

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): This section refers to temporary employees required "outside the city of Ottawa." Well, places like Shanghai, Nagasaki and Timbuctoo are among such "outside" places. The reference here is undoubtedly to temporary employees required in Canada outside the city of Ottawa. It is provided that the rate of payment to temporary employees outside shall not exceed the maximum rate of the class to which such employees belong, but there is no limit in the case of men employed outside the Dominion of Canada, except that the rate shall be the current rate in the locality where the men are employed.

Mr. ROWELL: In the case of men temporarily employed outside of Canada you must pay the prevailing rate in the locality; that is a necessary condition of securing the assistance. In points outside of Ottawa, in other cities in Canada, officers of the various departments have found themselves unable to secure temporary assistance at the minimum rate fixed in these schedules, and in order to secure the temporary employees absolutely necessary to the work of the departments, regard must be had to the prevailing rates of pay in these localities.

Mr. FIELDING: Would it not be well to insert the words "in Canada" after the word "required" in line 12?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, I think that would meet the point, and I so move.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. ROWELL: With regard to subsection (6), I confess that it seems rather drastic and a little too cast-iron. There are cases where temporary employees are necessary, where you do not want to increase the permanent staff—in connection with the administration of taxation laws and other work of a temporary character, as that of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, soldiers settlement, and so on. You may have a person temporarily employed who is rendering thoroughly efficient service, and the result of passing this clause in its present form would be to prevent the possibility of any increase of his salary, though if he resigned you would have to pay a much larger sum to get an inexperienced person to take his place. My own impression is that while that provision has been put in to make the law clear—and there is some doubt about it at the present time—it would be only right to modify it

[Mr. Rowell.]

so as to make possible an increase in order to retain a useful servant who has served temporarily.

Mr. FIELDING: It contemplates only short employment, does it not?

Mr. ROWELL: It contemplates limited employment, but the employment may be extended, with the approval of the Civil Service Commission. It is a question upon which I should like to have an expression of opinion from hon. members. Personally I think it would be in the public interest to provide that in cases where an employee has served for a certain length of time there may be an increase of salary. The clause as it appears in the Bill is in the form in which the commission submitted it to me, but my own thought is that it would be desirable to put in a proviso something like this: "unless he has been so employed for more than one year." Of course, that would apply only to exceptional cases where the employment is for six months and the commission, for reasons which appear satisfactory to them, decide to extend the employment.

Mr. FIELDING: Is the possibility of extension unlimited?

Mr. ROWELL: They can only extend the employment for six months at a time.

Mr. FIELDING: That means that it is unlimited?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Does this question have any bearing upon the question of bonus?

Mr. ROWELL: It affects only the question of salary.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I have been under the impression that a permanent employee is a man employed under Order in Council or appointed in the ordinary way by the Civil Service Commission. I think my hon. friend will find that in the various departments there are a large number of men who are classed as temporary employees—men who have been in the Government service for years, but are still on the temporary list. I have come across cases where men who had been in the service for many years were complaining that they had never been put on the permanent list. I do not know whether that is the case at present I know that it was the case some time ago.

Mr. ROWELL: The question raised by my hon. friend is undoubtedly an important one. As he says, there are in the