

worked from year to year. This provision was intended to remedy existing evils. The practice of compelling a man to stay for a certain number of years in a certain grade, before he was promoted, they considered injudicious. It appeared that this took away any stimulus to be afforded by the hope of promotion; it kept employes for a very long time at mechanical work, sometimes thus unfitting them for higher duties, and too long on lower salaries, which affected their self-respect, their character and the support of their families. The Committee thought that these employes should be promoted when their turn came, although they might not have served a specified term, provided such persons were reported efficient by their superior officers. Regarding discipline, they made no distinct recommendation, but they called attention to the system in vogue in the Province of Victoria, Australia, where the official head of the Department was allowed to inflict a limited fine as a penalty on subordinates, in addition to suspending them, and this was sometimes found to be of very good effect. The only points they distinctly recommended related to the selection of men for trial in the service by some other means than political favouritism; and the adoption of qualifying and competitive examinations. Their strongest recommendation concerned probationary appointments, which, if strictly carried out, would remedy a great many of the evils which now existed. This alone would work a great reform as to the class of men admitted into the service, without any change being made in the manner of making the first appointments. They strongly insisted on promotion according to some fixed rule, and not favouritism. This should take place *primâ facie* by seniority, and should extend both to the inside and outside service. They found that at present promotion hardly existed in the outside service in the Department of the Minister of Customs—though it prevailed to some extent in the Inland Revenue Department—where vacancies as to the higher places were generally given to outsiders. They hoped to avoid this by making promotions general in both services.

There were many other minor points in which he could not go unless he read the whole of the report.

Mr. TUPPER said he regretted that the report had been presented at so late a period in the Session. Hon. gentlemen would, however, have opportunity and leisure to examine it during recess, and consequently they would be better able to take the question up next Session than they were now. He was inclined to think that the Committee had substantially come to the conclusion which was long since arrived at, and the recommendations of the Committee rather pointed to the rigorous enforcement of the law and practice which had been adopted by Parliament with regard to this service, than to the introduction of any new system. There was no novelty in the probationary system, as it had already been authorized by Parliament. The practice was, that every person who entered the service was obliged to do so as a probationary clerk, at \$300 a year; and he so remained for one year before he obtained an additional \$100, and before he was appointed by Order in Council a member of the service at all. Clerks were obliged to shew themselves worthy of their positions before they could be appointed. This system might, to a certain extent, have fallen into desuetude, but it nevertheless existed. The hon. gentleman had himself admitted that the Government must have the power to go outside of the service, in certain cases, to secure qualified officials. He was afraid that there was too much necessity for the action recommended with regard to the present Government, because he believed it would be found that very little regard had been paid, during the last two or three years at all events, to the rules relating to these appointments. He had endeavoured to conform to them when head of two or three Departments, and he thought that the hon. gentleman would search in vain for any violation of the law in this respect. He regarded the decision at which the hon. gentleman had arrived with reference to the system of promotion as the very foundation of an efficient Civil Service, which could not be made so while