

probationary appointments, making a continuance dependent upon particular qualities shown during that year, would be a very effective means of getting good employees?—If carried out in its integrity it certainly would. But I am afraid it would not. Apart from political influences a man becomes attached to the service, and a probationary would be found to be against the fact that there is a very great reluctance to remove an employée.

Q. I would call your attention to the provision of the law of 1870, in England, by which it was provided that unless there was a favourable report, a man's appointment lapsed as a matter of course. Do you think that such a provision would meet the case?—Yes.

Q. No dismissal was required you see, unless there was an especial favourable report there could not be any confirmation of the appointment?—I think that would be useful.

Q. You would be prepared, as between the present system and such an one as I have mentioned, to advocate the competitive system with this additional particular test?—I would if we could not get a system better adapted to our circumstances. My idea would be not to have the examinations made general for the whole service, but to have it adapted to each particular Department.

Q. A competitive examination for each Department?—Yes.

Q. You would not restrict candidates for examination to persons nominated by members—would you or would you not?—I would like to do away with that system of nomination entirely, to take it away root and branch. And more than that, I would not expect any man in our branch of the Service to present a petition from the commercial community for his appointment. I consider that is the worse kind of recommendation a man can get; and that is a very common practice. An office becomes vacant and a man goes round and gets a number of persons to sign a petition for his appointment. These are the very men with whom he has to deal. The Customs service is to a certain extent a warlike service. Every man in the Service is considered like an enemy. I cannot say why it should be so; it should not be so, but that is the feeling. There is an effort to conciliate the officers and get them under an obligation to them if they can, so that they will get things easier for themselves. I don't say this with reference to any particular fact, but merely reason on the tendency of the matter.

*By Mr. Aylmer :—*

Q. Don't you think it would be a mistake to have too high a standard for admittance—that it ought to be just sufficient to see that the applicants were qualified for the office?—Decidedly. The examination should be confined to just such branches of education as would be essential for the duties.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Supposing you had an examination of that kind as preliminary, an examination showing the bare qualifications of the man, do you see any objection for a man, after he is appointed, to be examined in a higher branch when it is intended to promote him?—I would consider that the higher a man's education was, the better would, naturally, be his qualifications.

Q. So that a system of joint examinations and actual test would, probably, get the best men?—I think so. There might be instances in which it would operate otherwise. Sometimes a man has a great show of education, which would enable him to pass any examination, when really there was no substance to his education.

Q. Could not that be tested by the probationary system?—I think so.

*By Mr. Aylmer :—*

Q. How would you propose, if you have objections to nomination, that persons should present themselves for examination. Would you leave the thing open and permit any man to come forward?—Certainly, you could not restrict it; I do not see how you could.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You would require certificates as to character?—That constitutes a part of