

9-10 GEORGE V, A. 1919

laid down sometime in advance and must be adhered to and if they are not working satisfactorily it takes some time to remedy them, the result being that abuses which creep in take a long time to correct. They are not noticeable at first and, gradually growing, naturally become more frequent. It takes that to bring them to the attention of the authorities.

Q. Do you believe that that has resulted, up to the present, in reducing the efficiency of the Service?—A. Oh yes, I believe that. As to whether the Service is more efficient now than it was ten years ago I am not prepared to say. Parts of it are certainly more efficient. Parts of it may be less efficient.

Q. Are there any other causes?—A. I don't think of anything just now.

*By Mr. Redman:*

Q. You stated that the fact that there are rules which prevail constantly, which cannot be broken, works against efficiency. Supposing we put it on a business basis and empowered the Civil Service Commission or the deputy heads to change these rules, would it eliminate that cause?—A. That would help greatly—if you gave greater power to the commission, in consultation with the deputy heads, to change the rules, I believe that when they find any rules not working properly they should be in a position to change that rule quickly and remedy the state of affairs they find to exist.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. Would you elaborate your statement by some cases and say how the authority of the heads of the branches is interfered with by such rules? In the Civil Service the efficiency in a branch must be largely under the control of the head of the branch?—A. Yes.

Q. Wherein is he restrained by these rules from securing that efficiency?—A. That is very simple. He has for instance an inefficient employee. He warns the employee, cautions the employee, and after several times decides that the case must be taken to higher authority. It is then taken to higher authority and there is nothing to do. There is none to punish the employee or to get rid of him.

Q. It means that he has no power to get rid of an inefficient employee?—A. Yes, and after a while, that is naturally noticed by the other employees and has a bad effect on them. They think rules can be broken if not with impunity at least with a very slight rebuke.

Q. What about the over-manning of the departments. Can you tell us anything about that? Where there is inefficiency, there necessarily will be over-manning.—A. I think that is a very difficult thing to get at, but it is not so much a question of classification as it is of organization. If you have a proper organization, the over-manning will hardly be possible because certain work will require two, three or five people. They will be employed. They will be under proper authority and they will do their work properly. Where the organization is not good, where the work changes or increases and the organization is not changed to suit the circumstances, the easiest way is possibly to add one or two or three employees and let the work drift along. Then here, in Ottawa, one of the most glaring things we have to destroy efficiency is the fact that departments are spread all over the city. For instance, if a department feels that it needs a larger building it sends one branch to a certain other part of the city. Then another branch from another department possibly is sent out to this building. Thus we have departments spread here and there all over the city and we have letters written and messengers running backward and forward where matters might be settled by word of mouth.

Q. Have you any statement as to the number of buildings occupied by departments?—A. No, I have no statement, no specific figures prepared.

[Mr. Joseph Charles O'Connor.]