

traffic curve. By ten o'clock at night the 'day operations' may be said to end and the night work begins. From 10 p.m. till 7 a.m. the calling is intermittent, and except for emergencies can be handled by a greatly reduced staff. The normal curve, is, of course, subject to periodic and special variations and fluctuations caused by exceptional conditions such as arise on exhibition or race week, or are occasioned by a fire or interruption to the city's light or car service, or other happenings likely to cause an increased use of the telephone. Saturday morning's business occasions a regular weekly variation as distinguished from these periodic or spasmodic variations. The nature of the business, then, requires that the operating staff shall be divided, so to speak, into instalments, and also that extra or relief members should be constantly at hand. To effect this division so as to economize operators both in the regular and the relieving staffs is the problem with which a business manager of a telephone company is confronted.

The operators being young women, for the most part between the ages of 17 and 22 years, it is necessary that regard be had for their protection and safety in going to and returning from their employment. This regard places a limit on the hours at which it is desirable for the day staff to leave at night and the night staff to come on, and similarly to the hours at which the night staff is to be replaced by the day staff on the following morning. From 10 p.m. to 7 a.m., with a suitable provision for rest, have become the generally accepted hours of the night staff. Later than this at night or earlier in the morning it would be imprudent to have the young women employed in this calling passing to and from their work through the city and its suburbs.

From 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. is 15 hours. This period, it will be seen, admits of an exact mathematical division of the day staff into groups of three, each group working for a period of five hours, or into groups of two, each working seven and a-half hours. It was claimed in support of the five-hour schedule at the time of its introduction that it permitted a division of the staff into three groups, the members of which could be brought on in regular order, the largest numbers being taken on at the time of the heaviest load, there being under this arrangement comparatively little difficulty in arranging the numbers of the staff so as to correspond with the traffic curve. It did away, moreover, to a considerable extent, with the need for reliefs. Employees were expected to work five hours continuously without a break, or if relief was sought during this period, it was expected to be for a very brief interval only, and was afforded rather as a matter of concession than of right. It was claimed as a further advantage of this schedule that the work of the operators being confined to five hours in a day, they would have more leisure during the twenty-four hours and would, as a consequence, be more refreshed in taking up their work.

When it was decided to return to the eight-hour schedule, it was contended by the company that the five-hour schedule had failed to meet the expectations of those who had favoured its introduction; that instead of the operators being in better shape for work in consequence of a longer period of rest, many of them during this period engaged in some additional employment, such as assisting in housework, or the making of clothes, or other service which taxed their energies, or else participated in amusements of one kind or another to such an extent that they were more fatigued at the time of beginning work under the five-hour schedule than they would have been had the greater part of the day been devoted to the work of operating, as would have been the case under the eight hours. It was further contended that the five-hour

arrangement had failed to afford the efficient service to the public which the public had a right to expect, and a change of some kind under the circumstances was necessary. What, in reality, were the determining causes of the change to the proposed eight-hour schedule, and to what extent the grounds set forth by the company were borne out by the facts as given in evidence will appear later.

#### Reasons for Change from 5 to 8-hour Schedule.

It is quite evident that during 1906 the company, whatever may have been the cause, experienced considerable difficulty in carrying on its service efficiently. Mr. Dunstan, the local manager at Toronto, had never looked with any great degree of favour upon the adoption of the five-hour schedule, and had had little faith in the possibility of its successful working. He was inclined to believe that the inefficient service was due to the five-hour schedule, and at different times made representations to this effect to the head office at Montreal. In March, 1906, the head office decided to have a special report prepared upon the subject. Mr. James C. T. Baldwin, an American citizen residing at Boston, and employed by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, was retained by the Bell Telephone Company to visit Montreal and Toronto and conduct an investigation. Mr. Baldwin visited Toronto in the latter part of June, 1906. He remained in the city not longer than two days, but arranged while there to have record sheets and other material sent to him for purposes of examination after his return to Boston. On November 30, 1906, he submitted his report, and this, with a report of Mr. Hammond V. Hayes, the chief engineer of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, dated December 4, 1906, was forwarded from Montreal on December 17, 1906, by Mr. James A. Baylis, the electrical engineer of the Bell Telephone Company, to Mr. Dunstan. The reports are as follows:—

TELEPHONE SERVICE—MONTREAL AND TORONTO.  
AMERICAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY,  
BOSTON, December 4, 1906.

Mr. JAS. A. BAYLIS,  
Engineer, Bell Telephone Company,  
Montreal.

DEAR SIR,—In accordance with your request of May the 4th, Mr. Baldwin looked into the question of the telephone service given in Montreal and Toronto, with the particular point in view of obtaining information with regard to the method used in the latter place of working the operators only five hours a day. I am sending you herewith Mr. Baldwin's report covering the result of his investigations, and I should like to make the following comments in regard to it:—

The suggestion to employ operators only five hours a day is a radical departure from the generally accepted best practice, and it requires most careful consideration before recommending it for general use. *Broadly speaking, the system should be judged from the standpoints of cost, service and the ability to secure operators.\**

Considering the question of cost, it is obvious that it will take more operators at five hours a day than if they are employed eight hours, unless the loads are increased proportionately. I do not believe that such an increase as this is probable, and it therefore follows that the cost of giving service will be increased on this basis unless the pay for each operator is reduced. While it is probable that some reduction

\* The italics throughout are the Commission's own.