the way up to \$70 or \$85 and an organ sells from \$50 to \$200, according to the name. They give them fancy names in order to deceive the public. A piano or organ manufactured by an ordinary maker, can, by placing a popular name on the instrument, obtain from \$300 to \$325 for what a dealer would only ask \$125 otherwise. As I said before, the party so purchasing these machines, organs, or pianos, are induced to sign a lease by which they surrender all their previous payments, and also the machine, organ, or piano if they fail to pay out each and all of these weekly or monthly instalments. It is useless for the young seamstress, wife or mother, to plead

sickness or death in the family. The agent will tell her that unless all the payments are made, the machine is forfeited. No matter how much has been paid, if she fails to pay the balance, the article is seized and taken back to the store, to have the same process repeated on somebody else, so that you see while it is very "profitable" to one party to the transaction, it is ruinous to the other. One of the fraudulent features of this business is this: about perhaps 70 or 80 employees are engaged by various firms in this city in furtherance of this trade, if I may call it. They are attracted by an alluring advertisement promising them \$40 a week. They are sent out to canvass illegible names. They are promised a very large commission upon procuring a list of favorable names. The list is brought in in the evening; and the manager or proprietor, or some other discreet member of the firm follows next day with this list on the footsteps of the canvasser, and urges a sale to these parties; makes a sale, and enters it as a sale by the firm, who refuses to allow any commission to the employee or canvasser. Thus, these poor employees are defrauded of their commission or salary, and the utmost they can get, if anything at all, (should they choose to stay) is an average of \$6 a week. Another feature of the piano trade is this one: a piano costs \$125, and is marked, say for the sake of illustration, "The Lansdowne." One of the tricks of the trade is to give an ordinary piano a fancy registered name. An ignorant person coming in to buy a piano is quoted \$300 for a particular grade. He wishes to have a better one, and ask if there are any better ones in the house. "Yes", says the manager, "here is one for \$400", pointing to one with a fancy registered name—whereas it is the same class of piano, the same in mechanism and every other particular, but the name. The name only has been changed, and the price.

By Mr. WALSH:—

Q.—In speaking of these weekly or monthly payments, you are speaking entirely of the instalment plan? A.—Yes.

Q.—I suppose that those engaged in those businesses are not all dishonest? A.—No; I am not referring to those who do a legitimate business. I am referring to those who do business on the "instalment plan" which some largely devote themselves to. I have known some cases of very great hardship, where women had purchased sewing machines on the instalment plan where they had become greatly necessitated by sickness or death in the family, and had the machine taken away from them when \$10 only was left unpaid. Latterly, I believe, the proprietors of these firms are inducing the husbands to sign the lease as well as the wife, or they ascertain that the wife is separated from the husband as to property, in order to give them greater strength in regaining possession of the article if the payments could not be made. Until a very recent period the practice was to induce the wife to sign this lease by which she agreed without reading it to the absolute forfeiture of this machine if she did not make all the regular payments. I think I have covered the ground I intended to cover.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—These statements that you have just made, are based on your own actual personal knowledge? A.—Yes.

Q.—Both as to sales and forfeitures? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How do you know the cost price of sewing machines, pianos and organs? A.—By having seen the invoices.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that any actions have been taken in Court by persons who have bought some of these goods, against the firms reclaiming the goods, or having reclaimed them? A.—I knew of one case in which the husband, a working man, took action, contesting the legality of the forfeiture, but I am not prepared to say what the decision of the Court was.

Q.—You knew of a case? A.—Yes; but I cannot say what the decision was, although I was connected with the business at the time.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that those firms in attempting to reclaim or in reclaiming possession of such goods entered houses without being assisted by the Courts of law? A.—Certainly.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What is the difference in the cost of a machine sold for cash and a machine sold for credit? A.—A sewing machine?

Q.—Yes. A.—A sewing machine would cost \$8 to produce and would sell for \$20 cash, A machine costing \$8, \$12 or \$15 to produce, sells for \$20, \$25 or \$28 cash.

Q.—And the credit prices of these machines? A.—Of the \$8 machine?

Q.—Yes. A.—\$50, \$60, \$75 and \$80, payable in instalments of \$3, \$4 and \$5 a month.

Q.—Do the manufacturers ever lose any machines sold on the instalment plan? A.—I presume they do sometimes. I could not make a positive statement.

Q.—So that they make up the losses out of the profits of these other sales? A.—Yes; and a very large profit too. Of course, the desire of the agent is to sell to a responsible person, and a severe check is kept on him to ascertain the substantiability of the person. The agent is paid a small commission, and it is a matter of importance to him that the machine is properly placed.

Q.—Is it the practice to leave machines at people's houses for a month on trial? A.—Yes.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that sewing machines, or pianos have been left at responsible person's houses, left there for some time, and after a certain time had passed, to claim payment for the machine, or piano? A.—I have repeatedly heard of this.

Q.—Have you a personal knowledge of it? A.—No; no personal knowledge. I have heard that is a feature of the trade.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Are you aware that pianos—I am speaking of the piano trade exclusively—have been sometimes leased, and afterwards seized by the creditors of the party purchasing, by persons other than the owner and the seller, and that the rights of the seller have been lost altogether? A.—Not under the lease that I have reference to. Besides, a piano must be insured by the party purchasing—insured from fire, and it is secured from seizure on the part of the landlord for rent—or other extraneous creditors, before the piano is placed in the house. On the instalment plan, the landlord signs an agreement by which he exempts that particular property from seizure.

Q.—But then, it is not exempt from the general creditors? A.—No; I do not think it can be seized by the general creditors of the town.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Have you ever known the name of a high priced piano to be placed on an inferior article for the purpose of selling it? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Then, you think we require the necessary machinery here to prevent fraudulent imitation? A.—Yes; the way that cheap pianos come here is this: a large manufacturer gives a man an agency, but does not put his name on the goods. He leaves that to the agent, who puts on any name he pleases, so that it will sell. A

fancy name piano sells all the way from \$300 to \$400, and \$500. It is well finished outwardly, but in its construction, it is not different to the cheap piano.

Q.—I suppose pianos of certain names have such a reputation that people would not think of them being counterfeited? A.—No.

DOUGLESS MCGREGOR DECROW, of the City and District of Montreal, Doctor of Medicine, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have made some examination into the sanitary condition of working men's houses? A.—Yes, in my work as a physician in the treatment of infectious and contagious diseases.

Q.—Are you officially employed by the city? A.—No.

Q.—You just get your information and experience in your rounds as a physician? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many rooms are there in the average house of a mechanic, as distinguished from a day laborer, in Montreal? A.—There are about usually from two to four, sometimes as high as five, and in houses exceeding that number of rooms we usually find them renting rooms, or else the families club together, using one stove.

Q.—What would the average size of these rooms be? A.—I should think about seven by ten, or eight by twelve feet, perhaps six by eight to ten by twelve—various sizes.

Q.—How many rooms would there be in the average tenement of a laborer? A.—About three to four, with sometimes conveniences added. I do not refer to water closets.

Q.—As a rule, are the water closets in these tenements? A.—No, only in the better class, the modern ones.

Q.—How many families would, as a rule, occupy one house? A.—Well, as a rule, about two.

Q.—That is one house, one tenement, you refer to? A.—Well, two to three families, or sometimes two families using one stove between them, and if there are several families, each family will have one room for a sleeping room, and use the kitchen for a dining room—the kitchen and stove in common with others. There is sometimes another room that they would have as a dining room in common, but it is rare.

Q.—Are there houses or tenements of only one room where several families occupy that one room? A.—That would be rare.

Q.—That would be exceptional? A.—That is just what I was going to say. I have known a great number of families using the same water closet or privy outside.

Q.—Would there be more than one water closet or privy for one house? A.—There would not be more than one.

Q.—Are there many cases in which the people of more than one house are compelled to use the same closet? A.—A great number. I know one case where fifteen people are daily using one closet. It is an outside closet.

Q.—How many families would that be? A.—I should think, four or five families.

Q.—How many water services would there be in one house? A.—Usually one.

Q.—Are there houses in which there are separate kitchens in which there is only one water service? A.—Each family has usually its own water service when they have their own kitchen.

Q.—Where water is brought into the house, are the waste pipes sufficiently trapped, so that the sewer gas cannot be forced back into the house? Is it

trapped and ventilated? A.—As a rule, no. They are not, except in the more modern houses.

Q.—Is it your opinion, as a physician, that sewer gas forced back into the house, through improper plumbing, is a cause of disease? A.—Yes; I would not go any farther to look for the cause, if I should find that to be the case.

Q.—Are you able to tell us anything about the different waste pipes and other drains between the house service and the sewers? A.—Of the waste pipes and the drains—do you refer to the trapping?

Q.—Well, the whole conducting of the waste pipes from the house to the sewer, between the sewer and the house? A.—There is usually a trap—a syphon extending from the bottom of the sink—and then, that is connected with the drain pipe. In the older houses the drain is of wood, often times uncovered; a mere open drain, extending either from the house to the drain, or it is allowed to percolate into the backyard. If there is an uncovered drain, of course, it is highly injurious to the health of the tenants. I have one in my mind at the present time.

Q.—In this drain, does the sewage escape into the ground? A.—It is often times allowed to escape through a hole. Oftentimes my attention has been called to that this winter.

Q.—Can that exist without being dangerous to the life of the people in the immediate neighborhood? A.—I should think it would be a great danger to the people.

Q.—Is mortality greater among the people who are compelled to live in these houses than among people who can afford to live in a better class of houses? A.—Yes.

Q.—That is within your knowledge, as a physician? A.—Yes; I can give you the reason, if you wish. These houses are of small size, and, without going to prohibitory measures, without going to much expense, could be made reasonably healthy for the poorer classes of people. I think that, with thorough sanitary laws, they might be. Of course, rent has a great deal to do with it.

Q.—If sanitation were rigidly enforced, so as to correct the evils of which you have spoken, would the money lost, or spent, in complying with the law, be a gain to health and the saving of life? A.—I honestly believe it would. That is to say, I believe the money would be well spent. It would be a saving in health and expense to the tenant and to the proprietor. The workingmen would be oftener at work, and would be able to prosecute his work better with healthful surroundings at his home. The outlay would prove a profitable one, to put it in a sanitary condition.

Q.—Are the working people of Montreal, as a rule, excepting those who are unfortunate through illness or accident, able to keep their houses comfortably warm in winter? A.—They do keep them warm, as a rule. I have known houses where it was through the man's own negligence and folly, through the use of alcohol, that they did not keep their houses warm or weather proof, and were forced to live in places unfit for habitation; sometimes in places with doors and windows not properly closed in. Of course, houses require good ventilation.

Q.—I suppose there are no houses where the inmates are unable to gain access to the water closets? A.—Not under ordinary circumstances. It is usual to allow them a water closet or privy. I have known cases, but they were extreme cases, where the drains were all frozen up, and where the water closet inside was frozen and full, so that the tenants had to use barrels outside to hold the refuse and excreta. But as a rule, water closets, such as they are, are provided of sufficient capacity.

Q.—Where cesspools remain, how often are they cleaned out? A.—It would be pretty hard for me to answer. The law, in that regard, as in many others, is such that a coach and four horses could be driven through it. There does not seem to be a law compelling the landlord to clear it until it reaches a certain height—I believe it is six inches from the level of the floor or ground. I know one property so situated that I own myself, and there is no law to compel me to do it.

By Mr. CLARKE:—

Q.—Were proprietors, during the small-pox epidemic, not compelled to empty these water closets or privies? A.—Well, I believe that a good deal of law was made then, with a view to ensure the health of the city. It was absolutely demanded by the United States and Ontario. For instance: that all persons going West and South from Canada, should be vaccinated, otherwise compulsory vaccination would never have been carried out.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—I am informed that you have laws, if they could only be carried out? A.—We have sanitary laws now which, if carried out, are quite sufficient to enable the authorities to look after the health of the city efficiently, and to ensure good drainage.

Q.—Have you visited houses, as a physician, into which the stench from cess-pools reach in the summer time? A.—Yes; I have. I have visited houses the tenants of which would suffer from that cause, from the way in which the houses were built and the surroundings were arranged, where another man, with premises adjoining, kept horses or cows. If you lifted the trap door of this house to go into the cellar, you would obtain indications that there was sufficient matter there to produce any contagious disease. The stench was something terrible.

Q.—Does it not often happen that stables and, of course, manure heaps, are too near the houses? A.—Yes; I know of one at the present time, the one which I reported to the Sanitary Board, in which stable manure was piled right near another man's tenement, and if you only lifted the trap to the cellar, the stench was, to use my expression of a moment ago, terrible. These instances came under my notice this winter.

Q.—Are there any means of rapid transit by which workmen can get into the suburbs to reside? A.—Not except by the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Grand Trunk Railway. They can go out west, but the means of transit here, are not sufficiently rapid.

Q.—Are there no cheap suburban trains? A.—There is train service to St. Henri, a five cents train service either way, but the train brings you no farther than the St. Bonaventure Station. There is none in my end of the city. I live in the east end of the town. The city is spreading out westward. A great many people now live at Lachine, and between the city and Lachine.

Q.—But it is not practical for a working man to live there? A.—I do not think it is.

Q.—Do you know of many living at Longueuil? A.—I do not know that many working people live there, except those who work there. It is not to my knowledge. Longueuil is used more as a summer resort. I might state for the benefit of the Commission—I was entirely ignorant when I was called here on what matters I was to be examined, other than a general supposition—with reference to getting houses repaired, the sanitary condition for instance, of the traps or drains. They are very often out of order, and it is the next thing to impossible to get that done, unless the landlord is anxious to do it himself. I have found that unless the landlord is anxious to improve his own property, it is almost impossible to get repairs done, as this class of tenant has no means of enforcing the landlord to make these improvements. The tenant oftentimes has to put up with the existing state of things or gets it done himself. I know of one case where I had a house fumigated. It was a case of diphtheria. I found the traps out of order, and that the water was falling, at the least, ten inches from the sink into an open mouth sewer. It was a V shape drain quite similar to the old country pig troughs. I reported the case to the Board of Health, but nothing could be done. Another physician was brought forward and certified that the condition of the premises could not be made better until these improvements were made. I never certified to it, but I reported it to the Board of Health.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you know of any cases where tenants have taken action at law against proprietors on account of insufficient sanitary arrangements? A.—I have heard of such, but suppose there is a leak in the sink about an inch from the trap, and every time water is let on it leaks through, and runs into the house? The landlord goes there and putties it up, and the landlord having done this himself, it is then considered quite sanitary, according to law.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—What is the greatest number of people you have known living under one roof? A.—I have known as high as seventeen or eighteen living in the one house.

Q.—How large would that house be? A.—I should think about—I have known as many as seventeen or eighteen souls residing in a house of six rooms. Five or six rooms.

Q.—Do you find many instances where there are a number of people living together in that way? A.—Yes; I have found a number of people living in that way. I find a tendency sometimes in some men to claim that wages have increased of late years. This may be the case; but it should be remembered that the expense of living is increasing in our city. Expenses have increased twenty per cent, and the poor man must, therefore, go into small houses and live as cheaply as possible.

Q.—Then, it is getting to be a rule with the poorer classes of people to “double up” as much as possible? A.—Yes. I have known instances myself, in which a family would occupy a portion of a large house for sanitary reasons, they well knowing at the time they took the house that they would have to relet the rest of it. This is actually caused by the poverty of the family; they were unable to incur the expense of a large house, and I believe they were right in doing what they did. I would do the same myself under similar circumstances.

Q.—Do you know if the actual cost or expense of living has increased in large cities? A.—I can only speak from my own knowledge. I have known instances where expenses have rapidly increased, and wages have not increased. Now, as to the cause of the large mortality among the poorer classes: The greater number of this class of people occupy small premises, that is, they have limited accommodation for their family. Supposing diphtheria breaks out in a large family occupying only two or three rooms, all on the same flat. At once, the afflicted one should be isolated, or the disease will spread rapidly. Now, supposing the family has all rooms upstairs, they could then put the afflicted one in a room upstairs by itself, and it would be far better for the others. Therefore, I believe, in cases of that kind, in cases of contagious diseases of that description, if the sick could be removed immediately from their homes to, say our civic hospital, the mortality would be brought down greatly.

Q.—Do you say that at the present time there is no place where you could send them to? A.—I have used the English Hospital for children sick of diphtheria; I have sent them there.

Q.—And they have not been sent back? A.—No; the hospital authorities have been considerate. I have taken a mother and her child, two years old, there; and others older than that were in the house when the youngest child was attacked. The hospital authorities very kindly allowed the mother to go with the child. I do not know that it is a general thing, but they do it.

Q.—Do you know, as a general rule, that the people were not afraid of any contagious disease up to about a year ago? A.—I do not know. The people may not have been afraid of contagious diseases up to a little over a year ago.

Q.—Now, small-pox—do you think they isolated those afflicted with that disease? A.—No. I think the great prevalence of small pox was due to people visiting each other. There did not seem to be that fear of the disease among the lower classes of people. Among the upper classes they seemed to take great precautions.

By Mr. WALSH :—

Q.—Is there any special hospital for contagious diseases? A.—There is the General Hospital, and there is the Small-pox Hospital. We have a new Small-pox Hospital shortly about to be opened. This Civic Small-pox Hospital is never opened, except for small-pox. Besides other contagious diseases, I may say I have seen one case of glanders in the English Hospital. This disease is caught by contact with horses, as a rule, but still, I would hate to conduct a post mortem examination upon the body of a man who died from glanders.

Q.—Do you think that a place like Montreal, or any large city, requires specially to have a hospital for contagious diseases? A.—I believe that in a city like Montreal or any city, there should be a hospital in which any person suffering from any contagious disease might be treated and cared for,—if he desired it, by his own physician, as well as by the hospital staff. I believe it would be a great benefit to a great city to have such a hospital in which contagious diseases such as small-pox, and scarlet fever could be treated.

Q.—And even typhoid fever? A.—Well, that is not actually contagious.

Q.—Some say it is? A.—It is not actually contagious. I can understand this, that typhoid fever can be propagated in this way. For instance, supposing, say a minute portion of the excreta of a person suffering from typhoid fever, became mixed in the dough during the process of bread making, and it was eaten over again by some person, that would be contagious.

Q.—Has the Hotel-Dieu a contagious ward? A.—I believe so. We have a ward specially set apart in the English Hospital for contagious diseases—diphtheris and scarlet fever.

JAMES A. MATHEWSON, of the City and District of Montreal, Merchant, sworn :—

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—You are a merchant, doing business in Montreal? A.—Yes. Since the year eighteen hundred and thirty-three I have been connected with business in Montreal.

Q.—Have the grocers of Montreal an Association? A.—There is an agency here, I understand, and the wholesale grocers are the persons who compose that association.

Q.—Is it an association for mutual protection against debtors, or for keeping up the prices of goods? A.—I am not exactly sure, but I can give the information direct from their own constitution which covers the whole case. They have had this association since eighteen hundred and eighty-four—January, eighteen hundred and eighty-four. Their constitution and by-laws were published in the *Montreal Daily Witness* of February the 11th instant. I will just briefly run over it :—

The preamble says: The necessity for co-operation, and the benefits to be derived from reciprocal interchange of opinions and uniformity in the customs and usages of merchants, have induced the subscribers to associate themselves together for the purpose of promoting, by all legitimate means, the advancement and prosperity of the grocery interests, and, further, to enforce the principles of justice and equity in all business transactions; to regulate, as far as practicable, the prices, terms of credit, and discounts of the trade; to facilitate the speedy adjustment of all commercial disputes; and, by concerted action, to protect the interests of the members of the association against the unfair discrimination in regard to foreign or local freight rates, adverse legislative enactments, or any other obstacles that may interfere with the success of the respective interests.

Having these objects in view we therefore agree to be governed by such rules and by-laws as may from time to time be adopted by the "Wholesale Grocers' Association of Montreal." The constitution and by-laws were adopted the seventh of

January, eighteen hundred and eighty-four. The "articles" are eighteen in number. Articles one to fifteen may be briefly stated to refer to balloting, receiving of members; the officers of the association consisting of president, vice-president, honorary secretary, treasurer, and three directors, who shall constitute the executive committee, which shall appoint a paid secretary, if necessary, and fix his salary, shall supervise the purchases, and audit and direct payment of bills; annual meetings, regular monthly meetings, voting, quorums, duties of officers, committee of arbitration, consisting of five members elected by ballot at the annual meeting. But the special points are contained in articles fifteen and sixteen in this printed constitution which are as follows:—

Article XV. There shall be a Committee of three elected by ballot at the Annual Meeting, to serve for one year, whose duty it shall be to revise and fix lowest selling prices on any article, or articles, that may be unanimously agreed upon by the Association; and, whenever a change takes place on the manufacturer's or producers' price list, it shall be their duty to notify every member of this Association of such price, in any manner they may think best.

Article XVI. Any firm or individual, belonging to this Association, who shall sell the Article stipulated, or allow them to be sold for less than the prices fixed by the Committee, shall be reported to the Committee of Arbitration, and upon conviction of that fact to the satisfaction of the Committee, said member shall be expelled from the Association by a majority of the votes at any regular meeting; a vote of censure shall be placed upon the records and reported to all the manufacturers of the article in question.

Now, the secrecy of this Association is duly exhibited in another Article known as Number "6" or, rather, Resolution Number "6," adopted 7th January, 1884. This Article or Resolution says:—

"Resolved.—That the members of this Association shall be in honor bound to keep strictly confidential all discussions and transactions of the Association, when in Executive session."

This is "The Wholesale Grocers' Association" that has an existence in the city to-day, and which claims the right of tribunal; almost claiming as much authority as the ancient heathen tribunals, or the tribunals of the Dark Ages.

Q.—Does this Association, then, fix the price of the principal goods dealt in by these members? A.—They take that responsibility upon themselves.

Q.—And refuse to deal with any but members? A.—They refuse recognition of outside parties.

Q.—Do they make special efforts to obtain dealers in groceries to join the Association? A.—They have made very special efforts, and have succeeded with the wholesale grocery trade, except another firm and ourselves in the city, in getting them to join them, and I may mention that they have also got certain retailers to join them in this organization, on the promise that they would get the privileges to which the others were entitled. Certain of these retailers and wholesalers combined—that is, grocers doing wholesale and retail business—have been cut off from this combine during the last few weeks, to their damage.

Q.—Have you known of any case or cases where, through the action of this Association, the price or prices of any commodity has gone up beyond the cost of manufacture, to the consumer? A.—I have not paid any special attention to it. The Association at first tried to cajole us; they then threatened, and we are the only two firms who are against it. We have no kind of sympathy or any kind of association with it, and do not intend to have. As to anything doing about prices, you may take hold of several articles, and you will find the combination are very rarely successful in maintaining their prices, and amongst those belonging to the Association, there have been instances of members breaking their own agreement. My experience in the city ought to convince me that this kind of thing is all wrong and a folly. In fact, it is impossible to carry it out, and it will never be carried out fully; besides, the private rights of individuals are trampled upon, and it cannot be permitted that

the prices and terms for goods shall be dictated to the commercial men of the city. These things should not be tolerated in any respectable community.

Q.—Can you tell us if it was through this association that the present sugar combine was brought about? A.—Oh, yes; they took hold of it, this Grocers' Association. And I may mention that one of the objects of the existence of this association was the formation of others in other cities and parts of the Province—in Toronto, and in Hamilton and London, and Brantford, in Ottawa, Kingston and Belleville. All these formed associations of the same character, and gave them there the name of guilds. The fact that they had caused or instigated the formation of many so-called guilds, none could object to, but to maintain the same inviolable secrecy, the same absolute authority, and to endeavour to compel others to join their association is, in my opinion, decidedly wrong. I will mention various articles: coal oil was one. This Coal Oil Combination has since been broken up; they could not maintain their prices. They got the coal oil refiners to agree to certain rates and conditions, and they would then send five, ten or twenty barrels to one individual, and scatter them around at the prices they wished to sell them at. Another combination brought about by this association, was that in sugar.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do I understand you to say that this Coal Oil Combination, as you term it, has since been broken up? A.—Yes. In fact they tried other lines of goods, including many articles which I do not sell, and one of the articles said to be the best, which I do not sell, I am informed is free to-day. Such agreements as this entered into between the members of this association, never have been, and never will be honestly and honorably carried out. Now, the Sugar Combination and Conspiracy, for I can give it no softer name than that. They waited upon me, and suggested an agreement in sugar. I said there could be no objection to an honorable agreement, such as an honorable man could agree to, with a view to a fair profit on granulated sugars. But parties who had no training in British law and dealings took upon themselves the liberty of initiating a system of trading never heard of in Canada since the time the one hundred associate merchants came from France.

The Sugar Agreement is published in the Montreal Star of the ninth of February instant.

I may mention, as stated in the agreement, that this organization in sugar is only for what is known as refined, such as ground, extra ground, Paris loaf, cut loaf, grocers' A, standard A, and granulated sugars (three boxes of Paris lump to count as one barrel.) It did not then touch yellow refined sugars.

Now, here are some of the prices arranged for in this matter: The scale of advance to be based upon refiners' prices in Montreal, for car load quantities, said prices to be arranged by the President and Vice-President of the Montreal guild, or such other person or persons as may hereafter be authorized for the purpose by the Dominion guild. Now, the association here denied that it was a guild; but here it is, you see, practically one and the same. The Dominion guild meets in Toronto, so that Montreal is ruled from Toronto. As a merchant of Montreal who has been doing business here for fifty years, I object to any such abasement of the trade of this city. That is one of the features of the case, "Said prices to be arranged by the President or Vice-President of the Montreal guild, or such other person or persons as may be authorized for the purpose by the Dominion guild, with the refiners' on Saturday morning of each week, and to be communicated by telegraph by them at the expense, to the secretaries of the different local guilds."

Then (9) sellers' are to be at liberty to prepay or allow buyers' cost of freight to competing points only.

10. Parties to this agreement to have the privilege of delivering sugars to all points where there are merchants who buy sugars from the manufacturers direct; but no place shall be considered a competing point until after notice from the Secretaries.

tary of the Dominion Wholesale Grocers' Guild to that effect has been mailed to the several signers of this agreement.

Two months' notice of intended withdrawal is required, addressed to the secretary of the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, who will be custodian of this agreement."

Such is the agreement which two of the grocers of this city at that time said they could not sign. For myself I consider it a dishonorable combination and I did not and do not belong to it. Such was my opinion then, and is my opinion to-day. It affects my civil rights and with another firm I refused to sign, and at first a quarter of a cent per pound was levied against us and paid on all the granulated sugar we bought from them until July, eighteen hundred and eighty-seven. Thus there are only two firms in the city of Montreal who held out against this Association; and who again declined to have anything to do with it. Then in July, eighteen hundred and eighty-seven, half a cent per pound on refined white sugars was placed against all those who refused to join in this scandalous combination. That is to say the refiners themselves consented to this sort of thing. The refiners in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick lent themselves to the scheme, and with the Montreal refiners in secret chamber in the month of December, met to see if something could not be done to effectually destroy those people who would not accede to their wishes altered to one-eighth cent the pound additional on all sugars, and also took away the cash discount of two and one-half per cent. fourteen days ($2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent 14 days) making it equal to eighty (80) cents a barrel for all sugars. The meaning of this was to the refiners the levying of *practical blackmail* on the independent outside wholesale grocers of about equal to eighty (80) cents the barrel on every barrel of refined sugar, no matter, white or yellow, bought from the refiners by such non-combination firms over and above what the other wholesale grocers would have to pay, that is eight hundred dollars (\$800.00)—eight hundred dollars per thousand barrels, or say on a business of ten to twenty thousand barrels a levy of eight thousand dollars (\$8,000.00) to sixteen thousand dollars (\$16,000.00) of blackmail. I look upon the action of this tribunal against me as one of malicious blackmail. Eighty cents per barrel is levied against those in the trade who will not submit to be dictated to by this Committee of three, and the Guilds and Refiners behind them.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Has this combination been a benefit to the consumer? A.—It has been most disastrous to the consumer—getting the refiners to consent to their purposes. The refiners are furnished by the Guild in Toronto with a list of the names of those to whom they are to sell, and from time to time with the names of those that have been added or taken off.

Q.—So that those whose names were not on the list were charged a-quarter or half a cent or eight cents per barrel as the case might be? A.—Yes; from that day until within a fortnight prices have been gradually rising, not slowly and not even largely from advances in foreign countries, but because these people in these Guilds have lent themselves to the refiners, and "one good turn deserves another," they say. Well, they only serve to certain persons, and the rest have to pay an extra percentage. This has had a very mischievous effect. Not only have prices been raised, but prices have been so the last year as we have never known before. As to inferiority, there is twenty (20) to twenty-five (25) per cent more moisture in the sugar than there used to be, and you have to take it or leave it. Never before has there been so many and such general complaints as to the inferiority of the yellow sugars. The sugar monopoly is one of the great monopolies here.

Q.—You say it is greatly inferior to what it used to be before this combination was formed? A.—Yes; grossly inferior.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Between the month of June last and the present time, what is the difference

in price in raw sugar? A.—The prices of the raw sugars and the refined, do not correspond.

Q.—Do you know what the difference is? A.—The difference may be from two to three shillings sterling the hundred weight, but they give an inferior sugar today to what was offered us at any time since the refinery was started in eighteen hundred and fifty-four. We did what we could to encourage sugar refining here, but we never got so low a grade of sugar as this year. A barrel of refined sugar should not be over three hundred pounds gross; every barrel that is four hundred pounds gross is seventy-five pounds at least more than it should be, and in the case of yellow refined sugars especially, there can be no satisfactory importation of such sugars, because the tariff is so onerous as to make the importation of yellow sugars practically impossible.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you know if the cost of production is increased in the same ratio as the cost to the consumer? A.—I do not know of anything to cause this except what an advance may be in the cost of the raw material.

Q.—Have the retail grocers of Montreal any connection with this Wholesale Grocers Association? A.—Yes. I see that some of the retail grocers are in connection with the wholesale grocers.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—So that one body of merchants or manufacturers try to rule the rest? A.—Yes.

Q.—They then mean to control the market? A.—Yes; they do. You can see the extent of the power which they possess, and which others deem so slight.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do they include syrup practically in the combination? A.—Well, they have kept it in such a form. Two years ago there was plenty and small demand. The warehouses were filled with syrups. No possible outlet could be found for them. They were low beyond precedent. But since the advance in these refined syrups, a quantity of syrups could not be procured, and a considerable advance in price has been maintained, so that these wholesale grocer's guilds have had, I verily believe, much to do with increasing the price. They have had all to do with lessening the value of the lower quality of yellow sugars. That is to say, that they get sugar which has in it moisture, which should have been taken out of the sugar and sold as syrup, and which was taken out up to the time of the formation of this association.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—For a long time prior to, and from 1884 to 1887, was not sugar produced in the West Indies at a loss? A.—I think so.

Q.—And consequently has it not been rising lately? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you aware that the price of Barbadoes molasses has risen a great deal in price during the last twelve months? A.—It has risen by a third, I suppose.

Q.—But in Barbadoes it has? A.—Yes; it is higher. But sugars, such high qualities as Demerara Chrystals, that is number fourteen, have been sold in New York within a few weeks at from three and one-half to three and five-eighths cents. Number fourteen, Dutch Demerara Chrystals, is as high as we may import to profit.

Q.—In New York low priced sugars are bought for the refineries, are they not? A.—The bulk of the refining sugar is brought from place of growth, and is very low in quality and cost.

Q.—So that sugar is extremely low? A.—But the price of sugar does not warrant this action on the part of any association or combination.

Q.—Your great objection to these things is that it is a secret association and illegitimately aggressive? A.—I object to their fixing a price on articles. It is an unlawful interference with the rights of the community to fix a price without authority. No one has any right to come into my place of business and fix the price at which I shall purchase or sell goods. I am in favour of the old doctrine, "Buy where I like, and sell where I please." Buy where I can, and sell as cheap as I can, wherever I please.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—What would be the average profit at which a wholesale grocer could do business in Montreal? A.—Well, it is not so much what he could do as what he has to do.

Q.—Can you give us the average percentage of profits on the volume of business? A.—Well, ten (10) to twelve and a half (12½) per cent. would be a fair profit at present prices.

Q.—What would be the average profit on these granulated sugars? A.—Three-eighths of a cent to seven cents, and a quarter to half a cent, is the profit they put by their standard. One-quarter to one-half a cent to seven and seven-eighth cents, is perhaps, to-day, what it is.

Q.—That would be a little less than six (6) per cent.? A.—Something about that. But it is the question of principle and freedom, not mere profit that is involved. Slavery would be still the same although the chains would be made of gold instead of iron.

Q.—When this matter was first broached, do I understand you to say that you agreed to enter this combination? A.—I never agreed. I never assented to the proposal nor anything of the kind. I said they had the right to agree honorably to get a fair profit—any honorable thing proposed, but not this.

Q.—When that was proposed, did you agree to it? Did you agree to any proposition? A.—I never agreed to anything of the kind, but some remarks were made in our office, and I said I would agree to any honorable thing proposed, but not this. I said that some parties were destroying the trade and selling at cost.

Q.—Were you getting at that price, fair prices for sugar? A.—We do not run with those who sell for nothing. We most generally try to get a fair profit on sugar.

Q.—Are you getting a fair and reasonable profit on sugar? A.—We are prevented from obtaining it by the parties who are in the combination. We do not get as much as we would like.

Q.—And you agree that something should be obtained? You agree to that? A.—No. I never said that these parties should do what has been done by them.

My life-long experience goes directly against any such combinations or conspiracies. I want to be let alone.

Q.—Did you, or did you not, agree that something better should be done whereby the wholesale grocers should get a fair and reasonable profit on sugar? A.—I agreed to the remark that the prices should be better.

Q.—Did you, or did you not, in familiar terms, assent to the proposition that something should be done whereby a reasonable profit should be obtained on sugar? A.—No; not in any but informal or familiar terms.

Q.—Did you in any terms? A.—No more than I now say. When these changes were assented to, I said they were getting them in a dishonorable way. The price that the refiners proposed we did not follow, and would not follow, so we acted independently all through. We look upon a combination formed for the purpose of securing higher prices as strictly illegal.

Q.—Then, when you assented to a fair and reasonable profit on sugars, you assented to an illegal combination being formed? A.—No.

Q.—Do you think that any combination that advances prices is illegal? A.—I

think an agreement could honorably be made by merchants, how to carry on business; but in this there was nothing honorable from first to last. It was dishonorable and disgraceful, and I would have nothing to do with it, and have had nothing to do with it.

Q.—Do you think that a combination to advance prices is illegal? A.—I do.

Q.—Would a trades union to advance the price of labor be illegal? A.—I would consider it so.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You would consider it to be on the same footing? A.—Yes; and less excuse for these men, who are supposed to be men of education, training and influence, who seek to tyrannize over other persons and the community for their own selfish ends, well knowing that they are doing wrong. I say the laborer is tyrannized over when he is induced not to sell his labor to whom he pleases, and he allows that tyranny to exist, knowing no better; and this is the same, because it is done by men who ought to know better. There were some other matters referred to in the Board of Trade, matters which I think this Board might deal with. There is one thing I would like to bring to your notice, and that is the unnecessary running of Sunday trains. I am sorry to say our Board of Trade had something to do with this. They were not satisfied that a train should carry the mails on Saturday night or Monday morning, but they made application which resulted in the running of eight or ten special trains running to and from all parts of the Dominion, but chiefly to and from Montreal and points in the United States, and which should not have been allowed to run. I think this is a very serious interference with the rights of the labouring man, and should receive strong opposition. I think the man who is worked on Sunday is not so strong as the man who has a day's rest with his family. I think that some expression of opinion should arise from the Commission on that important question. You have ten business trains (passenger) leaving or coming into Montreal on a Sunday. We do not want it, and then, as Canadians, as men who would do as we would be done by, we have no right to make our fellow man labour on the Sabbath—a day that hitherto has always been set apart for rest and for the worship of God. This running of Sunday trains was first started on the plea that it was necessary to run a Sunday train occasionally, from New York, in order to carry the mails. There can, perhaps, be no objection to a special train starting whenever the mails arrive, but there is no necessity for four or five trains to run from Montreal to other points, and four or five to Montreal. I look upon this breaking in upon the Sabbath rest of the community, as one of the most injurious things to the labouring man, and the tyranny of this oppression can hardly be realized. If anything can be done by me, to prevent the growth of this evil, I shall only be happy to do it.

I also consider that the exhibition of theatrical advertisements posted on the fences and walls, within the city, and in the windows of the saloons in this city, needs supervision, as well as the theatrical representations as they are placed before the public. The advertisements bear pictorial representations at all times of a tendency to lewdness, and are often times of a very indecent and immoral character. I am informed that at one time the chief of police prosecuted certain saloon keepers for exhibiting these pictures and that they were convicted by the Recorder, but that the sentence was not enforced against them. At another time, the chief of Police (acting under orders from the Mayor) whose attention had been called, by no less a dignitary than the Roman Catholic Bishop of this diocese, to the immorality of the so called play, then being placed before the public, peremptorily closed the theatre. I therefore believe, what I have very recently been informed on reliable authority, that some of the scenes exhibited at one of our theatres, very recently, were of a most indecent character, and should not be permitted in any community. The whole of the "plays" (so I am informed on the same authority) produced at one theatre in particular, are utterly demoralizing in their character, and particularly dangerous to the young.

I think also that labouring men and their families should have better residences,

better houses. Having lived here since eighteen hundred and thirty-three (1833) I have a pretty fair knowledge of the character of the houses they live in, and think that something ought to be done to improve the condition of the dwellings of the working classes.

One word more about the sugar matter. When our foreign trade was in its infancy, we sent deputations to the West Indies—to Demerara, and other places. Sir Francis Hincks sent samples of sugar to this city. The sugar tariff was made in the interests of these refiners very largely, and who have proved themselves unworthy of the extraordinary advantages given them. These surely should be mainly withdrawn, and freedom of intercourse and trade made possible with our West Indian fellow colonists, and which our tariff has almost destroyed—to this day; and further than that; we have sent deputations to the West Indies, in the past, to facilitate trade, and then almost as soon as these got back to this country, such changes were made in the tariff as practically nullified what they had done, by making it impossible to import the better description of sugars, so that nothing better than under A 14 was brought to this country, and their better sugars being rejected, reciprocity that is so greatly to be desired, was thrown away, and our vessel owners and traders, farmers, and manufacturers' interests sacrificed to the selfishness of parties whose business contributes least to the general good of the country, when contrasted with the weighty burdens of which they are the occasion.

Here is their sugar agreement as published in the *Montreal Daily Star*, of the ninth (9th) of February instant:—

1. We, the subscribers to this agreement, hereby covenant and agree for ourselves, and with each other, to faithfully and honorably perform, and carry out the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth for the regulation and sale of all graded sugars, such as ground, extra ground, Paris lump, cut loaf, grocers A, standard A, and granulated sugars.

2. Sale of minimum advance to be as follows:—Under fifteen barrels half a cent per pound; fifteen barrels and over in one scale, three eights of a cent.

This scale of advance to apply to each grade separately of the above specified sugars, viz.: All graded sugars, such as ground, extra ground, Paris lump, cut loaf, grocers A, standard A, and granulated sugars (three boxes Paris lump to count as one barrel.)

3. (A.) Scale of advance to be based upon refiner's prices in Montreal for carload quantities, said prices to be arranged by the President and Vice-President of the Montreal Guild, or such other person or persons as may hereafter be authorized for the purpose by the Dominion Guild, with the refiners, on Saturday morning of each week, and to be communicated by telegraph by them at the Guild's expense to the secretaries of the different local guilds, whose duty it shall be to give the information promptly to each party to this agreement, within their respective territories, which on that day, with the advance per agreement, shall be the selling price for the ensuing week, commencing on that morning, unless they should be changed in value during the week, of which due notice would be given, and in cases where the travellers have not been advised of the price before, orders to be taken at open prices to be charged and invoiced at prices established and ruling at the time.

(B.) Off brands may be offered only as such, and at prices not more than one-eighth cent per pound less than best brands.

(4.) GUILD TERMS:—Namely, 60 days, or one and one half per cent., for cash paid within 15 days, or one per cent. within 30 days.

(5.) No net cash prices to be quoted.

(6.) Scale of advance not to apply to transactions between parties to this agreement, who are to be allowed to sell to each other on such terms as may be agreed upon.

(7.) Scales of sugar must not in any case be dated later than first delivery on such scale.

(8.) Parties to this agreement to have the privilege of selling to buyers in the

city of Montreal and also to buyers west of Montreal, as far as the Coteau and all south of the river St. Lawrence, at one-eighth of a cent per lb. less than agreement prices exclusive of freight, and to be allowed to give ten days extra time on shipments from Montreal to points west of Toronto.

(9). Sellers to be at liberty to prepay or allow buyers cost of freight to competing points only.

(10). Parties to this arrangement to have the privilege of delivering sugars to all points where there are merchants who buy such sugars from the manufacturers direct, but no place shall be considered a competing point until after notice from the Dominion wholesale Grocer's Guild to that effect, has been mailed to the several signers of this agreement.

(11). Parties to this agreement bind themselves not in any case or instance, to sell, or allow their travellers to sell, or offer to sell, other kinds of sugar or other kinds of goods in connection with sugars covered by this agreement at lower prices as an inducement for parties to purchase those sugars.

(12). And we, each of us, hereby pledge our honor as merchants, that we will ourselves carry out this agreement faithfully, in spirit as well as in letter, and insist upon its being strictly adhered to by every person in our employ.

(13). Should we hereafter desire to withdraw from the agreement, we further pledge ourselves not to do so without giving two month's written notice of our intention, addressed to the Secretary of the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto who will be the custodian of this document.

—————, of the City and District of Montreal, Messenger, sworn :

By MR. HEAKES :—

Q.—Where are you employed? A.—I am a Messenger for the Citizens' Insurance Company.

Q.—I believe you desire to make a statement with reference to the Sewing Machine industry? A.—Yes; I have been eight years employed in the Sewing Machine business and have seen the growth of the trade in the city here. I am pretty familiar with the various charges and prices, and the mode of manufacture. The first thing that I would mention is that a system of piece work has been introduced into the shops, that is detrimental to the interests of everyone employed there. This system has been introduced among the boys, to the great detriment, as I say, of the working men in the shops. At first, the boys had nothing to do on piece work in the shops. A sewing machine being peculiar in its construction, each boy is put to make one piece or part in large numbers; and latterly, on this piece work, the boys have to work very hard, and very fast, in order to make up anything on the prices they are allowed for their work, so that they do not put out the best of work, and when the pieces come to be put together by the workmen, it comes very hard on the men that have to receive these parts imperfectly finished, and who have to put them together, particularly if they also are working on piece work. The pieces, of course, are irregular, and you cannot get every piece to fit without further labor. The men have no better pay at the present time than they had before. They thought that, with better times, they would be better paid, but they have not been. The boys are badly paid. They get very little money.

Q.—What are their wages on the average? A.—Fifty to eighty-five cents a day. The system is to put the boys on piece work as follows: They first put them on day work, to break them into the work. They work then for a little while at day work, and they then take them and put them on a machine, and say: "How fast can you make them" (referring to the particular part the boy is making). "Go ahead at the work, at this price" naming a certain price), "and hurry up and do it as well as you

can." And, naturally, the boy works very hard, and makes more than he would get by day work.

By THE CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—This is the system followed in the shops in this city? A.—Yes.

Q.—You have a personal knowledge of it? A.—Yes. The boy having put these pieces through very fast, cannot keep up the pressure, and by and by reduces the number of his pieces turned out by piece work. The price is then reduced, and he is kept on piece work, and of course he tries hard to keep up the number of his pieces, and consequently the work is got out at a rush, and hence the putting together of the machine is made much harder. Otherwise, the men get fair enough pay, compared with what some other mechanics get, that is, mechanics at certain other kinds of work, but they make no allowance for bad construction of the pieces. No calculation is made for that, and if a man can make nothing on piece work, he has to suffer. I have myself suffered considerably at times, and although there was no such thing as a strike in our shop in my time, I know the men suffered greatly.

Q.—What are the prices now paid to the men? A.—The price paid, average for piece work to experienced men, \$2.25 a day.

Q.—Is that day work, or by the piece? A.—That is by the piece.

Q.—What are their wages by the day? A.—Well, we will take the average right along. They do not average more than \$7 a week. There is a good deal of unskilled help, but the machine hands are obliged to be skilled men. There are practically very few skilled mechanics in the Sewing Machine business. There are always a dozen tool makers in the shop, but the rest are specialists. They only know one thing. Take them off their particular work, and they cannot do much else. There are very few mechanics employed. Day work is never paid for at more than \$1.25 a day.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What is the age of children working at piece work? A.—You might say there are no children younger than thirteen or fourteen. They are generally thirteen and fourteen. They are generally small looking boys.

Q.—What are the hours of labour? A.—Seven to six.

Q.—Never later? A.—No.

Q.—When those boys come out of their apprenticeship, are they skilled workmen? A.—No.

Q.—Can you give no information to the cost price of a sewing machine? A.—I have heard of course. I can state upon what others know. I could not state the price, but I have my own ideas.

Q.—The price has to be stated directly of your own knowledge. A.—I have my own opinion about what they cost; I could not give any figures.

Q.—Are girls working in these machine shops? A.—There are some.

Q.—What do they do? A.—They work in the japanning room. That is a very unhealthy place. For instance, when the oven is opened in the morning, there are from five hundred to one thousand machine stands, and so forth, baked in there all night for the japan to dry, and when this oven is open, the smell is something terrific. Girls are employed in japanning, and painting the machines—not very many. There is one factory here where there are two or three girls engaged at this work. Other factories employ more.

27th February 1888.

EDWARD MURPHY, Montreal, merchant, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are a member of the firm of Frothingham & Workman? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you one of the exclusive agents of Mr. Girouard, of Three Rivers, who manufactures coffin furnishings? A.—No. We purchase goods from him, but we are not agents or in any other way connected with him.

Q.—Are you aware that there are only some half a dozen people or firms in this city to whom he is allowed to sell his goods? A.—Positively, I do not think I ever heard of it.

Q.—Would you be surprised to hear that this document which I hold in my hand is a letter from himself? You understand French, I believe? A.—No.

Q.—This is a letter saying that he is obliged to refuse a person who wishes to buy from him, because there is an association of funeral furnishers by whom he is only permitted to supply a limited number of merchants with his goods? A.—Really, I do not know anything about it. Our manager who is a partner may know of these things, but I am not so well posted as I was forty years ago and I do not now attend to the details of the business. If such had been the case, I think I would have known it, but I may say this: that our manager attends to the details of the business. There are certain details that I know nothing about.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—How long have you been engaged in the business? A.—For very many years.

Q.—And it is possible that you may have been dealing in these things, and yet not have known of such an organization? A.—Well, it is quite possible.

Q.—There are other partners you say, in your business? A.—Yes. Our manager may know more about it than I do. I would have no hesitation in giving the information, if I could, for we have nothing to hide, but I do not know of any such combination.

ALFRED BAUMGARTEN, Montreal, Manager of the St. Lawrence Sugar Refining Company.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are many men employed in the sugar refining business in Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you give an idea of the number? A.—I could not say what other refineries have got; but I can say what we have got.

Q.—How many men are employed in your refinery, altogether? A.—Four hundred men; not quite four hundred (400).

Q.—What would be the rate of wages earned by these men? A.—The lowest would be one dollar and twenty cents; and the highest three dollars and a-half a day.

Q.—Does that include those who make barrels. A.—Yes.

Q.—Were you connected with the sugar business in any way, directly or indirectly, in Canada, ten (10) years ago? A.—I was not in the refining business myself then.

Q.—Was any refining done in Canada ten years ago? A.—No; only since the National Policy was started, we started.

Q.—Are you able to state what the price of granulated sugar was in 1887? A.—No; I cannot.

Q.—Can you give us no information as to the relative prices? A.—No.

Q.—Where does raw sugar come to Canada from, for the most part? A.—Well, it depends upon where the sugar is cheapest. We buy it from all sugar-growing countries.

Q.—Do you use beet sugar or cane sugar? A.—We use all kinds of sugar, beet and cane.

Q.—Is beet sugar the cheapest in Canada? A.—Yes; it is the cheapest. It has been the cheapest for some time. It would not be used alone.

Q.—What is the difference between raw cane sugar and raw beet sugar, as to sweetening? A.—One hundred pounds of sugar from beets has as much sweetening in it as any other sugar.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—How do you determine the sweetening power of sugar? A.—There are several ways. The most usual is by the polariscope.

Q.—Does it show the percentage of granulated sugar? A.—No. It will show how many crystals there are (by polarizing them to the right hand side) contained in a certain quantity of sugar. It gives you the percentage—the absolute power of the sugar—the sweetening property of the sugar.

Q.—But it does not tell you by this test whether the one is better than the other? A.—Chemically, and in every other respect, they are absolutely the same substances. It tells the sweetening property of the sugar. There may be a difference between beet and other sugar. We find them about the same.

Q.—Are you aware that one may be an ordinarily wholesome food, and another may be chemically, poison? A.—No; I have not heard of that.

Q.—Does your refinery keep in operation the whole year round? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is the work pretty constant, so that the workmen get steady employment? A.—Yes; all the year round.

Q.—During what hours do they work? A.—We have two shifts; one works from six in the morning till six at night, with an hour's intermission, and then another gang goes on, and they change about the next week.

Q.—Are their wages any extra for night work? A.—No; it is the same wages, night and day.

Q.—Is much skill required in the work in the refinery? A.—Not for the ordinary men. Of course, we require to have the best of engineers and sugar boilers.

Q.—Where do you sell the sugar for the most part? A.—I think the most part we sell in the Province of Ontario.

Q.—Would it be possible to make sugar in Canada for export, if the duties on raw sugars were refunded? A. I have never thought of that. We have other refineries making fifteen times as much as those in this country, because they have larger facilities for exporting, and their expenses are reduced.

Q.—Does the cost of refining decrease in proportion to the amount manufactured? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you employ any boys? A.—No.

Q.—Or any women? A.—No.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you do any Sunday work? A.—Well, we do as little as possible. Of course, we cannot allow the furnace to go out. If we did it would take too long to start it again, and the men would be idle half the week.

Q.—How many men do you employ to prevent that? A.—I think from sixty (60) to eighty (80).

Q.—Are they working all Sunday? A.—Yes; they are working all Sunday.

Q.—And you say you do not do any more work than what is absolutely necessary? A.—Except what we can help. If we let out our fires, it would take three days for our refinery to start up again.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—When do these men get their rest that work on Sunday? A.—Those that work on Sunday night, they will go on the next Monday night, and continue on at night work for the rest of the week. They are on night work every other week, or every two shifts in succession.

Q.—Are they paid extra for Sunday work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it at the same rate of pay as for week days? A.—Yes.

Q.—These men work all day Sunday? A.—Yes.

Q.—As hard as on week days? A.—Yes.

Q.—When do they get their rest? A.—On Monday.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Is Muriate of Tin employed in the refining of sugar? A.—It has been employed in the United States.

Q.—Is it employed in Canada? A.—No; not that I know of. I don't know that it is, but it is used in the States.

Q.—Is it in any way unwholesome? A.—Not unless quantities of it are used.

Q.—Is it injurious to life? A.—Not unless quantities of it are used.

Q.—It is a poison? A.—Yes.

ROBERT S. CLIFT, Montreal, merchant and insurance surveyor, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—What supervision have the Marine Insurance Companies over the loading of vessels in the Port of Montreal? A.—None at all. Only on their own behalf.

Q.—Do the Marine Insurance Companies insist upon the vessels being properly loaded? A.—I have nothing to do with the Insurance Companies, I only represent one agency. I am the surveyor for one gentleman, in order to give him private advice, that is all.

Q.—Can you tell us if the men employed in loading ships in the Port of Montreal are competent stevedores? A.—There are some good stevedores in Montreal, some very good ones that I have seen.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Are there any incompetent ones? A.—None that I know of.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you have men in this business who are well qualified for the business? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know if care is taken in the loading and stowing of cargoes? A.—Yes.

Q.—If a surveyor objected to the stowing of cargoes, or rather if he objected to the manner in which cargoes had been stowed, would they take notice of him? A.—No. If I objected, my principal would not take the risk on the ship.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—And that is the principle with Insurance Companies generally? A.—Well, some do not have Insurance Surveyors.

Q.—But with those that do, that is the principle? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Then, all must be properly loaded before the owners can get an insurance? A.—Well, if they do not get it in Montreal, they get it in England, or elsewhere.

Q.—Are there many instances in the Port of Montreal, where insurance is refused on account of bad stowage? A.—I have never refused any. If I had fault to find, I should go to the Port Warden and he has full authority.

Q.—But have you known cases in Montreal where insurance has been refused on account of bad loading? A.—No, not particularly. I am trying to think, ... I have nothing to do with other Insurance Surveyors.

GEORGE W. MORRISON, Montreal, Deputy Port Warden of the Port of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you have a supervision of the wharves of Montreal? A.—Not of the wharves. I have of the leading vessels, but I have nothing to do with the wharves. The Board of Harbour Commissioners can tell you all about them.

Q.—Can you tell us if the gear and appliances used for the loading of vessels are of the best quality? A.—Well, we do not supervise the gear. We have nothing to do with the gear.

Q.—With regard to the loading of vessels, do you know if accidents are frequent? A.—With regard to the loading of vessels I could not say that I do.

Q.—Can you say if the Stevedores of Montreal are competent men for their business? A.—I think they are very competent. Some are better than others. Take them as a class they are very fair.

Q.—Do these Stevedores come under your control? A.—There is an Act of Parliament which compels us to give them a license, but the last clause in it destroys all the rest.

Q.—How is that? A.—The last clause reads to the effect that nothing in that Act shall prevent any man from acting as a stevedore.

Q.—In your opinion would it be better if that clause was struck out? A.—Well I never had any trouble with any of them. I tell them what I want, and they always do as I tell them.

Q.—Would it have the effect of getting more capable men, in giving the licenses? A.—Well, it might be a good thing.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Would you then license all those who are now permitted to act as Stevedores? A.—I think so.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you recognize the Plimsoll mark in Montreal? A.—It is put on by the owner of the ship, and we do not recognize it at all. We are governed by the rules of the English Lloyds. We have adopted the rules of the English Lloyds, and we act upon the rules, irrespective of the Plimsoll mark altogether. There may be some instances where the Plimsoll mark may be too high up, and others where it is too low down. I have heard of something being said here about the "Polynesian" going away deep, and of the "Sarmatian" being deep also. It is absurd to say such a thing, much more so to believe it, because of the mail steamers none of them go away before they are inspected by us. We have the supervision of all ships with regard to free-board.

Q.—Has it ever come under your notice of vessels having left the Port of Montreal overloaded? A.—No; none. They cannot go over-laden, because if they did they would do so under a penalty of eight hundred dollars—that is if they go away without our certificate, and we are not likely to give a certificate if they are overloaded.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Can they misrepresent the water she draws? A.—No; we go aboard before she leaves, and she has to go by Quebec. There is a Port Warden there.

EDWARD TOWNSEND, Montreal, Railway Conductor, in the employ of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, of Canada.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are you a freight conductor? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are all the conductors in the employ of the Grand Trunk Railway Company obliged to sign any paper releasing the Company from liability from accident? A.—Well, I will not be sure about that. It is a long while since I signed any papers, twelve years ago. I will not be sure about that; I believe they are. But I will not be certain about that.

Q.—Can you tell us what is the average width of the running boards of freight cars? A.—On the Grand Trunk the standard width of the running board is from twenty to twenty-four inches.

Q.—Do you consider such a running board sufficiently wide to insure the safety of the brakeman? A.—Yes. The Grand Trunk standard is the best on the road.

Q.—Is it on all the cars? A.—It is put on all the cars as they go into the shop. There are very few without it.

Q.—Are there many accidents connected with the running of cars? A.—Well, take myself and the distance I run, one hundred and twenty (120) miles. I do not think there are half as many as there are on the Montreal wharf.

Q.—Do you consider the bell cord a source of safety to brakemen? A.—I do not; well it would not be if we did not look after it, and keep it in running order. In bad weather it is a source of danger; it is apt to go wrong, and he will try to save his bell cord and thus slide off.

Q.—Can you suggest any remedy to prevent him from being so liable to accident? A.—Yes. A railing high enough to catch the foot if he fell down, four or five inches high—it should be high enough to prevent him from slipping over the side, something that he could catch hold of to prevent him from falling.

Q.—Do you think the bell cord, as at present used, is of sufficient utility to warrant its being kept in use? A.—In my opinion, it is useless.

Q.—Is it possible at all times to signal an engine with the bell cord? A.—No. For instance, if it rains and freezes, it freezes the bell cord to the top.

Q.—Do you know of any lines where the bell cord is not in use? A.—I do not know of any in Canada, but I believe in the States it is not in use. The men have a method of communicating with the engineer by brakes, not by the bell cord. They have no bell cord.

Q.—Speaking of brakes, do you consider it possible to adopt the same brakes on freight trains as on passenger trains. A.—Not as we are now situated, the rolling stock must suit the brake. The cars must be altered to suit the brake.

Q.—They must all be of a standard height? A.—Yes.

Q.—If the cars are all adapted for the air brake, then it can be used? A.—Yes; but I do not think it would increase the safety of freight trains.

Q.—What is the shortest distance in which you can stop, by hand-brake, a freight train of twenty-five loaded cars, running at the rate of twenty miles an hour? A.—Why, that is hard for me to say.

Q.—Take it on the ordinary run? A.—Well, it would all depend upon the men that are on the train. A brakeman has to be born the same as an artist.

Q.—Cannot you give an idea in how long a time a train of twenty-five loaded cars

running at the rate of twenty miles an hour can be stopped by hand-brake? A.—I will stop it within six hundred yards if you will give me my own men

Q.—How long would it take you coming on a down grade? A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Can you say anything about the experiments in Hamilton? A.—No.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—How many brakes can an expert brakesman set in a mile? A.—Ten.

Q.—And taking the general run of speed of your division of the Grand Trunk, how many brakes can an expert brakesman set in a mile? A.—Ten I should say.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Can you tell us anything about couplers for train cars? A.—What kind of couplers?

Q.—Well, have you ever seen a couple that will couple cars without danger to the brakesman's life, or their going between? A.—Well, I have no experience that has shown me one to beat the old fashioned pin and link, they have not come under my observation yet, none that will be adopted for railway business.

Q.—What do you think of the Miller Coupler? A.—It will not do unless the cars are changed.

Q.—Supposing all cars were erected a standard height, and the Miller Coupler adopted, do you think it would answer better than the present system? A.—There is the question of slack, that is all that I see. That would be the only thing, that I see, that would destroy the effect of the Miller Coupler. A freight engine cannot start a train with tight couplings.

Q.—Have you seen the Coupler? A.—I have seen it at Montreal on exhibition. We want a coupler that we can use in shunting. There is a great deal of shunting in a journey of one hundred miles.

Q.—Are more men injured in coupling cars or uncoupling them? A.—There are very few with the standard draw-bar.

Q.—What do you think of the Dead-woods? A.—The "Deadwoods" are the greatest killers of men, and should not be allowed in any country. They are the cause of more accidents, than all other descriptions of brakes put together.

Q.—Are there any lines running cars into Canada to-day that use the "Dead-wood"? A.—Yes; the Delaware and Hudson. Many of the American Lines use the "Dead-woods." There are no Canadian lines, that I know of, that use the "Dead-woods."

Q.—Are there cars running in Canada that it is almost impossible to couple without great risk? A.—Yes; some of them I would not couple, not with my hands. I would use a stick or a pole, or anything like that.

Q.—Are all men on the Grand Trunk Railway obliged to become members of a Provident Society? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you tell me if that society is generally acceptable to the men? A.—Well, I think it is now, it was not at first. I have not heard anything lately. At first there was; but not since its objects have become thoroughly known.

Q.—Is it true that on becoming members of that society, they agree not to hold the company liable for any injuries they might sustain? A.—That would all depend upon what the act was.

Q.—What is the greatest number of hours during which you have been continuously employed? A.—I cannot say that. That is at our own option. I can stop a train at any point on the line, and lie over if I wish. No man is compelled to continue working if he is not in health, or does not wish to.

Q.—What is the greatest number of hours you have actually worked? A.—I cannot say, because I am not supposed to remain out any exceptional time on the road. Any time that I am tired out, as the train is under my control, I can lay over at my terminal point, and I need not go out again. Want of rest is no excuse to the

Company for any damage. I cannot plead want of rest as an excuse to the Company for neglect of my duty. That is under my own control.

Q.—What would be the monthly earnings of a Conductor, if he makes one trip each day, not including Sundays? A.—That would be twenty-six days a month. Well, he may earn—he may make a day and a quarter every working day.

Q.—Is it usual to have such a long trip as one hundred miles every day? A.—Yes; mine is one hundred and twenty miles.

Q.—What are the earnings of a freight Conductor for one hundred miles? A.—Two dollars and fifteen cents, (\$2.15); that is my pay. There are lower grades. We have to go through those till we get to the higher ones.

Q.—What would be the average earnings of a freight Conductor per month? A.—Well, sixty to seventy dollars; it all depends upon the number of miles you run. As a rule, they make more than one hundred miles daily. Well, we are slack just now. I have drawn eighty dollars (\$80), and last month fifty-two dollars (\$52). I shall draw less this month.

Q.—That is less than the average? A.—Less than the average of the last three years.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—What wages do freight conductors average the year round? A.—You see what we get is two dollars and fifteen cents a day, and our day is one hundred miles. I should say from sixty to seventy dollars. That has been it for the last year or two. That is the highest rate.

Q.—What is the lowest wages paid to a Conductor? A.—One dollar and seven-tty-five cents a day, and the highest is two dollars and fifteen cents.

Q.—Do you get paid for the time you are laid up on track? A.—I have not laid up on the track, but if I did lay up, I should be partially paid.

Q.—What do you mean by partially paid? A.—Paid for my services.

Q.—Have ever laid your train up? A.—I never have; but I have known those who have laid their train up.

LOUIS LAWRENCE PELTIER, of Montreal, Railway Conductor.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are you a freight or passenger conductor? A.—Passenger train conductor.

Q.—Did you hear the evidence of the last witness, Mr. Edward Townsend? A.—I did; part of it at least.

Q.—Can you corroborate the testimony given by the last witness? A.—Well; generally, yes.

Q.—Do you know of any wish on the part of conductors of railways to be licensed the same as engineers? A.—I do not think it would be necessary.

Q.—Have you ever heard of applications from conductors west of Montreal, asking that certificates be granted to them.

A.—I have heard of an association representing a large number of conductors, asking for this. I have read about it only.

Q.—Are you a member of the conductors' Association? A.—No; not of this particular conductors' association.

Q.—Are there many accidents on the Grand Trunk Railway, through the "frogs" not being properly filled? A.—There are.

Q.—Do you know of any regulations compelling the Grand Trunk Railway Company to fill these "frogs" on their line? A.—I have heard of such a regulation; but judged there was not.

Q.—If there is such a regulation, it is not carried out? A.—No; at least not in the Montreal yards, and those parts of the road that I run over.

Q.—Do you know how many men have been killed by reason of these open “frogs” during the past year? A.—I could not say.

Q.—You know of some? A.—Well; I could not say. It has become such a usual occurrence to men on railways, we do not count by time, we count by absent faces.

Q.—In your opinion, Mr. Peltier, if these frogs were filled within two inches of the top of the rail, say, would it not prevent men from being caught? A.—We think it would.

Q.—Have you heard any reasons urged on behalf of the company for not doing so? A.—Yes.

Q.—What was that? A.—The difficulty on the part of the company to keep the frog clear of the snow.

Q.—But this objection would not apply to the spring, summer and fall of the year? A.—No.

Q.—Do you know of any “black-listing” on the company’s line? A.—What does that mean.

Q.—When a man is discharged his name is posted, and he cannot get a certificate. A.—Well, I have heard that a man could not get employment; this is the first I have heard of “blacklisting.”

Q.—Does the Grand Trunk Railway Company require a certificate from all classes of conductors? A.—No. The Company requires a man to be of good character on entering the service, and if he continues in the service and conducts himself properly, he is raised to be a freight conductor, and from that to a passenger conductor, as there may be vacancies, and as past services recommend him, I believe.

Q.—The passenger conductors, do they furnish certificates from the Guarantee Company? A.—No.

Q.—Do you know if the present signals for trainmen are satisfactory? A.—Yes; I think they are. I think the Company is willing, at all times, to listen to any suggestion, or any complaint of the men.

Q.—Have there been complaints made by the engineers, as to the confusion of the lights in the yard. A.—Well, that is a question the engineers can answer.

Q.—When a charge is preferred against an employee in the yard, how is that charge investigated? A.—Well, it is investigated by a committee of three, consisting of the superintendent and two others.

Q.—Is it customary to have the parties present at the investigation? A.—No; it has not been.

Q.—Has he the privilege here of bringing witnesses to that investigation? A.—I do not know that he has.

Q.—Has the Local Superintendent, or Manager, power to investigate a case? A.—Well, they have no power to investigate and decide a case; that is the business of the Local Committee.

Q.—Who is the Local Committee of your road, here? A.—Mr. Wainright, Mr. Wallingford, and Mr. Wallis.

Q.—Do you know of any appeal the men have against the decision of the Committee? A.—Well, I know I would find a means to appeal, if I considered I suffered an injustice from the decision. We find no difficulty in getting an opportunity to speak to the General Manager, or the Local Superintendent.

Q.—Is it usual for railway companies to employ detectives to watch their men? A.—I believe they call them Inspectors. Some call them “Spotters.”

Q.—When one of these Inspectors, or “Spotters,” makes a charge against a man, is the man notified at once? A.—Well, I believe they always have been. We are always whenever any charges are made against us, giving us an opportunity to explain before the Local Superintendent, and, in fact, I think men who have sufficient nerve, and who went as far as the Manager, would find no difficulty in getting an opportunity to explain their grievance.

Q.—Is the evidence of one of these Inspectors sufficient to dismiss a man?
 A.—Well, I would rather that he would not give any evidence against me.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—How long would a man have to wait before he is brought before this Board of Examiners, after he is suspended? A.—It depends upon how serious the charge is.

Q.—What is the shortest time that you know of? A.—Well, it is difficult to bring to my mind any particular case.

Q.—Have you known a man to wait a month? A.—I cannot bring to mind a man waiting that long. You mean under suspicion?

Q.—Before he is tried—before his case is enquired into and decided? A.—I have known him to wait two weeks, and after waiting two weeks, to be reinstated.

Q.—Would he get his pay? A.—No; not unless he worked.

Q.—Do you know that there have been many men killed, and lamed, or otherwise injured at railway crossings, in the city of Montreal? A.—I have known two good men to be killed at these crossings.

Q.—In the event of a fatal accident at any of these crossings, is a coroner's inquest held? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have there been many killed during the present year? A.—There has been one or two, I believe, during the past year killed at the gates (street crossings). I do not know who was to blame. I will, if you allow me, add a word or two to what Mr. Townsend has said with regard to foreign cars. These cars are very dangerous to the men working them. I have nothing to say against the company. Whatever grievance we have to make, if we go to the proper authorities, we shall be heard. Nor have I anything to complain of as regards the cars of the Grand Trunk Railway Company; but the dangers the men have to labor under with respect to the cars of the Delaware and Hudson; and the Delaware and Lackawanna railroads; and some other western cars, are very great. These cars cause a great many accidents. These are matters that we feel more interest in speaking about than anything else. The Delaware and Lackawanna cars are almost impossible to couple without being injured. Of course they have to be coupled by hand, and that is most dangerous work. It gives a man little or no chance to save himself. A man sees the cars coming back, knows what is expected of him, and sees the imminence of the danger. And it is my opinion that often a man, in his effort to save an arm, loses his life.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—It is very dangerous work? A.—Yes. In fact it is not human to expect a man to do such work.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—I would like you to oblige us with some information with regard to the railing that some of the witnesses have proposed should be erected on the sides of the cars as a protection to the men in the event of their slipping. You admit that such a protection is necessary? A.—I certainly do.

Q.—Do you think six inches high enough? A.—Yes. If you had a vessel on the river without railings, you would feel a little skittish about going on it, yet men go on the roof of cars covered by a couple of inches of ice without railings.

Q.—What in your opinion should be the width of the foot board? A.—Two and a-half feet wide.

Q.—Are you of opinion that a railing six inches high is sufficient protection around the sides? A.—Yes.

Q.—Would there be any danger of its throwing the brakeman between the cars in jumping from one car to another? A.—No. They could be made to curl off at the ends into a handle leaving the passage way free to the brakeman.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—What is the longest distance that a brakeman has to jump from car to car—from one car to another? A.—Sometimes three feet, and sometimes four feet.

Q.—How long are the cars? A.—Twenty-five feet—twenty-five and a-half feet.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Would you have the railing continue on to each end of the car? A.—I would have the foot board project ten inches over the end of the car, and the railing should come to this, and curl over in the shape of a handle. As it is now he takes hold of the brake, turns the brake, and jumps from one car to the other. He shuts his eyes and makes a jump. I might say while on this matter, that it is not one to which the Grand Trunk Railway Company can be brought prominently before the Government. On the contrary the Grand Trunk Railway Company was the first to remove the "Deadwoods" from their cars in order to prevent injury to the men and loss of life, and I think they deserve credit for it. It has long been the chief road in Canada and as a Company it has always had a regard for the safety of its employees.

Q.—Have you any suggestions that you would like to make, or anything to add to that which you have already said? A.—Well, I would suggest some arrangement on the part of the Government with regard to cars, similar to the arrangement of the fishery question. Fish is considered to be very valuable, and worth protecting, what about men? There are fifteen thousand (15,000) men killed and maimed annually by railways, or rather on railways on this continent. I think that is a matter worth looking after—fifteen thousand men killed and maimed annually—that is, according to statistics.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—That is to say, employees of the railway companies only? A.—Yes.

THOMAS ANDERSON, Montreal, Railway Conductor, in the employ of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you heard the evidence of the last two witnesses? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you anything to add to what they have said? A.—No. I do not know that I have.

Q.—With regard to the cars, do you approve of what has been said by the two previous witnesses? A.—Yes.

Q.—With regard to the danger to brakemen in working cars, have you anything additional to say? A.—No. I do not know that I have.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—You thoroughly agree with the statements made by the previous witnesses?
A.—Yes.

EDWARD HOLLIS, Montreal, Gentleman; Secretary of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Women and Children.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How long has your Society been in existence? A.—About six years. We protect the persons and property of women and children.

Q.—Yours is a volunteer association; and is supported by voluntary contributions? A.—Yes; the society is supported by voluntary contributions.

Q.—Do you get any aid from Government? A.—No. The city allows us four hundred dollars a year.

Q.—Is it your duty, or have you any officer that goes about and sees into the condition of the special classes of the community you seek to protect? A.—I generally go around and visit the cases. We had an inspector; but we have not one at present.

Q.—I suppose you get information of the houses you visit? A.—We have an office; and after due enquiry and investigation, as a last resource, take the case into court. As soon as a complaint is made to us, we go and visit the house and the parties, and make enquiries—we carefully investigate the case.

Q.—Have you found houses unfit for human habitation? A.—Yes; we have found them in a very unhealthy, dilapidated condition.

Q.—When you find them in such a condition, what do you do? A.—We are powerless; we cannot help them. Rents are so high that they cannot afford to pay higher rent, and are obliged to put up with it.

Q.—Does the municipal government assist them? A.—No. Rent and everything is too high. It is impossible to get lower rents.

Q.—Among these people, are there some that are really unfortunate from causes for which they are not responsible? A.—Very few.

Q.—Can you state what is generally the cause of so much destitution? A.—We generally trace it to drunkenness; in most cases it is due to drunken habits. During the time the society has been in operation, we have had seven hundred and thirty-eight cases of cruelty to women and children brought to our notice—in six years; and four hundred and thirty-eight convictions. Men who are convicted of being drunkards and not supporting their families, are generally fined and sent down to prison; and the females of the families are left to starve. The one who should be the bread-winner is gone. He is taken care of, and generally leaves the gaol improved in health and strength, while the family continues to starve, unless some benevolent person or persons, or society, comes to their relief. It seems to me that there should be some Reformatory where such men can be sent to work, and support their families in the meantime.

Q.—Do you find the sending of them to gaol for three months, works any reform in them? A.—No; very seldom. We have placed two hundred and eighty one children in the Institutions during the time we have been in existence as a Society. We have placed them where they are carefully taken charge of. We have taken them out of these evil, and unhealthy surroundings, and placed them where they will learn to become useful members of Society.

Q.—Have you ever found families in their houses destitute, that is, with nothing to eat? A.—Many a time, and with hardly any furniture.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Is the whiskey bottle represented in these houses? A.—I have not seen the bottles exactly, but I have seen the effects, I have seen the state of the place.

Q.—So that from your own observation some people will drink, where they will not eat? A.—In many cases they cannot drink much, and what drink they get takes away the appetite for eating.

Q.—Is there much Sunday work going on in the city that you know of—much Sunday drinking? A.—I have no doubt there is much Sunday drinking.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you found people in destitute circumstances, who have been brought low by other means than the use of strong drink. A.—Very few, if there are any; we try to help them up by giving them assistance, and obtaining for them situations.

Q.—Is it any portion of the duty of your Society to seek out such people?
 A.—No; if they come to us we help them. We have an office where anyone can report, or make a complaint. These reports or complaints, are carefully enquired into, and we help the parties as much as possible.

Q.—Do you ever visit the factories, where women and children are employed?
 A.—No.

Q.—Have you ever known of any infringements of the Factory Act? A.—They have not come under my own notice. We are of the opinion that the Factory Act is not so comprehensive as it might be. The Factory Act of eighteen hundred and eighty-five (1885), has never been put into operation. We have appointed a deputation to visit the Government, to see if it cannot be put into force. It only needs to be put into force, and in order that this should be done, due care should be taken in the appointing of Inspectors.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—Do you assist these unfortunate women and children otherwise than by prosecuting the male adults? A.—Yes. We do what is in our power to relieve them, and we report to other societies who provide them with a few groceries and fuel.

Q.—You confine yourselves principally to the prosecution of the adults, and leave the support of the families to other societies? A.—It may be put that way. We do all we can with the means at our command.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Your society was formed for the special object of protecting women and children from being cruelly and unjustly dealt with? A.—Yes.

Q.—Does your society represent all classes of the community? A.—I think I may say it does. No doubt it can be very much improved, but we are glad to go on with the support that we have.

Q.—At what age does your society think a boy or a girl should commence to work in a factory? A.—My own opinion is that they should not be allowed to go to work at a less age than fourteen. I should say fourteen and sixteen.

Q.—Has your society expressed an opinion on the length of hours of labour for children? A.—No. The society would be very glad to get that Act put into operation, and see how it works.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Are these cases of drunkenness which you believe lead to the neglect to support the families of those indulging in the habit, increasing or decreasing? A.—It is rather on the increase.

Q.—Is the increase greater than the growth of the population in the meantime?
 A.—No. I think not.

Q.—Do you make any endeavour to get situations for the children, or homes for them where they will have an opportunity to learn a trade? A.—That is part of our duty to obtain for them shelter in homes or Industrial schools.

Q.—Do they learn anything in the school? A.—Yes. They have a daily school. The boys are taught various branches of industry, and the girls are brought up to be domestic servants.

Q.—Do you provide them with clothing? A.—The institutions provide them with clothing.

GEORGE H. HOLLAND, Merchant, Dealer in Fancy Goods, Wall Papers and Musical Instruments, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—The men you employ, do they belong to Canada, or are they imported?
A.—It is my brother that you have reference to, but I know his business, and can answer you. He has both foreigners and Canadians.

Q.—He also manufactures baskets? A.—Yes. He is also a manufacturer of willow work, German and English. He employs both Germans and Englishmen, and, I think, one Frenchman and one Canadian.

Q.—The foreign hands employed, are they engaged on the other side by contract? A.—He paid their passage—the Germans—and they are working it off.

Q.—Does he pass contracts with these men? A.—No; he passes no contracts.

Q.—Are they doing kinds of work that Canadians cannot do? A.—Yes; the work the Germans do the others could not do, and the same with the English and French.

Q.—For how many years has he been employing foreigners? A.—About a year. It is only lately that he has gone into the business.

Q.—Does he manufacture musical instruments? A.—No; we import them.

Q.—Do you engage in the manufacture of any other goods? A.—No; we import them, and purchase of manufacturers in Canada.

ROBERT MCCOY, Montreal, Stevedore, sworn :—

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How long have you been working on the docks of the port of Montreal?
A.—For the last sixteen or seventeen years.

Q.—Can you tell us what the rate of pay of a ship labourer was in the port of Montreal seventeen years ago? A.—Yes. Twelve and a half cents an hour.

Q.—What is the rate of pay to-day for the same work? A.—Twenty to thirty cents.

Q.—What is the highest price paid for men working coal? A.—Twenty-five cents an hour.

Q.—Which do the men receive the most for, shovelling coal or grain? A.—There are men, I believe, who get thirty cents for shovelling coal from barges.

Q.—Which will try a man most, the dust from grain or the dust from coal?
A.—Grain will try him the worst; coal is far the dirtier.

Q.—Do the stevedores ever undergo an examination in Montreal? A.—Never to my knowledge.

Q.—Is there anyone who has charge of and looks after the stevedores? A.—The Port Warden has the right to supervise the work.

Q.—And the captains and chief officers of ships, are they pretty well looked after?
A.—I think they are very well looked after. It stands to show that both the stevedores and the ships are well looked after, that no vessel has been lost through bad stowage since I started.

Q.—You believe ships have been lost from other causes? A.—Yes.

Q.—About what time are the men paid their wages? A.—Six o'clock on Saturday evening. When I started in Montreal it would be nothing unusual to see the men on the wharf with their wives having their baskets on their arm, waiting until one or two o'clock on Sunday morning for their money. Some of the men are now paid early on Saturday afternoon.

Q.—Is there anyone to look after the gear—inspect the gear? A.—No.

Q.—Do you consider that it would be a good thing for a man to be appointed to

inspect this gear? A.—A man could inspect all this gear in two days. I do not see the utility of such an appointment. If a man has bad gear, and there is any bother about it, he stands the consequences.

Q.—Supposing a man was appointed to the position, would you suggest a stevedore, or a machinist? A.—Well, if a stevedore was appointed, he might have "bile" on his stomach against a young stevedore; and if a machinist was appointed, he would not know much about it.

Q.—Are the cattle stalls in the way of the men, in unloading and loading vessels? A.—No; there is lots of room to get around the hatches.

Q.—Have you ever loaded cattle? A.—It is not the place of the stevedore to put cattle on board; that is the duty of the shipper. He has his men, and he has men to go with the cattle across the ocean.

Q.—Do you know whether the hatchways are large enough to load the cattle with safety? A.—Well, there are five or six inches to spare in the hatch or gangway, and if the cattle tried to get back there would be no room.

By Mr. GIBSON:

Q.—Are the cattle so closely packed as to be injurious to their health on the voyage? A.—I do not think so.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are many incompetent men employed as stevedores? A.—None to my knowledge. There is one man superintending a line of boats, with a thoroughly good man under him.

Q.—What was the charge for loading vessels seventeen years ago? A.—Twelve and a half cents an hour. We are now paying twenty-two to twenty-five, and fifty per cent higher wages, than we were paying fifteen or sixteen years ago, and we receive a lower price for the work than we did then.

Q.—Are there many accidents among the men employed in the business? A.—I only know of one accident—a boy got his fingers jammed between two rails—out of one hundred steamers that were loaded and unloaded in this port.

Q.—Are the men generally well treated? A.—On the line boats they are generally well treated. I have heard no complaints worth speaking about.

Q.—You do not know of any complaints? You have none to make? A.—Well, in general, workmen always have some complaints.

Q.—Have you any suggestions about your business you would wish to make to us? A.—I have none particularly.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You have nothing to say beyond what you have been asked? A.—I do not know of anything particularly.

JOHN SHERIDAN, Stevedore, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Did you hear the evidence of the last witness Mr. Robert McCoy? A.—Yes; I heard it.

Q.—Do you approve of what that witness said? A.—I think he is pretty near the mark, at all events I know he is with regard to the rates of wages.

Q.—Have you anything to add to the statements that he has made? A.—Nothing that I know of.

Q.—Have you ever tried to work on the Co-operative plan on the docks? A.—No; I never did.

24th February, 1888.

CHRISTOPHER FRYER, of the City of Montreal, Painter and Decorator, age 45, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What wages do house painters get in Montreal? A.—The average is from seventy-five cents to one dollar and seventy-five cents a day. Some get two dollars but they are only first-class men.

Q.—Do the two dollar men include grainers? A.—No; grainers and carvers and gilders generally get two dollars and fifty cents a day, but they are very scarce.

Q.—Do painters in Montreal get steady work all the year round? A.—Not more than seven months steady work.

Q.—What season is the busiest? A.—From April until July, and then again from September up to December. For two months in the height of the summer season there is not much doing.

Q.—Have you any idea what the earnings of the average painter is in a year? A.—Well, I can tell you for myself. I should think I estimated not more than about —well, not more than five hundred dollars, and I consider myself a first-class workman.

Q.—And taking the average house painter what would he get? A.—I am not working as a house painter. I am a decorative painter.

Q.—What would the average earnings of a house painter be at the ordinary brush work, in a year? A.—I do not think he would average more than two hundred and fifty dollars.

Q.—Decorators and painters get more than the ordinary brush hand? A.—Yes; a general man in the shop may be kept on hand, but the ordinary man comes into shop for a month or two and when work gets slack goes out again. These men in the shop mix the paint and prepare the colors, as to these others that they call painters I call them merely “daubs.” They are not good workmen.

Q.—What do sign writers earn, the man that does nothing else? A.—Five dollars a day and others seven dollars and fifty cents. They are professional men.

Q.—You cannot give us an idea of what sign writers earn? A.—Four and five dollars a day. That is in the spring time of the year.

Q.—Not all the year round? A.—No; just when people are moving in the spring or require anything in that line of business.

Q.—Are paper hangers paid by the roll or are they paid by the day? A.—Some are paid by the roll and some are paid by the day.

Q.—How much do they earn in hanging paper? A.—I see it hung at ten cents.

Q.—How many rolls in a day do they hang? A.—I have heard of some that hung twenty, and some thirty in a day, but as a practical man I do not see how they do it.

Q.—Are these double or single rolls? A.—They are single.

Q.—Are many boys taken into your department of business? A.—Yes; I know some firms take them in from the country. I know one place that pays them from two to three dollars a week for the first year, and then they bring them out as first-class workmen.

Q.—Are the painters organized? Have they a society? A.—Not that I know of. I work by myself, entirely.

Q.—You do not know anything about an organization of painters? A.—No; not that I know of.

Q.—Do you know if these boys serve any length of time? A.—No; just the time the masters have work for them. For instance, I know one young man who got three dollars a week in the spring. When business got bad again, he went back home to the farm and stopped another winter, and then came back to Montreal as a thorough tradesman, he just picked the trade up the best way he could. They

come in from the country and work in this way. It necessarily injures the trade. To my knowledge there is no society of painters in Montreal.

Q.—Is there a scarcity of skilled painters in Montreal? Do you know if a good steady workmen could get constant employment? A.—I can only say that my son gets steady employment.

Q.—Can you offer any suggestions that you consider may be of use to the Commission? A.—Yes; a suggestion that I would like to make is this: I would like the architects to see that the work is done in every building in a workman-like manner, and not as it is done.

Q.—What would you suggest as regards apprenticeship? A.—I am sure that parties would only be too glad if they could make a boy stop and serve his time. The proper way would be to compel a boy to remain with his employer the full term of his apprenticeship, just the same as they do in the Old Country. There a boy comes out a thorough mechanic, but at the present time in Canada, no sooner has a boy commenced to learn his trade than he is anxious to get away and leave you in the course of two, three or four months, because someone has offered him more wages than you might perhaps be giving him.

WILLIAM W. HALPIN, Montreal, Undertaker and Livery Stable Keeper, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you sell trimmings for coffins? A.—I do, in furnishing funerals.

Q.—Do you know Mr. Girouard, of Three Rivers? A.—I might know him.

Q.—Do you know, in the first place, if there is an organization or combination for the sale of these coffin trimmings? A.—Yes; there is.

Q.—Well, that organization required Mr. Girouard to sell only to a few wholesale men in Montreal? A.—Yes; I think so.

Q.—Can you tell us what number there are of these houses who so purchase goods from Mr. Girouard? A.—I could not say exactly. I think four or five. It is a simple agreement and there is nothing binding in it.

Q.—I hold a letter here from Mr. Girouard and this letter is certainly binding on him? A.—Well, there never was any writing drawn up that I know of to that effect to make it any way binding. He has been asked, I know, not to sell to all the hardware men. He has been asked to sell only to a certain number.

Q.—How many? A.—Four or five.

Q.—And was he not told that if he sold to anybody, certain persons would take their business away from him? A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—At any rate, you are aware that no one can buy coffin trimmings in Montreal except four or five people? A.—That was the understanding between him and the undertakers, that he was to sell to four or five persons.

Q.—Is there such a thing as an organization of undertakers throughout the Dominion? A.—Yes.

Q.—And by the rules of this society, only certain persons have the privilege of being members of the society, and of purchasing these trimmings? A.—I will tell you how that is. There were some undertakers who were really a discredit to the profession, men of no character who would go around to solicit funerals, even up to your door, and who would enter the door to solicit the job from you. It made any one feel bad to think of the existence of such a thing, and to prevent such things from occurring, this organization was formed. Montreal was the last place to put out these unprofessional men.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Are there not just as good men outside of the association as in it? A.—I

do not think you can get a prominent man, or an honest man who understands funeral direction as it should be understood, outside of it.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—In fact, you are like those of other organizations in one particular at any rate. You are of opinion that there is nothing good outside of your organization?
A.—I do not think you could get a competent funeral director outside of it.

Q.—Many men consider there is nothing good outside their own organization. Have you any printed rules of this organization? A.—I have none.

Q.—Can you send us a copy? A.—I have not got one myself yet—not a printed copy. They were only got out this month, and I have not got one yet.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Will you send us a copy? A.—Mr. Seale is the person to apply to. He is the secretary.

Q.—Do they agree together, the association of Ontario and the association of Quebec? A.—They are, as yet, separate organizations, but still they are all under the same ruling.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Why were the four or five houses chosen to whom Mr. Girouard is allowed to sell his furnishings, was it for specific reasons? A.—No.

Q.—Do you know that he is bound to sell only to four or five firms? A.—I think that was understood with the manufacturer. I could not say how much they were bound.

Q.—Are you aware that the manufacturer, Mr. Girouard, expressed his regret to some parties that he could not sell to them? A.—No.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Has the association of Canada anything to do with any similar association in the United States? A.—No, not directly.

Q.—In what way are they connected? A.—They are all under one ruling.

Q.—Well, a person who is not a member of the association in Canada, could not be a member in the United States? A.—If he was a man here, who would act honorably in the profession, we would never think of debarring him.

Q.—Do you mean to say that those outside the association are dishonorable?
A.—I do not think that there is a good one to-day who is not admitted into the association. In fact, I do not call him an undertaker if he is not a member of the association.

Q.—How do you admit members into the association, by ballot? A.—No. They make application, and there is a regular rule that he must be thoroughly equipped. He has got to have a regular stock of horses, caskets, etc.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Would a respectable man in the country be admitted? A.—Yes.

Q.—Supposing a man went to Alexandria, where there is an undertaker running a business there, and that this other party started opposition to him, would this other party be admitted as a member of this association? A.—Yes; if he showed himself to be a sober man, of good character and social standing, and at the same time had the necessary equipment for carrying on the business respectably.

Q.—Has not your Association refused a man of the town of Iroquois in the Province of Ontario? Have you not refused to admit him to membership? A.—Very possibly.

Q.—And did you not know that the man was a thoroughly reliable man, competent, honest and sober, and as good a man in the business, as the party already there?

A.—Well, that is in Ontario. We belong to the Province of Quebec. We would have nothing to do with him.

Q.—But you say you are all under the same rules? A.—Yes; but he would have to refer to Toronto.

Q.—What form has a man to go through to become a member of your Association? A.—None whatever. He makes application and then he is supposed, according to the by-laws, to be thoroughly equipped as an undertaker. He must be properly equipped in order to be able to carry out a funeral with satisfaction to those who engage him, and to the credit of the Association.

Q.—How do you explain why only one man in the district or three or five men in a city should only be allowed to sell these furnishings? A.—I do not quite understand.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Why are the sales of these trimmings restricted to four or five wholesale merchants in Montreal? That is the question. A.—As far as its being restricted is concerned, the principal object is this. The undertakers thought at one time that they alone had the right to sell these trimmings, that it was a part of their business, and that the manufacturer should not sell to certain parties. Then some time afterwards we allowed certain wholesale men to handle coffin trimmings, and it was an understood agreement also that they were not to sell to certain parties. This was the understanding but it was never put into force. It now depends upon Mr. Girouard and the merchants.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Is there any understanding as to prices between the members of this association, as to the charges to be made by undertakers? A.—None. But the undertakers of course know the wholesale price. The undertaker who has not certain appliances of a certain character for his business cannot be admitted. He must be properly equipped. He is not an undertaker if he will do the job half way. Then, having the appliances and coming up to our regulations so as to conduct a funeral properly, he is admitted.

Q.—Do not your regulations make the funerals so expensive that every body who wishes to engage in the business cannot do so? A.—I do not think so.

Q.—Then a man needs these equipments in order to become a member of the Association? A.—They need these equipments in order to conduct a funeral properly.

Q.—Then, why would you not let all the men in Montreal be undertakers, who desire to enter that business. A.—They do all belong to it, without exception, who desire to, with the exception of one or two in the outskirts of the city.

Q.—Why do you not allow that man in the outskirts of the city to belong to it? A.—Because he has not complied with the rules, and because he could not be the best judge as to the appliances which are needed. He must have some style about him. As to prices, you can have a relative buried for the price of from four dollars up.

Q.—Is it not a fact that a person not belonging to the Association, cannot buy a casket in the United States? A.—I am not aware of it.

Q.—Are the manufacturers and undertakers members of the same Association? A.—No.

Q.—If an undertaker does not wish to belong to your Associations, are they, (the merchants and manufacturers), willing to sell to him. A man that has got lots of money? A.—They could better answer that question; they do as they please.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—How many manufactories are there in this Province? A.—In the Province of Quebec.

Q.—Yes? A.—I think only one.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—You said just now that they formed an Association in the Province of Ontario? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have the manufacturers an Association? A.—Yes; I think the man in Three Rivers belongs to them. There are four or five in the Province of Ontario.

Q.—If there is this liberty on the part of the undertakers to remain out of the Association, why do you not give the privilege to the merchants to remain out, and still furnish the trimmings? A.—They can do as they please; we have nothing to do with them.

Q.—Has the Association of undertakers ever brought pressure to bear on the merchants, as to the men they should sell to? A.—I think there was an understanding with Mr. Girouard, as the undertakers claimed there were some men who were a discredit to the business. There was one man, I think it was a good thing for Montreal to get rid of him, and this Association was gotten up particularly on account of him.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You say you think the undertakers themselves should handle the trimmings? A.—Well, some think we should sell them. Some think we have the best right to do the business.

Q.—Are you able to state the price paid to the manufacturer, and the price paid to the merchant? A.—We pay the regular wholesale price—the regular trade price.

Q.—Is it ten per cent? A.—Well, we paid the regular price on sales through hardware merchants.

Q.—Is it ten per cent? A.—I could not say.

Q.—What do you think a person buying a coffin would pay for it, over and above cost price? A.—It is all according to the style of coffin.

Q.—Would he pay one hundred per cent profit on it? A.—I should not think so. He would not have much judgment, if he did.

Q.—What is your opinion? A.—Well, I think not.

Q.—What would be about the percentage of profit? A.—I cannot answer that question.

Q.—Do you know that respectable merchants have been refused to be allowed to purchase goods from Mr. Girouard, in Three Rivers? A.—That may possibly be.

Q.—Is it not true that he sells only to three or four wholesale houses? A.—I think he sells to four or five.

Q.—And anyone outside those firms cannot buy? A.—No. As I said a while ago, we have no authority; it depends altogether upon the merchants and Mr. Girouard.

Q.—Is there a class of coffins technically known as “hospital coffins”? A.—Coffins are all prices, according to finish and trimmings

Q.—What do undertakers charge for the cheapest coffins? A.—I have no idea. They may charge different prices. I suppose they charge according to the finish and trimmings. You may sell a coffin and trimmings, and the trimmings be worth as much as the coffin.

Q.—What would the trimmings of a hospital coffin be worth? A.—It is all according to what you have. You may have a very cheap coffin, and have first-class trimmings.

Q.—You have no knowledge of the profit on a coffin? A.—There are various prices and various profits.

Q.—Is it one hundred per cent or not? A.—No.

Q.—Have you any objection to state what is the ordinary profit on an ordinary coffin? A.—I would rather not answer.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Can you give us the name of the Secretary of the Undertakers' Association?
A.—Mr. Seale. Mr. Seale is an undertaker himself.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How many years have you been in business, as an undertaker, in this city?
A.—Over twenty years.

(Translation.)

GUSTAVE PICHÉ, Ironmonger, of Montreal, sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You are a merchant in Montreal? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You are a member of a society of coffin makers? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Are you not one of five who were chosen to sell the effects of the firm of
Octave Girouard, of Three Rivers? A.—No, sir; not to my knowledge.

Q.—Have you on sale articles manufactured by Girouard, of Three Rivers? A.—
Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you obtain these articles directly from Girouard? A.—We obtained them in
a round about way. Last year I understood that we were one of the firms which might
be said to be boycotted. I protested to Mr. Girouard on that subject. I did not know
whether it was illegal or not; but, at all events, I maintained that it was unjust, for
we were not in a position to accept any conditions. It had simply been said: "We shall
not sell to such a house." It was understood that we should be refused the purchasing
of goods, and the manufactory was not allowed to sell directly to us. Mr. Girouard
owned the injustice of the thing, and said that we were one of the best houses—one
of the houses that sold the most of this line of goods in the Montreal market; and
Mr. Girouard said, furthermore, that he was obliged to bow to the conditions of the
Upper Canada manufacturers, who had imposed them.

Q.—In one word, then, you were boycotted? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you know how many parties there are in Montreal who are the agents
of this firm in the wholesale trade? A.—To the best of my knowledge, six or
seven.

Q.—These are the only houses that can sell wholesale? A.—Yes.

(Translation.)

DEMOISELLE ALPHONSINE FONTAINE employed in the manufacture of cotton,
Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have been in the employ of the St. Anne Cotton Factory? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you there now? A.—No; I am not there since Saturday.

Q.—Did you leave of your own free will, or were you discharged? A.—I was
discharged.

Q.—For how long did you work at the St. Anne Factory? A.—Six months.

Q.—Can you say if the superintendent or foreman had anything to reproach you
with on account of your work? A.—No; in my opinion they had nothing.

Q.—Would you tell us what is, in your opinion, the reason why you were dis-
missed? A.—My opinion is that it was because I appeared in the Superior Court

for Mr. Lepine, who lost his two arms in the work which he was doing at the St. Anne Factory.

Q.—Upon what have you formed this opinion? Have you heard something said? A.—Mr. Cook asked me why I was going to appear in the case of Mr. Lepine. I said that I had seen the work that he was doing, and told him that it was on that account that I was going there. He said to me: "Why are you doing that? You will do quite as well to remain at your work."

Q.—That was before the Lepine trial? A.—Yes, sir; the case had commenced, but the trial had not begun.

Q.—Who dismissed you? A.—Mr. Cook himself—Mr. Willy Cook, junior, the overseer.

Q.—What did he say to you when he dismissed you? A.—He said: "There, here's your time. I pay you off to-day."

Q.—Did he say to you to go? A.—Yes; he told me to go away.

Q.—Did he tell you why? A.—No; he gave me no reason, and I do not see any other reason than that I have just mentioned.

Q.—He did not give you any? A.—He did not give me any.

Q.—Have you relatives who worked in the Hochelaga Factory? A.—I had two who worked there—two sisters.

Q.—In what mill? A.—At the St. Anne's.

Q.—How long did they work there? A.—One worked since the same time as I did, that is to say six months; and the other for about three months.

Q.—They were also dismissed? A.—Yes; they were both dismissed.

Q.—Were you there when they were dismissed? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—It was Mr. Cook who dismissed them? A.—Yes; the same who dismissed me.

Q.—Were you there when Mr. Cook spoke to them? A.—I was not present at their work, but my sisters came and told me.

Q.—Are they also employed in the other factory? A.—No. The superintendent, Daniel Cook, cleaned them out of the other factory.

Q.—Did you pay any fines while you were in the factory? A.—There were only two pay-days at which I did not pay fines. On the other pay-days I always paid them.

Q.—In what department were you employed? A.—In the spinning room.

Q.—Why were you made to pay fines? A.—I once asked Willy Cook, jr., and he said to me that he did not know why.

Q.—Was it on account of work badly done? A.—He never made me pay for work badly done, because I always did the work properly; as well as I was able to do.

Q.—Do you say that when you found upon your envelope or envelopes a fine or fines to pay, they had not warned you during the week that you had to pay such fines? A.—No; not at all.

(Translation.)

DAME SARAH FONTAINE, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are the mother of the last witness? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You had two other daughters who worked in the cotton factories? A.—Yes.

Q.—When did your two other daughters enter the service of the Hudson (Hochelaga) Company? A.—They entered it about fifteen days ago. They had always worked previously in the St. Anne factory.

Q.—When did your two daughters enter the St. Anne factory—the first time that

they went there? A.—Before the trial of Lepine. The trial was going on. It was something like three weeks.

Q.—That was the first time they entered the service of the company? A.—Yes.

Q.—Were they dismissed from the St. Anne mill? A.—Yes; they were dismissed from the St. Anne mill.

Q.—Why? A.—Because they did not do their work as required.

Q.—They then entered the Hudon mill? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Were they taken into the Hudon factory without any information about them being obtained from the St. Anne mill? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Were they dismissed from the Hudon mill? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you know for what reason? A.—Yes; I know why.

Q.—Tell it to us. A.—I had asked the place from Mr. Jackson, the "boss." He said to me, "Send your two daughters to work in the spinning room." It was on this day I sent my two daughters. When the trial of Lepine came off my two daughters asked leave, and, having obtained it, went to give evidence in that case. They then returned to the Hudon factory. Then one of the big girls was in the St. Anne factory, and the second overseer, who was Mr. Max Karn, struck my girl.

Q.—Do you wish to say that it was one of your daughters who worked in the Hudon factory who was in the St. Anne mill? A.—Yes.

Q.—She then was able to leave her work? A.—It was at the time she was not working. She had obtained leave of absence to give her evidence. After that, took place the trial of Max Karn for having struck my daughter. After the trial of Max Karn was over, the two girls went to resume work in the Hudon factory, and then, by permission of Mr. Jackson, the second overseer gave them work; but when eight o'clock came, he said to the girls, "Take your things and go. You appeared in the case against Max Karn." I was not there when this took place; but I spoke to Mr. Jackson on behalf of my daughters, and he said that himself to me. I subsequently went to Mr. Jackson, and asked him, "Why did you dismiss my daughters? I have need of their assistance in order to live." He replied, "They went against Mr. Max Karn, and Mr. Cook does not wish me to employ them. Outside of this they are good girls at their work, and were well fitted for their work."

Q.—They were not given fifteen days notice? A.—No.

Q.—Did they pay any fines the last week they remained there? A.—At the Hudon factory my daughters did not pay any fines; but the young one, who was fifteen years old when she worked in the St. Anne factory, paid fines of \$1.80 cents and 80 cents.

(The witness produced pay envelopes with the fines written on them.)

Mr. * * * , Montreal, Stairbuilder, sworn.

I appear here as representing the carpenters and joiners.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How long have you worked at the business in Montreal? A.—Quite a number of years.

Q.—Have wages increased of late years? A.—They have increased slightly. The first place I worked at in this city I received one dollar and ten cents a day—ten hours work. I now receive two dollars and twenty-five cents a day.

Q.—What are the average wages? A.—Fifteen cents per hour.

Q.—Have you ever made a calculation of how many complete weeks you are employed in Montreal in a year? A.—I can give you the days. If he works all the days he possibly can he would work thirty days a month. By taking off twelve days for the time that he would lose in winter that is two hundred and eighty-eight days. We work from day-light to dark.

Q.—That is supposing he worked every day he could work? A.—Yes; every day he could work.

Q.—Now can you tell us what are the average number of days that a man does work in a year? A.—I could not give an average. I might give an account of myself personally.

Q.—Do you belong to any society? A.—Yes; I belong to several societies.

Q.—Do you keep what is called in the west an "Out of work Book"? A.—No.

Q.—Then you will not have a record of the number of days a man is out of work in the winter. Is it difficult for a first-class workman to get employment in Montreal? A.—Not at present.

Q.—Is there a tendency in Montreal to take on a good man, and put an inferior man on the bench with him? A.—Well, as far as my experience goes in Montreal, that is the regular thing.

Q.—What percentage of the workmen of Montreal can take the details of plans and drawings on an 8th scale, and take their work off of it? A.—I would have to allow a good margin, twenty-five (25) per cent. My own private opinion is that it is much less.

Q.—How do they manage in a shop where only twenty-five per cent can take the work off the board? A.—Usually they have a first-class foreman, and he usually works out the details himself. What we call drafting on the board the exact sizes of the work. The man has nothing to do but to look on the board and mark off his work on the line. There is a man on the board on the opposite side from me that does not know his alphabet yet.

Q.—Out of this twenty-five per cent., how many of them would be mechanics that have learned their trade outside of Montreal? A.—I can only speak as far as the English carpenters go. Not being able to speak French it is very hard to get particulars of the French part, and there are very few English carpenters in Montreal—they go west or to the States.

Q.—And out of the twenty-five per cent. that can take the details on a small scale, how many of them have learned their trade in Montreal and elsewhere? A.—That is a question that is very hard for me to answer.

Q.—If apprentices either before going to learn a trade or while they were learning a trade, were taught the technical part of the trade, would it improve the standing of the mechanic? A.—Certainly; because in our trade, particularly, it requires a very good knowledge of geometry in my particular branch of the trade, and there are very few who know the first principles of it.

Q.—Do you consider it essential for a good mechanic to know geometry? A.—I do.

Q.—Also mechanical drawing and mensuration? A.—I do.

Q.—Do you know that these subjects are taught in schools here? A.—No; I do not know that. There is one school where they teach drawing. That is the Government School on Saint Gabriel Street, but I do not think that school is any way sufficient for the purposes intended.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition of the workshops in Montreal? A.—Well, they are very bad. That is speaking entirely of hand working shops; I am not speaking of factories. The factories I consider very fair, because, when bosses have got machinery they are going to take care of it; they do not care a "rap" for the men.

Q.—What about the small shops? A.—The small shops are very bad. Any ramshackle of a building is taken for a carpenter's shop; they are very unsuitable, and have not sufficient or adequate conveniences. I know of one shop where there are no conveniences whatever.

Q.—Have the men ever taken any steps in the matter themselves? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Are there any Unions in the city of Montreal—any Carpenter's Unions in the city of Montreal? A.—Yes; there are two besides the one I belong to. There

was one English and one French, and I believe the English and French formed another.

Q.—Do the workmen generally take advantage of, and join these societies? A.—Ours only commenced last July, and we have done very fairly. But I think, for my part, the men of this city are not educated up sufficiently to know the advantages they may enjoy by joining them.

Q.—Do you think the carpenters of Montreal, by enrolling themselves members of these societies, would benefit themselves? A.—I believe they would.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Can you tell us anything about the condition of workingmens' houses?

A.—I can tell you about my own private house.

Q.—Is that in a good sanitary condition? A.—At the present time, it might be considered so; but it has not always been so.

Q.—What has been the matter with it? A.—When I first went into it, four years ago—it is a wooden tenement—the only drain in the house connected with the sink, an old wooden drain, and it was not trapped between the main sewer and the sink. There was no trap whatever where the connection should be from the sink pipe to the drain. It was an upright box four inches square, and without a pipe in the centre—without any trap whatever. The Sanitary Inspector inspected it once, and the landlord had to put in a tile drain. The wooden drain had been there for years, and when they went to remove it there was no box left—it had rotted away; it was so impregnated with night soil as to be something abominable, and instead of taking away the soil as they should have done, it was left there, and has been left there to this day. Not one shovelful has been taken out; and I believe, for my own part, that to no other cause but that is to be attributed the loss of one of my children from diphtheria. I had my wife and three children all down with it, and I only escaped myself. I lost one child, as I believe, through the unsanitary state of the cellar.

Q.—Is such a state of things common in Montreal? A.—I think so. I do not believe there is a single wooden house in the city but what has been in the same condition. The last few years—since the small-pox epidemic—the Sanitary Committee (Board of Health) has made things a little better. My private opinion is that the Federal Government should take it in hand as regards the sanitary condition of the city, and not leave it in the hands of provincial or municipal authorities altogether. We are governed entirely too much by people whose pecuniary interest it is (in their opinion) to lease houses costing them as little as possible, at a very high rental; and the great majority of these landlords are utterly ignorant, or affect to be, of sanitary laws.

Q.—Under what article of the Constitution is the Federal Government going to do this? A.—Well, I do not understand the Constitution of this country very well, and I am not a lawyer; I am simply an intelligent workingman. But at least, in my mind, in the Old Country the Government has authority to compel the sanitary authorities of a town to give in regular reports annually as to the condition of the cities and towns. Something should be done by Government, independent of civic control. When the small-pox epidemic was so severe, the railway companies running west and to the States, acting under the advice of the Provincial or State Governments, compelled all parties to prove that they were vaccinated by ocular demonstration of a physician, or be vaccinated on the spot, or else return at once to the Province of Quebec. Otherwise the disease would have spread much more than it did spread; and I contend that the Government should step in before matters come to such a pass.

GEORGE BROWN, Montreal, Stevedore, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How long have you been a Stevedore in the City of Montreal? A.—Twelve or fourteen years.

Q.—Have you ever done business in any other port than Montreal? A.—Yes; in New York and Boston.

Q.—Are you familiar with the coal hands and grain shippers there? A.—Yes.

Q.—How do the prices there compare with the prices paid in Montreal? A.—Five years ago grain trimmers received twenty-five cents an hour, and for general purposes, general cargoes, twenty cents an hour. The working day is as long in Baltimore as it is in Montreal. A steamer carrying one hundred thousand bushels of grain, will by elevator be loaded there in fifteen hours fully—it will complete a bulk cargo; while here it will take at least three days to load the same ship here with the same cargo.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Would there be any difference in the pay? A.—That is what I was going to say. The difference in the pay would be considerable. They pay here for trimming grain twenty cents (20c.) an hour.

Q.—And for general work how much? A.—Twenty cents.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—What lines are you mostly engaged in here? A.—The Dominion Line, the Thompson Line, and some of the lines that go to Sydney.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How much do you say they received four years ago? A.—Twenty cents an hour.

Q.—Twenty cents an hour in Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—Well, for shovelling coal what did they get? A.—I mean generally twenty cents an hour. But they have made a difference in coal. They have raised it to thirty cents an hour.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—What would a steady man earn, by steady work; not to work so as to injure himself? A.—A man who is steady and sober has as much work as he wants to do. He can work every day.

Q.—What is the longest hours you have known them to work continuously on vessels? A.—Thirty hours.

Q.—Continuously? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that optional? A.—Yes; they do not like to be off a vessel. When they begin on a vessel, they like to work on it until it is finished loading.

Q.—Do you consider that it would be any benefit to these men to be organized? A.—No.

Q.—Do many of them belong to an organization? A.—No.

Q.—Do you know anything about it? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are you a member of it? You need not answer unless you like. A.—That is a question I would rather not answer. As far as the benefits go, I think that they are equal. The man who belongs to it gets his twenty to thirty cents, and the man who does not gets his twenty to thirty cents, so that it does not make any difference to the work of the men.

Q.—In what condition is the machinery for loading and unloading vessels frequenting this port? A.—Well, practical men, doing business on the wharves, such as stevedores, have their tools and everything in first-class order. It is as much to the stevedores' interest as to the men's, to have their tools in first-class order. If he consults his own interest, he has them in good order—very much more so—because if he is found to be responsible for an accident, he will have to pay for it.

Q.—Have you ever known any accidents to occur from defective machinery? A.—I never had any accidents from defective machinery; but once, and that was a link of a chain got worn out—the people did not notice it—and a beam fell down, hurting a man, but it did not do him much harm.

Q.—Do you know of attempts being made, on the part of the men, to insist on a certain number of men being engaged when working in the hold of a vessel? A.—Yes; that is in a coal cargo—(8) eight men below.

Q.—Do you consider that demand just or unjust? A.—There are times when you do not require that number, and it would be very much more satisfactory to the employer for him to put down the number he likes.

Q.—When you hire your men, do you give them to understand that a certain amount of their pay will be kept back for insurance? A.—That is an understood thing in large firms. When a man comes to work for me, he is very soon told by the other men that, while we give so much a day or hour, that at the end of the week so much is deducted—so much is taken off for insurance—and that if they get hurt they receive four dollars a week during the season of navigation, if idle during that time through injury.

Q.—Have you ever found any objection, any feeling amongst the men, for being obliged to insure? A.—Yes; there might be a few now and then who kick against it.

Q.—What amount do you generally keep off those men for that purpose? A.—One per cent.

Q.—And that insurance exists just as long as they are in your employ? A.—Yes; that continues just as long as they are working in my employ.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Could these men insure elsewhere, if they got work at the same rate, in the same Company? A.—Well, I do not know about that.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—This is intended to apply while working on the vessels, and in your employ? A.—Yes.

Q.—If he gets hurt, while in your employ, he is insured up to the close of navigation, and no longer? A.—No; that is all.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Are we to understand that he is insured only as long as he works for you? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What you mean is, if he gets hurt during the year he works for you, he gets an allowance for the remainder of the season of navigation; if unable to work, he gets a weekly allowance for the remainder of the season of navigation? A.—Yes.

Q.—And he is only insured against injury while working for you? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Does he pay in the same amount of money every year? A.—Yes.

Q.—And he is only insured against injury while working for you? A.—Yes; he cannot get hurt when he is not working.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—Supposing he insures with you, and pays you the required amount, would he be insured to-morrow if he did not work, and got hurt? A.—That is a question the Company never explained to me.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—Is this the way you interpret the Policy of the Company. You insure them just as long as they work with you. When they cease to work for you, the Insurances ceases, and the payment ceases? A.—That is as I understand it; that is the way with all the large offices.

Q.—Is it any advantage to the Stevedores to insure them? A.—Not a particle.

Q.—Then it is actually a benefit to the men? A.—Of course.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Now as to the prices to be made in New York, and Boston, and Montreal—in one word, which do you consider are the better off—the men who work here at twenty cents an hour, or the men who work in New York and Boston at thirty cents an hour? A.—I think the men who work here are infinitely better off in various ways. You can get a house here for thirty dollars a month that you would pay ninety dollars a month for in New York and smaller houses in a similar ratio. A man here who is steady and industrious can live in a nice self contained house or tenement, whereas in New York he is compelled to live in a large uncomfortable tenement house of six, seven, and eight stories. While the men here are well treated, receive steady wages, and regular work, and are very comfortable if they take care of their wages, there, they oftentimes are compelled to wait for work, and their work is not so steady.

Q.—You are familiar with the purchasing of wares there are you not? A.—Yes; clothing and so forth.

Q.—The wares which you purchased there what did you pay for them. For instance, take a coat? A.—A coat that you pay here twenty dollars for, you pay sixty dollars for it there. A pair of shoes that you buy here for three dollars, you have to pay ten dollars for there. A hat that you would pay two dollars and a-half for here you would pay six dollars for there.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Now about coal oil? A.—Well; I do not know about that.

Q.—That is an article in common use? A.—It is.

Q.—How much coal oil would a man use in a year? A.—I have not any idea. I can tell you how much we burn in our work in a short time. We use a cask a week.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—The shoes that you speak of are made to order. They are not ready made? A.—No.

Q.—The same with the coats? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know anything about the wharves of Montreal—the docks? A.—Do you mean the condition of the wharves.

Q.—Yes. A.—Yes; It is a pretty rough place in the spring and fall, and in the wet season it is a pretty hard place to work. It is hard to deliver and receive goods without getting them soiled.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—The gear that is used here in the loading and unloading of vessels, is it used

here only, or do the vessels carry it to England and use it also there? A.—The vessels that I work on, they carry their iron runners and chain “falls.”

Q.—The gear that is used here is used also in England? A.—They use their steam purchases and runners—and chain falls in England, and also here.

Q.—And are they examined in England? A.—Yes. And if anything is wrong it is taken ashore and repaired.

Q.—As a mere matter of economy would any of the leading lines running to this port retain in daily use any gear that was not in first class working order? A.—No. It would not paid them to damage cargo by imperfect gear or injure the men, and thus run the risk of law suits.

Q.—As a matter of economy would any of the leading lines of steamships employ anything but first class machinery? A.—I do not think it. I think it would be very seldom indeed that they would be found using anything that was not in the best of order.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—Do the men work at night time? A.—Yes. All night sometimes.

Q.—What pay do they get? A.—The same at night as during the day, excepting Sundays, after twelve o'clock on Saturday night we pay double time; and we pay double time sometimes during the week at night. There is no extra time allowed at the present time in New York—no extra time for night work.

Q.—Do you pay the men for the time they are putting up the apparatus for working at the ship? A.—As a rule we do, but it takes such a short time to get the apparatus in order that it is hardly worth while. It takes them but a very short time—a matter of fifteen or twenty minutes.

Q.—But it is work, the same as unloading a vessel is it not? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any reason to give us to why they should not be paid for it universally? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do you get your men who insure to sign a contract by which they give up or cancel any other right they may have to claim compensation for injuries received by an accident? A.—No.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Do you help your men to load and unload vessels? A.—In what way. What do you mean by “helping them.”

Q.—Taking a hand yourself in helping the men. A.—No. I do not. I do not think any practical man would do such a thing. That is, if he understood his business.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—I suppose in loading a vessel or unloading a vessel you employ just the number of men that you consider are sufficient to get around the cargo. A.—Yes. Too many would be as bad as too few. They would be in each other's way.

(Translation.)

JEAN BENJAMIN VILLEY, Saddler, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You are the foreman of Messrs. Heney & Lacroix at the Reformatory? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How are the men paid in your factory? Every week or every fortnight?
A.—Payment should be made every fortnight.

Q.—At the present time how are they paid? Every eight days or every fifteen days? A.—Every fifteen days.

Q.—Are they paid their full pay, or is the pay of several days kept back? A.—The pay of three days is kept back.

Q.—How long has this been kept in arrears? Was it during the summer? A.—Some two or three years, perhaps. The practice was introduced only because the men used to leave us at the busiest season.

Q.—Do you know whether the men of the other departments—the blacksmiths for example—are paid every week or every fortnight? A.—I could not tell you; I know only my own department.

Q.—Are there some men who are paid every eight days? A.—As for me I pay out of my own pocket, men who are in want of money, but I speak only for my own department.

Q.—In your department are the men paid every eight days? A.—Sometimes, as I have said. I pay them myself with my own money.

Q.—Is any money retained on their pay? A.—No; I pay everything entirely. The pay is due on Saturday and the payment is made on the following Wednesday. There are some men who prefer waiting a fortnight, and others who are better pleased to be paid by the week.

Q.—Are not twenty-five cents retained on the wages of such as ask to be paid before pay day? A.—That is a thing that I myself do voluntarily, with the people who are in want of money. I go and fetch my money to pay them and that gives me only 25 cents to go and fetch the money and come back. Why, only to-day, there came a poor man, that is a man who earns a wage, who wanted to go to Quebec to see his sick mother. He asked me for money; and rather than go to the shop he preferred coming to me who was nearer and I paid him.

Q.—You were a workman at the Reformatory before becoming a foreman? A.—Yes, sir; I worked there a little while.

Q.—Is it not true that while you were working there you engaged your comrades to make a request on Messrs. Heney & Lacroix for payment every eight days? A.—No, sir.

Q.—But did you not, along with other men, take steps to have your pay every eight days? A.—No; not at all.

Q.—Did you not ask Messrs. Heney & Lacroix to pay their men every eight days as is done in the other departments of the Reformatory? A.—I have already stated that once or twice, or once rather, I think.

Q.—Did the Messrs. Heney & Lacroix refuse this? A.—They told me that it had always been the rule in our department to pay every fifteen days.

Q.—Did these gentlemen tell you that they liked better to keep up the ancient system? A.—Certainly.

Q.—Do the Messrs. Heney & Lacroix, on pay-days, have the money done up in envelopes? A.—No, sir; I myself go after the money. They give me a cheque, and I go to get the money at the bank. I myself put them in the envelopes, or I give the money to the men.

Q.—It is not, then, the Messrs. Heney & Lacroix who make up the envelopes? It is you? A.—It is not they, but I.

Q.—Has it happened sometimes that you paid the men on Monday instead of Wednesday? A.—That happened through my fault, on account of the amount of work that I had. I am alone to carry on a big business. There are thirty or forty boys working by the piece; and, furthermore, I have to keep the books and the wages in order.

Q.—At what hour are the doors of your department closed in the morning? A.—At five minutes past seven.

Q.—At what hour are they opened again to admit the men who are late? For

instance, a man who arrives at ten minutes past seven, at what hour can he get inside the factory? A.—The men who are late may come in at nine o'clock. Lately, I have had so much work, and my boys have been so bad, that I laid down a rule. The men can come in up to five minutes past seven, and after that, if they have not come in at five minutes past seven, I re-open the door for them at nine o'clock.

Q.—Before you had made this rule, how did the men come in? A.—They came in at all hours; but since I have been ill, and obliged to go out into the country, I made this rule.

(Translation.)

STANISLAS PAQUETTE, Joiner, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You are a working carpenter? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that foreign workmen have been engaged by contract? A.—No; all that I know about employment, it is not directly that they engage workmen abroad, but in the country districts below Quebec, in Quebec, and St. Hyacinthe. During the press of work they are brought here, and they are not competent workmen.

Q.—Are they not competent workmen because they do not understand the work that is done in Montreal, or because they do not know their business? A.—In general, they are people who have not served an apprenticeship. They do not pay the best wages to these people as they do to town workmen, and they can also work cheaper than townspeople, because they are people who have no families, and do not pay any taxes here. They live, perhaps, with relatives or friends, put themselves, three or four in a room, or with friends, as I have just said, and they board themselves.

Q.—Are there a certain number of Quebec workmen in town? A.—Principally in the summer season there are a great number. They return in the autumn. I have known people even who have discharged fathers of families here; in order to employ these people.

Q.—Is there a system of apprenticeship for carpenters? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you not think that it would be more advantageous to have a system of apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Would you be in favor of an apprenticeship by indenture? A.—Yes, sir; they complain, at the present time, that there are not good workmen. If there were a system of bound apprenticeship they would make better workmen.

Q.—Did you serve your apprenticeship? A.—No, sir; I served eight or ten months in the country. All that I know, I have learned at one place and another.

Q.—How many years has the system of apprenticeship been abolished among carpenters? A.—I cannot say exactly, but I know that since I have been at the trade, that is to say, fifteen years, I have no knowledge of any system of apprenticeship.

Q.—You have certainly worked by the side of workmen who had served their apprenticeship? A.—Yes.

Q.—In your opinion those workmen, who served their apprenticeship, are they really more capable than those who have not served such apprenticeship? A.—Yes, sir; they are more capable in this sense. Masters make it their duty to teach them. They know more of drawing, detail, and plans. They can take the details upon a plan, and trace it on a plank. Ordinarily, the plan is made small, and the architect ought to go into the details at length upon paper, and the foreman of the shop, taking it from the smallest plan, details it upon a plank. It is the custom of workmen in the shops to work out the details on a plank.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Is it the custom to give to a man the details of the work he has to do upon the bench where he works? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How long a time do you think an apprentice ought to serve? A.—Three years is sufficiently long.

Q.—You believe that, at the end of three years, an apprentice would be capable—not to be a perfect workman—but he would be able to earn his livelihood, and do good work? A.—Yes.

Q.—To your knowledge, how long are the hours of labor, in Montreal, of competent carpenters? A.—Ten hours in summer, and in winter it would be as long as daylight lasted, when they do not work by gaslight.

Q.—You are paid by the hour? A.—Yes, sir. When we work ten hours in winter, there are shops where we are made to pay for the gas. They generally charge for gas, or lamps, ten cents per hour per man. I even know shops where they employ not only carpenters, but machinists and laborers, and charge the entire gas bill to the carpenters. There are shops where there are 112 or 120 men, and out of these there are, perhaps, 30 or 40 carpenters, and they make these 30 or 40 carpenters pay for the entire lighting.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How many hours do you work by artificial light—gas or lamps—each day? A.—The longest is two hours.

Q.—What is the average time? A.—A half hour.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—On this average of half an hour they charge you ten cents per hour? A.—Exactly. They charge, from All Saints' Day to the month of April, ten cents per day. They only give full wages to a man from the month of April.

Q.—Do you mean to say that they regularly take from you 60 cents per week, from All Saints Day to the month of April? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you speak of the shop where you work, or for several shops in Montreal? A.—In particular, the shop where I work.

Q.—Only the shop in which you at present work? A.—At present, yes; but as a general thing, it is done principally in the eastern part of Montreal.

Q.—What is the salary, or what are the salaries—if there are several prices—of working carpenters? A.—On the average it is 15 to 16 cents per hour.

Q.—What is the lowest salary that you know of? A.—It is 13 cents an hour.

Q.—And the highest? A.—The highest is 20 cents; but the 20 cents is for people who have charge—foremen, for instance. There are a few who make 25 cents.

Q.—Can you tell the Commission if the salaries in Montreal are as high as in Ontario, or in the United States? A.—I may say no; they are not as high.

Q.—Do you know the prices paid in Ontario and the United States? A.—I have never been in Ontario, but I speak according to what I have heard.

Q.—You have never worked in the United States? A.—No.

Q.—Working-carpenters and joiners, are they on a footing of equality, as regards salary, with other workmen engaged in buildings? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Why? Do you know? A.—The reason is that working carpenters have no union, and no understanding with the employers. Moreover, I know that, at the present time, the working carpenters and joiners have been united as such for some time; but to day they are not willing to recognize them.

Q.—Do you wish to say recognized by the employers? A.—Recognized by the employers.

Q.—Have you made approaches to the employers in this matter? A.—Yes. We demanded an increase for the Spring and we only received unfavourable replies.

Q.—You have read the testimony given by certain employers here, who have said that there were few good carpenters in Montreal? Can you tell us, if, in your opinion, that is true and why then there are so few? A.—It is the fact. There are only a few, and the only reason, on account of which there are not good workmen, is that they are not sufficiently paid.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that good workmen have left Montreal to go and work elsewhere? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Were they fathers of families? A.—They were fathers of families.

Q.—Who would certainly have preferred to stay here, if they could have obtained good salaries? A.—Naturally. A man who has five or six children to maintain, at 15 cents an hour, I can assure you has little enough.

Q.—When you do not work by gas, do they charge you the same 60 cents per week? A.—No; but I remember, five or six years ago—it was nine years—I worked in a shop where they did not work by gas; but they cut the wages just the same.

Q.—What is the class of houses generally occupied by carpenters—by your associates? A.—It is most common; indeed, it is a general rule that if you want to find a carpenter it is in the lanes or at the back of a yard.

Q.—Why? Because they do not earn enough? A.—Because they do not earn enough, naturally. They live in houses that have no foundations—stuck upon posts. I may tell you, indeed, that where I now live we feel the wind coming through the planks.

Q.—Carpenters and joiners are they obliged to have what is called a tool chest? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How much does a complete tool chest cost, on the average? A.—Upon an average from \$100 to \$125.

Q.—What does it cost per year for maintenance—to replace tools etc? A.—According to my experience it must cost a man who works in outside buildings \$10 to \$15 per year.

Q.—When you work on what you call jobbing do you furnish your own tools? A.—We furnish our own tools everywhere.

Q.—When you go to work in a house, do you carry with you your tool chest? A.—Not always, sir; we have what we call a tool basket.

Q.—As a rule, do you leave a certain number of your tools in the shop, or houses where you work? A.—In the shops, principally; we leave about three-fourths of our tools in the shop.

Q.—When these shops are burned, as frequently happens, does your employer reimburse you for your tools? A.—No, sir; never to my knowledge.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that employers have taken policies on the tools of their workmen, and have not reimbursed them? A.—I cannot say.

Q.—What is the sanitary condition, generally, of carpenters' shops? A.—In general they are cold, very cold.

Q.—Do they make fires in winter? A.—They make fires, yes; but the reason for which they make the fire is rather to heat the glue than to warm the journeymen.

Q.—Is it cold enough to hurt the work as well as the workmen? A.—Oh, yes; I assure you that we have to blow our hands many times a day when the storm comes through the cracks, for there is only a single row of boards around the shops.

Q.—Are the closets inside the shops or outside of them? A.—Ordinarily, they are outside the shops. In the shops where it is all handwork, principally, it is outside the shops, but there are some where it is inside the shop.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that working carpenters make many savings? A.—They make more debts than savings. As for myself, this winter I got into debt more than \$35.

Q.—When you work, in winter, in houses which are being constructed, how do you take your meal, at noon? A.—Generally, we take our meal as we go along.

Q.—Why? A.—Because it is too cold. We have no warm room in which to take our meal. Then we have to eat frozen bread, frozen meat, and more often than otherwise, we have no water.

Q.—Do they forbid you making a little fire outside with the cuttings, or shavings? A.—They often forbid that.

Q.—Is it for fear of fire? A.—It is not altogether that. It is principally when the plastering is done, and they wish to dry the plaster with the cold. They do not give us a stove which makes no smoke. Then, should we make a fire, we discolor the walls. That is principally the reason for which they forbid us to make fires.

Q.—How are the journeymen carpenters paid; by the week, or by the fortnight? A.—Some are paid weekly, others fortnightly. There are some who have to run after their employer.

Q.—When you work upon a house, in course of construction, are you obliged to go to the shop to get your money, or do they pay you on the spot? A.—That depends; there are bosses who make us go to the shop, and others who pay us at the building.

Q.—Are you paid pretty regularly? A.—According to what I know, in the manufactories the men are paid tolerably regularly; but, since I have been working outside, I have frequently run from eight to nine hours to be paid, and very often could not find the masters. It has been necessary to wait to Monday and Tuesday.

Q.—That put you to great inconveniences, as a matter of course, to be, on Saturday evening, without money? A.—Naturally; when the wife expects \$7 or \$8 to live upon, and the husband arrives and has not got it, it is not convenient.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that in Montreal some workmen have lost money, on account of the failure of their employers? A.—No.

Q.—When it happens that, for any reason, a workman is discharged, do they pay him at once, before he goes? A.—Not always.

Q.—When do they pay him? A.—Ordinarily they make him wait the fortnight or the week, until pay day.

Q.—What is the percentage of men who can work upon a plan or specification? A.—I will say that there are not more than 20 or 25 per cent.

Q.—What is the reason? A.—It is that there is no system of apprenticeship, and that the workman is not sufficiently instructed.

Q.—Are those men, who know more about the business than the others, better paid? Do they receive a higher salary? A.—Yes; but not proportionately so. They have ten or fifteen cents per day more.

Q.—Why! a man who can work upon a plan is worth more to the employer than another? A.—Yes; in my opinion.

Q.—Do you believe that actual wages are sufficient to enable a man to live honorably, properly, and to bring up his family? A.—No, sir.

Q.—At what age do you think a young man ought to commence his apprenticeship? A.—At 15 to 17 years.

Q.—If he remained at school until the age of 15 years, and learned drawing, that would be very useful, would it not? A.—Yes; principally in our branch, drawing would be very useful.

Q.—If a young man commenced his apprenticeship at 15 years, what would you consider reasonable pay for his apprenticeship? A.—In my opinion, it should be \$3 per week for the first year.

Q.—Would such a young man be worth it? Could he render services equivalent to \$3 per week? A.—Oh, yes; because generally, if there is rough work, it is the young man who does it. It is he who does the errands, piles wood, etc.

Q.—And for the second year? A.—\$4 or \$4.50.

Q.—And for the third year? A.—\$6. At least half the wages of a journeyman.

Q.—Are there many children employed in the lumber industry? A.—In manufactories principally, and in those factories we find children of ten, eleven and twelve years. To my own knowledge, indeed, there was a child of eleven years who cut three of his fingers off with a saw.

Q.—Do you know if this was during his work? A.—During his work.

Q.—Was he playing? A.—He was attending to his work. It was only lack of experience.

Q.—Do you believe they ought to put a child at work near a machine? A.—Certainly not; principally near our machines—for our machines are very dangerous.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—What was the lad doing when he had his fingers cut? A.—He was coigning with coigns the openings of the wind-mill frames to make the talon fit into the mortice.

Q.—Did the foreman or the boss put him there for that purpose? A.—I could not say whether it was the foreman; but certain it is that it was by the orders of the foreman or the master that he was doing that work.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Which is the smallest fraction of an hour for which you received pay? Are you paid, for instance, for ten minutes or a quarter of an hour's work? A.—No.

Q.—Not for half an hour's? A.—No; not to my knowledge.

Q.—Then you are paid only for the full hour of work done? A.—Yes.

Q.—If a man comes in five minutes too late, up to what hour is he debarred from working? A.—He is allowed to work at once. But in a case of my own I was charged for one hour, and yet I had come in on time, only the machinery was already in motion.

Q.—Are there privies established for the hands at work in the building? A.—

No.

(Translation.)

FRANÇOIS G. CAMPEAU, Joiner and Machinist, of Montreal, sworn :

By Mr. HEI BRONNER :—

Q.—You have heard the evidence of the last witness, on the industry of joining and carpentry? Have you anything to say as to the work? A.—What was said was about right.

Q.—You have worked in many saw mills? A.—Yes.

Q.—In your opinion, is the life of the men working in these mills exposed by the manner in which the machinery is set? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Could you give us some explanations? A.—Yes. When they place several dangerous machines facing one another, the one who is opposite is exposed. There is always one man in danger.

Q.—Does it often happen that machinery is placed in these conditions? A.—Unfortunately, often enough.

Q.—To your knowledge have any accidents happened as a result of the setting of these machines which you speak of? A.—Yes.

Q.—Often? A.—Often enough.

Q.—Have men been rendered incapable of working at their trade on account of wounds received therein? A.—Yes; some have been laid up three weeks.

Q.—Do you know of any men who lost their limbs or their fingers? A.—I know of a man who lost his life.

Q.—Did that happen under your eyes? A.—No. Fifteen days ago a boss was talking with a man at work on a machine and a piece of iron came out of the machine opposite the first and the iron passed through his head.

Q.—What are the machines that you look upon as the most dangerous in your

trade? A.—It is the “sticker,”—the moulding machine and then “the shaper” which makes the round mouldings and archings. Then there is the circular saw.

Q.—Are the men chosen to work these machines generally competent? A.—Not always.

Q.—Are they labourers that are put there? A.—Yes; labourers, and often men who have worked in tobacco are put on them. Even last year there was a man who had worked at Macdonald's and was doing nothing for the time being and he was put on a machine where he had a finger cut off.

Q.—Do you think that these machines, worked by unskilful men, are dangerous, not only to those who propel them, but also for the men employed in the factory? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Where is the wood dried in these factories? A.—In hot rooms, places especially heated by steam.

Q.—As a general rule what is the temperature of these drying rooms? A.—From 90 to 100 degrees.

Q.—Are there men working in the interior of these drying rooms? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are these men obliged to work outside sometimes? A.—Yes, sir; I know of a case which occurred, some time ago during a rainy season. A boss took a man from the drying room and put him in an enclosure to work on a pile of planks.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How long is a man supposed to work in those drying rooms? A.—Two hours, three hours, and when he works in the heating room he opens the window.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—What do they do there? A.—They take in the wood into the heating room and take it out.

Q.—Are you personally aware that men have been taken sick in working at that kind of work? A.—I cannot affirm that men have been made ill by it.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Is the steam shut off when the men work in the drying room? A.—No.

Q.—These gentlemen state that, to their knowledge, the steam is turned off in all the drying rooms which they visited. You are quite positive that you have seen drying rooms where steam went on the whole time that the men were working? A.—The whole time; only the windows were opened.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are your shops heated during the winter? A.—There are flats where the men are pretty well off and others where it is very cold—too cold to work with ease.

Q.—Are there many children working in the saw mills? A.—Yes.

Q.—How old are they in general? A.—From eleven to twelve and thirteen years.

Q.—What do they do? A.—They make them work about the wood pile. They are set opposite a machine to remove the wood issuing from the machine.

Q.—Have you seen any of them placed at the circular saw? A.—Yes.

Q.—In the shops where you have worked, have you seen accidents happening to children working on the machines? A.—Not many accidents, but, to my knowledge, two children had their fingers cut and still another had his fingers cut off by a planer.

Q.—The men that you saw maimed by machinery were they competent men—men well up in the trade? A.—No. They were not men skilful in the use of machinery.

Q.—When an employer discharges one of his men, does he give him a certain number of hours to set his tools to rights? A.—No.

Q.—Do the men employed in these manufactories require as large a number of tools as joiners? A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—Is it within your knowledge that in the mills that were burned the men were recouped for the tools which they left behind and which were destroyed? A.—Oh, no.

Q.—Did the workmen themselves ever make a call upon the employers to have their tools insured? A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—When a man has what is called his box burned up, is he able to continue his trade? A.—Without tools he cannot continue his trade.

Q.—Do you know whether employers ever advance money to their men for the purchase of tools which had been burned in the works? A.—I cannot say positively, only I have heard it said.

28th February, 1888.

(Translation.)

LOUIS GIRARD, Commercial Traveller, representing the firm of Léopold Girard, Manufacturer of Coffins and Coffin Trimmings, of Three Rivers, sworn:

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q. Are you the manager of the Girard establishment? A.—It is I who act exclusively for the house outside.

Q.—Do you know of any arrangement or a combination, in virtue of which Mr. Girard is bound to sell his trimmings to certain individuals of Montreal? A.—To reach the point, I must say, in the first place, that here in Montreal there was a Mr. Kehoe, who did business a little out of the common. Then the coffin makers of Montreal formed themselves into a society, with the view checking him, inasmuch as his movements prevented them from exercising their profession in an honorable way. Then, during the time of the epidemic, they presented a request to the Board of Health here, to the effect that only four hearses should be employed, in order to prevent the spread of the pestilence; and later, the society, getting along well, and having members outside of Montreal, became a more powerful body. And then came complaints of certain members outside the city of Montreal, finding fault with certain wholesale men, whom we supplied with trimmings at the time, furnishing these trimmings in their localities to parties who were not members of the Society, and who stood in the way of its members. We were selling at that time to thirteen tradesmen in Montreal; and as the result of an arrangement that I myself made with the coffin makers, I consented to reduce the number of these tradesmen to five, in order to allow the members of the Association to be better protected.

Q.—These five tradesmen sold only at certain prices? A.—There is no price mentioned.

Q.—But they did sell at certain prices? A.—That is, we happened to supply these five firms to the detriment of another section of tradesmen to whom we used to sell before, and who were also desirous of obtaining these goods as before.

Q.—These five tradesmen sell only to the members of the Association? Do they sell to other parties besides members of the Association? A.—I think they do so.

Q.—These five merchants, do they belong to the Association? A.—Well, that is they are recognized by the Association as parties to whom we can sell perfectly without incurring any blame. However, I am bound to say that the object of the Association is to discontinue, after a certain time, selling completely to tradesmen, excluding them completely, even the five mentioned above. But as the Association is not yet strong enough, we are bound to tolerate.

Q.—So that the coffin makers mean to keep the trade to themselves, and keep out all others? A.—I believe that such was their object. But, from a late interview

with them, I think they would be disposed to leave us our liberty, and allow us to supply goods to all tradesmen, at least for a certain time to come.

Q.—Is it not true that you have received orders from respectable, and well-to-do parties, and that you have declined filling them? A.—Yes, sir; I would instance Mr. Letourneux, here present.

Q.—For what reason? A.—For this very simple reason; first, that we feared to be blamed by the Association, and we wanted to stand by our word of honour. Having an agreement, not by writing, indeed, but a verbal one, with the Association. This is the ground on which we refused.

Q.—It follows, then, that if the Association has the exclusive right of purchasing from you, it can charge whatever it likes? A.—There is nothing specified on that head.

Q.—If they have the exclusive right, they certainly will sell at such prices as will suit them, will they not? A.—I cannot say what they will do.

Q.—Are there other factories of coffin trimmings in the Province of Quebec? A.—In the Province of Quebec we are alone.

Q.—Are there any in the Province of Ontario? A.—There are four in the Province of Ontario.

Q.—Have you any communication with the Province of Ontario? A.—Yes, sir, we are “combined” with the factories of Ontario.

Q.—Did they not threaten you if you did not enter the “combine”? A.—In the first place, before this “combine” existed, the prices were so much lowered by competition that the rivalry had become ruinous, because then the competition was in the wholesale, and nowise in the retail trade.

Q.—On what condition did the five wholesale tradesmen enter into arrangements with you? A.—The conditions, at the time, were that we should supply them with the goods, on condition that they would not retail these goods in the city of Montreal.

Q.—They could sell to parties outside of the city? A.—Outside of the city, or in the Maritime Provinces. There are three chief English firms here, and these three leading English firms sell for the most part in the Maritime Provinces.

Q.—Have you one or two regulations, two distinct regulations, for the coffins and for the trimmings? A.—On coffins we are combined as to the wholesale price, and on trimmings we have no “combine.” We ask the price that we like.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—According to a clause in your by-laws, a party making application for admittance, after a certain date in 1885, that application must be invested with the approval of three members residing in neighborhood of the party making application. Is it within your knowledge that any member has refused to endorse such application? A.—For my part, I cannot say that I know of any. I know that members have been admitted, and I believe that other parties have been refused; but I cannot speak from personal knowledge.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Are there fines, or some other penalty imposed if you sell to parties not belonging to the Association? A.—In the event of our violating our rules, we should be warned that if we continued that way of doing things the door would be closed on us. This Association, in the Province of Quebec, is combined with that of Ontario, and that of Ontario is composed of 475 members, whilst ours contains only seventy-five. If, by an understanding that we have between the manufacturers and the coffin makers, any party should violate these rules, he would be liable to a penalty. I have said there is a connection between the Association of Quebec, and the Association of Ontario. There is a connection in thiswise. The two associations are separate, but we are obliged to protect one another.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Are you favorably disposed to that kind of trade, or were you forced into that combine? A.—Up to date I cannot say that this system has been favorable to us.

Q.—Thus, so far as you are concerned, you do not demand that it shall be maintained? A.—There is this association of ours which we are willing to protect, but for the present I do not believe that the association is strong enough to hold the wholesale trade. That is my present notion.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Has the price of goods risen since the formation of this combine? A.—No, sir; I think they have lowered.

Q.—Is there a similar combine in the United States? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Has this any connection with the one in Canada? A.—Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Then you are three companies, Quebec, Ontario and the United States? A.—In Ontario (this did not happen in Quebec, but only in Ontario) there are certain members who wished to get goods from the United States, and, on complaint of the Secretary of the Ontario Association, they were debarred from getting the goods from the United States.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Where did the undertakers of funerals, not belonging to the association, procure their goods? A.—As to coffins, there is a coffin factory at London, Ontario, independent of the association; and as to trimmings, a wholesale merchant of Montreal, here, was taken to task for having sold them goods. Some people may fancy that this association is the work of the Knights of Labor; as for me, I do not think that it is the work of the Knights of Labor in the Province of Quebec. Personally I am opposed to the Knights of Labor.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—Are you aware that there is a coffin which is called "The Hospital Coffin"? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the reduced price of a coffin of that class which is generally sold for \$18? A.—It is hard for me to go into the prices of the coffin makers; it is altogether out of my line, except as it may concern the wholesale trade. As to the retail trade, prices, etc., we have nothing to say.

Q.—What is the price of the most common trimming, such, for instance, as handles used on an \$18 coffin? A.—This is a point to which it might be out of place to reply. I am of opinion that these things should be left to the retailing undertakers themselves. I should like to answer; but I think it is outside of our business.

Q.—What I should like to know is the cost of production as compared with the price paid by the consumer? A.—All that I can say is that we never have taken advantage of the Association to raise prices; on the contrary, I think that the prices have been lessened. I believe that these articles cost more formerly than at present.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Are there not a great number of respectable undertakers of funerals outside of the Association? A.—Assuredly, but all the same they have not the necessary practical knowledge.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do the undertakers of funerals pass an examination? A.—I think that this is done in Ontario; but, in Quebec, we are not so far advanced as all that.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—As to the undertakers of funerals who are not members of the Association here, at Montreal, do you think that they are not engaged in a lawful occupation? A.—Here, in Montreal, there are no undertakers of funerals outside of the Association. They are all members.

(Translation.)

DAMASSE LAFORTUNE, Baker, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You have the opinion of Dr. Fafard on the question of night work done by bakers? A.—Yes, sir. (Letter in question laid on the table.)

MONTREAL, 27th February, 1888.

I, the undersigned, certify that the night work done by bakers is very injurious to health. A change in this respect would be a humanitarian reform.

N. FAFARD, M.D.

(Translation.)

CHARLES D'AMOUR, of Montreal, agent for the "Doncaster Sewing Machine," of New York, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—What have you to tell us? A.—The company which I represent is the company that sells sewing machines, the highest of any in Montreal.

Q.—At how much do you sell them? A.—\$70, \$75 and \$80 on time. Five dollars a month generally.

Q.—How much do these machines cost you? A.—They cost us laid down here about \$28 to \$30 and upwards.

Q.—These prices are the prices laid down for you by the New York firm? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You do not know the cost of manufacture? A.—No, sir; I am ignorant of that.

Q.—Do you buy the machines or are you the agent of the company? A.—I buy the machines by the bargain which I make, I buy the machines directly and out right. I wish to make this observation that these machines have a duty to pay, and hence we are bound to sell our machines dearer than those manufactured in Canada.

Q.—What are the duties that you have to pay on these machines? A.—\$3 special tax and 10 per cent *ad valorem*.

Q.—At what price do you sell a machine which costs you \$30 in New York? A.—We sell them at about \$60, \$70 and \$80.

Q.—What makes the difference of prices? A.—That is precisely what I want to tell the Commission. The expenses that we are obliged to incur, the commissions that we are forced to pay to agents, and the ladies whom we are bound to employ to

be able to give satisfaction to customers, that is give lessons and make purchases understand the working of them, and then the losses that we are called upon to undergo,—all these things account for the the differences of prices. We sell a machine payable at \$5 a month, but we are often obliged to take less. We are not going to take people by the throat. We are forced to give easy conditions and the expenses are fearful.

Q.—How long have you been selling these machines? A.—I have been the representative of this factory only one month, but I have been selling sewing machines these seven or eight years. I do not come before you as a man without experience.

Q.—What machine did you sell before this? Were they Canadian machines? A.—The new Williams's.

Q.—Can you remember how many of these new Williams' machines you have sold in eight years? A.—I could not say exactly. I have sold a quantity but could not tell you just the number.

Q.—Do you know how many of these machines, which you sold, the company lost by? A.—I almost, always sold on my own account. Really the machines were sold by myself.

Q.—Have you yourself lost many of these machines? A.—Undoubtedly I have lost some.

Q.—Do you know how many? A.—I could not tell you how many. Now only one word, if you please. If you will allow me, I will come back to the Domestic machine, because I have been requested to tell what I am now about to say. I do not wish to pass for a thief. I wish to say this much, that the machine which I sell is mounted by special machinists and not by children.

Q.—How much did you pay for the new Williams' which you used to sell? A.—Allow me not to answer that because I have at present stopped buying them. I think this is the right thing for me to do, so as to escape reproaches from the Company.

Q.—As you have come here to upset another piece of evidence which was laid before this Commission, and in which the prices were set forth, you should also give your prices? A.—In that case I will do so, for I am interested in Canadian companies as much as in that which I represent. I paid to Williams \$19, \$20 and \$21.

Q.—What did you sell them for? A.—We had different prices—\$40, \$45, \$50 and upwards.

Q.—Was it the same machine that you sold for \$40, \$45, \$50 and upwards? A.—It was the same.

Q.—How far up did you go? A.—Up to \$75, catalogue price.

Q.—What caused this difference of prices? A.—There is this to be said. We are obliged to put down in the catalogues a very high price, because there are the machines for which we are obliged to pay almost extraordinary prices, and these old machines are nearly worthless.

Q.—But when a party had not an old machine to return you and bought a new machine, how did you sell it to them? A.—If the bargain was on time, we sold it as dear as possible.

Q.—Has it ever happened to you to take back machines which you had sold? A.—For my part, very seldom.

Q.—But you have taken some back? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you know how much had been paid on these machines? A.—Sometimes \$5, sometimes \$8, and sometimes more.

Q.—How much more? A.—To my knowledge I took back a machine or two on which I had received \$13, \$14 and \$15.

Q.—Never more? A.—I could not say. At all events it is very seldom that I take back a machine. I do not sell on a deed, but on notes as much as possible.

Q.—Why did you take back the machines when you had the note in your hand? A.—If the people feel disposed to give them to me and are not inclined to continue payment I take them back.

Q.—Do you return the account? A.—We return what we have already received, either the deed or the note. There is no fine for us in taking back the machine.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—You allow nothing for the machine nor for what has been paid on it? A.—No, sir. Parties are free to keep the machine so long as they pay reasonable instalments on it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have you ever sold organs and pianos? A.—I have happened to sell three or four; but it was for cash. It is not my line of business.

Q.—Why do you prefer selling for the same price American machines which cost you \$39 here, instead of Canadian machines which cost you \$19? A.—I am under the impression that the American machines are more lasting.

Q.—How did you come by this impression? A.—Because, having to sell a machine, and that machine being made after the model of the Domestic, I judged that it ought to be about the best machine.

Q.—Are you the sole agent of the Domestic at Montreal? A.—Yes, sir.

FRED. JUDAH, Esq., Advocate and Queen's Counsel, sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Are you proprietor of houses in both ends of the City of Montreal? A.—Yes; east, west and centre.

Q.—Will you tell us what kind of houses you own in the east end? A.—I own a few tenement houses in the east end.

Q.—Did you purchase them or build them? A.—No; I purchased them. They were taken for debt.

Q.—What are they rented for? A.—The tenement houses rent for from three dollars to five dollars a month.

Q.—What rooms do they contain? A.—Three rooms, and some of them have stables; those with stables rent for one dollar a month more—some.

Q.—Do you know anything of the cost of a *saisie gagerie* in those cases under sixty dollars? A.—Well, I do not practice law now. I have not followed the thing up. I know that the costs are pretty high, as far as the Court fees and bailiff's fees are concerned, but I cannot give the details, because I did not follow the thing up.

Q.—What, as a fact, is the amount of these law costs generally, as regards the tenants of the poorer class of houses? A.—I never took any proceedings in that way, because it would cost more to collect the fees than the debts are worth.

Q.—Are these rented generally by the month or year? A.—These tenants pay by the month and rent by the year. I have a gentleman who lets or rents my houses and collects the rents, and I give him ten per cent on collections.

Q.—Your houses in the west end of the city—what class of residences are they? A.—My houses in the west end are mostly cottages for medium tenants, mostly mechanics and bookkeepers. Anything of that class.

Q.—What do they rent for? A.—From ten dollars to fifteen dollars a month. They are self-contained houses all of them. They are self contained houses with baths and water closets in them. I built most of them about fifteen years ago with baths and water closets in them, and I get a nice class of tenants.

Q.—What is the comparison between the rents ten years ago and now? Have they increased or decreased? That would be 1878? A.—They have increased. Previous to 1878 they were about the same rent that they are now, and

when the hard times came they were put down at a much lower rate. Houses that rent for twelve dollars a month now, rented then for eight and ten dollars a month, and so on during the bad times, and then they gradually increased since, not every year, but occasionally, and we have now brought them back to what they were originally.

Q.—Have you built any houses recently? A.—Not for the last ten years—or twelve years.

Q.—Do you know the difference in wages ten years ago and now, as regards houses and the expense of building—the comparison between the “hard times” and the present time? A.—In a great many cases it is nearly doubled. Brick work for instance, which was worth six dollars to six dollars and fifty cents ten or twelve years ago, is twelve now. Masonry is the same. And I remember at that time a good carpenter could be got for \$1.25 a day.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Speaking of brick work, you mean the hundred built in the wall? A.—I am not building now, but I am speaking of the prices.

Q.—Are you acquainted with many mechanics in the city? A.—Yes, I am.

Q.—Do you think that many of them are proprietors of their own houses? A.—Oh, yes; a great many of them. I know that is more particularly the case in the east end of the city, among the French-speaking population; and I know from having been solicitor for many years to the Trust and Loan Company; and I know that a good many mechanics generally make the most of their wages. In fact, a large proportion of mechanics buy a lot and build their own houses.

Q.—Do they borrow some or all of the money to do this? A.—They borrow some.

Q.—Do they pay off these loans? A.—They do.

Q.—Promptly? A.—Yes; it is very exceptional for them to be sold out. They generally have one half paid for, and borrow the rest to finish the building.

Q.—In answer to the last question, you speak more particularly of French Canadians? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do they live more economically than the people of other races? A.—They do, according to my opinion of them.

Q.—Are they more temperate? A.—I do not know that they are more temperate than other people; but they are very frugal and industrious—and as far as my experience goes, they are a very saving and industrious people. I know from my experience as a director of the City and District Savings Bank, that a very large portion of the deposits made in that bank, are in the east end; and I may say that the deposits there compare more favorably than the deposits made in any other portion of the city. They are very prudent. I do not want to make any comparisons, but I have a very high opinion of the French Canadians, both on account of their economy, their industry, and their frugality.

Q.—You speak of some of these houses as having three rooms? A.—Yes; in the east end.

Q.—How many of these tenements are in the one house? A.—Three. There is the first, second and third story.

Q.—Would each of these have separate drainage connection—a separate waste pipe? A.—No; the drainage is for each house. There is one drain in each house. It starts from the top of the house and goes down to the bottom, and goes out into the street drain.

Q.—Are the drains of each house trapped? Is the connection with the street drain properly trapped? A.—I cannot go into these particulars. I know that each flat in each house is properly looked after.

Q.—If these drains were not properly trapped, would not the sewer gases be forced into the houses of these people, in the winter time particularly, and so make the house unhealthy for them to live in? A.—I believe they are properly trapped in

every department. I do not know that they are not, and have heard of no complaints from anyone. I would naturally presume that, if there were any defective traps, or any defects in the drainage, I would be notified by the health Inspector.

Q.—What is the distance of the privies of these houses from the houses themselves? A.—They are some distance from the houses, generally speaking.

Q.—Are there any as near as three feet? A.—Some are fifty feet away. There are none as near as three feet. There are many lots that are one hundred feet deep, and the closets, as we call them, are generally in the middle of the lot.

Q.—Would you consider yourself at liberty to leave a water closet or vault within three feet of the back door of one of these houses? A.—I consider that would be too close, except possibly in some very exceptional case, where it could not be put any further away. I would not like to put them as close as that myself.

Q.—About what size are these three-room tenements? A.—I believe twenty-two feet frontage, each of these. Twenty-two feet frontage by, probably, twenty-eight to thirty feet deep. That is divided into three. There is a large room in front and two in the rear. Some tenements have five rooms.

Q.—What taxes does a tenement pay? A.—Taxes are paid to the landlord. I pay them all.

Q.—Who pays the water taxes? A.—The tenant. The tenant pays nothing but the water taxes. With regard to the cottages the tenants, mostly, pay the taxes. They understand what it is.

Q.—How many rooms would there be in one of those cottages? A.—There are eight rooms, cellar, bath, and water closet.

Q.—Are there furnaces? A.—No; no furnaces. Not in houses of that description. It is hard enough work to make the tenants take care of the water closets and baths, without putting a furnace in. In the first place, that would be a cause for increasing the rent, and then the repairing of the furnace would be quite an item. It is only in the larger houses that furnaces are provided. These houses that I speak of are heated by a coal stove in the hall—what we call a self-feeding stove.

Q.—You spoke of these houses being occupied by clerks and master mechanics. What meaning do you place upon the term? A.—Book-keepers and foremen earning from three dollars to three dollars and fifty cents a day, and upwards—not exactly foremen but some men employed in and around shops, and I have got one or two millwrights.

Q.—Which is the best investment, small cottages in the east end or in the west end? A.—Tenements houses in the east end there is an objection to, on account of keeping the water pipes in order—you see the lower part may not be let, but still the water has to go to the upper part. In the cold weather the pipes in the lower part are liable to freeze, and should the water freeze in these pipes they are liable to burst, and this causes an expense to the landlord. I prefer cottages and to realize less profit on my outlay. They are more satisfactory both with regard to the tenants and myself. I was the first to build these self contained cottages, as I thought I would secure a better class of tenants.

Q.—Have you ever examined the internal arrangements of the small class of cottages in Philadelphia? A.—No.

Q.—Have you furnaces and set ranges? A.—No; but I was one of the first to introduce water-closets and baths in this city. But not furnaces.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—What would buildings like your cottages rent for in New York? A.—I cannot tell exactly, but I know that they would rent for probably double as much. I believe that they would rent for at least that, if not for more.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Are wages higher now than they were in 1870 and 1876? A.—Of course they are. I just said a minute ago they are nearly double both wages and materials.

Q.—Can you particularize the dates? A.—Well I cannot particularize the dates, but I know during the bad times wages were very low, and that in many cases wages have nearly doubled since.

Q.—Were not the bad times the period between 1876 and 1878? A.—About that time. I cannot particularize that date exactly. I know about twelve years ago we went through a period of hard times, and of course wages and everything else went down, and they have gone up since.

Q.—Are wages higher to-day than before these times? A.—I think so. I do not think they have ever been as high as they are now.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you know what the wages of carpenters are to-day? A.—All the way from one dollar and fifty cents to two dollars and fifty cents and three dollars a day. I suppose stair-makers probably might make fifty cents a day more. Some get more. Some get one dollar and fifty cents to two dollars a day.

Q.—Are you aware that carpenters and their employers say that the wages of carpenters range from thirteen cents an hour up? A.—I do not think you can get any carpenter for one dollar and thirty cents a day now. I know that the man who does my jobbing all the year round gets more than that, and he is not a first-class carpenter.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q.—What is the law as regards leaky houses? A.—The landlord is bound, except in exceptional cases where an agreement is made with his tenant, to keep the house in order.

Q.—But without any special arrangement? A.—He is bound by law to keep the premises in order; and in every other respect to keep them water-tight.

Q.—In case of the landlord refusing, can summary law be invoked? A.—Yes; there is the law of lessee and lessor, by which he can take proceedings after notifying the landlord, in order to make him do it. I take it upon myself to see to this. As a general rule, a man goes around and attends to the roofs all the time. The tenant is obliged to send in a protest or a letter to put the landlord on what we call *en demeure*. If the proprietor does not then attend to the repairs, he can then be made to put the premises in repair, and pay the costs of the suit, I do not know of any case arising like that. The landlord is obliged to make the repairs after receiving notification by letter or protest. If the roof was proved to be leaky through no fault of the tenant, it would be sufficient without a notarial protest. That is sufficient proof of itself to show that it could have been made otherwise.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—As a rule, if the floors of tenement houses are bad, or the walls are bad, can the tenant compel the landlord to put in a new floor or a new door? A.—Well, I cannot say about others, but I consider as a landlord I am bound to do everything for the comfort of my tenants. Of course, reasonable wear and tear has to be allowed for, and the constant working of boards makes them uneven, and of course doors will get out of repair. When anything is required to be done, I do it.

Q.—We have been told by some of the witnesses who have been heard before us that some tenement houses in this city are unfit to live in? A.—There may be some, of course; but the law says the landlords are obliged to keep them in repair—that is, they must be tenantable.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—If a soil-pipe is leaky, and constantly leaks into the soil, would you consider it necessary to repair that at once? A.—Well, I would consider that it should be repaired. I have always done so. Of course, if that is done by the neglect or fault

of the tenant, that is a different matter; but if it is out of repair by constant usage, and becomes defective, I generally have Mr. Radford, the Sanitary Inspector, on my back, and if his requests were not attended to, he would soon have something to say against me before the Recorder.

JOHN BAKER EDWARDS, Montreal, Ph.D., D. C. L., Emeritus Professor of Chemistry and Microscopy, in Bishops College, Montreal; Consulting Chemist, and Public Analyst, for the city and district of Montreal, sworn.

I do not know in what capacity I am called here, so that I will ask the Commission to have the goodness to question me and I will answer.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—You are appointed by the Dominion Government as public analyst? A.—I am.

Q.—How long have you held that position? A.—Over ten years.

Q.—Do you analyse any such specimens as are brought to you, or do you seek specimens of food and drink or other articles in order to analyse them? A.—No. Specimens of food and drink, such as water, milk, and other articles are brought to me by officers of the Dominion Government. Of course I examine other articles in order to analyse them, samples for private parties.

Q.—If a private individual brings you a specimen of food or of drink to analyse, do you charge him a fee, or is that part of your duty to the Government? A.—It is no part of my duty to the Government. I charge him or them a fee which I consider equivalent to the amount of trouble involved in such analysis.

Q.—Is the water supplied to the people of Montreal, as a rule, wholesome? A.—It is wholesome as a rule. It is river water and is taken from a point on the river St. Lawrence, above Montreal where it cannot be polluted by the City Sewage.

Q.—It is not polluted by sewage? A.—It is not.

Q.—Have you analysed any beer or ale in Montreal? A.—I have.

Q.—Have you found them to be of good quality? A.—Of fair quality—unadulterated.

Q.—Have you found any strychnine in it? A.—None.

Q.—Do you know of strychnine being put into ale to give it clearness? A.—I have heard of it, but I have never found it in the samples brought to me for examination.

Q.—What is the quality of milk generally supplied to the people of Montreal? A.—Ten years ago it was generally adulterated with water, and it was also diluted by the removal of the cream.

Q.—Were any foreign substances added? A.—I cannot say that there were. I might say that since a number of prosecutions by the Health Department and the conviction of some of the milk dealers the dilution has ceased, and at the present time I have reason to believe that there is very little adulteration in milk.

Q.—Have you examined many specimens of the bread sold in the city of Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you find much alum in it? A.—In extremely few cases—not one per cent.

Q.—Did you find any other deleterious substances in it? Q.—None but those which might be considered as a diluent, such as the use of potatoes—mashed potatoes is one of the substitutes of bread, but I do not consider it is in any way deleterious to health.

Q.—Is not a certain quantity of potatoes almost necessary in the making of bread? A.—No.

Q.—If potatoes are used, is it because they are cheaper than flour? A.—Not

wholly so, but because it gives a brighter colour to the bread, and upon the whole the potato yields fresher vegetable in the bread than the wheat does alone.

Q.—You would not consider a small percentage of potato to deteriorate the character of the bread then? A.—I should consider it would improve the character of the bread, because potash is a necessary element of food, and that supplies a want, as the fresh vegetable does.

Q.—If alum is used in the bread, what is its effect upon the health of the consumers, if used in large quantities? A.—It would be injurious to the health of the consumer if used in large quantities.

Q.—Have you examined many specimens of butter as supplied to the public in this city? A.—A great many.

Q.—Are they reasonably pure? A.—No; the majority of them are impure.

Q.—Are the various substances injurious, or are they usually neutral? A.—They are usually neutral, but they detract from the quantity and strength of the article.

Q.—As to mustard, is that frequently adulterated? A.—Mustard is usually adulterated.

Q.—Are the adulterants of mustard injurious, or are they merely neutral? A.—They are merely neutral.

Q.—Can you tell us about the coffee and tea usually sold in Montreal? A.—I have examined a considerable number of samples, and I find that they are usually deficient in the strength and properties of these articles. They are rather diluted than adulterated, but I would prefer that you put the questions separately in order that I may be the better able to answer. Put tea first.

Q.—Well, as to the tea, what are the adulterants you find in it? A.—I find a dilutant in the form of tea leaves, that is exhausted tea—that is to say, tea stalks, substances which are in tea. Depriving the tea of its special quality of *alkaloid theine*. Some samples of tea I found adulterated with sandy matter—worthless matter. Others have been almost, entirely valueless in the form of tea dust, that is powdered tea.

Q.—Is the tea dust necessarily inferior to the tea leaf—the entire leaf? A.—No. There are qualities of tea dust which exceed the tea leaf in the excellence of its quality, because the tea dust sometimes arises from the sifting of the tea buds. The earliest leaf of the tea, which is considered the most valuable, being dried too rapidly, leaves a dust which is of more excellent quality than the full grown tea leaf.

Q.—Is the coloring matter of green tea, injurious to health? A.—The coloring matter used to tea, I would consider injurious to health, if swallowed by the drinker; but I would like to add to my answer, that the coloring matter added to the tea leaf is not likely to be dissolved in the infusion of the tea, and would, therefore, generally be a mere scum upon the top, or a sediment upon the bottom of the infusion.

Q.—And, therefore, it is not necessarily an injurious substance—injurious to health? A.—It is not necessarily. It is not dissolved in the infusion of the tea so as to be consumed by the individual drinking the tea.

Q.—Does it become dissolved by the tea being boiled a considerable time? A.—No.

Q.—Then as to the coffee, is that reasonably pure and wholesome? A.—It is usually adulterated—largely adulterated.

Q.—You are speaking of ground coffee, are you not? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can people be sure of getting pure coffee when it is ground—when they buy it ground? A.—No.

Q.—What are the adulterants, generally? A.—Well, in the first place, chicory is used. Chicory is a popular addition to the flavor of coffee—a popular addition which so delights the palate of the general public, that they prefer a small mixture of chicory with coffee—to the coffee which is in its integrity. The chicory is a root—it is a root which secretes sugar, and so adds a constituent flavor to the coffee.

Q.—Do you find many such substances as peas in the adulteration of coffee?

A.—I have found a great number of samples to have been adulterated with peas; also roasted corn and roasted wheat—damaged wheat.

Q.—Do you find many substances in coffee which are injurious to health. A.—I could not say that I have found any.

Q.—Have you examined many samples of sugar in Montreal? A.—I have.

Q.—What is the character of the sugar generally sold here? A.—It is within a reasonable degree of purity.

Q.—Is the sugar refined in Canada as pure as the sugar of like grade which is imported? A.—With regard to granulated sugar, I should say it certainly is equal. With regard to yellow sugars, I should say there is a difference as to value and quality. This may affect the price, but it would not affect the health of those consuming it.

Q.—Which is the better sugar of the yellows. Those which are refined here, or those which are imported? A.—I have had no recent experience in the analysis of such sugars. I am scarcely able to say what the state of the present market is. I reported to the Government I think some ten years ago on that subject, and at that time I stated that the Canadian refined sugars were of better quality than those imported from the States, but I have not had sufficient experience to answer that question as regards the present time.

Q.—Does much raw sugar go upon the market for consumption—for family use? A.—I believe not.

Q.—Are you able to tell us whether there is any difference in the sweetening power—purity being equal—between sugar made from beets and sugar made from the sugar cane? A.—My experience is that sugar made from the sugar cane is sweeter for its weight than any sugar made from the beet.

Q.—Have you ever found any muriate of tin in sugar of late years? A.—No; I have not. That would only apply to American sugar, viz.: refined sugars granulated, I have not examined American sugars for I think the last ten years.

February 28th, 1888.

ISAIAH C. RADFORD, Montreal, Sanitary Inspector of the Health Department of the Corporation of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—What are your particular duties? A.—It is difficult to define them almost as they spread over such a wide surface. My duties extend over all things where my services are required either by the Board of Health consisting of the Medical Health Officers and Aldermen, or on the report of citizens. I examine milk under certain circumstances; but more particularly my time is devoted to the examination of schools, colleges, dwelling houses, and buildings generally, and wherever complaints are made as to any smell existing which may be injurious to health.

Q.—Do you examine the food sold on the public markets of Montreal in order to ascertain if it is wholesome? A.—In the examination of food my duties have been more particularly directed to milk, and while on the question of milk I may say that some three or four year ago I understood there was a class of milkmen who came from below the city—from below the east end of the city, and who made a regular practice of mixing water in their milk. I was told they did it at a particular portion of the road. I accordingly took one of my best men with me at an early hour one morning and waited at a convenient distance from the place where they obtained the water. Five or six waggons went by while we waited there. One obtained a supply of one-quarter water to three of milk which he put into a can containing three gallons. He was summoned before the Recorder at my instance. I thought at the time that I had perhaps overstepped my duties, but he was tried and fined fifteen

dollars for the act. I think that checked them for a time. Since then I have collected samples of milk, which have been examined by Doctor Baker Edwards, and at the time, under our local by-laws, which I may add are not so clear as the Dominion By-Laws, we got convictions.

Q.—Do you think this raid upon milkmen had the effect of making them more careful? A.—It frightened them for a time.

Q.—Have you inspected the bread sold in this city, to see that it is full weight?

A.—That is no part of my duty. That belongs to the Police Department.

Q.—Do they attend to it? A.—I do not know that they have lately.

Q.—Do you inspect farm produce? A.—No; that is not my duty.

Q.—Is there any inspector of vegetables and meat? A.—Yes; there is of meat.

There are two inspectors who wait on the boats, and two at the abattoirs, to see that no bad beasts are slaughtered.

Q.—How do they perform their duty? A.—Fairly.

Q.—Do you examine houses and dwellings, to ascertain and remedy their sanitary condition? A.—Yes.

Q.—In what condition do you find, as a rule, the tenements of the poorer classes?

A.—Well, we have not a sufficient staff, and I have not had sufficient time to answer that question positively. My duty is to visit houses against which complaints are made, and of these complaints over seventy-five per cent are ascertained to be well founded, that is to say, over seventy-five per cent of the houses against which complaints are lodged with us, are found to be in an unsanitary condition.

Q.—To what do these complaints refer generally? A.—They not unfrequently refer to the drains. Until inspection of drains was brought about, under a by-law about seven or eight years ago, there was no inspection of drains at all. All the old drains, as a rule, were never properly cemented, and the drainage matter that at that time should pass through the drains, percolated through into the ground. The plumber is a man who is generally ignorant, as the public generally are now upon sanitary matters. When the drain is in a defective condition the sewage leaks through it into the soil.

Q.—What kind of a new drain would you set down? A.—It is distinctly specified that it shall be a tile drain in the by-law, but from information collected in the office and other places, and our own experience, we are of the opinion that for all purposes, iron drains are the best and they are not so liable to be broken as tile.

Q.—Are wooden drains put in now? A.—No.

Q.—And you will not allow them to be laid at all? A.—No. We get them ripped up wherever we find them and replace them with tile.

Q.—When the drains become very old and the ground saturated with sewage, is any attempt made to remove that soil? Is it removed or is it left there? A.—No; it is not left there. The Drain Inspector is sent on all occasions, and not only causes it to be removed, but orders quick lime to be put down and a good bed of ashes laid down to prevent anything objectionable from remaining behind. That is tolerably well looked after.

Q.—Are the streets and by-ways, especially the lanes and back yards, and the approaches and surroundings of the poorer classes of houses kept clean? A.—They are in some cases. I think they are generally fairly kept clean, if I may judge from what I have seen. There are some places very difficult to keep clean—the back yards. In fact, it is a source of constant complaint to the office that Mrs. So-and-so throws all sorts of matter down the stairs into the yard, and is a great nuisance to the other tenants.

Q.—How is the garbage collected? A.—It is collected twice a week—by contractors in barrels.

Q.—Do you think the collection of carbage semi-weekly enough? A.—I rather think three times a week would be better, but if the ashes were separated from the decaying matter, if two separate boxes were provided, it would simplify matters; then twice, and in some localities once a week, would be sufficient.

Q.—If the ashes were separated from the garbage, would not the ashes be useful as filling matter? A.—Yes. The plan of separating the garbage from the ashes has been tried twice, and notice has been given in the papers, but some people will not separate them until they receive a summary lesson.

Q.—Have you any statistics-system of collecting statistics showing the difference in the mortality in the districts in which the poorer classes of people live to the districts in which the more wealthy classes reside? A.—Yes. The lists of deaths are taken out by wards, and these wards are known here, and the difference in the social condition of the people of the wards can readily be traced.

Before dismissing the subject of the milk supply, I would like to say a few words. Some few months ago Doctor Baker Edwards, who is now present, made an examination of the qualities of some of the milk brought from the various milk farms. He also examined qualities of the cream so obtained. On his visit to these farms he kindly asked me to go with him, and that is one of the reasons why I did not wish him to leave the room before I had given my evidence. Our experience was most unsatisfactory. We have an enormous infant mortality. This arises from the excessive number of births among the French. Some people contend that those who have large families must necessarily have weakly children, as compared with those who have but few children. I do not believe it. Actual facts prove the opposite. If you take into consideration what we saw on these milk farms you would come to the conclusion that as the milk obtained from these men forms the principal daily food of thousands of little ones in the City of Montreal, it is of the highest importance that the milk should be obtained from competent and reliable men. If these farms were properly conducted it would be an immense boon to the public health. I will tell you what we found on one of the farms: During the inspection a place was visited on which eighty cows were found. The room in which the milk was cooled and stored had a disagreeable sour smell. Thirty feet from the cow stable there was a pond into which the water which had been used for washing the milk vessels, the floors of the dairy, etc., drained. This pond was black and foetid. Around three sides of the stable there was a large deposit of decomposing manure, and under the stable some three hundred loads more. The water used for washing the milk vessels, drink for the cattle, and for the occupants of the farm, was drawn from a well situated under a portion of the stable. This water, on being tested by the Government Analyst, Dr. Baker Edwards, was found to be very strongly polluted. In spite of all this, the dairyman, up to the time of the inspection, believed his premises and arrangements perfect. The milk from this farm was supplied to some of the best families in Montreal.

Q.—Have you found many such cases as that? A.—We found a number to be very bad indeed, so much so that, I think, that the cases in which it could be said: "This is properly kept," "This is an appropriate place," were comparatively few, indeed.

Q.—Were all these milk farms outside the city limits? A.—Nearly all.

GEORGE D. ROACH, Stevedore, of Montreal, sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How long have you been a stevedore, Mr. Roach? A.—Fifteen years.

Q.—In what condition is the gearing which is generally used in the port of Montreal? A.—For handling cargo?

Q.—Yes? A.—Very good.

Q.—Was there not an action brought against you for injury, which a man was said to have suffered by your negligence? A.—There was, eight years ago.

Q.—He sued you for how much? A.—He sued me for two thousand dollars, and the action was taken against me for that.

Q.—What was the result? A.—In the Superior Court the case went against me for four hundred dollars costs of Court, and five hundred dollars damages—eight or nine hundred dollars.

Q.—Did you bring the case before another Court? A.—Yes.

Q.—Before the Court of Queen's Bench in appeal? A.—Yes.

Q.—I believe not being able to settle the judgment and costs, you allowed the thing to go against you? A.—I furnished security in the Appeal Court, but I was unable to furnish security for the judgment in the Superior Court.

Q.—What was the result in the Court of Appeals? A.—It went in my favor.

Q.—The judgment was reversed? A.—Yes.

Q.—In the meantime were your goods seized? A.—Yes.

Q.—And were they sold? A.—Yes.

Q.—They were seized and sold? A.—Yes.

Q.—And when you obtained a reversal of the judgment did you recover anything on the judgment of the Court of Appeals? A.—No; I never recovered one cent; I never recovered anything.

Q.—What was the action brought for; what damage was it? A.—The plaintiff's leg was broken. He said it was through neglect on my part, and that my gear was not sufficient. That was his plea.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—On what ground was the judgment reversed in the Court below? A.—On the evidence I suppose.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

A.—The case is duly reported in the law reports. In rendering the judgment the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals said:—"It is proved, in the most conclusive manner, that if the accident has taken place, that accident was due to the negligent manner in which the respondent, and his fellow-worker tried to haul up the rails, and not to any fault of the appellants." And Judge Ramsay said: "On the merits, I am to reverse. There is no evidence that the chain was too weak for the work. Two of the smaller chains broke, but the weight of evidence is in favor of the pretension of the appellants, (G. D. Roach, *et al*), that the breakage, on both occasions, was due to the persistent disobedience and recklessness of respondent and his single witness."

HENRY PORTER, Montreal, Tanner and Manufacturer of leather goods, and member of the firm of Messrs. Porter & Savage.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How many men do you employ in your tannery? A.—I suppose I have in the tannery perhaps forty. I run a shoe business and leather belting works and various other works. Before the fire I had something over four hundred hands in the factory.

Q.—Do you employ children? A.—I employ one boy for lighting lamps and such light things.

Q.—What are the average wages of the men? A.—You mean the men or the employees altogether. There are many women. Do you mean the tannery and factory altogether?

Q.—No; the tannery. A.—I should think about seven dollars a week.

Q.—What is the lowest salary? A.—The lowest salary would be about five dollars a week; that is men who only work in the winter, and six dollars to six dollars and a half—that is the common labourers.

Q.—And what are the highest wages you pay? A.—Eighteen dollars.

Q.—What are the hours of labour in your tannery? A.—From seven to six and an hour for dinner.

Q.—Do you impose fines on the operators? A.—Sometimes.

Q.—Have you rules and regulations printed and put up in the factory indicating what are the fines? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are they in French or English? A.—They are in both languages printed in two columns. French on one side and English on the other.

Q.—Have you one with you? A.—No.

Q.—If one was read in French could you say that it was in accordance with those posted up in the factory? A.—If you showed me one and said it came from my factory I should say that it was.

Q.—Do you force your piece hands to give you a week's notice? A.—In the tannery we do, but we have only a few on piece work—perhaps half a dozen.

Q.—Are these piece hands continuously employed without losing any time? A.—They are continuously employed.

Q.—Does it sometimes occur that they lose one or two hours? A.—Yes.

Q.—If they are paid by the piece and there is not so much work, that is their own loss? A.—Yes.

Q.—But they are obliged to remain in the shop and lose their time if they have no work, are they not? A.—Oh, no.

Q.—Can it occur that a man working by piece-work can be without work during one or two hours, sometimes a day? A.—I do not remember any such instance, but it might occur.

Q.—Do you consider that a man working by the piece has not his own time on his hands, and if offered a better position he could not leave without notice? A.—The business of a tanner is what we call a perishable business. Everything a tanner handles is perishable, and we must have our men to take care of it, and they all know that they must be there to do the work, because if they are not there to do the work the material will spoil on our hands.

Q.—Why do you not engage them by the week? A.—We do. As I said before, we have not more than four or five engaged by the piece.

Q.—When your premises were burnt down, a certain number of operatives had to leave work? A.—Yes.

Q.—Were they paid for the week during which they did not work after the fire? A.—Well, we did not discharge any of our hands after the fire. We required them all to help rebuild, but some of them objected to assist in the rebuilding and to help the carpenters, and they got work elsewhere, but others worked, and we took on some other people (strangers).

Q.—Then your rule which enforces that an operative shall give a week's notice if he leaves your employment, does not bind you to pay him if he has no work? A.—If we have no work for a man we give him one week's notice, but if we did not enforce this rule or precaution we would obtain no enforcement of the rules in any other way. If a man is discharged, he is given his money.

Q.—If in one case a man is left without work, he is obliged to leave the shop without receiving a week's notice? A.—It has occurred. I should say it has happened.

Q.—When a man comes in five minutes late, is he charged a quarter of an hour? A.—It is the rule, but we do not do it.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You do not put it in force? A.—No, we do not. Our fines for a whole year do not amount to five or six dollars. We do not find it a pleasure to fine anybody.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Has it ever occurred that you have kept off the salary of a man for a day because he has been absent for half a day? A.—It may have occurred; I cannot say. We must have men in the tannery every day, but if there is sickness in the family, or any reasonable excuse, it is accepted.

Q.—Has it occurred that you have charged your operatives with the price of the hides they have damaged? A.—I remember perhaps only one instance. It is perhaps eight years ago, and that man is working for me still. He damaged several hides, and I charged him four dollars; the damage to me was perhaps fifteen dollars. It was owing to his carelessness in splitting the hide open. He has been there for twenty years.

Q.—Did you ever have a strike among your men? A.—No.

ROBERT A. BECKET, of Montreal, Ice Merchant, sworn:

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are the proprietor of the ice house, I believe? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many men do you employ cutting the ice? A.—Sixty-six or seventy; sometimes more, and sometimes less.

Q.—What are the wages paid by you to these men? A.—From ninety cents a day to one dollar and fifty cents a day—that is for laborers. We have laborers who go on day after day; regular men are employed in cutting the ice. Cutting used to be one dollar a day: now it is one dollar and fifty cents—that is for laboring men.

Q.—What are the hours of labor? A.—As long as it is light; now, they are never after five.

Q.—What time do they commence in the morning? A.—They start for the river at seven o'clock in the morning.

Q.—At what time do they take their lunch? A.—Twelve o'clock; they have one hour.

Q.—Have they time to come back to the city for their luncheon? A.—No; we have a shed erected, and we supply them with coffee out there.

Q.—What is the salary paid to the carters? A.—You mean the drivers?

Q.—Yes. A.—Nine dollars a week.

Q.—Have there been any accidents? A.—At the place where we are cutting ice, three years ago, one man injured his thumb. It is very rarely that we have accidents of any kind.

JOHN HENRY MOONEY, Tanner, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are there rules and regulations posted up in your tannery? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are they the same as those posted up in Mr. Porter's Tannery? A.—I do not know where Mr. Porter's Tannery is. I may say that I have not been in business for the last twelve months. Prior to that time we had rules and regulations printed and posted up throughout the building. Of course I only called in order to relieve myself of any responsibility. I can only speak for the past and not for the present.

WILLIAM PATTON, Montreal, Chief of the Montreal Fire Brigade, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How many men are there employed in the Montreal Fire Brigade? A.—One hundred and eight, and three officers at the present time.

Q.—What proportion of these men are married? A.—I suppose three-fourths of them.

Q.—What accommodation is provided in the stations for them for sleeping? A.—They are provided with sleeping rooms, and some of the rooms are not as large as I would wish them to be. The stations were built at a time when there were fewer men in the Department and the stations have all been made too small for the accommodation of the men placed there at the present time. Some of them are to be enlarged, I understand.

Q.—Do all the men sleep in the stations? A.—The men all sleep in the stations with the exception of the Guardians who have sleeping accommodation and lodging upstairs for themselves and families.

Q.—How many nights in the week are the men permitted to sleep at home? A.—None. They sleep in the stations the whole year round, but they get permission to be absent from the stations occasionally—once a week at least up to the hour of ten or eleven o'clock at night from tea time, and at other times, they get permission to be absent in the afternoon for anything necessary in their family matters, but they are always considered to be on duty.

Q.—How frequently do they get this afternoon? A.—Generally once a week, and they take their turn in going to church on Sunday? They are not permitted to be out longer than one afternoon and one evening, up to eleven o'clock at a time.

Q.—Is it usual to permit the men to stay away all night? A.—It is in cases of sickness, and then the man makes that application through the officer of his district.

Q.—What are the sanitary arrangements of the sleeping places of these men? A.—There are some that I do not approve of, but there are steps being taken to try and make them better.

Q.—Are the sleeping apartments in all the stations near the stables? A.—In some of the stations they are on the same flat. In fact, all our stables are, in consequence of the necessity for quickly hitching up, and for quickly getting out to a fire, in close proximity to the stables.

Q.—Does the smell and dampness from the stables get into the sleeping apartments? A.—It will, more or less.

Q.—Are the sleeping apartments of the men comfortably heated? A.—Yes; they are always supplied with fuel. Fuel sufficient to carry them through to the spring.

Q.—Are the firemen allowed any other privileges besides their pay? A.—No.

Q.—Do they get free water? A.—No.

Q.—Does any man in the brigade get free water? A.—Only the guardians.

Q.—What is the pay of the guardians? A.—The guardians receive six hundred dollars a year; and the men of the salvage company, five hundred and fifty. The engineers receive six hundred dollars a year, and the ordinary men receive five hundred dollars a year.

Q.—How do these salaries compare with the salaries paid to other firemen in other cities—take Toronto, for instance? A.—Well, they are less; but the accommodation for firemen in Toronto is better. The stations there were built at a later date than ours, and have a better sanitary system. Besides, they furnish them there with bedding, which is not done in Montreal. In Montreal the men furnish their own bedding, with the exception of a bedstead. The men are found a bedstead by the city, but they have to find their own bedding.

Q.—Have you a benevolent fund in connection with the Fire Brigade? A.—We have. It was incorporated by Act of Parliament of the Province of Quebec.

Q.—Do all members of the brigade participate in this fund, in case of sickness?

A.—No; it only consists of those who, when they joined the brigade, were under the age of 30 years.

Q.—What is the age limit for taking a man into the brigade? A.—It seems to me that there is no limit. Every fire committee puts on whom they please and how they please.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Does the Corporation contribute anything to this fund? A.—They have nothing to do with it, they have no control over it, and they contribute nothing.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are the men who are not fortunate enough to belong to this fund as good firemen as the others? A.—They are in both cases men who belong to it, and men who do not belong to it who are good firemen. That makes no difference about a man being a fireman, good or bad.

Q.—Who contributes to the support of this fund? A.—I might add that there is an age limit in all societies. This fund, is supported by the membership fees; contributions given by citizens, donations given after fires, and sometimes by the men themselves creating a little amusement for the public and themselves in the summer time by a pic-nic; the proceeds of which go into this fund. The greatest amount is given by the citizens.

Q.—Do the citizens give it to a part or the whole of the brigade? A.—They give it sometimes to the Benevolent Fund, and sometimes to the men. When it is given to the men it is put into a Bank and allowed to accumulate, and in January it is divided, the portion falling to the members of the fund going into the fund, and the other portion being divided among the men who are not members of the fund.

Q.—Are the contributions donated by the citizens divided in that way? A.—No. It is specially given to the fund. It is specially given to the Benevolent Fund.

Q.—Do the citizens generally know that the firemen do not participate in this fund as a whole? A.—Yes. They do; a good many that have given to it. In fact they are asked on giving donations: "To which do you appropriate it," and they generally give it to the fund. There is a specialty in the Benevolent Fund—two special parts in the Act of Incorporation—one provides for the widow's and orphan's fund. This provision was made some years after the Benevolent Fund was instituted, so that it is a separate fund to the ordinary Benevolent and Contingent Fund.

Q.—Is there any other Benefit Fund, other than this Benefit Fund that the firemen participate in? A.—Well. There are a number of them have accidental policies on their lives, and there are such societies as the Working Men's Benefit Society, and some of our men when injured have received benefits from them.

Q.—But there is nothing further in connection with the Fire Brigade? A.—No. There is nothing further in connection with the Brigade.

Q.—Do you think it would impair the efficiency of the Brigade if the men were allowed a night off at times? A.—Well, as a general thing, we are so often taken unawares by fires—and some of them very large ones too—that we cannot tell when a man's services will be required.

Q.—Is it the usual practice in other cities to keep the firemen in the stations every night? A.—I am not aware how it is in that respect. I do not possess their by-laws and rules, and I have never had an opportunity to visit other cities.

Q.—Do you think it any hardship for a man to be away from his wife and family the whole year round? A.—Well, I do not know—

Q.—Do you think it a hardship for a man to be only four hours with his family a week, except at meals? A.—It is a hardship, certainly, but it has to be. I may add that there are some men who would encroach upon the rule and instead of staying away four hours, would stay away eight. There are very few of these who are conscientious enough to be within the limit of the time.

Q.—Are not firemen sometimes fined for dereliction of duty? A.—It is very

rarely that firemen have ever been fined. If they commit themselves they are suspended until such time as their case may be enquired into, when they are sometimes reprimanded, and re-instated, and sometimes dismissed.

Q.—When they are re-instated are their wages refunded? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is their pay continued until they are dismissed? A.—Sometimes. According to the nature of the offence. If a man voluntarily deserted his post he would not be paid I presume.

Q.—Are they furnished with any clothing? A.—Yes. Two suits a year—coat, pants and boots, and a helmet every two years, a fur cap every two years and a forage cap, and this year we have increased the supply by giving them a rubber coat and long rubber boots—thigh boots.

Q.—What time is allowed a fireman after a fire to change his clothing? A.—No specified time. A man gets changed as soon as he can possibly do so. Sometimes he will have to change two or three times during a fire. He will have to leave a fire go home and get changed sometimes twice or three times during a fire.

Q.—Are the firemen ever compelled to retire on account of old age? A.—Never since I had to do with the fire brigade—and that is a period of thirty-eight years.

Q.—Is there no superannuation fund in connection with the Fire Brigade? A.—No.

Q.—There is nothing done in that direction? A.—No; no further than this. A motion has been made in Council, but it has reached no further than the nomination of a Committee.

Q.—Do you know if there is any general desire on the part of the men to have such a fund? A.—There is.

Q.—Have you ever known anything of the working of this fund in other cities? A.—There is in Boston, I believe, and I am not sure, but what there is in New York. There is what is called exempt firemen—firemen who were receiving compensation after serving a certain number of years, but I am not positive as to the amount they get or the rules they are under.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Does not the city pay, or has not the city paid donations to the widows of firemen killed? A.—The city does not pay anything more. There is one thing I omitted to mention, with regard to the benefits for the men under the present by-law of the City Council, there is insured to the widows or relatives of the men in case of death during time of service in the Brigade whether by accident or natural death—three hundred dollars for the first three years, and after that it increases one hundred dollars a year until ten years is reached, when it remains at one thousand dollars, when, should he die of disease, natural death, or accident, there is one thousand dollars paid to the widow or heirs.

Q.—Is any portion of the firemen's pay deducted for that insurance? A.—None.

Q.—The city pays for the insurance? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the water rate for firemen? A.—The water rate is the same as for other citizens.

Q.—There are no restrictions? A.—No; there is only one fireman living in each station who has water free and that is the guardian.

Q.—The other firemen live outside? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Sleeping in the station does not constitute living in the station; does it? A.—How do you mean, sir; in what way?

Q.—Where do they get their meals? A.—At home.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—If the alarm is rung they have to leave their meals and go to the fire? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are fines imposed? A.—There are no fines imposed; only for disobedience, and other gross dereliction of duty they are suspended.

Q.—Are they paid during the time they are suspended? A.—No; they are not paid, because they are not on duty.

Q.—You do not then impose a fine; you merely do not pay them while they are suspended? A.—That is all.

Q.—Has it occurred that firemen once suspended have been re-instated in their position? A.—Yes; they have been pardoned.

Q.—Were some re-instated because they were suspended unjustly? A.—There was one during last year suspended on the decision of the Committee, and re-instated again by the Committee, and he received his back pay and he afterwards resigned after shewing his ability as a fireman to the people of Montreal, and finding that he was laughed at and jeered at, and he took it to heart right away and resigned from the department.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Do the firemen have any regular summer holidays? A.—The men very often get a week, some a fortnight to go and see friends some distance from Montreal. Some travel as far as Niagara to see the Falls, and some have gone on a visit to the United States to see friends. I have known one man to get three weeks' leave to go and get married.

Q.—Do they have to apply for it, or is it regular holidays? A.—No; they have to apply for it, and obtain leave of absence from the city.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Since when have the firemen been relieved from paying water rates? A.—The firemen have always paid it; they have never been relieved.

Q.—Do you consider the Fire Brigade large enough for the city of Montreal? A.—Well, we had our hands full of late, by the addition of outside municipalities, and the rapid increase in the number of buildings. The buildings have increased enormously of late years; last year the force was increased by the addition of a few men, and this year by another addition. Since the fire on St. James Street fourteen more men have been added to the Brigade.

Q.—Do you find any great difficulty in working at fires, from telegraph and telephone wires? A.—Extreme difficulty, as owing to the number of wires, it is impossible to break through them, and they thus prevent the water from reaching the fire.

Q.—These wires from, being so near the building, are they frequently cause of loss? A.—Well, I do not doubt but at the last fire, Mr. Tiffin's on Commissioners Street, it was the cause of loss. We might possibly have saved more of the interior of the building, if we could have got nearer the wall.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have not these wires caused accidents to firemen? A.—In a very trifling manner. I cannot recollect anything for the moment.

Q.—Was not one of your ladders once nearly upset by these wires? A.—More than once. They are a perfect nuisance.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—If a man is injured at a fire, does his pay go on? A.—If a man is sick from any cause, his pay is not stopped.

Q.—Are accidents to firemen frequent by reason of the improper construction of buildings? A.—They are in some cases, but not often. Of course, the men are eager to perform their duty, and get into the building where the fire is raging, but self-preservation will keep him a good deal away from a dangerous spot, and if there

is anything dangerous, the officers in charge take care to keep them back, rather than risk their lives in an ineffectual attempt to put out a fire.

Q.—Are there many applications from good men for positions in the Fire Department? A.—A great number. Unfortunately I cannot put them on, because I have not the naming of them, the appointment of them.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have not the citizens often stated that the firemen are not well paid? A.—I have seen many letters in the newspapers, but of course I cannot say that they are from the citizens of Montreal.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—Have you ever thought what their pay would be per hour if on duty twenty-four hours a day? A.—Yes; I have seen it calculated.

Q.—How much would that amount to? A.—Five and two-third cents per hour. I think it would be something about that. The city gives the Chief of Police double the salary I receive.

(Translation.)

ALPHONSE LARIVIÈRE, Working Roofer, of Montreal, sworn :

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—What kind of roofs do you make? A.—Metal roofs.

Q.—Are metal roofs abundant here in Montreal? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are there many men employed in their manufacture? A.—There may be about one hundred.

Q.—What wages are earned by these men? A.—\$8, \$9 and \$10 a week.

Q.—Do you know anything about gravel or felt roofs? A.—No.

Q.—You know only what belongs to metallic roofs? A.—What belongs to metal roofs and slate roofs.

Q.—Do you work by the day or by the piece? A.—By the day.

Q.—Slate roofers, how much do they make? A.—\$10 and \$12 a week.

Q.—Do you put up your own scaffoldings on the roof? A.—Yes; we do our own scaffolding.

Q.—Are you supplied with the needed material to set up good scaffolds? A.—Yes. In the shop where I work we have that advantage; but there are other shops where they are not so well off.

Q.—Do the bosses and employers here in Montreal take proper means to prevent accidents befalling their men? A.—Some take such precautions; others do not bother about them.

Q.—Are there many accidents among the men working at your trade? A.—Yes, sir. I myself fell on the 19th of the month of January, and I began work again only this morning.

Q.—What was the cause of the accident which happened to you? A.—The boss had sent me to fix a roof, and I could not pass through the dormer window, so that I had to make my way along the gutter to get on to the roof. My rope snapped and I fell down.

Q.—You had neither scaffold nor rope? A.—Yes; I had a rope; but I had to tie it on, and it was on going to tie it on that I fell.

Q.—Are the accidents that happen to the men working on roofs due to the carelessness of these men or to the want of precaution on the part of the employees? A.—Often it happens that young apprentices who are working with us are sent up

and they, not being careful, fall and the fault is their own. In the last two years two apprentices have been killed to my knowledge.

Q.—What is the lowest age at which boys are taken on? A.—At any age which they say. There is one at the shop who is fifteen years of age. There are some who are younger than that. Others of fourteen and fifteen years old.

Q.—Are boys of that age put up on roofs to work? A.—They often are. Those who are fourteen and fifteen years old, when there is work, come along with us.

Q.—What wages do these boys make? A.—They begin at \$1.50 a week for the first year; the second year they rise to \$2 a week, the third year to \$3 and then they clear out and go to other shops.

Q.—Are these boys allowed to set up their own scaffold when they go to work? A.—No. It is we who do the scaffolding.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you anything to communicate to the Commission? A.—Yes. We should like to have another system for the apprentices because, as things go now, apprentices work one year and two years and then they leave the shop where they were and go to another shop where they give themselves out as journeymen.

Q.—Would you be in favour of binding apprentices by contract with their employers? A.—I should, sir.

Q.—And not allow an apprentice to become a journeyman until he can furnish proof that he has served his apprenticeship? A.—Yes. And he should be strong enough so that the man working with him would not be exposed to injury. It is a dangerous trade. At the age of twenty years, after three years of apprenticeship a young man might become a journeyman.

Q.—So that it follows that when an apprentice has no experience and does not know how to go about his work he not only puts his own life in danger but also that of the man with whom he is working? A.—Also that of the man with whom he is working.

Q.—During the illness that you underwent after the accident, did your employer make you any allowance? Did he pay your physician? A.—I cannot say whether I got anything from the employer. I did get something from the shop; and I learned that it came from the men, who had put their heads together for the purpose. The employer, it seems, contributed his equal share, like the others, with the men. I may have received as much as \$15.00. The men told me that they had made a collection among themselves. As a rule bosses do not give a cent. In summer we work ten hours, and in winter eight hours. Those who work only in slate lose half of the time in the year in bad weather. If they have no slate to prepare indoors the time is lost, for there is nothing to be done outside. Even at present, during the winter, they have no work and they lose their time. They work about six or seven months in the year, at \$10.00 and \$11.00 a week. They wear out three or four times more clothes creeping over the roofs than others. They are always in danger. It is the trade that pays the least. Those who work only at sheet iron, like myself, work five months at eight hours.

Q.—How much do you make an hour in summer? A.—As for me, I made on a footing of seventeen and a half cents an hour. I am paid by the week. Whether I work in steeples, or no matter where else, it is always the same thing.

Q.—Is the price by the hour the same in winter? A.—It is the same in winter.

Q.—And the work is harder? A.—The work is harder, because we have to work in the cold if we want to make a living.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do you roof in sheet iron and tin during the winter? A.—The same thing as in summer.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Have your wages been lowered during these last years? A.—I work for Mr. Drapeau. I have not been there very long. Before that I made \$9.00 a week; when I went to him, in the spring, I got \$10.00 a week. These are the biggest wages that he pays. Some of the men get \$11.00 and \$12.00. These are the old hands who have been eight or ten years in the shop.

(Translation.)

JOSEPH PELLETIER, Roofer, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You heard the evidence of the last witness? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you anything to say in relation to what he stated? A.—I should like to have a word about wages and scaffoldings.

Q.—What can you tell us about scaffoldings? A.—There are many shops where they do not provide the necessary timber. In other shops they have this.

Q.—When you cannot get the necessary timber what do you do? A.—We try to get wood from the yard and make scaffoldings with it.

Q.—Scaffoldings made in this fashion are dangerous are they not? A.—Yes; they are often dangerous.

Q.—Do you know of any accidents that have happened from such defective scaffolds? A.—An accident happened to myself.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—When? A.—Two years ago.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Will you tell us what took place? A.—We were scaffolding with sheet-iron bands, these bands were about four inches broad and one foot long. They were fastened under the rows of slate with nails, and there was a large beam and the slate was on the top of this. One of my mates was higher up than myself. The middle nail gave way. I was struck and fell down to the bottom.

Q.—Did you get hurt? A.—Yes; I was laid up for seven weeks and could not work.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—From what height did you fall? A.—Thirty feet.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How was it that you made use of sheet iron in your scaffold? A.—We could not construct a scaffold otherwise, except with sheet-iron straps, as I have said, unless we made a scaffold with cramp irons below. Oftentimes a scaffold is made by fastening the slate in the first rows to the wooden partition by the cramps. But in this case we had not started to build in that way.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—During the seven weeks that you were laid up did you receive any compensation from your employer? A.—Yes; they finished paying my fortnight of work, being two days.

Q.—Did they pay the physician? A.—No, sir; I paid him myself.

Q.—You are of an opinion that this accident took place because the employer did not provide the timber for the scaffold? A.—If they had given me the cramps I should not have fallen below.

Q.—Are you aware that men have been killed or crippled in consequence of a similar negligence? A.—There is one man that fell. I do not know whether it depended on the scaffold; but the scaffold was taken away.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Did the man die? A.—Yes; he was killed outright. Two of them fell, one broke his arm and the other was picked up cold.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you think it would be a great protection if the factory law, making provision for the safety of scaffolds, were put into force? A.—Oh, yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Where do you work? In what part of the city? A.—In St. Lawrence Main Street.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you ever seen the building inspector of Montreal, inspect the scaffolds that are raised in the city? A.—No; I never saw him.

Q.—How long have you been working in Montreal? A.—Twenty years.

Q.—And you have never seen him? A.—No.

Q.—Are you aware that there is a city by-law obliging the building inspector to inspect scaffolds? A.—No.

Q.—Do you know the building inspector, Mr. Lacroix? A.—No.

Q.—You do not know him even by sight? A.—No.

Q.—In fine, you have never seen anybody inspecting scaffolds? A.—No, sir.

(Translation.)

* * * , Tobacco-worker, of Montreal, sworn :

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—In the factory where you work, are there women and children employed? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest child working in the factory? A.—To my knowledge, I have seen some that were nine and a-half years old; and even nine years. But these were sent back home last week.

Q.—Were there many of these? A.—I think there were about fifty.

Q.—Do you mean to tell us that there were about fifty children sent away? A.—No; but about thirty were sent away.

Q.—At what hour did these children come to the factory? At the same time as the men? A.—At seven o'clock in the morning.

Q.—At what hour do they leave the factory? A.—At twenty minutes to six; sometimes at a quarter to six.

Q.—Have you seen them finish later? A.—One year we used to knock off at ten minutes past six; and this was about the latest.

Q.—You do not make overtime? A.—No; not in my department.

Q.—You pay fines in the factory where you work? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you paid any yourself? A.—Yes, sir; I have myself paid fines.

Q.—Many? A.—Not many in that factory; only they fined me unjustly.

Q.—Can you tell us the nature of the offences for which you were made to pay fines? A.—I can give you a few. For instance, a child, by accident, may break a small pane of glass worth ten cents, while throwing stones, and he is charged \$1.20 for it.

Q.—Have you seen a child pay such a fine, or have you seen the foreman tell him that him he would have to pay \$1.20? A.—It is posted up on a black board. The boss takes it out of the pay-list of the foreman in the department where the glass was broken, and the foreman takes it out of the wages of the employee. When a lad who is in a hurry for his work will run to the shop in order to go faster, and if he is caught running he is fined fifty cents.

Q.—You have seen this fine imposed also? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Was it in your department? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Had the lad been warned not to run? A.—It was always understood that he had no business to run.

Q.—Is there a rule posted up to that effect? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Keep on telling us what fines you have seen laid on to the children? A.—One of the lads may want to eat, and some of his food may fall to the ground. We take our dinner in the aisles between the tables, and if he is so unfortunate as to drop food among the tobacco, and there is no other place to eat, except on the floor, he is fined fifty cents.

Q.—Are the children allowed to eat outside, if they are so minded? A.—Yes; just as they like.

Q.—And those who eat in the factory eat in the midst of their work? A.—Yes; beside their work.

Q.—Have you seen other fines? A.—Fines? why, it is a plaything with them.

Q.—Have you seen fines imposed for talking? A.—If anyone talks during working hours, and if he is not at his work, but goes talking on another bench, he gets a fine of fifty cents, and sometimes \$1.

Q.—Have you paid any of these fines yourself? A.—No. I will tell you the circumstances under which I paid a fine. There were four of us. A piece of tobacco was stuck against the wall. One of the lads had thrown it there. We paid \$1 a piece for that—that is, \$4—as we were four.

Q.—In what department do you work? A.—I work at the rollers—which is hand-work.

Q.—What wages do you earn in summer? A.—That depends on the job we work; sometimes \$9, \$10 and \$12—and this happens in summer.

Q.—Do you work for yourself, or do you work for a man on the bench? A.—I work for myself; and I have help under me.

Q.—In winter, the wages are lower? A.—Yes; from 37½c. per hundred pounds of work, which reduces our wages from \$2.50 to \$2 a week.

Q.—Do you mean to say that in winter you make only between six and seven dollars a week? A.—We can make \$7.50 a week, not counting the time that is lost.

Q.—How much time do you lose, then, about, in one year? A.—In one year we may lose from eight to nine weeks.

Q.—Does the factory close up? A.—Yes; the factory closes up. At one time we lose four weeks, at another time three weeks, and from time to time we lose two weeks at least.

Q.—That reduction of thirty-seven and a half per cent has been a regular thing for the past few years? A.—Ever since I can remember.

Q.—Do you work as much in winter as in summer? A.—The same work is done; there is no difference in work.

Q.—Are there more hands employed in the factory during the winter than during the summer? A.—It is the same thing.

Q.—How much do you pay the hands who work for you? A.—They all work

by the job ; I have some of them who make \$1.50 and \$1.75. I have some who earn up to \$5 a week.

Q.—Those who make \$1.50 are children? A.—Yes; children.

Q.—How old are they? A.—I have one little fellow who is eleven years old, another fourteen, and, besides these, women and girls.

Q.—That's for winter wages? A.—Yes.

Q.—In summer you make a little more? A.—About twenty-five or fifty cents a week more,

Q.—Do you engage your help yourself, or does the factory impose them on you? A.—We make the arrangements ourselves, but it is the factory that sends them up. We have no right to promote anybody in the factory, but once promoted we engage them.

Q.—You have not the right to engage any outsider, and make him enter the factory? A.—No; we must see the first foreman, and he takes them on.

Q.—Once you have engaged a hand, if you find that he does not work properly, can you set him aside to take others? A.—Yes; if they do not suit, we can dismiss them. Often, among ourselves, we find men who have nothing to do, and we employ them.

Q.—And you pay them? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you agree on the prices with them? A.—It is I who make the prices with them. The prices are the same throughout the factory.

Q.—Are the prices that you pay, the prices that are established by the factory, or determined by yourselves? A.—Determined by ourselves.

Q.—You lower or raise them as you like? A.—When we lower them, we do so according to our means. Children are lowered from twenty to thirty cents, and the women and girls about fifty cents a week. We, ourselves, are reduced about \$4 or \$4.50, and we take away from them in all \$1.50 or \$1.75. The balance is all lost by ourselves.

Q.—How long does this reduction last? A.—Six months.

Q.—Do you pay for the gas? A.—We do not pay for the gas.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are the children well treated in the factories? A.—We have a new foreman at the factory, and from all I can make out the children are well treated; that is, they are not annoyed or teased, but they have to pay their fines all the same.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Who lays down these fines? The men on the bench or the foreman? A.—It is the foreman.

Q.—Do you know what is done with these fines? A.—I never could find out.

Q.—Were you ever told that these fines were sent to some or other charitable institution? A.—I have been told that they have been sent to the hospitals.

Q.—Are there several closets for the women and girls? A.—There can be nothing better than what we have at the factory.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—How long have you been working in that factory? A.—Going on ten years.

Q.—And you stop in a place where imposing fines is a plaything? I believe you said that the imposition of fines is a plaything and you stop all this time in a place where they make a plaything of imposing fines on the working people? A.—Sometimes a day passes without a fine being imposed.

Q.—But you have stopped there all this time? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—There is no dining room for the hands in this factory? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Do the women and girls, who work in that department, likewise sit down on the floor? A.—They sit down on the floor the same as we do. They eat on the floor.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Do you know of a factory, here in Montreal, where there is a hall in which the working people may take their meals? A.—No. They all eat in the midst of the tobacco. I have gone through all the tobacco factories and they all eat in the same way, in the midst of the tobacco cuttings.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—Do you know whether any one has ever been discharged from this factory because he belonged to the Knights of Labor? A.—I have been told that two foremen were put out for that reason; but I could not swear if that is so or not. There appeared to be no other reason for putting them out. They were both good men.

(Translation.)

* * * , Tobacco worker, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :

Q.—You heard the evidence of the last witness? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you anything to contradict in what he said? A.—No.

Q.—You are employed on what is called the press? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Tell us, in a few words, what you do? A.—I pack the tobacco in boxes.

Q.—You have nothing to do with the machinery? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Have you seen fines imposed in your department? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you seen fines imposed for machinery that was broken? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Will you tell us what was the amount of the fine, and what was the extent of damage to the machinery? A.—I have seen a fine of \$15 imposed in the department of those who work in the moulds, for having broken a block. It was the upper block that broke. There is always a man at the head, who has 50 cents extra for the superintendence of this work. The foreman got a neighbour to help him and this man put two plugs of tobacco in the mould, one on top of the other, and this caused the machine to break. The one who was at the head had to pay a \$15 fine. They made him pay for the whole time that the workman took to fix the break. They calculated how much it would cost to repair the block, and they made him bear the whole expense.

Q.—Was it the fault of the man who conducts the work? A.—He did not take notice that there were two plugs of tobacco, one on top of the other, in that mould. Of course, I did not see him pay the money, but he told me himself that he had done so.

Q.—Have you paid any fines yourself? A.—No, sir.

Q.—What are the lowest wages that you have seen made in the factory where you work? A.—It was \$1.75 for children

Q.—And for the men? A.—In my own work it is \$6.50 for the men.

Q.—Are there men who made less than this in your department? A.—There are young men of 17, 18 and 19 years of age, who make from \$3.50 to \$4 a week, and upwards.

Q.—There are no fathers of families who make that much? A.—There are married men who earn \$5 a week, during the winter.

- Q.—At what hour do you have dinner? A.—We dine on the stroke of noon.
- Q.—Does it sometimes happen that you are obliged to work during the dinner hour? A.—As for us, we had so much to do in one day, that there were times when it was too much to eat. We had to gain time by working at noon; and we gained time also in the afternoon.
- Q.—You were forced to work during the whole dinner hour? A.—That did not happen to me often. In the three years that I worked there, it happened to me four times.
- Q.—Did it happen oftener with other hands in your department? A.—No. It was about the same thing. To clear off the work, we were sometimes obliged to work at a quarter-past twelve, there being too much work to be got through.
- Q.—Have you anything else to tell us? A.—I have this to say for myself that I was sent about my business for an affair which had nothing in it.
- Q.—What was that? A.—I was packing in boxes, and there was another man at my side, who had other work to do, but who wanted to learn my work. I went on to show the man how to pack and, while doing that, he neglected his own work, did it badly, and they put me out of the shop. And it was in winter, too.
- Q.—Were you commissioned by the factory to teach this man your work? A.—No; but the foreman saw him at work, and he had not forbidden my teaching him.
- Q.—Are there many plug tobacco factories in Montreal? A.—I know of five.
- Q.—It is pretty difficult to get work in winter? A.—It is so hard that I have been doing nothing for the past two months, and can find no employment. They gave me no warning, and they sent me away.
- Q.—Without any notice either? A.—Without any notice. They did not say to me: "Do not let that man work at your job or you will lose your situation." Nothing of the kind. They simply put me out.

MALLOBY PALMER, Foreman, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

- Q.—In what department of the Canadian Rubber Company, of Montreal, are you foreman? A.—Over the manufacturing department.
- Q.—For how many years have you been foreman for the Company? A.—For the last fifteen years.
- Q.—How many men, women and children are employed by the Company? A.—I do not know how many children are employed by the Company. In my employ there are seventy men; I have charge of the men in the manufacturing department.
- Q.—You have not charge of any children? A.—Well, there are only four boys in my department; four young boys.
- Q.—What is the age of these children? A.—Some, I should think, about fifteen. One has been there about ten days, who is scarcely thirteen.
- Q.—Do you know the ages of the other children employed in the factory? A.—Not under my charge; I should think they were about fifteen. I do not know their exact ages. I know there is one there, who has been there about fifteen days. I have not charge of the whole of the department, I have charge only of the manufacturing department.
- Q.—Was there an accident by which a man was killed in your department? A.—Well, I do not think there was, I do not remember any. There was one killed in about eighteen hundred and fifty six, but I do not remember any since. Oh, yes, there was; there was one killed since that time. I think it was about fifteen years ago.

Q.—Is there any machinery in your department? A.—Yes; it is all machinery. The greater part of it is machinery.

Q.—Is provision made for protecting this machinery, so that employees are guarded against accident? A.—Yes; it is the best I ever saw. It is better than in the United States. Most of the gear is covered up with metal.

Q.—Is there any machinery unprotected? A.—Well, there are some places, I suppose, where it is protected a little more than others, but the Company guards as much as they can against the possibility of accident.

Q.—Are there children working among this machinery? A.—Well, there are these boys, but they do very little about the machinery.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Are there any children about this unprotected machinery? A.—Well, there are two, three or four working.

Q.—Are they working in a dangerous place? A.—Where they are working, they are back from the machines.

Q.—So there is no danger to the boys? A.—No.

Q.—Do you think if the Factory Act obliged that machinery should be guarded it would be advantageous to the employees and the employers? A.—Yes.

Q.—What are the hours of labor in your department? A.—They are working nine hours at present, but ten hours a day is our regular day's work.

Q.—You work from seven to six? A.—Yes; but we quit at five on Saturday's.

Q.—Do you work longer hours in the fall? A.—Not very often. We have done it but not very often.

Q.—What is the latest hour at which you have closed? A.—Well, I think last winter, I do not think I worked after eight o'clock, except on an odd occasion, when I might have worked three or four nights until twelve o'clock.

Q.—So that there were odd occasions when you were working until twelve o'clock at night? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do the children work until twelve o'clock at night also? A.—It has been very seldom that they have worked as late as twelve o'clock.

Q.—But they have done so? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are there women employed in your department? A.—No.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What extra pay do the children get if they work until twelve o'clock? A.—They are just paid by the hour.

Q.—Do they get paid all the time they work after six o'clock at night, in addition to their day's pay? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are the same wages paid in winter as during the summer? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are fines imposed on the operatives in your department? A.—No; no fines are imposed.

WILLIAM GALLAGHER, of Montreal, Foreman in the Shoe Department of the Canadian Rubber Company, of Montreal, sworn:

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you employ women and children in your department? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is, to your knowledge, the age of the youngest child employed? A.—I would say not less than fourteen.

Q.—Do you know three children named Dunn, Francis and Smith? A.—I know Dunn; but he does not work for me.

Q.—What age do you think Dunn is? A.—I would say that Dunn is not quite fourteen; but he is very near fourteen. I am not certain about his age.

Q.—What are the hours of labor in your department? A.—Ten hours a day—nine at present.

Q.—During the busiest season, up to what time do they work? A.—Seven o'clock, half-past seven; and up to eight o'clock occasionally.

Q.—Never later than that? A.—No.

Q.—When they work until eight o'clock, have they time to rest after six o'clock at night? A.—Always. If they want half an hour they can have it, or longer if they require it—if not, they can go on with their work. It is all piece work.

Q.—Can you give the average wages earned each week by the women and children? A.—Well, the children average from two dollars and forty cents a week to two dollars and fifty cents a week; some receive three dollars. The women average, when they work ten hours, from four dollars and fifty cents to five dollars a week. Some receive more than five dollars a week, and some receive less.

Q.—Have you separate conveniences for boys and girls? A.—Yes.

Q.—Completely separate? A.—Oh, yes; the boys have no interference with the girls at all.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—These children that work nine hours a day at the present time, do they get full pay? A.—No, sir; we take an hour's pay off them the same as the rest.

Q.—Do you light the factory with gas? A.—We do.

Q.—Are the operatives charged with this gas? A.—No.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are fines imposed in your department? A.—Well, there is a slight fine. If any girl spoils work she is charged for the making of it.

Q.—Have you imposed many fines during the last year? A.—No, we have had less fines the last year than ever we had before.

Q.—You have got no other fines except those imposed for bad work? A.—That is all.

Q.—The fines imposed never exceed the amount you pay for the making of the shoes or piece? A.—No. The only thing is, that when a girl gets an order to do a thing, if she disobeys the order she may be compelled to pay one, two or three cents fine, but not more, and that very seldom happens.

Q.—What do you mean by disobeying. What orders do you refer to? A.—I mean to say that if we give an order for a shoe to be made in such and such a style, we want it to be done in that style, and we make her do it in that way or she pays the fine.

Q.—Is not that style different to that in which she generally works? A.—No; but sometimes she wants to bring in a different style; she wants to improve on our work, I suppose, as she would think, and we do not want her to choose for us, and if she insists we have to use other means to enforce obedience to orders.

Q.—Does this occur with the apprentice or young person who is only a short time in the factory, or does it happen with those who have been in the factory a long time? A.—No, that is with the new hands until we get them in the way of working according to our orders.

Q.—Do they do that voluntarily or against the orders of the Company or Superintendent? A.—Sometimes it is done voluntarily and against orders. If it is done through negligence we tell them to do it in such a way. We point out where they have done wrong.

Q.—Would it not be well to get proper teachers to show them how it should be done? A.—They are shown. We always do that when they first come into the factory, and there is nothing very difficult about the work.

Q.—How long does it require to make a good operative? A.—Two weeks.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—How long does a boy work before he is able to earn two dollars and fifty cents a week? A.—That depends upon the size of the boy, and it depends on the way he works.

Q.—If he is very young it takes longer? A.—We never take them under thirteen.

Q.—Is the webbing, &c., used in the factory imported or is it made in Canada? A.—Some of it is made in Canada, and some of it is imported.

Q.—Do you export any articles of your manufacture to places outside Canada? A.—Well, we have sent some few cases of shoes to Troy, in the State of New York.

Q.—You do not do that as a rule? A.—Well it seems to be only to one or two customers.

Q.—Can you afford to make goods in Canada and pay the duty for export? A.—I merely prepare the goods for the salesmen. They can send it across by balloons or any other way they please to for all I have to do with it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—When you work later than six o'clock at night do you close the doors of the factory? A.—No; the doors of the factory are never closed, that is to say they are never locked. They are only closed to keep out the cold. There are no locks or bolts turned to keep the doors closed.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do the doors open outwards or inwards? A.—Outwards.

Q.—How many storys are there to the building? A.—The building is four storys high.

Q.—How many flights of stairs? A.—Three—there is one flight to the new building.

Q.—How wide are the stairs? A.—They are eight or ten feet wide.

Q.—Are there any fire escapes outside the building? A.—Yes.

THOMAS SHELLY, Montreal, machinist, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You are foreman at Messrs. Pillow, Hersey & Co's Nail works. A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you under your charge sub contractors. That is to say any foremen under yourself. A.—No.

Q.—All the persons employed in your factory, work for the factory themselves, without working for other parties? A.—The parties in the machine shop work under me, that is the men I have got charge of—the machinists.

Q.—Are they in your employ or the employ of the Company? A.—They are in the employ of the Company.

Q.—Do you settle with them about prices or does the Company do it? A.—I settle with the machinists about prices. I give them their prices.

Q.—On behalf of the Company? A.—On behalf of the Company.

Q.—You receive no profit off these men yourself? A.—Oh, no.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do I understand you to say that you are in the machinery department? A.—Yes.

Q.—What wages does a first class machinist earn in your establishment? A.—

We pay our machinists two dollars and ten cents a day. The average is two dollars a day.

Q.—Do you employ any unskilled labor? A.—No, not in my department.

Q.—Have you any apprentices in your department? A.—We have got one.

Q.—You have nothing to do with the rolling or annealing department? A.—No except if anything breaks down and we are called to work there, otherwise we have nothing to do with any other department.

THOMAS GREATOREX, of the City and District of Montreal, Laborer.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—We understand that you desire to make some further explanations with regard to the charges of bailiffs in the collection of small debts? A.—Yes. In the first place, I understand the charge by the bailiff in the Divisional or Circuit Court was owing to having to put an extra guardian on, according to the paper. The bailiff fetched these things away, with four carts, from the very house on Wolfe street, and took them into his yard, on the corner of Beaudry and Dorchester streets, and placed them in his shed, and kept them there until the day of the sale. He sold them in his yard by auction. The account, the bailiff states, was twenty-nine dollars and fifty cents, that was the value the goods sold for.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—There is the itemized account for the goods that he took up and sold and the amount they come to. You have the bailiff's account as returned into court, have you not? A.—Yes. Well, I give you the itemized account of what the goods cost me—it is what the goods were sold for. He distinctly states that all they were worth and all they fetched was twenty-nine dollars and fifty cents (\$29.50), and I say they were worth one hundred and three dollars (\$103), then the next question is, I want to know, when I never left the city these six years, and was in situations where they could always find me, I want to know how it was they did not make a seizure upon my pay instead of allowing it to run on six years without my knowing anything about it or that I was in debt.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Did he never give you an account of what these goods brought? A.—No. I have no itemized account at all. They know my residence and where to find me. You see, after the sale they issued another execution for balance of debt and interest, and the cost of seizing my pay, and interest running at six per cent on the money, and my never having left the city at the time. The question only remaining in my mind is, "Is it lawful to let a debt run for six years?"

Q.—Did you have to pay six years' interest? A.—I had to pay interest, and as I could not make an agreement with the lawyer, I had to go to one of the clerks of the Debtors' Court, who also said he knew nothing about it—the paper was signed by one of the clerks of the Debtors' Court, which can be produced—that he agreed to take so much per week to pay the debt off from our company (witness' employers) and myself, for we were both seized for the debt.

Q.—Can you tell us the total amount you paid and the interest? A.—I could not. The papers are here. They are fyled. The only question that I wished to have answered, but it cannot be answered, you see, is this, "When a man does not leave the city, has a creditor the right to wait for six years before collecting his debt, and then to charge six per cent. interest."

The Chairman objects to any further evidence of the witness on this subject being taken, as tending to question the jurisdiction of the courts of law, and taking a

case which has been already decided by the courts and placing it before an unauthorized tribunal to try it.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Were you asked if you were willing to furnish a voluntary guardian? A.—I was asked nothing. The things were taken away while I was at work, my wife wanted them to let the things remain but they would not.

The Chairman objects to a continuation of this line of evidence for the same reasons as before given, and further for the reason that it is not the duty of the Commission to try the bailiff in the case in question for alleged non-performance of his duty, or over-stepping the bounds of his duty as such bailiff of the Circuit Court.

Q.—Did the bailiff ask you if you had a voluntary guardian to furnish or not? A.—He did not.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—And he refused to allow the things to remain in your house until you returned from work? A.—He refused to allow the things to remain in my house from two to six o'clock.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Having carried your things out of your house, how did he charge you for a special bailiff, or special caretaker? A.—That is the question I want to ask. It is not to get my money back, but it is for the benefit of the working man, that I call attention to this seizure. I can give you another case only two weeks ago, for a debt of four dollars and eighty cents, a letter was sent the man threatening a lawsuit and the amount charged was six dollars and fifty-five cents. If you have lots of money to pay the lawyer it may be all very well, but if you have not you have got to go to the wall.

Q.—Then that man must have been charging you for something that you never got. Did you ever get a special caretaker? A.—No.

29 February, 1888.

THOMAS HENRY LOVE, Montreal, Manager of the Montreal Steam Laundry,
sworn:—

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you employ many hands? A.—Yes. I believe in the neighborhood of one hundred. I employ one hundred down to ninety-five and seventy-five.

Q.—Are they all female help? A.—No. Well, most of our work is done by female labor. I have some men shirt ironers, and I have men running machines, and drivers; but the principal number of our employees are females.

Q.—Have you many young boys or girls working for you? A.—I should say the youngest is from fifteen to eighteen years old.

Q.—Are the women engaged in washing the clothing, or making up the clothing? A.—We do everything we can by machinery. Only flannels and silks are washed by hand.

Q.—What wages do the women earn? A.—Some make as much as two dollars a day. Women ironers receive, some ten dollars, some seven dollars, and some eight dollars a week. The smallest wages I pay is two dollars and fifty cents a week, and that is to the young girls, when they commence to learn our business.

Q.—How long are they working for two dollars and fifty cents a week, before they get more? A.—Well, sometimes they do not work more than two months, and sometimes longer. It all depends upon their cleverness in the work.

Q.—What is the average pay of a week hand? A.—Four dollars and fifty cents is the average.

Q.—How long are they required to work each day? A.—Ten hours in summer, nine hours in winter.

Q.—Is this laundry well ventilated? A.—Oh, yes. It is the best institution of that kind in the Dominion.

Q.—Is the temperature of the rooms kept about the same? A.—Not about the same. In one place—where we dry our clothes—it is a little hotter. We have got a large fan, in one end of the building, and it continues all through the building in the summer time.

Q.—Do the employees complain of the heat? A.—Sometimes; a new hand coming in—one who is not experienced—may complain of the heat.

Q.—Are you aware that any of those who work in the rooms for a number of hours are exhausted with the heat? A.—No.

Q.—What do the girls earn on the machines? A.—Different prices. Some fold the linen; they receive _____ and we get cheap help to run the machines. They get three dollars and fifty cents to four dollars and fifty cents, and some get five dollars a week.

Q.—What wages do the men earn? A.—About the same.

Q.—Have you provided separate conveniences for the men and women? A.—Yes; the men go down stairs altogether. The men are not allowed in the conveniences for the women help.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Are there many laundries carried on by Chinese, in the city of Montreal? A.—Yes; there are a few.

Q.—Do they enter into serious competition with other laundries? A.—I cannot speak as to that. Ours is a laundry that cost a lot of money; it cost \$3,600 before I took it.

Q.—It was owned by a company? A.—Yes; and I have spent considerable on it.

Q.—Has the number of Chinese laundries increased during the last few years? A.—I believe it has.

Q.—Are you afraid of Chinese competition? A.—No; I am not. But I will tell you what I am afraid of. I am afraid of the Good Shepherd's Reformatory convict labour. I got other institutions to sign a petition against it. That is the only institution that I am afraid of—and they can enter into strong competition with me, while I have to pay taxes, they pay none; they have not even to pay a water tax. They are exempt from all taxation. Of course, if an institution like that runs into competition with a place like mine, my place has got to be shut up. I have been told by the Pullman Palace Car Company that they have been asked for their work by this institution; and if I lost that, I should lose a good customer.

Q.—What convict labour have they got? A.—Well, they have got a female Reformatory; and now they propose starting this business and compete with us.

Q.—How many laundries are there at work in the Home of the Good Shepherd? A.—They have not started their laundry yet, but they are going to. They have got a large place built for a laundry—very large.

Q.—Are you aware that the City Council granted permission to the ladies of the Home of the Good Shepherd to erect a steam engine on their premises, only on the condition that the water should be paid for by meter? A.—I was told by Mr. White, who had my case in hand. I suppose he did all he could for me; and I guess he attended some of these meetings here in my behalf.

Q.—Do you know at what price the ladies of the Home of the Good Shepherd have agreed to do their laundry work for the Pullman Palace Car Company? A.—No; I do not know that. I have been employed by the Pullman's for some years. I have been in the laundry business on the "other side." I had been seven years in their employ then, and I have been seven years in the laundry business.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you think that they paid you a higher price than they are likely to pay these ladies ? A.—That is hard for me to say—I cannot tell. It is hard to say that. Of course, I suppose, there is no poorer class of help hired than I hire, and I pay them good wages. I hire poor widow women when they come around ; and another thing which I did not tell you, I keep a doctor that I pay out of my own pocket, and when any of my old help falls sick, I pay them just the same as if they were working, when they are ill when they are away sick I pay them just the same. During the smallpox epidemic I had the doctor call at our place every day, for which I paid him myself, without any charge to the help.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Do you know anything of the methods pursued by the Chinese in the washing of clothing ? A.—I have no idea. I have seen in some places white women washing for them.—They generally prop themselves up somewhere opposite a place like ours, but I have no idea of the method pursued by them.

By Mr. GIBSON :—

Q.—Have not some people objected to their method of washing clothing to you, as being not clean, and one calculated to spoil the clothing ? A.—I have heard objections in a general way, but I have not taken the trouble to enquire anything about them. I may say that we manufacture shirts and collars to order, and we keep a small staff of help for that purpose.

JOHN BECKINGHAM, Montreal, Captain of the Salvage Department of the Fire Brigade of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—How many hours each day of the year are the men of the Fire Brigade required to be on duty ? A.—Twenty-four.

Q.—What number of hours in a week are the fireman permitted to be away from the station ? A.—Well, they are allowed, as a rule, about four hours one evening in the week—about four hours that particular evening.

Q.—Are many of the firemen of this city married men ? A.—Yes ; a number of them are married.

Q.—How frequently are the firemen allowed to be a night at home with their family—a whole night ? A.—On very rare occasions that is allowed.

Q.—Is there not among the rules governing the Fire Brigade of this city, one allowing the men to take a night off in turn ? A.—No.

Q.—Are they ever allowed a day off ? A.—Well, occasionally they may be allowed a part of a day off ; but not the whole day.

Q.—What days are the firemen allowed by the city each year ? A.—There is no rule ; the men are supposed to give their whole time to their duties as firemen throughout the year.

Q.—They are supposed to be at their respective stations, ready for duty, the whole year through ? A.—Yes.

Q.—To whom do they apply when they desire to obtain a day's leave ? A.—They first make application to the foreman, or guardian, as we call him at the station, and through him to the chief of the fire department. The chief is the only one that can grant more than a couple of hours.

Q.—Is permission always granted to a fireman when he asks to get away a couple of days ? A.—Yes ; I believe it is.

Q.—How frequently does a fireman get permission to remain away a part of the day? A.—Very seldom.

Q.—What privileges have the guardians of stations over the firemen? A.—The privileges are these: that a guardian of a station resides on the premises; he has separate apartments for himself, wife and family, comfortably situated; and he is at home with his family all the time.

Q.—What difference is there in the pay of a guardian and an ordinary fireman? A.—One hundred dollars a year.

Q.—And these privileges besides? A.—Yes.

Q.—He is furnished with water and a home? A.—Yes; water and house rent; but no fuel.

Q.—Is he furnished with light? A.—There is one light to show him down when the alarm rings.

Q.—What are the regulations regarding the benevolent fund of the fire department? A.—The regulations are separate and distinct from the fire department—the benevolent fund is a distinct organization. It is incorporated by Act of Parliament, and is mainly supported by the citizens by donations, for work done by the firemen, in saving their buildings when threatened by fire; and also by small contributions of the members.

Q.—You have not got a copy of the by-laws? A.—No; but I can get one in a few minutes. I will ask one of our men to go to the station and get one for you. (Witness does so.)

Q.—How many men are members of this benevolent association? A.—There are about fifty-eight.

Q.—And how many men are there in the brigade? A.—I believe there are one hundred and eight.

Q.—Why are not all the members of the brigade permitted to belong to the association? A.—Its rules are against it.

Q.—Why are not all the members of the brigade permitted to join this benevolent association? A.—Well, that is very simple. Each member has got to pass a doctor's examination. He has got to be under thirty years of age. Besides, some do not care to join it. That is one of the reasons so many do not belong to this association.

Q.—Are there any men in the department who are refused admission? A.—Yes.

Q.—Are these men in good health? A.—To all appearances they are.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Were any refused by the medical inspector? A.—In one or two cases the medical man would not pass them and others were over age. The object of refusing any that are over thirty years of age, is to ensure healthy members.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Are the monies donated by the citizens, donated to the fire brigade, or a portion of the fire brigade? A.—Sometimes it is donated to the brigade and at other times to the fund.

Q.—Why are those in the society debarred from participation in these benefits? A.—There is another fund, the firemen's fund, where the money is donated to the brigade, it is divided up at the end of the year, so that all receive their donation; one portion is divided amongst the members of the brigade who are not members of the benevolent fund, and the other portion goes to the benevolent fund—perhaps one half of this amount is divided amongst the men and the balance goes into the benevolent fund.

Q.—Is the sleeping accommodation in the stations all that it ought to be for the men? A.—In some stations it is not. In fact, in the majority it is not.

Q.—What is the chief objection to these sleeping quarters at the present time?

A.—Well, one of the objections is that the sleeping quarters are on the same flat as the horses' stables, and that the rooms are not large enough.

Q.—Is there a bad smell? A.—They claim that there is.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Do they furnish you with beds? A.—Just a bedstead, no bedding. There should be bed clothes and everything supplied by the city.

Q.—Supposing that one of your men is too poor to get proper bed clothing, what does he do? A.—He has got to lie on the iron bedstead. The city furnishes that.

Q.—Do these men pay for the washing of their own bedding? A.—Yes.

Q.—What do they receive from the corporation in addition to their pay? A.—Two sets of clothing, spring and fall. They are furnished with a pair of pants, and pair of boots, and a coat for winter and summer. They are also furnished with an overcoat. This year they have been supplied with rubber boots and a rubber overcoat.

Q.—In a year like the present, in which there has been so many fires, is that all that is furnished? A.—These will do very well until the present year is up, but we want others to replace them.

Q.—Are they sufficient for the year? A.—Well such a year as this, our pants, coats and boots get used up in a very little time.

Q.—How do the wages paid to the members of the Montreal Fire Brigade compare with other cities? A.—The wages are about twenty-five per cent lower than Toronto and fifty per cent lower than Boston or New York—exactly fifty per cent.

Q.—Taking into consideration the wear and tear on the firemen's clothing and the hardships they have to endure do you consider that the members of the Montreal Fire Brigade are paid sufficient to keep them? A.—No; I do not.

Q.—Have the firemen ever petitioned the Chief to allow them a night off in turn? A.—They have petitioned the Fire Committee.

Q.—What was done with that petition? A.—It was shelved. I never heard that anything came of it.

Q.—In your opinion would it impair the efficiency of the brigade if the men were granted that privilege? A.—Well it would, because there has not been sufficient men in the brigade to allow a man to remain off.

Q.—Do you know if firemen in other cities are granted that privilege? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is the number of firemen larger or smaller in Montreal in proportion to size than in other cities? A.—It is smaller. Toronto has one hundred thousand inhabitants and Montreal has nearly two hundred thousand inhabitants and there is only ten or fifteen more men here than in Toronto.

Q.—How many firemen are there in the Toronto Fire Brigade? A.—I believe there is something like ninety-five men, I would not be positive.

Q.—Have the men of the Montreal Brigade petitioned for holidays in the year? A.—As a rule our men cannot take advantage of holidays because they have no money to take them out of town; but occasionally when a man is fortunate enough to have a little money he can generally get from eight or ten days holidays.

Q.—Then it is not the want of holidays it is the want of money? A.—Yes; to take the advantage of getting out of town.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you consider the method of appointing men on the brigade the best to be adopted? A.—No.

Q.—Do the best men always get on the brigade? A.—No; they do not, it is all on one side. There is more chance of a poor man (so far as ability goes) getting on the brigade than a good one.

Q.—How are the firemen paid? A.—Twice a month, on the fifteenth and last day of every month.

Q.—Do they prefer that method to weekly payments? A.—Well I never heard any complaints with regard to that.

Q.—Speaking of the men who are in the benevolent society, and those who are not, do you consider the men who are out of the society as good men as those who are in it? A.—Well, as a rule, there are younger men out of it than are in it. The fifty-eight men who belong to it are more experienced, and better tried, so that if I were to give an answer to your question, I should say that I would not consider the men who are out of it are as good as those who are in it. There are exceptions, of course.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—When are you allowed to go to your meals? A.—The men go by turns, and they are allowed an hour for each meal.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—When vacancies occur on the force, are there many applications for the positions? A.—I believe there are, but I am not in a position to answer positively.

Q.—Do many men frequently leave the force to go to mechanical trades, or other businesses? A.—They do.

Q.—They think it more desirable to get their living as mechanics, or in a work shop, or other businesses, than to remain on the force? A.—Well, they do not like the confinement. If they last over a year, they remain on the force, but it is trying to them. They remain until the attraction ends.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Do you know what class of firemen were employed before your brigade was organized? A.—We had a volunteer department, but we had no auxiliaries.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Are the firemen appointed through outside influence? A.—They are appointed after being nominated by an Alderman.

Q.—And has the City Council anything to do with it? A.—They are appointed by the Fire Committee.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is the clothing furnished by the City to the firemen? A.—Yes.

Q.—When a fireman's clothing is destroyed or injured, by attending at a fire, is it replaced by the City? A.—Not until the time comes round for a new issue. If our uniform is torn, or burnt, we have to get it mended or replaced.

Q.—At your own expense? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have there been any occasions when the City Council or Fire Committee have replaced the clothing of firemen injured at fires? A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—If the work at a fire is very hard, or very long continued, do the authorities supply you with refreshments? A.—They have of late. Before, we were dependant on private generosity.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have many men been wounded or killed during the past year? A.—There

were eight men injured—two severely last year—during the past month we have had sixteen men laid up after one fire. None of them were seriously hurt, but some have not recovered yet.

Q.—Do these men get regularly paid when sick? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do they get medical attendance at the cost of the city and other remedies?

A.—No; each man has his own doctor.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—And he has to pay the doctor? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—The city does not take care of firemen injured in its service? A.—No; this last month I speak of—the month of January there was a doctor, I do not know if he was appointed by the city, but he came around and visited all the parties laid up and he has never sent in his bill to the individual members. That is the first time it has occurred to my knowledge.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that men were killed during fires on account of the bad construction of the buildings? A.—Yes.

Q.—Especially when there were very high brick walls? A.—Well, it has generally been through floorings giving away.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Are the firemen supplied with plans of buildings showing where the hatchways and escapes are? A.—No.

Q.—Do you know of any place where they are supplied to the Fire Brigade? A.—In New York, I believe, some of the men go round every quarter to examine the buildings so that they are mostly all posted with regard to where there are elevators, and goods hoists, and places where inflammable or explosive materials are stored. Each fire section or precinct looks after its own section or precinct.

Q.—Do you think that the adoption of a similar plan by the Fire Committee of the City of Montreal would be a benefit to the firemen? A.—Yes; it would be a great benefit.

Q.—Do you know of any Canadian city where that plan is adopted? A.—I do not.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Are these plans easily available when a fire breaks out? A.—We would not have time to look at the plan. We would know the nature of the buildings before the fire breaks out. When a fire does break out we get down to it and into the building just as quick as we can, but if we knew the buildings beforehand, as some of us would know, it would prove of great benefit. We would know on which side the stairs were and we would know where to find the hoist. There would be several of us would have a knowledge of the building.

Q.—You think the system would be of great advantage to the firemen? A.—Certainly.

Q.—I see that all applications for membership to this society must be laid before the board and passed by the majority of those present? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that method adopted now? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many votes reject an application? A.—The majority.

Q.—It depends upon nothing but the doctor's certificate and the age? A.—No.

Q.—If a man made a mistake in his age he would be requested to withdraw? I understand that has been done once? A.—Yes; that was sometime ago—that was the first time since the present department was organized.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Does the City of Montreal insure the lives of the firemen for the benefit of

the families or relations of the firemen? A.—Yes; the city keeps up their policies, that is, there is a slight scale of insurance from three years up to the time they have been ten years in the brigade, when their friends would receive one thousand dollars—that is the highest their friends could receive if they were killed.

Q.—That applies to all of the men who are members of the force? A.—Yes.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—If a man is permanently disabled what does he get? A.—Nothing.

Q.—Does he get anything from the city? A.—Nothing, unless it is by the good wish of the people.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—And that too if he is disabled while at work in the interests of the city? A.—Yes; he will loose his work and perhaps be disabled for life.

Q.—I believe some have received something from the Council? A.—There are some I believe.

Q.—And that has been by special vote of the Council? A.—Yes.

JAMES DOOLAN, Fireman, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—You are a member of the Montreal Fire Brigade? A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you been a member of the Brigade? A.—Eleven years.

Q.—Have you heard the evidence of the previous witness? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you anything to add to what he has already said. I think you have heard the different things that he spoke of. Have you anything to add? A.—Well, the only thing that I have got to add is to that last thing that he spoke of. I say that when a man joins the department, and passes a medical examination in a satisfactory manner to the doctor, he ought to be admitted as a member of the benevolent fund. I think thirty years of age is too great a limit.

Q.—You think the age should be extended? A.—I do.

Q.—Before taken on the Brigade, are the men examined by a doctor? A.—No.

Q.—Are the duties of a fireman the same as those of a guardian? A.—Yes.

Q.—They are pretty much the same? A.—Yes.

Q.—Only he is at home, and the men are not? A.—That is it.

Q.—Do you know anything about a petition got up to the Chief, asking for certain hours leave of absence from the stations? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know what answer was given to that petition? A.—No; not exactly. I do not know the answer, but as far as I can understand the thing was brought up, and, after it had been explained a little, it was remarked in the Committee, that the Committee could not afford to give the hours we wanted; that our number was so small at the time, that it could not be granted.

Q.—Are the men ever in danger, while working at fires, from telegraph or telephone wires? A.—Very often.

Q.—Do these wires impede the work of firemen seriously? A.—Yes; there is a good deal of danger to the men while working, of getting entangled with them. We have considerable trouble owing to the number of wires and the many directions in which they run. Now, it is worse than ever as the telephone wires add largely to the number, and run in and out of buildings.

Q.—Have you ever heard of instances, or any instance, where firemen have been killed or injured by the electric current passing through the wires of the Electric Light Company? A.—Not in this city. I have heard of it in New York.

Q.—Are those wires so placed as to be dangerous to men at a fire? A.—Well, they tell me in the Electric Department that they have switches to cut off the electric current in case of fires.

Q.—Now, do you think it would have any serious effect on the efficiency of the brigade, if the men were allowed a night off in turn? A.—Not now; I do not think it would. We know more now than at the time the application was made.

By Mr. CARSON:

Q.—Would it not be possible to have a spare man to send around to take the place of the man who is absent for the night, in order to let the men have a night off in turn? A.—Most decidedly, if the city paid the man. There are lots of good men to be had.

Q.—Has there been any large increase in the number of the men? A.—Some stations have not got any more men than they had six years ago; some other stations have.

Q.—How far from the stations are the firemen required to live? Within what limits? A.—No special limit. Some live a good way off, and some live near. To some of the men it is no advantage to live near.

Q.—If the men lived only a short distance from the stations, would it remove the difficulty of getting a night at home? A.—I do not think it would. I know I have lived right straight across the road for the past two years close to the fire station, and I have never got a night off.

THOMAS HENRY HOGAN, Montreal, member of the Montreal City Fire Brigade.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How long have you been on the Montreal Fire Brigade? A.—Since the year eighteen hundred and seventy-six. I am attached to the Wellington Street Fire Station.

Q.—Do you belong to the Firemen's Benevolent Association that we have heard of? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you ever belong to it? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the reason that you do not belong to it now? A.—The reason was, when I joined the Fire Department my mother could not give my proper age. I said I was a certain age, and passed the doctor, and was accepted. Subsequently, when sick, upon asking for seven days' benevolent allowance, they objected, and said I was over age, and the consequence was the Chief came down to the station and compelled me to sign a bill, and refunded me the money.

Q.—How long had you been a member of the Benevolent Association connected with the Fire Department at this time? A.—Probably a year or more.

Q.—And you had paid your dues regularly? A.—Yes.

Q.—How much were you over the age? A.—I was two years and seven months.

Q.—Do the firemen consider this present mode of managing this fund favorable to the brigade? A.—Some think not, and some think it perfectly right. For this reason a certain class of firemen cannot join the society. Anybody can join the department, there is no distinction whatever, providing you are fit for the position. but they formed a by-law about twelve or thirteen years ago that nobody could become a member of this Benevolent Association, except he was under thirty years of age. That was to debar other men from coming in for its privileges and protection.

Q.—What benefits are given out of this fund other than assistance when injured by accidents? A.—They get their wages, and the relations receive so much a year

if they die. The widow receives one hundred dollars a year for life if she remains a widow. If she re-marries she loses her pension.

Q.—Does the widow receive funds in any way from the society if her husband dies from natural causes? A.—I cannot say that—there are men here belonging to it who can tell you about that, They will be able to answer any question you like to put to them.

Q.—Supposing that two men were injured at a fire, and that one belongs to the association and the other does not, does the one who does not belong to the association receive anything? A.—No. Only in this way. His pay and his salary run on at the option of the Chief.

Q.—And the one who belongs to the Association what does he receive? A.—In the benevolent fund it is the same way I suppose. There are some men who have been sick for several days, and who do not get paid for the time. They do not get paid any money, it was taken off them.

Q.—Have you ever known men to be fined? A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you tell us what that was for? A.—Well; it was in the same way. They were fined for not obeying orders, or attending to their duty properly. I cannot tell definitely what the fines were for. There was a party—a man fined twenty dollars. Others have been discharged by the chief, and taken on again, and other men have been fined and the money has been refunded.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—What disposition is made of the money acquired by fines levied on a man?

A.—I cannot tell you.

Q.—You do not know what becomes of the money? A.—No.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—Were these fines imposed for anything done at fires contrary to orders?

A.—I do not know.

Q.—Do you think it is possible for the men to have a turn off—that is a night off duty without injuring the efficiency of the Fire Brigade? A.—Yes.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Have you anything that you wish to tell us in connection with the Fire Brigade in addition to what you have already stated? A.—Well; I see some of my comrades here giving evidence with regard to the Fire Brigade very truthfully, but there are some things that have not been asked. In the first place no improvements have been made in the condition of the married men. I would like you gentlemen to put yourselves in the place of some of the married men—firemen living in a small place at a big rent—with the mother and children living there, and the fireman's mother or his wife's mother living there with them. A guardian has told you that we sometimes get out from 3 p.m., to 10 p.m. Now it is very hard for an elderly woman to sleep in the same room as the mother, her husband and the children. It is disgraceful certainly, in plain language. We will not talk about cotton factories, for I mean to say there is as much immorality in that, as in the cotton factories and nothing less. In fact our salary is very small. A fireman cannot live on \$500.00 a year and pay his honest debts, because I and others are in debt. It is very small pay, as rent and everything else has gone up in price. We have asked for an increase in pay. We have often asked the chief, and the chief has refused to say anything in the matter to the Fire Committee. We have also petitioned the chief to receive a night off, and I believe he has used some very hard language in the presence of others in the room.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Those objections that you made to the Chief have they been presented to

the Fire Committee? A.—We got up a petition and were going to give it to the Chairman direct, but some thought we should give it to the Chief, as it would show respect to him, so we gave it to him himself. After he had received it, and read it, it was thrown into the waste paper basket. And there is another thing gentlemen, that it is sometimes dangerous for men to speak the truth, or ask what is right and just, because if he does so he is a marked man.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that firemen who have complained of their grievances have been dismissed from the brigade? A.—Well, they may not have been dismissed for that, but there is a way of finding fault with a man, so that he might as well leave, as be dogged about.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—What holidays do the men receive in the summer time? A.—We are not entitled to any. Some men get off for eight days, others ten.

Q.—Where do they go? A.—If they have got any money they go and stay with their friends in the country, but we cannot get any holidays providing we stay in the city.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are you not granted a day to go out with your family? A.—The Guardian has the privilege of refusing us or not. Providing I have the privilege to go off at night at six o'clock, my Guardian can stop me. We have no protection.

Q.—Under the by-laws are there none granting the firemen a certain number of hours a week? A.—Not at all, only our meal hours. Three hours every day.

Q.—Is it to your knowledge that firemen have been refused a holiday when it could have been granted to them? A.—I, myself, have been refused for a single day when it could be granted, but not lately.

Q.—In case you get three days holidays is your pay the same? A.—Our duties are the same, but the way we do it is this. In the station there are four men, and when the one man is off on a holiday the other three men do his work while he is away.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Are applicants for positions in the Fire Department examined by a physician as to physical efficiency before being appointed? A.—No; they are not. The only time a man is examined is previous to his passing for the Association.

Q.—That is to say you are examined by the doctor belonging to the Benevolent Association? A.—Yes.

Q.—Would it be an advantage to the firemen for the men to be examined by a physician before they receive their appointment as members of the brigade? A.—Yes; for the reason that members of the Fire Department have been refused as members of the Benevolent Association, and have been accepted by the Board of the Department.

(Translation.)

JOSEPH THEODULE ST. PIERRE, Guardian of No. 8 Fire Station, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—What are the duties of a Fire Station Guardian? A.—The duties of Station Guardian are these: they are at the head of the Station, at the head of the men, and work under the orders of the Chief.

Q.—What power have you with regard to letting the men out at night? A.—I cannot allow them more than three or four hours.

Q.—Are fines imposed on the men for disobedience of the Guardians' orders?
A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Is there any discontent among the men on account of this by-law, which forces them to stop in the Station? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What distance from the Station are the men allowed to go to take exercise in the course of the day? A.—There is no determined distance. A man asks leave to go out for two or three hours, and he gets it, but he has no permission to leave the city without the authority of the Chief.

Q.—While the men are presumed to be on duty in the Station, what distance are they allowed for exercise? A.—There is no distance. They are supposed to be in the Station all the time.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—But are they? A.—A man may cross the street, but goes no further than a hundred yards.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—While they are at the Station do the men get leave to go out for the sake of exercise? A.—Yes; when they ask leave they get it, but not too often.

Q.—To go across the street are they bound to ask leave? A.—No; they do not ask leave.

Q.—Are those who run the engines looked upon as members of the Brigade? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What are their wages? A.—As to the reels it is generally the Guardian himself who runs that, and he gets \$100 more than the others, as Guardian of the Station also, but the drivers of the ladders get the same wages as the others.

Q.—At what hour of the night are the men reckoned to be on duty? A.—They are reckoned to be always on duty, but when a man asks an evening to himself, he starts out about seven, or half past seven o'clock, and comes back about half past ten to eleven.

Q.—How is the guard organized by night? A.—It is the same as in the day time, only we are allowed to lie down. The gong awakens us.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Then there is no person on the watch? A.—No, sir; except at the Chaboillez Square Station, because there all the men lie upstairs.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—Are there men who leave the Brigade by reason of old age? A.—Up to the present I have never seen any.

Q.—Have the Firemen ever expressed a wish to have a superannuation fund? A.—Yes; at the last meeting of the Benevolent Society, a committee was cast to go before the Fire Committee, and ask for that fund.

Q.—Is this fund for the members of the Benevolent Society only, or for all the members of the Brigade? A.—All the members of the Brigade.

Q.—Do you consider that the existing by-laws of the Benevolent Society are fair to all the members of the Brigade? A.—No; up to a certain point, as it strikes me, that a man, past thirty years of age, might become a member of the association.

By Mr. McLEAN :

Q.—What constitutes the uniform or set of clothing? A.—Almost nothing. There is a great coat, and a pair of trowsers, and in summer, a light coat, and as to boots and shoes we are supplied with money to buy them. We buy boots and shoes as we like.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Are you here given rubber overshoes? A.—Yes; this winter, when it was seen that we stood in need of them, we got an India rubber coat and India rubber boots.

By Mr. CARSON :—

Q.—Do they give you a cap? A.—They give us one every second year.

Q.—Do they give you an overcoat? A.—A great coat in the Fall, an overcoat in the Spring.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Has the Guardian the power of preventing a man from going out at any time? A.—I think he has.

Q.—Does it often happen that the Guardian refuses a man leave to go out? A.—I have never yet refused such a man leave. I do not know how the other Guardians do.

(Translation.)

29th February, 1888.

CAMILLE J. GRENIER, Corset Maker, of Montreal, sworn :—

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—Is the Manufacture of corsets considerable in Montreal? A.—No; not to any extent. Beyond mine, there is only one other corset factory.

Q.—Could you give us an idea of the number of persons employed in these two factories? A.—In mine, about 25; in the other, I am not positive. I think it is about 12 or 15.

Q.—As a rule, are they men or women? A.—The majority are girls.

Q.—What is the age of the youngest girl in your employ? A.—The youngest is 15 years old, and there is only one of that age.

Q.—Do the young women make use of the sewing machines? A.—Yes; they make use of sewing machines propelled by steam, so that it does not come hard on them. At the start—about eight years ago—I had no steam, and then it was hard on the girls.

Q.—Are many of the girls employed at ironing? A.—There is one.

Q.—Is the ironing done mostly by the men? A.—Elsewhere, yes; but not with me.

Q.—Is it not a very hard work? A.—No; it is not very hard. Most of the corsets are not starched to-day, and the work is not so hard as when they were wholly starched.

Q.—What are the wages for a woman who has been a sufficiently long time at that kind of work? A.—\$4.25; but I have some employed, in more difficult work, who make \$8.50 a week, but those prices are for the very skillful.

Q.—How much do the young women earn? A.—Some \$1.25, and others \$2.50.

Q.—How long are they expected to work for \$1.25? A.—That is hard to say. That kind of work which is very easy is entrusted to little girls, and all depends on their skill. There is no other way of telling.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Can any child do that class of work? A.—Any child, whatever, can do that work.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—The cutters, how much do they make? A.—It is my brother who does the cutting. I give him about \$60 a month.

Q.—The sanitary condition of the shop is good? A.—All is very clean. The Health Officers have found it to be a very good shop.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Is it a new building? A.—Yes; comparatively. Five years old.

By Mr. FREED:—

Q.—Do the men work by the piece or by the week? A.—They all work by the week. I used to have them work by the piece, but that gave me too much trouble. As the men are almost all on the same floor, and my brother and myself are constantly there, we find that it is less trouble, and more profitable, to have the work done by the week.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you exact that the girls replace the needles which they break? A.—No.

Q.—Do you impose any fines on the girls? A.—Never. We run our concern on a fatherly principle. I have girls working for me these six, seven and eight years. That shows that the shop is well kept.

(Translation.)

M. L'ABBÉ DESCARRIES, curé of St. Henri, Hochelaga County, sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—In your opinion is the superintendence of cotton mills such as it ought to be? A.—I cannot answer that question in the shape in which it is put to me. I do not know what that superintendence is.

Q.—I speak of the moral condition of the hands? A.—It is difficult still to answer because I really do not know what superintendence is exercised. Certain things may happen of which I may have cognizance; but positively I do not know if there is any superintendence or if the superintendence is overdone.

Q.—Are you aware of the fact that scandals have happened among these people? A.—Yes; I may state that fact.

Q.—Is there a great proportion, nevertheless, of honest people who work there, that is, is the ratio of honest people a great one? A.—Certainly; it is the great majority—even it is almost the whole. Certain things have happened; but I may not condemn in a general way.

Q.—Do you think that a foreman who has behaved badly in an establishment should be kept a single hour after his conduct has been reported to the superintendent or the proprietor? A.—No; if there is a question of morals.

Q.—Have you any reason to believe that this rule has not always been observed? A.—I may not reply to that, having lodged a complaint, one day, myself I was promised that it would be seen to.

Q.—Is the behaviour of these people generally good? A.—Yes; generally. I may answer that generally it is proper, and that really the other cases are the exceptions.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Do you know of any foreman who has abused his position to illtreat those under him in the sense of morality? A.—If I am not bound to reply to this question I shall not do so. I repeat what I said. I once made a complaint and was promised that it would be attended to.

By Mr. CARSON:—

Q.—To the best of your knowledge have these abuses been kept up? A.—I should prefer not answering that question.

—
Translation.

EMMANUEL MASSON, Boot and Shoe Foreman, of Montreal, sworn:—

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—You have put into my hands a resolution passed at a meeting of working boot and shoe men? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—That resolution contained the grievances and demands which the meeting of workingmen is desirous to lay before the Commission? A.—Yes, sir.

“We, the workingmen in a boot and shoe factory, after meeting and discussing the interests of the employers and the workingmen, have the honor of submitting to the Labor Commission what follows:

“Whereas there is no regular system of apprenticeship in boot and shoe factories;

“Whereas the apprentices, chiefly in the department of leather and pattern cutters, often leave the factory when they know only a small portion of their trade;

“Whereas these apprentices, being less skillful, receive on that account less wages than the workingmen who are more capable;

“Whereas, if there existed a system of apprenticeship, the employers would be better served, inasmuch as the work would be better and more economically done;

“Whereas the raw material employed in the manufacture of boots and shoes for the people is abundant, and as cheap as elsewhere; and that the manufacture of that class of work is well advanced in Canada, and more than in Europe, so that the Government might possibly assist in the exportation of Canadian boots and shoes, we submit:

“1. That there be an agreement in writing between the employer and the apprentice, setting forth that the employer binds himself to teach the apprentice during the time laid down in the indenture.

“2. That no child under 14 years, and that is not in good health and of sound constitution, may be admitted into a boot and shoe factory as apprentice or otherwise.

“3. That every apprentice shall read and write sufficiently to keep an account of his work, and report thereon to whom it may concern.

“4. That the women shall work no more than eight hours a day from 1st December to 1st April; and ten hours the balance of the year.

“5. That night schools shall be opened free in the several wards of the city, chiefly for workingmen and apprentices.

“6. That the factories shall be obliged to open their doors at least one half-hour before beginning of work in the morning, and at noon; and these same doors shall remain open at least one half-hour after the hour set forth for the completion of work.

“7. That the Government shall give a certain amount of money to the employers, for each nationality engaged in this industry, to enable them to send agents, or

Q.—Are these tariffs found in the law books, or are they printed separately?
A.—The tariff is found in the books of practice, and in the codes of procedure.

Q.—Could you give us an idea of the retainers; are they in proportion to the amount of the suit, or are they left to the discretion of the lawyer? A.—They are left to the discretion of the lawyer, more or less. He must make arrangements with his client to get his retainer, for the reason that, generally speaking, the lawyer is limited to the items of the tariff.

Q.—Do you know the ordinary charges for petty suits, and small debts? A.—I have very little experience in that class of cases. I have not practised, to any extent in the Circuit Court. I know that the amount appears considerable to the pleaders. When there is question of a matter of \$10 or \$15, the parties involved are usually not very well to do, and when they are sentenced to pay these amounts, with costs, figuring up to \$7 or \$8, it looks rather serious to them, and it is really a serious thing. But even in such a case, it strikes me that the lawyers' fee is very slight, as, for instance, in an affair of \$15 or \$20 he may get no more than \$5. The balance goes off in costs, for writs, returns of writs, and other steps to reach a judgment at last.

Q.—Are there charges in Montreal different from those levied in other parts of the Province? A.—Yes; on account of disbursements in connection with the tax on buildings, but the fees are uniform throughout the Province of Quebec, and are laid down by the Judges of the Province.

Q.—Will you tell us whether the products of the charges, which are extra in Montreal, are, nevertheless, divided between the different parts of the Province; does the Province collect this, or does it remain in Montreal? A.—The disbursements are collected by the Prothonotary, and by the Sheriff, and transmitted to the Government.

Q.—Have you anything to suggest to the Commission? A.—I should like to make a suggestion in regard to the disbursements which have been paid since 1849, and which I look upon as excessive. The suggestion is that the government would reduce this amount of tax for the buildings, if they did not make them disappear altogether. That tax was imposed in 1849, when the building of the Court House was begun. About 10 years ago, Mr. Wurtele, who was a member of the Legislature, at Quebec, made an effort to have this tax abolished. His law plea was that the building had been paid for, years before, with all the accumulated interests and that, in consequence, there was no farther reason for laying the tax for the Court building. The Bar was likewise under the impression that the costs of the building had long been settled. Yet, lately—about one month or two ago—I learned from quite an official source, that it was all a mistake and that there was still a certain amount to be liquidated which had been incurred for repairs.

Q.—Are you aware of the fact, or have you ever heard that here, in Montreal, lawyers go around hawking after customers, and drumming up suits? A.—I believe that this is an evil which is quite general throughout the country, and I fancy that we are not free from it here.

Q.—Could you tell us whether there exists an understanding among lawyers not to do the business called "*disceditante*"? A.—There is no such understanding, but there are rules, which were adopted by the Council of the Bar and sanctioned by the Legislature—very strict rules.

Q.—And, in spite of that, the lawyers break the law? A.—Yes, they solicit clients.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—The retainers which are settled between the client and the lawyer, are they generally included within the limits of the tax established by law? A.—No. The retainer depends entirely on what is understood between the lawyer and the client.

Q.—Does it happen that lawyers solicit the collection of debts? A.—As to the

collection of debts, I have heard that lawyers do, indeed, solicit it, but I know personally of no particular case.

Q.—If a lawyer does not pay his tax or fee, he is not entitled to practise? A.—No. Every member of the Bar has, I think, \$6 a year to pay, on or before the 1st of May, otherwise his name is not entered in the lawyers' list, and he is thus debarred from practising. They are under obligation to pay \$6, but that affords them several advantages, such as the right of using the library and the like.

(Translation.)

PIERRE LACROIX, Inspector of Buildings of the City of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN :—

Q.—Will you tell us the number of houses that there are in the City of Montreal?

A.—It would be impossible to tell you. The assessors alone are able to give the number.

Q.—Which are the buildings that you visit within the city? A.—Generally the buildings that are in course of construction, and those of which complaints are made.

Q.—In what state do you find the buildings of which complaint is made? A.—Very often the complaints are made by tenants who want to break their lease, or, at other times, are desirous of molesting the landlord. I have also received complaints from the landlords themselves, seeking to get their own houses condemned in order that the tenants may be put out. Generally speaking, more than one half of the complaints made against certain houses are utterly without foundation.

Q.—And with regard to the houses about which the complaints are made, what are the flaws that you find? A.—Very often there are most damaging flaws which require the demolition of the house itself, or else the trouble is with portions of other buildings, that are more or less hurtful to the public health, on account of parts of the wall falling away, or when the life and property of some tenant is in jeopardy.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—And, at other times, it is on account of sanitary reasons? A.—No; not for sanitary reasons. I have nothing to do with what concerns tenants' repairs, nor with what relates to the sanitary condition of the building.

By Mr. BOIVIN :—

Q.—Have you printed instructions, setting forth the conditions which you impose on those who are about to build? A.—I have drawn up, for the guidance of builders, that is, of the man who builds a printed schedule, in which I lay down the conditions according to which the building is to be erected—such as the strength of the materials, the solidity of the foundations, the depth into the earth: in order to make sure that the building may not be subject to defects in construction such as would render the building unsafe. Otherwise, I should be obliged to exact from them a detailed specification of their house, which would lead to useless costs. What I exact of them is an abstract.

Q.—Is it a part of your duty to see that the sewers and drain pipes are solid and in a proper sanitary state? A.—I have nothing to do with that. There are many streets in Montreal, through the annexation of new municipalities, which have not even drains in the street.

Q.—Do you find that you have, in your department, powers sufficient and necessary to erect substantial buildings? A.—I think so. Sometimes, however, I

am checked by certain influences. I am of opinion that everything concerning the drainage of houses should be under single control. Certain mistakes are a cause of regret, and one of them is that of a poor devil who takes a notion to build. He goes to the Corporation; he rushes to the Road Committee, and thinks he has got through all right, until later, when he is sent to me, and does not know what to do next.

Q.—In your visits of inspection, do you find many workingmen who are landlords? A.—I find many workingmen who became landlords, and many who remain landlords.

Q.—Have you often received the complaints of some great contractor, going before the Corporation, and demanding all necessary instructions, inasmuch as he is desirous of conforming to all the by-laws of the Corporation, but cannot succeed in getting hold of what he wants? A.—That is just the anomaly that I spoke of a moment ago. If the man does not get all the information, he is hard pressed to know where to go. If he asks, I think that he is generally informed. At all events, if it is a contractor who is concerned, and if he has passed through the mill before, he will know the way to get back.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are you a mechanic? A.—Yes.

Q.—When a wall is found to be defective, do you order it to be repaired or knocked down? A.—I always do so, and, even last week, I myself demolished a wall which I found defective on Commissioner Street, one of the most central places in the city, and there is, at present, a most important building which I have condemned and which will have to be torn down.

Q.—Have there been several cases of this kind since you have been inspector of buildings? A.—Occasionally. I have several every year.

Q.—Have you ever discovered bad material in the composition of mortar, or any defective bricks? A.—Yes; that thing has happened.

Q.—And did you give orders that such things be altered? A.—Always. But such cases are met with generally, when there are no architects. Usually, too, the architects are conscientious enough, because of the responsibility which they incur from the statute enjoining that the materials employed must be of good quality.

Q.—Is the law generally complied with? A.—I have generally little difficulty in enforcing the orders which I issue.

Q.—Have you ever found defective scaffolding around buildings? A.—There have been several occasions when accidents took place through faulty scaffolding, but I must say that I do not visit scaffolding, except when I come across them as I go along. I am all alone for a city of 200,000 souls, whereas in other cities of twice the population, there are 13 to do my work. I cannot see to everything.

Q.—Do you not regard this question of scaffolding as of the very highest importance, on the score of the safety of human lives? A.—It is of vital importance. There is even in the building by-laws a clause requiring that scaffolding be inspected. It is the duty of every contractor, in the management of his men, to have his scaffolding inspected, but I am never asked to inspect them, except on the rarest occasions.

Q.—Do contractors generally employ special men to make their scaffolds, or is it the workmen who put them up? A.—That depends very much on the contractor. Being responsible he should see to it himself, but it is often left to the discretion of the men.

Q.—Are you aware that contractors have had to pay large sums, in consequence of accidents happening on their scaffolding? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have accidents been very frequent in the last five years? A.—They have not been very frequent. I am aware of two accidents which took place last year.

Q.—When accidents happen, is there delay in transporting the wounded to the

hospital? A.—No; I believe that the ambulance is sent for at once to the spot where the accident takes place, and the wounded workman is taken up at once.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Are all public buildings and all buildings of more than two storys in height, supplied with salvage apparatus, in case of fire? Is the by-law to that effect enforced? A.—No, sir; I believe that it is overlooked, inasmuch as I have not the time to see to it. There is a provincial law to the same effect. I am not very well acquainted with the law, in all its extent, but I have caused several arrangements to be changed in certain school institutions on that score. But I meet with such lukewarmness on the part of the landlords, and there are so many influences brought to bear against me, in such cases, that I cannot give my serious attention to the matter.

Q.—Do you consider that there are certain establishments which are in an unsatisfactory condition, on that same score, in Montreal? A.—There are some, and they are especially numerous among the factories.

Q.—Is there a law obliging landlords of public establishments, like these, to have the doors open on the outside? A.—There is a corporation by-law in virtue of which all public buildings must have their doors opening on the outside. It is the law.

Q.—I beg your pardon. There is a law which enjoins just the contrary. That law orders that all doors shall open from the inside and “not from the outside?” A.—The exception is that of public buildings. These public buildings are bound to open their doors on the outside, and I have even insisted on church doors opening on the outside.

Q.—“It is likewise forbidden to raise frame or wooden buildings of more than two stories in the city?” A.—Since, however, two stories and a mansard roof have been tolerated. A certain pressure led to this result, which has been carried out, and has passed from theory into practice. Two years ago the committee, under whose jurisdiction this by-law comes, attempted to put it into force, and it was determined that, provided the frame building does not exceed thirty-three feet, it may be built of three stories and a half.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Is there not a wooden house of four stories built on Papineau square? A.—I brought the owners before the committee, and the committee decided to leave it, as it was built already. At the corner of St. Catherine street and Papineau street there is a frame building belonging to a certain Charles Vegina, which was put up, about eighteen months ago, of three square stories, and a mansard roof into the bargain. I took every possible step to have it taken down, but this man came up before the committee, with certain influence and protection, and got that body to determine that the house should remain as it was.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—In the rear of Dorchester street, near Crescent street, or near Bishop street, is there a frame shop of two or three stories? A.—No. I know nothing about it. I know of two frame shops on Crescent and Bishop streets. I must say here, that landlords have not been forced to line their houses in brick, because bricks got dearer than they were really worth, and it was decided to tolerate that poor people should put off lining with brick on account of brick being higher than its real worth. There are many things that I cannot see, because the city is too big for my eyes.

Q.—Will you describe the ambulance system? A.—I know nothing about the system of ambulances. The ambulances are exclusively controlled by the hospitals.

Q.—Must the patient pay for being carried in an ambulance? A.—No.

(Translation.)

EDOUARD OCTAVE CHAMPAGNE, Boiler Inspector, of Montreal, sworn:—

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Have you your by-laws with you? A.—I have two by-laws—one for my guidance with engineers, and the other to direct me in the inspection of boilers.

Q.—Is there not a city by-law which obliges every one who drives an engine, either as engineer or as stoker, to pass an examination? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—This is outside of the Dominion certificate? A.—Yes; it is a city law.

Q.—May an engineer, having a Dominion certificate, exercise his profession at Montreal without passing a new examination? A.—That is not my impression, but I pass them, nevertheless, and regard them as fit. By law, however, they would not have the right.

Q.—They do not pay, then, if they do not pass an examination? A.—On the contrary, they go through a formal examination, but, according to me, they are competent. I make all applicants pass through the same examination, and generally I meet with men as well qualified as our engineers, or as any party who has received a certificate. That is what I want to say, and I order furthermore a certificate of the same class. At present the Government supplies three certificates, first, second and third class, according to the capacity of the engineer. We give, for our part, four certificates: a stoker's certificate and three engineer's classes, somewhat alike to those of the Government. The reason for having a fourth class is that many establishments in this city have only one boiler to heat an establishment. That does not require so much capacity, but still a party must have a certain skill to heat such a boiler without incurring any danger.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—Will you tell us what is the number of engines in the city of Montreal? A.—I have 730 engines. I do not know whether I have them all, inasmuch as there are additions every day. These 730 engines are not all under my control, however. You will see, in section 39, that all persons who insure their boilers, in an insurance company, do so with the view that the boilers shall have all the fittings necessary for their correct working, according to the by-laws. Then, as the insurance company shoulders the risk, I have nothing more to do with it, as I have nothing to do with the company. When I speak of 730 boilers, I refer to 730 boilers bearing more than 120 pounds of pressure to the square inch.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—How many competent men are there in charge of these engines? A.—I have the pleasure of informing you that I believe them to be all competent, so far as I know them.

Q.—They all have certificates? A.—Yes; I think so. They all have certificates either from me or from the government. It stands to reason that some one always steps in before I reach the engine, and thus I find some that hold no certificates; but so soon as I come to know of it, within two or three hours after making their acquaintance, I make things right.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you inspect all the boilers—as well the stationary as the moveable ones? A.—The boilers which are not placed in a building do not come under the law. This I regard as a flaw in the law. All the boilers that are under cover, I look upon as under the law; but the moment they are put out in the open air, they are no longer within my jurisdiction. One word has been omitted in the text of the law; the word “elsewhere” is not there.

Q.—Are the alarm signals, for engines of high and low pressure, generally in a proper condition? A.—If you wish to speak of the alarms for high and low water, I may tell you that they are not a fixture required by the law. But I consider that they would be very useful, and those which I saw worked well.

Q.—The law does not bind you to inspect safety valves? A.—Certainly, it does; and if you mean that these several patents should be adopted, I am at one with you, for I have seen them do good work. It is a kind of diminutive empty globe floating on the surface of the water.

Q.—Do you know what is the feeling among engineers, in regard to the certificates and the yearly tax levied on them? A.—I can assure you that I never heard the least complaint. At first, I was under the impression that we had to pay for a license, which was to last during life. Only when we came to examine the matter, we found the difference. Some earned only \$7 a week, and others even made more than \$9 a week, and they passed under the plea that it would be too much; but the licenses are of 25 cents, 50 cents, and \$1. The more the certificates increase the dearer you have to pay, and that little trifle makes no show therein.

Q.—Does it not have the effect of preventing those who do not know how to drive an engine taking the place of qualified parties? A.—I judge that it is a great benefit to the poor working man. Under the present system, he is not asked where he comes from, nor who he is, but he is asked simply whether he has a certificate, and, if he has, he takes his place at once.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—You have said that there are 730 engines in the city? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—All under your inspection? A.—No, sir.

Q.—How many are there under your inspection? A.—To be very precise I will set the number down at 400. There is another thing to be taken into account. There are about 730 engines in the city, as I have said. But there are a great number of engines that are stopped. A man makes a change of some kind, and he does not have his engine inspected for that year, because he is not using it, and so in other ways. Thus, as in this case, there may be 113 boilers that are not working at all.

Q.—How many engines are there not under cover, and which are not under your control, in consequence thereof? A.—I do not know the precise number, but it is about 150. I wish to be well understood. A boiler is brought in: I am called upon, and I have the right to cause it to be set exactly as the law commands; and then, if the owner, as I said a moment ago, wishes to put the engine under the control of an insurance company, I have no more to do. Now, to my knowledge, there are over 150 boilers under the control of insurance companies.

Q.—Do you know the number of engines fed by gas or other propelling force besides vapour? A.—These few days past, I counted twenty-one; but that is only thereabouts.

Q.—Do you know whether electricity is made use of as a propelling force? A.—Yes; but I think they are only small engines, used for making experiments; and I think there is also a petroleum engine, but I do not know whether it is still working.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—Do you know whether the engines which are under the control of the Insurance Companies, are in the hands of competent men? A.—Up to the present time, they are the only engines that give me any trouble on the score of the capacity of the men.

Q.—Then, must we suppose that these engines are in the hands of unqualified men? A.—No. Because so soon as I hear about them, I go there at once and put everything to rights.

By Mr. BOIVIN :—

Q.—Can you tell us the wages of stokers and engineers? A.—About eight years ago, stokers were employed to fire a boiler at even \$5 a week, while the high priced engineers got \$8.50. When a man received \$9, he thought he was getting good wages. To-day, the stokers, who earn the lowest wages, get \$1.25 a day, which is \$7.50 for six days' work; and engineers of the 3rd class earn \$9, and even \$10; those of the 2nd class, \$10 up to \$2.75 a day; and those of the 1st class starting from \$2. There are companies that pay \$4.25 a day to their engineers. There are some who make as much as \$1,700 a year. I could give you the names of four or five, if you wished it.

Q.—Have you any suggestions to make to the Commission? A.—If there were any means of preventing it, I should like that none of the old boilers which I condemn were sent into the country. I am always in dread about this. If I condemn a boiler here in town, everybody agrees with me. The boiler goes out of sight, and it often returns, at the end of five or six years, by another road. I recognize it by the measurements which I make on it, and in fact at the first sight thereof. If I had a further suggestion to make, it would be that boilers, once condemned, should be cut asunder and turned into old iron. I would suggest likewise, that all other cities would find it to their advantage to adopt the law which we have here; and also that the inspectors, including the one of Montreal, and those of other cities, should be placed above and beyond the embarrassment of the Insurance Companies. These people are paid to run risks, and we are paid not to run them, as well in stationary engines as in steamboats.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Are you aware that men holding certificates of an inferior class, have had positions which required men of superior skill? A.—Yes. Not long ago, an engineer of the 3rd class worked an engine of the 2nd class. So soon as I heard of it, I repaired to the place, and I gave the man who held the engine—for we had not in hand a man of the 2nd class—the privilege of waiting a week until another man turned up; and at the end of the time, such a man was found.

(Translation.)

CHARLES LACAILLE, Merchant, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN :—

Q.—Have you brought with you a list of prices of teas, coffees, and such other articles? A.—I did not bring with me such a list as that, but I struck an average.

Q.—Will you tell us how long you have been in the grocery trade? A.—Ever since 1857.

Q.—Can you tell us whether sugar, tea, coffees, groats or oatmeal, and such other articles as working people are in the habit of using, sell dearer to-day than they did five years or six years ago? A.—They are cheaper to-day, all of them, according to the average which I made out.

Q.—Could you give us an idea of how much cheaper they are at present? A.—I find that, since 1880, down to the present day, sugar averages about 20 per cent. cheaper. Rice shows about 10 or 12 cents cheaper to-day than in former times. Coffee is just about the same now as it was then. It went down more than that for a while, but it has risen since. In 1886, it was much lower. Tea is also lower. Tea must be 25 to 30 per cent lower, at least, for the last eight years. Molasses is about 12 to 15 per cent less than in 1881. These are the chief articles, and I did not strike a balance of prices with the others.

(Translation.)

JOSEPH ODILON DUPUIS, Merchant of Montreal, Alderman, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—Will you tell us how long you have been in business? A.—These last 22 years.

Q.—Will you state to the Commission how many people you have engaged in your establishment? A.—From 90 to 100

Q.—Will you tell us whether, in a general sense, the dry goods meant for the working classes are cheaper or dearer than they were five, ten and fifteen years ago? I refer specially to cotton goods and such goods as go to the clothing of working people? A.—My answer to this requires to be qualified. Yellow cotton, for instance, prints, calicoes and flannels of low price are a little lower to-day than they were ten years ago or more. I am not at present the buyer of my house, nor do I even sell the goods that are displayed on the shelves and counters of our store, but, to the best of my knowledge, and it is my opinion besides, there has been a slight reduction. There is a slight difference in that the prices are a little lower. On the other hand, there are dry goods of which the working classes made use ten years ago and to-day these goods are not employed. Although they are cheaper than they were ten years ago, the working people will not have them. Take, for instance, the stuff called duck, which is a species of cotton that work people made use of for overalls. Well, to-day we do not sell one-eighth of what we used to sell ten years ago.

Q.—Was this change brought about among the working people, and did they give up buying such goods because they had lost in quality, or did it result from a shifting of the fashions? A.—I could not tell you; but it was a very lasting quality of goods which rendered excellent service. Less of it is now sold, but why, I cannot say. In my place, not one-eighth of this line is sold compared to the sales of ten years ago. It is true that I sell less, because my class of customers has changed. The class of customers who bought these goods has left me. I have another class now that wants none of it.

Q.—Do you believe that tweeds, whether shoddy or whether of superior quality but fit for workingmen's uses, are dearer or cheaper than they formerly were? A.—I think that they are a little cheaper.

Q.—Well tell us how many of the 90 or 100 persons, employed in your establishment, are able to read and write? A.—All the men employed in my service are able to speak and write the two languages. And then, I have young lads who are beginning to learn English. They may not know it thoroughly, but I fancy they can make themselves understood by those with whom they have dealings, and I believe that they understand all that is said to them. Then again, I have a number of young ladies, but I am not so positive about them. There are the principal young ladies who attend at the counter for the purpose of making sales, and they know how to speak English as well as French but as to the milliners I could not say whether they can speak and write English as well as French.

(Translation.)

MOISE BROSSARD, Merchant of Montreal, sworn.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—What has been the price of flour these past years? A.—I have taken down the price of flour, since 1867, every October.

Q.—We go no further back, on this Commission, than 1877, in our inquiries and investigations? A.—In 1877, the price at which flour sold was \$3 a 100 pounds; 1882, \$2.75; 1886, \$2; 1887, \$2.10. This takes in bags.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you find that there is an improvement in the quality of flour within the past 10 years? A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—Is this improvement due to superior appliances in milling or to the superior quality of the wheat? A.—There is a superior kind of machinery and a superior kind of wheat. We now have Manitoba wheat which is better than the kind we had before.

Q.—Is there much Manitoba wheat used in the Province of Quebec? A.—Almost all the wheat which we use at present comes from Manitoba. A few years ago we could not buy flour for bakers' use, unless we got it from Minneapolis. Now we receive it from Manitoba.

Q.—Is the Manitoba wheat employed for domestic use or only for bakers? A.—For both. It has the qualities required by both. It makes a patent flour of a high grade, of as a high a grade, indeed, as they have in the United States.

(Translation.)

OVIDE LECLAIR, Assistant Secretary of the Mutual Insurance Company, of Montreal, sworn:

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—Since what year was your company established? A.—Since 1859.

Q.—What was its capital then? A.—It had none at its foundation.

Q.—What is the total of dwellings insured at the present time in Montreal? A.—\$6,317,718.00 in the city of Montreal.

Q.—What is the amount of the policies at present? A.—The amount of the policies at present is \$4,738,135.00.

Q.—What is the actual capital of the company? A.—\$487,720.00, of which \$401,534.00 in notes given by the policy-holders; and \$86,186.00 in specie. These notes constitute a privileged mortgage, without registration, taking rank after seigniorial rights, and rendering all the notes of equal value by means of a mortgage. The charter was recast in 1881, and sanctioned on the 30th June. This re-constructed charter confers the greatest powers on the Company.

Q.—You deposit these notes in different banks? A.—In three banks; bearing interest at 4 or 5 per cent. This Company, with its capital, gives \$10.25 for every \$100 insured, of which 2 per cent. are in money, and \$1.25 on the note; and all the policy-holders are responsible, the one towards the other, for the amount of the note only. Previously, they paid 4 per cent. more, but since the charter has been draughted anew they do not pay more, in case of conflagration, than the amount of the note.

Q.—What is the amount of distribution or assessment? A.—Every year there is an assessment. The mean or average of the distribution is \$3.50 on the notes. The average of distribution has been \$245,841.00 during these past 28 years.

Q.—How much, thereabouts, does it cost each party for \$1,000.00 for each year of insurance? A.—For first-class risks, the cost is \$3 for every \$100, during three years—that is to say, \$1 a year. The profit on premiums is from 25 to 30 per cent. on first-class risks; and from 40 to 50 on business risks.

Q.—Have you many contested fires? A.—One law suit in twenty-eight years. The yearly average of fires is from forty to sixty.

Q.—How many men are employed in the management of your Company? A.—Four.

Q.—What is the total of the salaries paid to these men? A.—\$4,800.00 a year.

Q.—What are the hours of work? A.—They are from nine to five—or eight hours a day.

Q.—What are the expenses of the office? A.—\$6,856.00 a year.

Q.—What is the number of the insured, or of the policies? A.—We have 1,715 policies in force; and the number of insured is 1,295, of whom 1,200 names are French Canadian, and 86 English.

Q.—What is the number of directors of your Company? A.—Nine. I should also like to state that the mean of fire premiums paid yearly has been \$3,328.00 a year.

Q.—What is the usual cause of fires? A.—The first cause is negligence—a negligence resulting very often from the too great facility with which certain companies make policies for amounts that are extra high. The secondary causes are the accumulation of inflammable material—the keeping together of certain articles which may, on a sudden and at a certain temperature, take fire spontaneously—the explosion of lamps, the ashes of pipes and such like.

(Translation.)

PIERRE GIGUERE, Inspector of the Montreal Mutual Insurance Company, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—How long have you been Inspector of this Company? A.—22 years.

Q.—What is the most numerous class of your policy holders? A.—They are French-Canadians.

Q.—What are the measures of precaution of your company in taking a policy of a party? Is it the danger of the dwelling that he occupies or the moral side of his person? A.—The first precautionary step is on the side of morality. There are certain parties who cannot be insured at any price.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you refer to certain industries or trades or to the man? A.—I refer to the man himself.

Q.—In what condition of tidiness do you find the dwellings that you visit? A.—Generally speaking, I find them in good trim and well kept. The bulk of our business is done with the working classes and, as a rule, their houses are in a proper condition.

Q.—Are the city by-laws generally carried out? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have the insurance rates been raised in Montreal of late? A.—Not on private houses.

Q.—But on public houses, on business establishments? A.—On business houses and factories—the rates have risen very much.

Q.—When did the last rise take place? A.—Last fall, and during the past winter. Before the New Year, there were several heavy fires and this led to an increase of insurance rates.

(Translation.)

CHARLES EDMOND RANGER, Boot and Shoe Trader, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—Have you been in the retail trade? A.—Yes, sir; I am in the retail trade.

Q.—Do you trade more particularly with the working class? A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the amount, or thereabouts, of the business which you transact, every year? A.—In all \$442,000.

Q.—Can you tell us whether the boots and shoes which you sell, at the present time, are cheaper than some years ago? A.—I have been 7 years in business and boots and shoes are certainly 25 per cent cheaper than they were then.

Q.—When you say 25 per cent. cheaper, does that apply to boots and shoes used by the working classes? A.—Yes, sir.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Are the boots and shoes as good as they were five years ago? A.—My belief is that they are better.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you feel the effects of prison labor in your business? A.—Not in any way. Up to the present time no goods manufactured in places of that kind have ever been offered at my store.

Q.—How do you make out that boots and shoes are cheaper than they were five or seven years ago? A.—It is hard enough to say. I could not exactly tell how that comes to pass. It is said that workmanship is cheaper to day than it was at that time. As for myself, I have never paid much attention to it and, indeed, before I took up the boot and shoe trade, 7 years ago, I paid no attention to that.

Q.—Do the working class chiefly purchase custom goods, or do they buy ready made boots and shoes? A.—They buy ready made boots and shoes, and, as for me, I am positive that my trade lies chiefly with the working people. I do not really sell for \$4,000 of goods to the richer classes, the fact being that, in my shop, very costly goods are not to be had, because the need for such is not felt.

(Translation.)

GUSTAVE PICHÉ, Ironmonger, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—Will you tell us how many years you have been in business, and are you acquainted with the iron trade? A.—Eighteen years.

Q.—About how many years have you been trading on your own account? A.—Seven years.

Q.—Will you tell us whether the articles which are usually consumed by the working classes are dearer to-day than they were when you started in business, or cheaper? A.—Cheaper.

Q.—Could you give us the percentage of reduced cheapness? Is there a difference great or small? A.—The difference is not uniform and varies according to circumstances. There are goods upon which there may be 10 per cent., and others upon which there may be 35 per cent.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—Do you sell as many farmers' tools and implements, such as harrows, scythes, and the like, as you did before? A.—There is a falling off in certain lines, while other lines hold their own.

Q.—Is that due to the fact that farmers make use of improved instruments? A.—It is due to the manufacturers going directly to the retail men and selling to them. I, for instance, am a wholesale trader—they pass me by and sell directly to the retailers.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—Do you import any goods? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What class of goods do you import? A.—Cutlery, more especially.

Q.—And mechanics' tools? A.—Yes, but in less quantities.

Q.—Do you import American and English goods? A.—Yes; and German and Belgian.

Q.—As to tools, do you find that Canadian tools are as good as those manufactured in the United States or the reverse? A.—I think it may be said that Canadian tools are as good as the American, with some exceptions—the exceptions being certain lines not yet perfected.

Q.—Taking in the same quality, do perfected goods sell at lower rates? A.—It is hard to say.

Q.—Do you find that the demand for Canadian goods is on the increase? A.—Yes.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—How much cheaper are mechanics' tools to-day than they were five years ago? A.—I should say between ten and fifteen per cent.

(Translation.)

NARCISSE PERODEAU, Notary, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—You are a notary, and you keep an office? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Can you tell us if, as notaries, you have a tariff? A.—There exists a tariff for notaries.

Q.—Would you tell us if this tariff is put in use in every case, or if it is only put in practice in some cases? A.—Generally, according to my practice, the tariff is not put in use.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—But generally? A.—Yes; generally it is not put in practice.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—Will you tell us why it is not put in practice? A.—The tariff, as it exists to-day, is generally too high to be followed in every case.

Q.—Will you tell us if you propose to make any change? A.—There is a new tariff scheme actually under the consideration of the Lieut.-Governor in Council.

(Translation.)

ERNEST DORÉ, Butcher, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—What are the kinds of meat which you sell? A.—Beef, veal and mutton.

Q.—For about how long have you been in business? A.—Thirteen or fourteen years.

Q.—Will you tell us if, within ten years, there has been changes in the price of meat, and if so, is meat dearer or cheaper, or is it at the same price? A.—At retail it is always about the same price. That does not change at all.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—During ten years? A.—During ten years.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—Will you tell us what was the price of beef, of the first quality, ten years ago, and what is the price to-day? A.—For ten years and up to to-day, the first quality of beef is worth fifteen cents per pound.

Q.—Will you tell us what you understand by the first quality? A.—I mean to say by the first quality, roast beef, roasts and steak.

Q.—Will you tell us the price of the second quality? A.—Ten to twelve cents. There is also roast in this quality.

Q.—Will you tell us the price of quality No. 3? A.—It is seven to five cents. It is the shin and shank, and the common pieces, with flank or side for soup.

Q.—Will you give us the price of mutton of the first quality? A.—It is ten to twelve cents generally, for mutton of the first quality.

Q.—And the second quality? A.—It is eight cents.

Q.—Will you tell us the price of veal? A.—There is another quality in mutton—the third which sells at seven to five cents.

Q.—Will you tell us the price of veal? A.—Veal is the same thing as mutton for the three qualities.

Q.—Would you have anything to suggest in your line as an improvement, or are you satisfied with current prices? A.—One is never satisfied. One always likes to sell dearer.

Q.—Are meat and poultry sold upon the market, directly out from the farmers' vehicles? A.—Farmers have the right to sell poultry; but they have not the right to sell meat, for it is now announced upon the market that it is not permissible for them to sell at retail without a license, but they can sell in quarters.

Q.—Is there a fixed hour at which these sales have to take place in the morning? A.—There is a law to that effect, but it is not carried out.

Q.—Do you not think it would be advantageous for the public if there were an hour fixed at which the public could go and buy their meat from the farmers before the retailers came along? A.—Yes; this would be much better for the public.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—The meat which you retail, does it all come from the country, or are they animals which you import? A.—It is all the meat of animals from this country which is sold in Montreal.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—But there is some of it from Ontario? A.—Yes.

Q.—But not from the United States? A.—No. In my line there is no American beef

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Are the animals which come here better than they used to be ten years ago? Has there been an improvement in this section? A.—Yes; much of an improvement.

Translation.

LEOPOLD LALIEU, Pressman, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—How long have you been in the country? A.—A month.

Q.—What country do you come from? A.—From Belgium.

Q.—You came here through the influence of an emigration agent? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you any papers with you? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have these letters the heading of the Emigration Office of the Government of Canada? A.—Yes, sir.

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA
EMIGRATION.
General Agency. }

THUIN, 27-2, 1888.

To MR. LALIEU,

Be good enough to assure your mother, Mrs. Lalieu, that she may be perfectly at ease concerning your future career in Montreal; I have already written on your behalf and recommended you very highly.

There are only daily newspapers in Montreal. If Madame Lalieu would wish to make my acquaintance, I would be happy to meet her on Thursday at Gilly.

I remain yours very cordially,

P. WATELET.

Q.—When you received that letter, you believed that the gentleman had written to you under the authority of the Canadian Government? A.—Naturally.

Q.—You had other letters than that, guaranteeing you a salary of how much? A.—Fifteen francs—\$3 per day at least.

Q.—What have you done with those letters? A.—I gave them to Mr. Redmond, bookseller, on Chaboillez Square. He asked me for them.

Q.—Can you tell us if these prices are posted up in any public place in Belgium? A.—There are posters set up, in which it is stated that working people are paid quite dear in all the trades. There is also a poster at my place, which I could bring to you, if you wish.

Q.—How many of you came here the last time that you arrived? A.—We were twenty to twenty-eight.

Q.—Are there any who went to Winnipeg? A.—Yes; there are several of the number who went to Winnipeg.

Q.—What was their business? A.—They were working on the flattening of metals.

Q.—How much were they promised; do you know? A.—Always, without exception, 25 francs, at least, seeing that they earned at home, at least, \$2.50.

Q.—They did not find flattening mills at Winnipeg? A.—There are none at all.

Q.—How much did you pay to come out? A.—140 francs.

Q.—Did they make any reduction on the passage? A.—No, sir; there are

some who had it; there are some who came for 125 francs, and others for 130 francs. There were three or four different rates.

Q.—And why those different rates; is it because they came from further in Belgium? A.—No; the same thing. It was because some of them asked a diminution.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Have you learned that the individual who wrote you was not the agent of the Canadian Government? A.—Yes; we learned it here.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—He came with you? A.—He came with us to the station, and he went to Winnipeg to take the others on. He again returned here, and remained six or seven days, and then he went away to our country.

Q.—When he returned, what did he say? A.—I went to look for him, and I made my demands. He said he would look after them. I said to him, "These are not the promises which you made me." But he did not answer me.

Q.—By what boat did you come; do you know? A.—The Lake Ontario.

2d May, 1888.

CHRISTOPHER B. CARTER, advocate of Montreal, sworn.
I have practised in Montreal as an advocate for 22 years.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do you think that lawyers, costs and the costs of the Court, in a personal action, for an amount of \$25 and less, are what they should be? A.—I think that in actions of \$25 and less no costs at all should be granted, and that the cost of the Court ought to be reduced to a sum not more than a dollar for all proceedings. It is an injustice to working people to grant costs. I knew several cases of action for \$1.50, in which, on account of a contest, the costs have mounted up to \$7 and \$8. That does a great wrong to poor people who are proceeded against.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—Do you think then that a lawyer should take these cases? What should he do? A.—In the same manner that they do in other countries where these costs are not accorded. It is the client who pays the costs and the advocates, and in other countries it is not the advocates who plead before the Courts of Justice in these small causes. It is the students.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Does a Commissioners' Court exist in Montreal? A.—No, sir; not in the city of Montreal.

Q.—Do you believe that it would be a good thing for the working people, to have a Commissioners' Court in Montreal? A.—I do not think that it would do them much good; but I think that a judge of the Circuit Court could be appointed, who could take all these cases before him, and there would not be lawyers' costs. He could judge these cases as they do, in the Recorder's Court, cases where servants sue for their wages.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—What would you suggest? A.—I would advise the same system here as is followed in other countries, that is to say, that a writ of summons be sent out and

that the debtor be brought before the judge, and questioned by the judge as to his means of paying the debt, and he could order the payment of the debt by instalments, and give the delays necessary for payment.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—This exists in the province of Ontario? A.—Yes; it exists in the province of Ontario.

(Translation.)

FERDINAND NAPOLÉON BELCOURT, Secretary and Director of "La Canadienne" Assurance Company, sworn :

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Is there, among Assurance Companies, a system which allows workmen to assure themselves by paying their premiums of Assurance by the week, or by the month? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it for ordinary assurance upon life and against accident? A.—Against accidents only. The "Metropolitan," an American assurance association, has opened a branch—a department in this line of business—recently.

Q.—Can you tell us how payments are made? A.—Monthly, and even weekly.

Q.—There are no other companies which assure according to the monthly or weekly system? A.—I do not know of any.

Q.—Are there any which assure upon life? A.—Upon life and against accidents at the same time.

Q.—Which are these companies? A.—La Canadienne has inaugurated a system of assurance upon life, combined with assurance against bodily accidents.

Q.—Can you give us an idea of the working of this assurance? (The Witness produced certain papers.) A.—The Company assures upon life, and pays a weekly indemnity when the assured is the victim of a bodily accident. The first column of the document produced, indicates the premium to be paid for assurance upon life only; and the second column, the price to be paid for \$500, or \$1000, for assurance upon life and accidents combined, and the premium can be divided up into six months or three months.

Q.—Are there many workingmen who have taken assurance policies according to this system? A.—Yes: we have a good number of them.

(Translation.)

CHARLES LANGLOIS, Provision Merchant, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN —

Q.—Will you tell us what are the provisions in which you deal? A.—Eggs, butter and cheese.

Q.—Will you tell us if there are any of these articles which are dearer at the present time than they were ten years ago? A.—I cannot answer for ten years. I can speak for seven years. It is seven years that I am in business. During seven years, prices have been but little changed. That is to say, in spring, eggs sell at 12, 13 and 14 cents. It is about the same thing at all seasons. Before the fresh eggs come, eggs sell dearer; but, apart from that, it is always about the same.

Q.—And butter? A.—During the seven years, there was one year when butter was dearer than usual. I do not remember what year. Last year, indeed, it was a trifle dearer; but not to make a great difference—a cent or two, perhaps.

Q.—And cheese? A.—Cheese—one of the dearest years was last year, and even that was not exorbitant. It went to twelve cents, the highest—a little better in the summer than usual.

Q.—Is it many years since you found the means of keeping eggs in perfect condition? A.—They kept them before I began; but they did not keep them as much as at present. Now they are no more scarce in winter than in summer; but they ask a little higher price on account of the work of keeping, and interest upon the money.

Q.—Will you tell us if there are many eggs exported to the United States? A.—We export in the autumn and import in the spring. In the autumn we send our eggs to the States when they are more abundant, and in the spring, as eggs arrive a little earlier, they are imported to some extent. At present the time has already passed for importing them this year.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Do you find that the quality of butter is better now than it was seven years ago? A.—Yes: as people look more after quality, better precautions are taking in making it. There is much difference in common butter as compared with seven years ago. Seven years ago common butter sold almost as dear as good, but now common butter is sold at 12 cents and other butter at 25 cents.

Q.—Do you find the same improvement in the making of cheese? A.—It is not so noticeable; however, the improvement exists.

Q.—Can you say if the farmers are more disposed to send their milk to the cheese factories than to keep it to make their own butter? A.—They are much more disposed to send it to the cheese and butter factories than they used to be. At present it is the few who keep their milk at home.

By Mr. HELBRONNER:—

Q.—Do they prefer to send it to the cheese factories or to the butter factories? A.—That depends on the locality. In parts of the country where they raise many animals they prefer to take their milk to the butter factories, because they have more profit from the milk, as they get the skim milk.

(Translation.)

OCTAVE LAGACÉ, Beadle of the Church of Notre Dame, in the office of the Fabrique of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—Will you tell us if the faithful have much to pay for their church service? A.—Generally, they have nothing to pay for the service.

Q.—Have they to pay for the maintenance of the church? A.—No one is bound to do that.

Q.—Are there seats in the church that are free to poor people? A.—I believe there are sufficient to seat a couple of hundred or thereabouts, without counting the large aisles, where people can remain standing or on their knees, as best pleases them.

Q.—Are there paying places in the church? A.—Generally, the pews of the church are rented by the year, the half year, or the quarter, but a certain number of

these pews are not rented, because they are not favourably situated, either to see or to hear. Then it follows that they are left unrented. Some years ago, they kept these pews closed with a bar. After my installation there, the idea struck me to make use of those seats to place people in them, and ask from them a contribution, for Mass only. For Vespers they do not pay. Then, for five cents, they can have their seats for Mass.

Q.—Is a worshipper obliged to pay something in order to receive the sacraments or to have a child baptised? A.—There is nothing of the kind that I know of, and, if there was, I should know it. There is, however, a sacrament for which I see they pay. It is that of marriage. There is a contribution to be paid for marriage, which has been imposed by the Ordinary, that is to say, the Bishop.

Q.—What is the contribution for a marriage pure and simple, that is to say, without a ceremony? A.—With us it is \$2.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—And when the bells are rung? A.—Generally with us they do not ring the bells for marriages.

Q.—And for baptisms? A.—That depends. They ought to be rung for every baptism, but they do not always ring them. The lowest is \$1 and the highest \$20, but \$20 has not yet been paid since I have been there. It, however, happened once. Miss Symmes, who was godmother, asked for it, but the big bell (Bourdon) could not ring at the time.

Q.—What is the cost of an ordinary burial? A.—The highest price is \$4.75. I say the highest price, for there are several prices. There is the Union of Prayers, and in favour of the Union of Prayers they reduced the cost from \$4.75 to \$3.70. I speak of adults. The highest price for children is \$2.50.

Q.—Is the Cemetery included? A.—The entire burial and the grave are included in the above.

By Mr. BOIVIN :—

Q.—Have not the faithful a certain stipend to pay to the curés? A.—Some years ago. Monseigneur, our Bishop, levied a contribution which we call "dime," which is \$2 for each family and \$1 for every individual who earns anything. Now, to all these things, perhaps it would be proper to add something for burial, but there are many who could not pay. At least, they tell us so, and, in fact, they do not pay. There are those—and I do not believe I am exaggerating—there are at least a quarter—who do not even pay for burials. Now, as to the contributions, only those who are able are expected to pay, and I think that, were a census made, it would be found that many who are able, neglect to do so; but no matter, it is understood that those who cannot pay do not pay. That is to say, no one is compelled.

Q.—That money—that which is collected—goes to pay the debts of the church, etc.? A.—It is all meant to pay the debts of the Fabrique.

Q.—Will you tell us when a person dies and is poor, and no one takes care of him, whether it is the Government, the city, or the Church, which buries him, if he is a Catholic? A.—To my knowledge the Church has buried a good number. Now, I know that the city has buried some; but generally for those who belong to the Parish of Notre Dame we have our Almoner for the poor—there is provided—that is to say he provides the coffin and the necessary hearse. As for other people, I believe the city is obliged to bury them.

Q.—Can you tell us which is the cheapest pew in the church of Notre Dame and which rents for the highest amount? A.—The dearest for the year that I know of, is \$40 and the cheapest \$2.

Q.—How many seats are there in a \$40 pew? A.—Four.

Q.—And in a \$2 pew? A.—Three.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—When a person buys a lot in the cemetery, is he given a clear and complete deed? A.—We do not always give it. The deed costs the Fabrique something. We have obtained from the Provincial Legislature the power to make our own deeds and these deeds made with us have the same value as those made by Notaries, and it costs something to make copies, etc. We charge fifty cents for that. But deeds with us are not absolutely necessary. The receipt is sufficient, being entered in the book.

Q.—Do you give assistance to the poor? A.—We have our Almoner who distributes \$6,000 to \$7,000 every winter.

Q.—Are these generally poor people belonging to the town, or are they poor people who come from outside? A.—I believe we give assistance to those who come from outside quite as often; but I am not very certain.

Q.—Does the church derive a revenue from properties other than those consecrated for worship? A.—I do not know.

(Translation.)

GUSTAVE GRAVEL, representing the Canadian Rubber Company, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—Will you tell us if the wages of your work-people have augmented or diminished during the last ten years? A.—They have increased with us. I made a statement of these amounts this morning. In 1887, we paid the men on an average \$10.54 per week, and the girls \$2.10. In 1883, the men \$7.63, and the girls \$3.83. In 1877, the men \$7.72, and the girls \$4.13.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—How do you explain the increase of salaries? A.—The hands have become more experienced, and rather than lose them we preferred to pay them more.

Q.—Were you in business before 1887? A.—Before 1887, yes.

Q.—Has the business of the Company increased? A.—It has increased, yes.

Q.—By how much has it increased during the last ten years? A.—I cannot tell you; I am not in the office.

Q.—Do you employ more men than in 1887? A.—Yes.

Q.—How many more? A.—Three hundred more.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—Does the Company suffer on account of the competition of American agencies in the Dominion? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can it compete with the American agencies? A.—Yes; I believe that we are holding our own.

Q.—Is the competition as strong as it was ten years ago? A.—I am not posted on these matters; I could not say.

Q.—Do you manufacture hose for fires? A.—We manufacture hose; but for fires, that is a speciality.

(Translation.)

ADOLPHE RAYMOND, Fish Merchant, of Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN :—

Q.—You only keep the fish of the country, or do you also import them? A.—I also import them.

Q.—Is the greater part of your business in fresh or salt fish? A.—Fresh fish, generally.

Q.—Can you tell us if fish is dearer to-day than it was ten years ago? A.—A portion of the fish is about the same price. I except the fish which we are now bringing here over the Pacific. This is cheaper, and lowers the fish of the same quality we have here; for instance, salmon, as well as whitefish, and trout.

Q.—Are salt fish dearer or cheaper than they were? A.—That goes and comes. It is not regular. It depends upon the quantity taken, and the demand in the autumn. Salt fish is sold in the autumn; and it is the autumn which gives it its price. Then it is according to the demand, and the quantity taken. It may happen that it is much higher in the autumn, but that soon varies. Since the Intercolonial opened, however, prices are much more regular at present than they were before.

OCTAVIEN ROLLAND, Merchant, of Montreal, sworn :

By Mr. BOIVIN :—

Q.—You represent the house of J. B. Rolland & Sons? A.—Yes.

Q.—You also manufacture paper, I believe? You keep a shop at the same time? A.—Yes, sir. The manufacture of paper and the store are two separate things.

Q.—What we wish to know is, if the prices of the furnishings of schools and school books are dearer now than they were ten years ago? A.—I think writing paper and school books are much cheaper to-day than ten years ago. There is a great difference among other things, copy-books, in fact everything connected with writing paper, is much cheaper than it was ten years ago.

Q.—Have you any idea of how much per cent. the market is better? A.—There is a difference of about twenty-five to thirty per cent.

Q.—And the books which are used in schools? A.—The books which they use in schools at the present time, are about the same price. But the quality of paper of which we make use for these books is much better. Some years ago we made use of very common paper for school books. On opening the books the leaves fell out. Now we use a much superior paper.

Q.—Will you tell us if the binding is, at the present time, superior to what it was at that time? A.—The binding is much superior. We pay in proportion for the binding.

Q.—Are there any copy-books upon which there is a royalty? A.—That is to say they are copyrighted? Each bookseller has certain books which belong to him. There are printed books, school books, and model copy-books.

FREDERICK W. HENSHAW, of the City and District of Montreal, General Commission Merchant; Agent for the Sydney and Louisburg Coal and Railway Company; Reserve Mines, Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, sworn :

By Mr. BOIVIN —

Q.—There have been complaints made before this Board, that a great deal of coal, after it has left the public scales, is lost on the street. Can you tell us if that is the truth; and if so, what remedy would you suggest? A.—I believe it is the case—in fact I have no doubt at all that there is more or less of the coal lost after the carters leave the scales with their loads, and before it gets to its destination; and the farther it is carted the greater the loss. I think that that loss arises from two causes—one from the overloading of the carts, and the other that there are boys and people nearly always following behind the carts; and the carter will sometimes throw off a piece of coal to the boys, which is readily seized upon, placed in a small box or cart, or basket, and carried home. I do not say that it is a universal practice, but it is done; and I have seen it done. The amount of loss from this cause, I do not suppose is very great. The loss is chiefly from over-loading the carts.

Q.—Could you suggest any plan to remedy the evil first spoken of by you, namely, the over-loading of the carts? A.—The only remedy is to have a cart sufficiently large to prevent the coal from falling out. The fact is, the cart is not quite so large as some of the stevedores' tubs, used in hoisting the coal out of the ship's hold. From these tubs it is dumped into the carts, which are waiting alongside. The carts should be sufficiently large to prevent the coal from falling off; and there should be a guard around the edge four or five inches higher than the coal.

By Mr. McLEAN :—

Q.—Is the loss sustained while the coal is being carried from the coal ships to the coal dealers, or while it is being carried from the coal dealers' yards to others? A.—It is lost while being carried from the scales after having been weighed by the public weigher.

Q.—Cannot you put them in sacks, they do it in other cities? A.—No. Except at retail, that is an impossibility because the utmost they can do is to receive it right off the ship into the cart.

By Mr. BOIVIN :—

Q.—How would you remedy the evil of the loss of coal while it is proceeding from the coal merchant's yard to the consumer. How would you prevent the drivers from throwing it to boys? A.—If it was possible for the Police to be on hand it could not occur, but that is an impossibility, as they cannot follow every cart, or be in view of every cart.

Q.—Can you tell us if soft coal is cheaper to day compared to what it was ten years ago? A.—Yes. It is from fifty to seventy-five per cent cheaper.

Q.—Do you know anything about hard coal? A.—No. I do not know anything about hard coal; all that I know about hard coal is that I buy it for my own use, and that I pay more for it now, than I did before the duty of sixty-cents a ton was taken off. When that duty was taken off of coal it was supposed to be for the benefit of the people but instead of that they have put up the price. My coal costs me to day—hard coal—more than it ever did before, and I think that it was a great misfortune that the duty was ever taken off.

Q.—Please explain that? A.—I say that since the duty was taken off, the dealers have put it in their own pockets instead of giving the benefit to the people.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Does the same amount of loss in the carrying of coal take place while it

is being taken from the merchant's yard to the consumer, as it does from the ship to the dealer's yard? A.—I do not know what is done when it goes into the dealer's yard. I think the dealer takes care not to overload his carts.

Q.—Have you heard of any party that did not get his proper load from the dealer? A.—Yes. I cannot particularize, but there is universal grumbling that people do not get their weight of coal.

Q.—Do the merchants receive from the mine the long ton? A.—Yes; always. And they always sell the long ton.

Q.—Does the consumer always get the long ton? A.—I do not know about the consumer. The wholesale merchants always sell by the long ton.

Q.—Is there an understanding between merchants with regard to making a uniform price for coal? A.—There is none among the mine owners. I speak as representing the mines, and not as a distributor of coal in the city at all. I sell to anyone wanting a large quantity to ship, but of course if there is any such understanding among the coal dealers that is their own arrangement—that I know nothing about.

Q.—Is there any such arrangement among the merchants, and the coal exchange in New York? A.—There is in anthracite coal, none in steam.

Q.—Do the arrangements made in the New York Coal Exchange have any effect on the distribution of coal in Montreal as to price, I mean among the merchants? A.—Well, that is a question I am not at all competent to answer, but as a natural consequence I would suppose so. Their object is to get a higher price.

Q.—You cannot say there is an understanding among the retail merchants as regards the uniform price of coal? A.—No.

HOLLIS SHOREY, Montreal, Senior member of the firm of Messrs. Shorey & Co., Clothiers.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—You have appeared before this Commission before, have you not Mr. Shorey? A.—Yes.

Q.—We thought you would be good enough to come once more to tell us if the goods you sell, suitable for the working classes, are dearer than they were ten or fifteen years ago? A.—They are cheaper.

Q.—Will you tell us what is the percentage? A.—My son and I went to work, last night, and spent an hour looking over the books for this year, eighteen hundred and eighty-eight, and the books back to seven and ten years ago; and the prices, for three years previous to seven years ago, was about the same as the prices were seven years previous to that. We went into the same class of goods and the same class of cloth, made up in the same way, and we find, on the average, the prices of workingmen's clothes are from sixteen to twenty-five per cent lower than they were then—that is good deal.

Q.—For how many years back? A.—Seven.

Q.—The last seven years back? A.—Yes; seven to ten years back, and the same class of goods are from sixteen to twenty-five per cent cheaper now than they were then. They will average that. I have got down different articles here; some vary. Some are seventeen and a half per cent, and some twenty-five per cent, and there are others which any member of the Commission, who may be in business, will readily believe, where there is a good deal of competition, on which we get very little profit. Mr. Boivin, for one, will understand this. Now, there is one kind of cloth, and in that particular kind of cloth there is a good deal of competition with the manufacturers, so that sometimes we receive a fair profit, and other times we receive very little. They cost us more than they do now, and than we sell them now.

Q.—To what article of goods do you now refer? A.—Well, it is a leading line, and I am sorry to say that we sell them without profit; but the average is from 16 to 25 per cent. After careful examination of our books and everything, I and my son have found that we were paying larger wages. A little larger, compared with the previous year, than we expected. This has been growing upon us a little by degrees, until the average price paid for the labor is the average advance which my son makes up to be about 20 per cent higher.

Q.—For about the same length of time? A.—Yes. Some hands get a little more and some a little less, but we strive to equalize the wages.

OWEN MCGARVEY, Manufacturer and dealer in house furniture, Montreal, sworn.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—How long have you been in business? A.—About forty years.

Q.—We want to get to the bottom of a question and to make it short I will ask you direct: Can you tell us if the furniture used by the medium class of mechanics is dearer to-day than it was ten or fifteen years ago, or if it is cheaper? A.—That is the class of goods purchased, generally speaking, by mechanics, and the laboring classes.

Q.—The medium class, from medium to lower class? A.—They are from twenty-five to fifty per cent lower now than they were fifteen years ago. The lower the grade the cheaper they are in proportion to quality.

Q.—And you think those goods are just as well made now as they were before the advent of the National Policy? A.—Probably they may not be so durably put together for the price. They are made to sell cheap, but they have got to about proportion, namely, from twenty-five to fifty per cent cheaper.

Q.—Do you think these articles, these goods made by machinery, are just as good as those made by hand? A.—Well, if the machinery is perfect they are just as good, of course some portions of every article are made by hand.

Q.—Do you manufacture? A.—We manufacture furniture and deal in it.

Q.—Are wages as high now as they were twelve years ago? A.—Very probably they are twenty per cent more than they were twelve years ago. We have from twenty to twenty-five men whom we pay from ten to thirteen dollars a week now. We paid them from eight to nine dollars a week then.

Q.—Do you use machinery in the manufacture of furniture? A.—No.

By Mr. GIBSON:—

Q.—Skilled work is largely if not wholly hand work? A.—Yes; such as carving and the making of goods to order.

Q.—Do you use much machinery in the manufacture of this cheap or medium class furniture? A.—We do not use machinery personally, but we contract with those that use it in the manufacture of this class of goods. Mr. Lynch of L'Epiphanie, makes our chairs and common class of goods, and has done so for the last thirty years.

By Mr. McLEAN:—

Q.—You say that certain classes of furniture are now twenty-five to fifty per cent cheaper than they were fifteen years ago? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it a better class of furniture? A.—I have answered that question. Probably they may not be as durably put together, but they are a good serviceable article. For instance, articles which could be sold at that time for sixty-

five dollars, will sell now for twenty-five dollars wholesale, and thirty to thirty-five dollars retail,—namely, cheap parlour and bed room suits.

Q.—You find a market all over the Dominion for your goods? A.—Yes; we sell a good class of furniture, and we ship to all parts almost. We ship to British Columbia, Manitoba, and all over the Dominion. We do not consign goods to agents, but parties purchase from us, and have them shipped to their address.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:—

Q.—You ship wholesale out there, that is, parties buy it here and have it removed? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you find that there is an increasing demand—a greater demand—for high class furniture among the working classes than formerly? A.—Yes.

Q.—Has the advance of the use of machinery in manufactories a tendency to cheapen articles of furniture? A.—I consider it has cheapened articles very much, and also caused an increase in the number of hands employed; in fact, all classes of furniture are produced very much cheaper now than they were ten or fifteen years ago.

Q.—Is more machinery used now than was used ten or fifteen years ago? A.—I do not know that more machinery is used, but there are always improvements being made in all classes of machinery every year.

Q.—Have the hours of labour decreased in that branch of trade during the past fifteen years? A.—No; it is the same as it has been during my time, namely, ten hours a day.

Q.—Is the furniture made of Canadian woods? A.—Yes; except the veneers, which are imported from France, and other places. That is French veneers, and veneers taken from other foreign woods.

JOHN C. WATSON, Montreal, Wall Paper Manufacturer.

By Mr. BOIVIN:—

Q.—You were at one time an alderman of the city of Montreal, Mr. Watson, I believe? A.—I was.

Q.—The only question I have to put to you is this, if you will be good enough to tell us: is the wall paper, such as is used in the houses of mechanics and the working classes generally, cheaper to-day than it was ten or fifteen years ago? A.—Yes. I fancy it is cheaper.

Q.—You mean to say that the ordinary wall paper, such as is used in the houses of mechanics, is cheaper to-day than it was ten or fifteen years ago? A.—Decidedly.

Q.—Can you tell us what percentage, if it is five or ten per cent. cheaper than what it was? A.—I fancy the force of competition has brought it down probably five or ten per cent. less.

JOHN T. REDMOND, Montreal, Bookseller, sworn.

By Mr. HEAKES:—

Q.—How many years have you been in the book selling business? A.—Nine or ten years.

Q.—What kind of literature is most sought after by the labouring classes? A.—Since the reduction in the price of literature I find there is an increased demand for standard works, that is, since the introduction of cheap libraries.

Q.—Are the books standard novels like those of Thackeray, Dickens, and Sir Walter Scott? A.—Yes; and other standard novels of the day.

Q.—Are they cheaper now than they were years ago? A.—Oh yes, much cheaper. Editions of most of the standard works.

Q.—How do you account for the higher standard literature being sought for by the masses? A.—It is more within the range of their abilities to purchase.

Q.—I should judge, that from your experience, if they had a shortening of hours of labour they would devote their spare time to the cultivation of their minds by reading? A.—Yes; I find it so.

Q.—Do you find any mechanics in the City purchase books on mechanics or mechanism for the purpose of educating themselves in that portion of their particular trade that might be looked upon as scientific? A.—I do; but I know there would be a greater demand for mechanical literature if it was not for the duty. There is a duty on books of all kinds which is a great drawback—which is a hindrance to the parties who would otherwise purchase. There are no publications in Canada to speak of on the Mechanical Arts. Books on the Mechanical Arts are not published in Canada and they have all to be imported.

Q.—But could not those books be re-published by publishers in Canada? A.—No; I do not think so.

Q.—Are there not some publishers in Montreal capable of publishing these works? A.—They could, but there is not sufficient demand.

Q.—Supposing there was a reprint in Montreal of some of these works. Do you think it would increase the demand? A.—Yes, there might be a large number sold.

Q.—Do not you think if that was done it would pay for the undertaking—the experiment? A.—No; I think the market is too small.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—You have been for the last few years a master workman of the Montreal district of the Knights of Labour? A.—I was, for a portion of them.

Q.—The Commission was informed in Hamilton, Ontario, that the Knights of Labour of Montreal had received aid from the Knights of Labor in the United States, to make strikes. Is that the case? A.—Not at all. There has never been any money forwarded to the Province of Quebec to support men in strikes.

Q.—If that had been the case, would you be in a position to know it? A.—Certainly. I am a member of the Order; and have been since it was first instituted in Montreal.

Q.—Since you have been a member of the Knights of Labour, has it ever come to your knowledge that any sum or sums of money has or have been sent from the United States to Montreal to assist the working people of Montreal in strikes? A.—I am certain there has not been.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—If there had been, you would know of it? A.—I would know of it; certainly.

By Mr. HEAKES :—

Q.—You said just now, that the reason works on mechanical subjects were not published in Canada, was because the demand was not great. A.—Yes.

Q.—Could you suggest a means of increasing that demand? A.—I cannot; and because the population of the Dominion is not sufficient to warrant the publication of mechanical works.

Q.—Would not the shortening of the hours of labour have something to do with it? A.—No. Because the members of each craft in the Dominion are so few in number that it would not pay to publish a treatise on mechanics.

Q.—In the settlement of labor difficulties, do you believe in the principal of arbitration? A.—Certainly.

Q.—On all occasions? A.—Yes; on all occasions.

Q.—Do you think that principal is growing among the working classes that are organized in Canada? A.—Yes. My knowledge of the working classes is that they are always willing to accept what is fair. They are always willing to submit to arbitration.

By Mr. HELBRONNER :—

Q.—Can you state what has been the influence of your Association—the Knights of Labour—on its members with regard to the temperance question—at least what are its own principles? A.—It has been beneficial. It is an association that strongly favour temperance.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG :—

Q.—Do you find, in your experience in Montreal, a diminution in the number of persons using intoxicating liquors—is there a falling off in drinking among the working classes? A.—Among the organized working classes, I am certain there is.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you know one Robert D. Layton, who was secretary of the General Association of the Knights of Labor in 1883? A.—I had correspondence with him in 1883.

Q.—Do you agree with this part of the evidence which he gave respecting the Association before a Commission of Congress, appointed the seventh of August, 1882, and which sat at Washington for the first time on the sixth of February, 1883, when he said, in giving his evidence as Grand Secretary of the Knights of Labor of North America, in answer to a question put by the Chairman: "Is that society a secret organization?" he answered: "It is. The organization embraces all trades and callings, except lawyers, bankers and rum sellers." By Mr. George: "You mean whiskey dealers?" Answer. Yes; and those only are the three classes that are excluded from the organization. Manufacturers can belong to it." A.—Yes; those three classes are excluded.

Q.—Mr. Layton then stated, in answer to the question, "There is no restriction in the matter of wealth, I suppose, no property qualification?" Answer. "No; if a person has been a wage-worker at any time in his life, he is entitled to be admitted." Are you of that opinion? A.—I am of that opinion.

Q.—The secretary, Mr. Layton, stated that the association was a secret organization—are you of that opinion? A.—I am not of the opinion that it is a secret society. There are certain things reserved to the members.

Q.—Which is not secrecy? A.—There is nothing dangerous to the common good in any of its teachings—quite the contrary; the society interferes with the rights and liberties of no man.

Q.—Has the constitution of the Knights of Labor been changed since the sixth of February, 1883? A.—There have been certain amendments made at each session. The General Association meet once a year, and amend the constitution according to the laws of the country and the rules of the Association, as the members may decide.

Q.—Have there been any amendments since the 6th of February, 1883? A.—There have been no amendments to the constitution since 1883.

Q.—On the sixth of February, 1883, while under examination, as already stated, the secretary, Mr. Layton, in answer to a question put to him, stated that "Every member is expected to comply with the specific requirements of the Order under an obligation that he assumes when he becomes a member. So far as discipline is concerned, we have not, perhaps, been quite as rigid in that respect as we ought to have

been under the circumstances. This action is chiefly advisory, although if a man assumes a position, and then, without any good cause or provocation as far as we can see or learn, deserts it in a cowardly manner and causes others to be victimized, we undoubtedly bring as much moral pressure to bear upon him as we can; that is, we ostracise him, we have nothing to do with him in the works, do not speak to him, nor render him any assistance any more than is absolutely necessary; we do not consider a man of that kind to be a man."

Q.—Now, is that your opinion, and the opinion of the members generally?

A.—It would not be my opinion.

 APPENDIX.

 LETTERS, DOCUMENTS, AND PAPERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE
 FOREGOING EVIDENCE.

MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE,
Office, Corner St. Sacrament and St. John Streets.

GEO. HADRILL, *Secretary.*

MONTREAL, February 8th, 1888.

A. H. BLACKEBY, Esq.,
Secretary Royal Commission on Labor, Montreal.

SIR,—The question of the exemption of laborers' wages from seizure has been brought to the attention of this Board, with a view to procuring a change in the law so that the whole of the wages, instead of the half, should be so exempted.

It appears to the Council that this question is one that might be considered by the Royal Commission on Labour, and I am to express the hope that it will receive attention,

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

GEO. HADRILL, *Secretary.*

(*Translation.*)

MONTREAL, February 14th, 1888.

Mr. HELBRONNER.

If the following facts are of any use to you, I will be at your service to prove them, under oath, whenever you may think fit. It will be three years the 1st of May next that I occupy the dwelling, No. 56½ Montcalm Street, for which I paid six dollars per month for the two first years. The first year I paid \$13.50 water rates, including \$4 for w. c. The second year I sub-let two rooms—one flat—for \$2.50, and I received an account of \$12 for water, w. c. still included, my tenant another for an amount of \$5, making a total of \$17 for a \$6 dwelling. I lost a half day's work, and after a great deal of trouble, I obtained from Mr. Morin a decrease of seventy-five cents. The third year my water rates were \$8, and my tenant's \$5. There was no account for w. c. I paid without demur.

Yours, etc.,

O. BIBAUD, 56½ Montcalm Street.

MONTREAL, February 27th, 1888.

To the members of the Labor Commission :

GENTLEMEN,—

Before closing your examination into the condition of affairs as pertaining to the position of wage-earners in the City of Montreal, I would respectfully ask your careful attention to the evident discrepancy that exists between the income of our bread-winners, in every sphere of life, and the cost of living in this community, particularly in reference to the item of rents.

I do not know if you have visited the dwellings of the poorer classes in our midst, but if you have done so, you must have seen that many of the houses they occupy are scarcely fit for human being to live in, and their whole surroundings are equally deplorable.

From practical experience I find that the chief causes for this state of affairs are owing to the high value placed upon land in localities convenient to the centre of the city, or not too far removed from where the wage-earners are employed, and the high cost of building operations, when even a plain but substantial class of dwellings are put up, capable of resisting the extreme changes of climate to which we are subjected to in this locality.

I do not wish to trouble you with figures in this communication; but am prepared to show that with the simple introduction of ordinary modern conveniences a comfortable home of four and five rooms, in a clean and healthy part of the city, cannot be provided by anyone willing to invest capital at the rate of six per cent. per annum for less than \$12 to \$15 per month, or say \$144 to \$180 per annum, to which must be added municipal taxes and water rates.

This being the case you can readily see the necessity of an increase of wages and salaries, all round, before there can be any general improvement in the dwellings of those living under limited incomes.

To be well housed is an important factor in raising the social status of our fellow beings, and I feel it a duty to call your attention to this fact, as the greater portion of the population are earning not over \$1.50 per day, equal to say \$450 per year (barring illness or lack of employment), out of which *not more than one-sixth*, say \$.75, or \$6.25 per month, should be used for rent in order that other necessities may be furnished for the family, and that it should be a small family of not more than four children.

You will therefore see that under the present state of things, overcrowding is inevitable, and only the cheapest and most inferior class of rookeries, can be paid for out of the current rate of wages.

An experiment has recently been tried here in the direction of constructing an improved class of dwellings for artizans, and the results are as stated above. I enclose a copy of the rules and regulations of the company referred to.

Permit me to say further that I very much regret to find that the Commissioners have not investigated the question of salaries paid to the lady and gentlemen teachers in our common schools, no class of wage-earners are so poorly paid and when we consider the importance of their profession it is simply disgraceful to expect efficient services for a remuneration that yields but a bare subsistence, especially so, when the duties to be performed demand considerable self-sacrifice and much responsibility, with very little prospect of attaining a position where one can accumulate a competence for the closing years of life; and upon whom, to some extent depends the formation of character and habits in the rising generation.

You will observe that the two points I wish to especially impress upon the minds of the Commissioners, are the need of better dwellings for the working classes and an increased income for all wage-earners in the city, and throughout the Province of Quebec.

Yours faithfully,

WM. T. COSTIGAN.

78 Osborne Street.

ARTIZANS DWELLING HOUSE COMPANY.

OFFICE : 2430, NOTRE-DAME STREET, MONTREAL.

ARTIZANS DWELLING HOUSE COMPANY.

RULES AND REQUIREMENTS.

1. Occupants are requested to take the same care of the property and fixtures that they would, if it were their own, and at the expiration of the lease or agreement, deliver up the premises in good order and condition, damages by the elements excepted.

2. Cleanliness. In every respect, is especially required from each resident, who shall promptly execute and fulfil all legal ordinances of the City Corporation, and obey all orders and requirements of the Board of Health, and Police department ; for the correction, prevention and abatement of nuisances.

3. As far as possible all refuse, rags, paper, dust and kitchen garbage must be burned in the kitchen or hall stoves, with the dampers open, so as to carry the smell up the chimney, and to prevent unhealthy odors, occupants will please flush and wash out the water-closets, basins and sinks frequently with boiling water.

4. Care must be taken to avoid throwing either sweepings, refuse, scraps of paper or dirty water in the hallways or over the galleries.

5. Ashes and house rubbish of all kinds must be deposited regularly in a place set apart for the same, the removal of which will be attended to daily by the caretaker, and to guard against fire, hot ashes must not be put into wooden boxes or barrels.

6. No obstructions whatever shall be allowed on the stairways or in the vestibules and main halls used by the different occupants, and smoking will not be permitted therein ; it is also especially desirable that spitting on the floors, stairs or sidewalks shall be avoided. Children will not be allowed to remain or play in the main halls, or on the front or back stairways, the play ground having been reserved for that purpose.

7. All supplies must be taken in by the back entrance.

8. No improvements or alterations shall be made without the consent of the manager of the Company in writing, and the driving of nails or placing of screws in the wood-work or plaster must only be done under the supervision of the caretaker, all improvements to belong to the Company on the expiration of the lease.

9. Occupants will be held responsible for injury to the wood-work, plastering, windows, blinds, doors, electric-locks, speaking-tubes, water and gas-pipes, taps, sinks, baths, wash-basins or closets, beyond the ordinary wear and tear of such property or on account of the stoppage of drains through allowing rags, hair, peelings of fruit and vegetables or other material to pass into the water-closet, bath, basin or sinks. Broken window glass, locks, knobs, latches, hinges, fastenings, coat and hat hooks, towel holders, soapdishes and lost keys must be replaced.

10. Light will be provided from a No. 1 burner in the main halls and basement of each floor from dusk until 10.10 o'clock, p. m., and will be under the control of the caretaker, whose duties it shall be to see that the halls, stairs, vestibules and steps front and back are swept out daily and washed regularly once or twice a week if necessary, sweep off the footpath, outer steps and sidewalk, keep the grass plot in good order and the play ground free of dirt, shovel snow away in winter and see to removal of ashes and rubbish from place allotted to such material.

11. Levelling Arrangements. Where families prefer to use a gas-stove in the kitchen, pipes will be introduced into each self contained compartment for that purpose, and this mode is especially recommended by the management, as the cleanest and most economical.

12. Coal and wood enclosures must be kept locked by the respective tenants and the chopping or splitting of wood in the house, or on the galleries, is strictly forbidden; all such work must be done in the basement.

13. Hoist arrangements are in common, and when not in use, the platform must be kept in the basement with the guards closed at each floor.

14. Stabling will be provided at an extra charge, away from the dwellings, as it is intended to avoid the use of all outbuildings near the premises.

15. The sodded terrace and grass plot in front must not be walked upon and when passing in or out each party will please keep to the right.

16. Limitation of numbers. For the welfare, comfort and convenience of all it is to be understood that no more than six persons, old or young, shall occupy each dwelling of four living rooms.

17. Sub-letting. No tenant shall assign their lease or agreement or underlet the premises or any part thereof without the consent of the manager in writing.

18. Occupants entering or leaving the house after the caretaker has retired at night, or in the early hours of the morning, are requested to see that the main doors are properly closed after they pass through.

19. The rental will fall due on the first day of every month, and must be paid not later than the third day of the month.

20. Non-conformance to the requirements and regulations of the Company or any disorder through drunkenness and failure to agree with neighbors, will, after investigation by the manager, be deemed good and sufficient cause for peaceable and prompt vacation after one month's notice, and it is particularly desirable that no boisterous talk be indulged in, to disturb the usual quietness of others.

WM. T. COSTIGAN,
ROBT. COSTIGAN, M.D.
JOHN COSTIGAN,
RICHARD COSTIGAN,
ALEX. H. COSTIGAN.
M. J. COSTIGAN.

THE MERCHANTS' MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

A. A. AYER, *President.*

GEO. CREAK, *Sec.-Treas.*

R. W. EATON, *Supt.*

MONTREAL, 27th February, 1888.

A. H. BLACKEBY, Esq.,

Secretary Royal Labor Commission.

SIR,—In reply to your favor, received this morning, asking for a list of the fines imposed in this Company's mill during the past five years; and a list of the wages confiscated during the same period, I hand you the following particulars:—

Mill started 1882.—	Total wages paid—\$	43,922 78	Total fines—\$	42 67
1883.—	“	— 88,814 25	“	— 297 44
1884.—	“	— 42,586 01	“	— 150 57
1885.—	“	— 69,072 05	“	— 134 13
1886.—	“	— 87,284 72	“	— 237 41
1887.—	“	— 99,952 55	“	— 253 72

Total wages paid.....\$431,632 36 Total fines...\$1,116 04

Regarding your second question, I do not know of a single instance of an employee's wages being confiscated and retained by this Company. The mill regulations on this subject (being printed on the pay envelopes, and thus constantly under the notice of the employees) seem to have effected the desired purpose of obtaining proper notice from any employee desiring to leave; and the actual necessity of enforcing this regulation, has, to my knowledge, never occurred.

I trust these explanations will be satisfactory, as I am unable to come into town to-day; but I would like to add that Mr. Eaton had all this information with him when under examination by the Commission, and would have been happy then, as he is still, to reply to any and all enquiries, but the question as to total fines was not asked.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,

GEORGE CREAK,
Sec.-Treas.

27th day of February, 1888.

At a session of the Royal Labor Commission at Montreal this day, on motion of Mr. HELBRONNER, seconded by Mr. FREED, it was

Resolved,—That the Allan Steamship Company be requested to lay before the Commission :

1. The number of ship laborers engaged by contract in the port of Montreal during the seasons of 1886 and 1887.
2. The number of ship laborers engaged by contract who, in 1886 and 1887, did not receive the premium mentioned in said contract, and, if possible, the reason why such premium was kept back.
3. The number of ship laborers engaged by contract who, in 1886 and 1887, did not receive the 10 per cent. kept off their salary, and, if possible, why such salary was kept off.
4. The amount made up in 1886 and 1887 by the retaining of 1 per cent. for insurance on the salaries of the workmen assured.
5. The amount paid to the insurance company in 1886 and 1887 to assure said employees.
6. The amount paid to their assured or the families in 1886 and 1887, either on account of death or for being incapacitated from work.
7. The largest number of consecutive hours during which the ship laborers have been obliged to work without any rest during the years 1886 and 1887.

ALLAN LINES OF ROYAL MAIL STEAMSHIPS.

HUGH & ANDREW ALLAN, *Agents*.

MONTREAL, March 30th, 1888.

A. H. BLACKBEY, Esq.,
Secretary Royal Labor Commission.

SIR,—

We have the honor to supply the following replies to the enquiries conveyed by your communication of the 28th February ultimo:—

1. We have no knowledge of "the number of ship laborers engaged by contract

in the port of Montreal during the seasons of 1886 and 1887." But the numbers of laborers under contract with us during those seasons were, in

1886.....	100
1887.....	120

2. Our contracts with ship laborers for the seasons of 1886 and 1887 did not stipulate for the payment of any premiums.

3. The "numbers of ship laborers engaged by contract who in 1886 and 1887 did not receive the ten per cent. kept off their salary" from us were, in

1886.....	2
1887.....	7

The amounts of such ten per cents so forfeited were, in

1886.....\$	16.17
1887.....	58.14

And the reason "why such salary was kept off" was because the laborers deserted their employment in violation of their contracts.

4. The amounts retained by us from laborers' wages to cover the premium of one per cent. for insurance against accident and death, under policies with the Citizens' Insurance Company, were, in

1886.....\$	914.83
1887.....	1,044.78

5. The amounts paid by us to the Citizens' Insurance Company to assure said employees were the actual sums of one per cent. retained from their wages, and these aggregated, in

1886.....\$	914.83
1887.....	1,044.78

6. We have no personal knowledge of "the amounts paid to the assured or their families, either on account of death or for being incapacitated from work;" but we are informed by the Citizens' Insurance Company, as per certificate herewith, that these payments were, in

1886.....\$	702.40
1887.....	686.22

7. Our ship laborers are not at any time "obliged to work without any rest" for any number of hours beyond the regular day of ten out of each twenty-four hours. Any additional time worked by the men was voluntary on their part, and not under compulsion from us.

We have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

H. & A. ALLAN.

CITIZENS' INSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA,

MONTREAL, 2nd April, 1888.

Messrs H. and A. Allan, Montreal.

DEAR SIRS,—The communication from Mr. Blackeby, Secretary of the Royal Labour Commission, under date of 28th February last, which you forwarded to this Company for replies to queries Nos. 5 and 6 we have received and return herewith.

In reply to query No. 5 reading as follows :—

“The amount paid to the Insurance Company in 1886 and 1887 to assure said employees.”

We beg to state that the amount paid for 1886 was \$914.83, and for 1887, \$1,044.78.

In reply to query No. 6, reading as follows :

“The amount paid to the assured or their families in 1886 and 1887, either on account of death or for being incapacitated from work.”

The claims paid during 1886 amounted to \$703.40, and for 1887 to \$686.22, to which must be added for medical fees and cost of collection the sum of \$484.18.

We would also state that under this particular policy our Company has been fortunate enough to escape any death claim, the accidents thus far having been of a temporary disabling nature only, but you will see, from the above figures, that the margin for this contingency is a very small one and that therefore the rate is the minimum that would be charged.

Yours truly,

GEBALD E. HART,

General Manager.

27th day of February, 1888.

At a session of the Royal Labour Commission, at Montreal, this day, on motion of Mr. HELBRONNER, seconded by Mr. FREED, it was

Resolved,—That the Hochelaga Cotton Company be requested to furnish for the Commission:—

1. Statement of the rules and regulations, printed or otherwise, established by their superintendent or foremen for the imposition of fines, giving the nature of each offence and the amount of fines imposed for each of these offences.

2.—Total amount of fines collected during the year 1887 by the Company in each of their mills, and also the total amount of fines collected in each department of said mills.

3. The amount of wages confiscated in the two mills during the year 1887.

4. The number of day's work and amount of wages abandoned by operatives who voluntarily left the mills during the year 1887.

These statements to be furnished separately for each of the mills.

THE HOCHELAGA COTTON MANUFACTURING COMPANY, Limited.

MONTREAL, March 1888.

RETURN FOR THE ROYAL LABOR COMMISSION.

FINES:—There are no regulations, either private or otherwise, made by the Manager or Superintendent for the imposition of fines. We have requested each Overseer of a department to state, in writing, the reason for which fines are imposed in his department, and we now enclose these statements for the information of the Commission. In making the Return of Wages and Days Work confiscated, we have been obliged to include the Voluntarily Abandoned, as it has been found impossible to separate them.

FINES COLLECTED BY HOCHELAGA MANUFACTURING COMPANY, YEAR 1887.

	Hudon Mill.	St. Ann's Mill.
Carding Room.	\$ 245.05	\$ 172.62
Spinning and Dressing Room.	181.23	257.30
Mule "	91.06	42.00
Weaving "	1153.63	560.18
Cloth Room, Bleaching and Repairs.....	2.50	.75
	<u>\$1673.47</u>	<u>\$1032.85</u>

RECAPITULATION.

Total amount Fines, Hudon Mill,.....	\$1673.47
" " " St. Ann's "	1032.85
	<u>\$2706.32</u>
Total amount of Wages paid in both Mills, year 1887.....	\$285,985.15
Wages confiscated, including Voluntarily Abandoned (66 names) Hudon Mill,	\$247.94
Wages confiscated, including Voluntarily Abandoned (96 names) St. Ann's Mill,.....	282.65
	Days.
Days Work confiscated, including Voluntarily Abandoned (154 names) Hudon Mill,.....	611
Days Work confiscated, including Voluntarily Abandoned (89 names) St. Ann's Mill,.....	294

MONTREAL, March 29th, 1888

CARD ROOM FINES.

For single or double roving, 2 cents per bobbin.

For gross carelessness in breaking machinery, a fine will be imposed for the amount of damage done.

J. TAYLOR,
Overseer Carding Dept.

Card Room Hudon Mill.

SPINNING ROOM FINES.

We fine the spooler girls 1 cent for each bad spool, and spinners and doffers 50 cents for each broken spindle; also for breaking bobbins, 1 cent each. We also fine for bad work and waste, after being repeatedly warned about it.

NOTICE IN THE ROOM.

That each girl will be fined 1 cent for each bad spool, and 25 cents for each broken spool full of yarn.

JOHN JACKSON,
Overseer Spinning Room.

MONTREAL, March, 1888.
Spinning Room Hudon Mill.

FINES—FOR WHAT INFLICTED.

Boys.—For not cleaning properly; leaving tubes on the floor; refusing to work; throwing oil, water, or filling about; cutting roving to waste; being away from their work without reasonable cause; standing on the elevator sliding doors (very dangerous); interfering with the elevator in any way; fined from 5 to 25 cents. If done repeatedly, discharged.

SPINNERS.

For bad work, 1 cent for each bad cop. If no more than 5 or 6 in 3 or 4 boxes a caution to be more vigilant.

For being away from their work without cause during working hours, a caution. If repeated, fined 25 cents.

For interfering with the machinery, fined or discharged.

Machinery broken through carelessness, or neglect in oiling, is charged for according to the value of the piece broken.

Window glass is charged for, 25 cents for every broken glass, when discovered. All charged alike.

Fines year 1887, \$91.06.

JOHN HEALD,

Overseer Mule Department.

Mule Room Hudon Mill.

MONTREAL, March 21st, 1888.

LIST OF FINES IMPOSED IN THE WEAVING ROOM OF THE HOCHELAGA COTTON MILLS

These fines vary from ten cents to twenty cents the piece, according as the work is more or less badly done. I am very rarely obliged to impose fines for damage done to machinery. A weaver putting in two shuttles through carelessness, pays fifteen to twenty-five cents, according to the number of threads that may have been broken. Such are the fines imposed in my department.

P. C. CHABOT,

Foreman in the Weaving Room of the Hochelaga Cotton Mills.

ST. ANN'S MILL—CARDING ROOM FINES.

Caused for singles, doubles, bad piecing and slugs. (Six bad bobbins per week allowed) One cent per bobbin charged for over that number. For breakages done wilfully or through gross carelessness.

JAMES SKEITH,

Overseer Carding.

Carding Room, St. Ann's Mill, March 22nd, 1888.

RULES FOR FINING IN SPINNING ROOM FOR 1887.

For bad spools, one cent each.

For broken spools, without yarn, five cents each.

For broken spools, with yarn, twenty-five cents each.

For broken spindle, fifty cents each.

For bad piecing on frames through carelessness, twenty-five cents each.

For damage to machinery, when done wilfully or through carelessness, in proportion to damage done.

WM. COOK,
Overseer.

Spinning Room, St. Ann's Mill.

MULE ROOM, 1888.

Fines as follows:—For cutting bobbins so as to make waste, twenty-five cents.

For breaking glass, twenty-five cents.

Breaking brooms when only short time in use, twenty-five cents.

Bad work, through neglect, twenty-five cents; in rare cases, fifty cents.

For breaking machinery, according to value thereof.

Fines for the year, \$42.

ELIJAH CHEETHAM,
Overseer in Mule Room, St. Ann's Mill.

Mule Room, St. Ann's Mill.

I imposed fines in amounts of ten, fifteen to twenty-five cents the piece, according as the work was badly done; and sometimes for looms being broken through their fault.

F. PARENT,
Foreman of Weaving^g Room, St. Ann's Mill.

Montreal, March 24th, 1888.

FOR INDEX, SEE END OF PART II.