

put on, or something in the Immigration, which was then in the Interior Department. There may have been an extra inspector or deportation officer, but it did not amount to much in the aggregate as far as we were concerned.

*By Hon. Mr. Calder:*

Q. Have you any part-time employees?—A. Yes.

Q. Would you take them from the Commission?—A. Yes, I do not think the Civil Service Commission could help us a bit with part-time employees.

Q. What do you class as part-time employees?—A. When surveyors start out in the spring with their parties, they simply hire men for the season.

Q. They are seasonal employees?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. A man who works an hour or two a day, or a few hours?—A. We have sub-agents of Dominion Lands who are part-time employees.

Q. They get very small salaries?—A. From twenty-five to seventy-five dollars a month. The man is perhaps a real estate agent or insurance agent, or postmaster in one of the small towns.

Q. Would you take all the part-time employees, and all the seasonal employees from under the Commission?—A. Well, if we want a sub-agent on timber reserves, it is quite possible the Commission might select the same man as we would.

Q. There would be no objection to that?—A. No, but I do not think they help us a bit in the matter of seasonal employees.

Q. What about temporary employees for rush work?—A. They have given us leeway now. We can put a man on for thirty days or a woman, and write to the Civil Service Commission and ask for a certificate for her or for somebody else. If the certificate gets out in thirty days, well, the thing is all right, and if it does not get out for thirty days or sixty days, that party has not got any money.

Q. If you require a temporary employee for the period of three months, and you are sure of that, or say not exceeding six months, you are quite certain the work will cease in six months?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you consider you should have the right, departmentally to make that temporary appointment without any?—A. There is a great deal of reason why we should, because we know exactly the class of work that person has to perform, and we are making it right in the town or village or district in which the work is required to be done, and we can get on just as well, I think. Our officer does not want to take an inefficient servant if he can get a qualified servant, and in that way I think we can make a selection as well as the Civil Service Commission, but I have no strong feeling in the matter at all.

Q. At the present time you have latitude for one month to make that appointment?—A. Yes, and three months in London—ninety days in London, England.

Q. Would it be better if the period of one month were extended, still leaving it with the Commission to extend it for three months say?—A. Yes, that would make it easier, but I think the Commission feel that in many cases they can perform the service in thirty days, but there are cases where they have not.

Q. You have not any strong objection to the present system so far as temporary employment is concerned?—A. No, I have not. I think if there are services the Commission can perform, if we are going to have a Civil Service Commission, if there are services they can perform just as well as we can and as expeditiously, I say let them keep that service, but the only objection I have to it as it is constituted now is that they are trying to do too much, and therefore there are delays and lapses. Here and there you need a big organization—

Q. Look at that Bill, and look at clause C of section 1. Objection was taken in the House to the effect that if the Bill passed just as it is worded there, that that expression "professional, scientific and technical officers employed for the performance of duties as such," it is too wide, it is too general, and that you would bring

[Mr. W. W. Cory.]