

- 'Q. Did you find it a strain upon you ?
'A. Yes, I did.
'Q. How much would your wages be upon the 8-hour system ? You were getting \$22.50 ?
'A. Yes.
'Q. That would be \$25 ?
'A. I would get \$25.
'Q. So that you would be working as many hours in the month as you did overtime and possibly more, and getting less money for it ?
'A. Yes.
'Q. Then the experience you have had of the 5 hours with the overtime would lead you to believe that you would make more money with the 5 hours and the overtime you were working, than you would with the 8 hours ?
'A. Decidedly.'

Gladys Sangster in her evidence stated as follows :—

- 'Q. Now, while you were working on the circuit for the 5 hours did you leave to go on and work for another five at any time ?
'A. I often worked over.
'Q. Was that willingly or against your will ?
'A. Sometimes I was willing and other times I was not.
'Q. Which did you prefer to do, not to work ?
'A. Well, sometimes I needed a little extra money and I worked of my own free will.
'Q. And you were prepared to take the extra labour as it helped you to get extra money ?
'A. Yes.

Mamie Breck stated, with reference to the increased wages with the introduction of the 8-hour system, as follows :—

- 'Q. And what was the increased rate of wages to you, for instance ?
'A. I think I would get \$5.
'Q. And for that you had to work 78 hours extra ; was it about 78 hours extra ?
'A. I did not consider that was very much, because I always had that. I had to take a certain amount of overtime. We simply had to take it whether we liked it or not, so I always had \$5 extra in the month anyway—very seldom I did not have it.
'Q. In this case it would prevent you— ?
'A. To take any overtime ?
'Q. So that you would be working just as hard for about the same money as far as you could determine, is that it ?
'A. Yes.
'Q. Is your idea of it that this lengthening of the hours would save the company the overtime ?
'A. I think it would.'

Laura Rockall said :

- 'Q. Did you work overtime ?
'A. Once in a while.
'Q. Why ?
'A. I needed the extra money.
'Q. Did you have your board to pay ?
'A. No, sir, living at home.
'Q. Did you need the extra money for your clothing ?
'A. Yes.'

The truth is that under the so-called 5-hour system those operators who were self-supporting and who were dependent for their livelihood upon their earnings from the company, could not make ends meet without working 10 hours a day instead of 5 during certain days of the month. As has been seen, they constituted between 30 and 40 per cent of those employed. The operators who lived at home or were not dependent solely for their livelihood upon their earnings from the company could afford to refrain from working the 10 hours instead of 5. It does not appear, however, that the company at the wages it was paying, was able to secure in sufficient numbers the operators it required, and as a consequence, any operator, irrespective of her wishes in the matter, might be obliged at times to work the double period in order that the service might not be shorthanded.

Services Given without any Remuneration.

While 'overtime' in the nature of 'double time' or a 10-hour day was thus a part of the so-called 5-hour system, of 'overtime' in the ordinary use of the term, there appears also to have been a very considerable amount, though except where this overtime exceeded one or two hours, and then not always, it does not appear to have received any remuneration. This practice, also, was regarded as one of the conditions of the 5-hour system. The evidence of Mr. Maw, the inspector of service, is sufficient on this point :

- 'Q. Can you tell me how many times it is that you compel each girl to report and go to work 15 minutes before the hour at which you commence to pay her ?
'A. No, I cannot tell you offhand.
'Q. At a quarter to eight, for instance, and credit her with eight o'clock ?
'A. Yes, there are some come on.
'Q. How many ?
'A. . . . I can't tell you without making inquiry. . . .
'Q. How many are there that you compel to work for 15 minutes afterwards every day ?
'A. I could not give you that information.
'Q. Is 'nt it a fact that every employee you have has to either commence 15 minutes—now speaking of your operators—15 minutes before the hour at which you commence to pay them, or work for 15 minutes after the hour for which you pay them, making a half hour in there that you get between the two right along every day ?
'A. No, they do it probably in a series, they may take six months to do it, take their turn on the wheel as they revolve. . . . that was one of the conditions of the 5 hours, there should be 15 minutes 'leeway.'

The 'leeway,' however, does not appear to have been intended to work 'both ways,' as the following statements also from Mr. Maw's evidence will show :—

- 'Q. If a girl is five minutes late, what happens ?
'A. She is spoken to. . . . She is not told she will be dismissed; if the thing is repeated and becomes chronic, she is told she will have to improve, or if she can't get there on time or give a satisfactory reason for it, if it is pure negligence, we tell her we will have to fill her place.'

The evidence given by Miss Florence Maitland, who had been six years in the service of the company, would go to show that the company was not above permitting a threat of dismissal to be used to exact from an employee a somewhat extended period of service without compensation. Miss Maitland testified as follows :—