

Mr. STIRLING: I am not quite clear yet with regard to this matter. If I followed the minister correctly he said that because it was anticipated by the government that these employees should be temporary the assistance of the civil service commission would not be required. But surely there are hundreds of temporary employees in the public service now who have been chosen with the assistance of the civil service commission.

Mr. ROGERS: That may be true, Mr. Chairman; certainly I would not seek to dispute it without further information, but I think I am correct when I say that the unemployment relief branch of the Department of Labour has had its staff chosen in the manner I indicated, during the past five years. The appointments have been made by the governor in council upon the recommendation of the Minister of Labour. We are dealing here with what we all trust will be a temporary problem, and it does seem to me that to some extent that does place certain restrictions on the manner in which we shall make the appointments. The desire is to utilize to some extent the services of those who are now in government departments and at the same time to make it possible to employ others as the situation may necessitate from time to time.

Mr. BENNETT: The first thing to know is what establishment is contemplated, in numbers. I can recall the insistence with which the party opposite, now in office, questioned the former government in connection with these matters, as to how many people it was contemplated would be employed. I should like some evidence on that. Secondly, the minister will have to admit that as this matter now stands it is wholly a patronage proposal. Let us be fair about it. There is nothing in it that involves consultation with the civil service commission about anything, or the appointment of anybody. These appointments rest with the government purely and simply. In the third place the government are doing the very thing that we were so upbraided for doing, namely, appropriating money by order in council for the payment of the public service without any indication as to how much is to be voted. That is, these men are to be paid sums not exceeding so much; there is nothing to indicate how much it is going to be. What a terrible scandal it was a few years ago when anything like this was suggested; what a terrible thing that money could be given by orders in council and salaries fixed for people, without indicating in the statute what they were to be. Surely there must be something wrong here. Surely

the minister has overlooked that; he intended to put it in and forgot about it. It cannot be, by any possible chance, that this is done deliberately. On those three points we should like some information, and after the attacks made the other night we intend to get it, too.

Mr. ROGERS: As to the first point raised by the right hon. leader of the opposition, I think the answer lies in the fact that these employees of the national employment commission are temporary, and their salaries will be covered by an appropriation which will appear in the special supplementary estimates.

That will accord with what I take it is the normal parliamentary procedure, unless we were in a position now to indicate precisely every employee of this national employment commission and the functions he will perform. My right hon. friend has had some experience with this whole question of unemployment and relief, and I do not think he would seriously suggest that we are in a position now to indicate exactly the classification of the employees that will be required by this commission. Let me go further. I should like to ask him if he is not fully aware that in the development of the unemployment relief branch of the Department of Labour he followed exactly this practice. I am not quoting that as a precedent or justification which necessarily should apply to us, but I do suggest that this practice grew out of the same situation which I urge as a justification for the policy we are following here.

Mr. BENNETT: And when it was urged by me as an answer to the attacks then made it was regarded as wholly inadequate. That is the point.

An hon. MEMBER: Br-r-r-r.

Mr. BENNETT: That does not advance the matter at all, except to indicate the ill manners of the hon. gentleman who made that sound, and that is nothing new. Just let us consider this. Here we have provision made which the minister justifies on grounds that were the reasons given in times gone by, but which were condemned as wholly inadequate. Hours were taken up; in one case I think a whole day was taken up with a matter of this kind. Now when I point out that the government are adopting the very course which we said it was so absolutely essential to adopt in order to accomplish this end, because of the very conditions under which you operate, the minister says we should know because we did the same thing. He does not put that forward as a justification, but it