

APPENDIX No. 6

encouragement in the service. It is a most discouraging thing for a man to have to do the work of a superior officer, an old man who is above him, who has the title of the position, who is supposed to do the work, and who is drawing the salary, for the young man under him to be doing the work with no prospect of getting that position and no credit for the work he is doing. It is a most discouraging position in the service.

Q. It is not putting it too strongly to say that you unhesitatingly favour superannuation?—A. Absolutely, but I would qualify it with a pension system. That is, that I would give the superannuation not only to the man who has failed in health and who has been all these years in the service, but I would provide in some way for his dependents. I think I would make it wider than the individual.

By the Chairman:

Q. From your knowledge of your own Department do you think that is necessary? Are the conditions in your Department such as to require the getting rid of a number of old employees?—A. The Department would certainly be benefited by the superannuation or the replacing of a certain number. As half of my Department is new, I have practically no men in that half but on the other side there are men who could be replaced.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. Do you require all the staff you have got to do the work?—A. We are very badly undermanned at the present time. During the rush of the war our work was increasing all the time, and we could not get the staff to keep pace with it. The staff was working after hours to a very large extent.

Q. I suppose naturally in your department the war affected you very greatly?—A. Yes.

Q. And in the Public Works Department it would be the reverse?—A. Yes.

Q. I was very much struck with what you said as to your system of utilizing a stenographer. You apparently have a relieving staff?—A. Well, it would have the same effect.

Q. Only it would be a relieving staff within the Department rather than a relieving staff for the whole service?—A. Yes.

Q. You think operating the way you do will lead to efficiency and keep your clerks employed?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. It would be preferable to have a relieving staff on which any department could call?—A. You can do both, but what happened if a stenographer is attached to one particular officer? That officer may be very busy for days and then for one or two days never dictate a letter, and the stenographer will sit with her hands crossed before her and will do nothing, whereas if she is in one room with a large number of stenographers she will not be allowed to do that.

Q. I absolutely concur in what you state, and I think it is a wise way of utilizing the help, but I was trying to get you to say if you think the idea we are discussing could be worked out satisfactorily that way, as distinguished from a relieving staff for the whole service?—A. I think the two have a different object. The staff as we have it arranged takes care of the regular work, and while there may be a little less pressure in one branch one day there is a little extra pressure in the other branch. That is regular work. From time to time there is great pressure, a large amount of work comes in and temporary help is necessary. Then we get that temporary help in. It is a regular thing. From time to time we have to do that. We get that temporary help in, and it is, as a rule, not very efficient, because the efficient help is employed permanently, and the floating help which is available at any time, is not very efficient. The staff which would be a relieving staff might be of advantage in that way, but there would be this drawback, that if any employee felt that he was being employed in the Department so long during a rush and so soon as that rush was over, he could go back

[Mr. George J. Desbarats.]