

it was necessary to add 587 new classes, to revise the salary range of 515, to amend the definition of 205, and to abolish 158. The net increase at that time was 429 classes, or a total variation in two years of 1,470 positions.

Let us be serious about this, because this pertains to the Civil Service Commission. The leader of the Opposition has spoken of a large number of exemptions, and I shall refer to that in a moment. I hold in my hand what I called last year "the joke book," the civil service classification. This will appeal to hon. gentlemen sitting directly opposite to me, who in a very commendable spirit are always preaching economy. This first volume, after having been translated into French, was destroyed, burned as it was not satisfactory, after thousands upon thousands of dollars had been squandered upon it. The second edition is now in my hands, and I have also brought in here as an absolute physical demonstration the supplements that have been added to this joke book. There are now four volumes each bigger than the original volume, containing over two thousand additions, modifications, alterations and combinations of that classification.

Does it not seem that it is time for us to stop? As one hon. gentleman sitting directly opposite well said last year, we have created this commission as a machine without a brake. The expenditure goes on perpetually increasing and money is squandered just because of the lack, not of administration, but of a proper legal determination as to what the civil service law should be. I say that those who make the appointments should be responsible to someone. If the commission would undertake to follow out every word of that law of 1919, I have not very much to say, but I say that they cannot, and more than that, they have not in the past stuck to the wording of the statute. If we are going to have a statute and it is not going to be obeyed, then I for one voice my protest as a legally trained man, for I am not going to be an accomplice with regard to a statute that we break every day. I say in all sincerity that the commission is doing the best it can to administer the law, and let me say right now I have the greatest faith and the greatest confidence and the greatest respect for the civil service commissioners. I have received nothing but courteous treatment and considerate attention at their hands every time I have had anything to do with them, and I say that also of the officials of the commission. It is not to them that I am looking. It is not to the law, and I blame those who put that law on the statute book in that way, just as I would blame my-

self if having an opportunity to change that law I did not change it, and for what? Again I repeat, and I challenge anyone to find in my speech of last year or my speech this year anything but the thought of keeping efficient the Civil Service and promoting its best interests. This act says that all appointments to the Civil Service must be by competitive examination or by demonstration of skill. If the right hon. leader of the Opposition would undertake to make all appointments in that way, I would agree; but the commission have found, quite loyally and sincerely found, and I give them credit for it, that there were certain portions of that act that could not be administered in the way in which the law was put on the statute book, that there were certain appointments that could not be filled by competitive examination or demonstration of skill. Would the right hon. leader of the Opposition appoint a charwoman upon a demonstration of her skill or by competitive examination? Would he appoint a bricklayer upon a demonstration of his skill, or any other of these labouring positions? If he would, then again I have nothing to say. But the commissioners in their wisdom, in their loyalty and sincerity, and I was not responsible for the placing of these gentlemen there, have decided that they could not hold a demonstration of skill for the appointment of people to these positions, and making use of Section 38 of the act, which after all the government of that day was responsible for introducing, they proceeded to hand back to the departments the positions which could not be administered by the commission itself. True there were exemptions made last year. But let me recall to the memory of the leader of the Opposition that all labourers all assistant labour foremen, all labour foremen, all charwomen—now mark the category—all labourers, all assistant labour foremen were exempted by an order in council passed on September 21, 1921. Then all positions carrying an annual salary of not more than \$200 were exempted on August 14, 1919.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why was it done again in 1922?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I beg the leader of the Opposition's pardon. I have here Sessional Paper No. 102 of April 7, 1922, giving the report for the year 1921 of positions excluded, under the provisions of section 38b, from the operation of the Civil Service Act 1918. Now let me answer the leader of the Opposition further: In those positions which were set out, and which he held out to this House were a number of positions that were included in the category released previous to the