

adopting something which it is not necessary to adopt now, and run the risk after the investigation in our being convinced that what we adopted was wrong."

Investigation First.

Mr. Rowell pointed out that this had been the course followed in the British House of Commons, when the measure was introduced some years ago, passed a second reading and allowed to stand for a year pending an investigation. The bill as drafted would require some amendment in detail. It is not intended to apply to workers in sewers or trenches, but should be extended to protect those engaged in underground work, as in mine and railway tunnels.

Legislation of a similar character, Mr. Rowell pointed out, had been adopted in Great Britain. The history of that legislation was interesting. Prior to 1872 men, women and boys were allowed to work underground in the coal mines at hours varying from ten, twelve, fourteen, and even longer. That year the House of Commons passed an act limiting the hours of youths in the mines and prohibited women being employed altogether. It was stated at the time that this would cripple the coal mining industry and would increase the cost of coal. It was also urged that this legislation would be prejudicial to the public interest.

Beneficial Results.

"But the effect is that after the bill was in operation no one suggested that they should return to old conditions," said Mr. Rowell. At this time the eight-hour day had been adopted in some of the mines and the mine owners found that they got better results under that system. The men went at their work with more alacrity and enthusiasm, and actually got out a greater tonnage. Finally in 1907 the bill referred to, providing an eight-hour day for underground miners, was introduced into the Commons. Similar legislation had also been passed in British Columbia, in Alberta, in New Zealand, and in continental countries like Austria, France and Germany. The constitutionality of the eight-hour bill had been contested in the United States, and the question had been decided by the Supreme Court in favor of the bill. The Supreme Court pointed out that the effect of such work deeply concerned the health of the worker, and anything longer than an eight-hour day at underground work was prejudicial to health.

The conditions in northern Ontario, Mr. Rowell continued, were such that the hours varied from ten, nine, to eight and one-half hours per day, and the actual results from the shorter day had been so satisfactory that the owners were inclined to continue on that basis.

There Were Exceptions.

"There is practically no difference in the principle of these bills," said Hon. W. H. Hearst, Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines. Their object was to prevent men working under ground for a length of time that would prove deleterious to health. He heartily subscribed to the principle. He would even go farther and would take ample care to see that men were not employed at any kind of work under insanitary conditions. This was a matter that was vital to the industrial health of the country. After all, the provisions of the bill involved matters of detail. He did not know whether the bill was altogether desirable in some cases. No hardship was worse than where they created anomalous conditions. Referring to the Helen mine, where the conditions for working were admirable, Mr. Hearst said there were two shifts of nine hours each. The men worked on a tonnage basis with a minimum allowance. There would be a riot if they were prevented from working an additional hour to catch up when the mining had been hard.

Mr. J. McQueen (North Wentworth) pointed out that in coal mines in England better results as to the quality of work done and the amount of coal produced had been obtained by the use of an eight-hour working day.

Mr. T. R. Shillington (Temiskaming) said that the time had come when the Government should do something for the underground workers. He favored giving them an eight-hour day, and did not think that

their wages should be reduced on this account.

"Poor Mine-owners."

Mr. Studholme (East Hamilton) criticized the Government for its solicitude for the "poor mine-owners" in giving the eight-hour working day bill a hoist. The hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines had been trying to find all the little stumbling-blocks for the bill that he could. Mr. Studholme predicted that the same thing would happen to this bill as had happened to the workmen's compensation bill, which had been introduced in 1907 and promptly put on the shelf. It was taken down around election time and put back immediately after.

Mr. Studholme contrasted the condition of miners as existing in this country and in England. "Aren't you just as good as Mr. Asquith and his Government," asked the Labor member, "who sat up last night and voted for a minimum wage for workers?"

Lawyers Set Example.

Incidentally Mr. Studholme took a rap at the legal profession in the Province. Justifying the organization of labor, which he represented, he said that all men of a class had to stand together. Even the members of Mr. Hearst's profession were organized so strongly that an outsider, who had forgotten more law than Mr. Hearst had ever known, was unable to get permission to practise in the Province. They would tolerate "no scab labor; would have no strike-breakers."

Mr. Studholme moved the adjournment of the debate at a few minutes before 6 o'clock.

The motion for the six months' hoist reads:—

"In the opinion of this House the regulation of the hours of employment in underground work is a matter in which undue haste should be avoided, and should be the subject of careful investigation; that such investigation can be made during the recess and in time for the results of it to be laid before this House at its next session, and that therefore the said bill be not now read a second time, but be read a second time this day six months."

Amend Mining Act.

An amendment to the mining act introduced by Mr. Hearst provides an extension of time for doing development work if it falls due between November and April. Abandonment of a mining claim must be posted in the Recorder's office ten days before it takes effect. Jack pine not under timber license passes to the grantee of the mining claim. Sanitary provisions are made more stringent, and the responsibility for providing safeguards is placed upon mine-owners. Code signals are simplified. It is an offence for anyone intoxicated or carrying liquor to enter a mine. Mine-owners may bring in water, drain adjoining lands, cut roads and tramways through adjoining locations on compensation fixed by the Mining Commissioner.

To prevent the reproduction of their kind on the part of idiots and insane persons, Dr. Forbes Godfrey (West York) introduced a bill for the appointment of surgery boards in connection with Provincial asylums to perform vasectomy or oophorectomy on persons whose children are likely to inherit criminal tendencies. A penalty of \$1,000 is provided where the operation is performed in error.

Mr. W. McDonald (Centre Bruce) seeks to amend the liquor license act to have bars closed on statutory and civic holidays.

Relieve Deadlock.

Mr. W. K. McNaught (North Toronto) introduced a bill to amend the railway act, designed to relieve a possible deadlock in Toronto over the interchange of traffic between the civic car lines and street railway. It provides that where in different parts of the same city two lines of street railway are lying contiguous to one another but operated by different corporations, it shall be the duty of each corporation to afford to the other all reasonable facilities for the interchange of traffic and running rights. In the event of the corporations being unable to agree the matter shall be adjusted by the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board, who may vary an order from time to time to meet changing conditions. This bill shall apply to all or any part of a system of street railway constructed or hereafter to be constructed.

At the present time the Railway Board has ordered an interchange of