

APPENDIX No. 6

Q. Do you have reports made as to the number who work overtime.—A. No. In some branches during the war we had a regular system of reporting all overtime, and there was a very large amount of it. In the Accountants Branch during the war they were working until six o'clock every day and on three days in the week up to eleven o'clock.

Q. Do your reports show which employees are working overtime, and which are not?—A. No, it runs by branches, and it was evened up. If one was on overtime one day, the next one had to be on overtime the next day.

Q. Does that not work injustice to the employee who does not wish to give overtime, to the willing servant?—A. It was not a case of being willing; it was a case of having to. It was divided up, and each one had to take his turn.

By Mr. Charters:

Q. You do not pay for overtime?—A. No, and that has been a cause of complaint in branches where overtime had to be worked.

By the Chairman:

Q. I have been told that it frequently occurs that in a branch there may be two or three rather unwilling employees not anxious to work. That of course, necessitates that other employees will be doing part of their work. Have any matters of that kind been brought to your attention in your Department?—A. Oh, yes, we drop them.

Q. How do you drop them?—A. We have such a large proportion of temporary employees; it has occurred largely amongst them.

Q. Suppose they are permanent employees?—A. That is a more difficult case to deal with, if he is an old permanent employee. If he is a new permanent employee who is not doing his work, there is no difficulty in dropping him, if we notify the Commission that they are not satisfactory, and that we do not wish to keep them.

Q. Does that mean he is dismissed from the service?—A. Yes.

Q. Or is he simply transferred to some other branch.—A. He is dismissed. I have frequently had cases where a man did not get along in one branch, and we have transferred him to another branch. It may be that he was not getting along with his chief. There may be some reasons, and before dropping a man who has been with us for some time, we would give him one or two chances. If he did not make good, he had to go. I had one case this year which was a fairly bad one, a man who had been six or seven years in the department. He was not doing his work, he was not useful, and while it was quite a struggle, we got rid of him. When you get rid of a man in a Department in that way, it wakes up the whole Department. If a man knows he runs the chance of being dismissed, he is not going to slur his work.

By Mr. Redman:

Q. In running over the lists relating to the number of days of illness, I find that the average illness is greater than it would be in an ordinary business concern. Do you think I am right in that conclusion?—A. I think that for this year you are right. There is a further reason in our Department. We had a bad breakdown in two of our branches due to overwork undoubtedly, the strain of the war work and the extra hours. I think it was our accountant's branch that broke down completely, and we had to ease up.

Q. Leaving out these particular causes, do you think that there is more leave of absence for illness in your Department than there would be in an ordinary business concern.—A. There is a little more. The rules which the Civil Service Commission have put in undoubtedly allow for easier leave of absence than would be given in an ordinary business concern.

Q. Do you think that possibly the rest they get in that way would tend to greater efficiency, or do you think you get less efficiency than would be reasonable on

[Mr. George J. Desbarats.]