

quarterly reports. The service would like to know if these are satisfactory as efficiency records. Does the Commission receive at the end of each year the quarterly reports, as required by sub-sections 2 and 3 of section 40 of the Act?

Has the Commission carried out the requirement of sub-section 4 of section 40, which reads as follows:—
“Such reports if adverse or unfavourable shall be shown to the persons respecting whom they are made?”

Quarterly reports are useful as a basis upon which the merits and otherwise of promotions are appraised. Obviously it may be inadvisable to have an intimate disclosure of the contents of such reports, but some reference to the subject of such reports as a system compared with other systems for establishing efficiency records would seem desirable. In the four reports issued to August 31st, 1912, no reference has been made to this subject by the Commissioners.

Section 33.

This section provides for the payment of a sum not exceeding \$500 to increase the minimum of entrants to the service in cases of special qualification. Some comment has been aroused as to the administration of this section. All increases granted so far may be capable of justification, but the fact must be stated that in some cases the man near the head of the examination pass list goes on the pay-list at the minimum, while the man at or near the bottom of the pass list sometimes gets an additional sum of \$100 or \$200. There may be some good explanation for the practice of giving the least qualified candidate more salary than the highest qualified man, and the said explanation may have nothing to do with the spoils system, but it appears to be a departure from the square deal and requires explanation.

Section 21.

The Commissioners do not deal in goods and chattels. They have to

do with human hearts—precious souls. Many of the signatures of the Commissioners to documents involve the happiness or unhappiness of many.

Section 21 was intended to serve a very necessary purpose; to provide facilities for a department to employ a man from the outside world, whose special qualifications are necessary to the efficiency of that department. It is understood, when such an appointment is made, that there is no man in the department capable of performing the duties appertaining to the new position. If there be one man in the department, below the rank to be taken by the new appointee, who is capable of doing the work required, a gross injustice is done to that man. Great regard should have been paid to the scrupulous administration of this section of the Act. The Commissioners are well armed to meet any attack upon the citadel of Merit, as that principle is involved in this section, for they cannot be removed from office except on address of the Senate and House of Commons; being as secure in office as the Auditor General, scarcely less so than King George V. The Commissioners may appeal a case to Parliament, and if their cause is just they will be sustained, unless the people are hopelessly corrupt.

During the past month the writer made it his business to interview a great many civil servants, with the object of learning some lessons regarding the administration of the Commission. Much information has been gleaned that must be discouraging to those who hoped the service was to be placed upon a higher plane under the merit system. Two cases only will be given here.

“Yes, I can tell you something of Section 21,” said a civil servant, on being questioned. “A certain department employed a man in the Outside Service at \$500 to manage a small agency. He proved most in-