

Q. Since the Civil Service Commission began, has that question been brought up to you at all?—A. So far as we are concerned, the Commission has stuck to the rule very well.

Q. Could you let me know when you are bringing down the other facts, what percentage of returned soldiers were put on the permanent staff before the Commission, what percentage of them have been put on the staff afterwards; that is, all the temporary appointments that were made permanent; and also what percentage of returned soldiers have been appointed since the Commission; what percentage of appointments were given to returned soldiers, and what percentage were given to others?—A. Yes.

Q. You can get these facts and give us them to-morrow?—A. Yes, to-morrow.

Dr. ROCHE: In response to a question as to whether any members of Parliament tried to influence your recommendations for promotions, you stated definitely no. I would like to ask you whether before this system came in any promotions were held up by a member of Parliament?—A. Well, not in connection with returned soldiers.

*By Hon. Mr. Calder:*

Q. That was before the war?—A. They were constantly held up.

Q. By members of Parliament?—A. Yes.

*By Mr. Currie:*

Q. What kind of promotions?—A. All kinds.

Q. Do you mean promotions to the head office or postmasters?—A. Yes, all along the line.

Q. Let us get down to the basis. Before the war, and when the patronage system was in vogue, many of those high offices in the postal service were given to members of Parliament. We will take the Toronto office, you know that that always used to be held by a member of Parliament. Hamilton the same. Have you found any improvement on that under the present system?—A. Yes, a great deal of improvement since we have appointed men from the staff on merit.

Q. Name some cases?—A. Take Vancouver, it is run well. The present man was assistant postmaster for a year. Take Calgary, we used to have constant bickerings and quarrellings, but since we appointed a man named Hargreaves we never hear of them. Edmonton is pretty fair. He was not appointed under the commission, he was appointed under the old system; he is a satisfactory man. All along the western line it is more particularly observed, we have had the best men.

*By Hon. Mr. Calder:*

Q. What is the reason for that?—A. Because they are trained men, and they are first-class men.

Q. If you put a man who has never had training in the post office, what does he do?—A. He does nothing but sign his name. He does not know anything about post office work.

Q. How long would he take to acquire that knowledge?—A. If he wanted to acquire it he might acquire it in two or three years, but the majority do not want to acquire it.

Q. And they are more or less figure-heads?—A. Yes, absolutely.

*By Mr. Currie:*

Q. Take Hamilton, the old postmaster of Hamilton, who was there for many years, was a member of Parliament for many years—Adam Brown. I understood that he was a pretty efficient man.—A. He was one of the exceptions. A great deal depends on the man himself.

Q. Take another appointment that was made under the old system. We will take that of T. C. Patterson of Toronto. He was an ex-member of Parliament.—A. In

[Dr. R. M. Coulter.]