

interest and the tenure of whose employment require the most substantial guarantees that can be given, to protect them from the very appearance of partiality, or unfair treatment.

It is the custom under all governments given to the patronage system, to appoint men possessing no special qualifications to administer technical business. In the service of the United Kingdom there has been dissatisfaction in regard to appointments to the 1st Division, of men ignorant of all the varied intricacies of a public department. The telegraph and telephone system was nationalized in the United Kingdom, and men who knew little or nothing of that particular business were appointed to administrative positions in that service and inefficiency ensued. That it is unusual to appoint technical men to administer technical departments in the public service was illustrated by the surprise caused when the Canadian Government, with commendable propriety, appointed railroad men to manage the Intercolonial and Transcontinental Railways.

The Bankers' Association does not appoint a medical man as its presiding officer. Similarly the Medical Society does not appoint a banker. Yet, when it was required to find two men to administer the civil service, in Ottawa, the Government sought out two men whose knowledge of this very special and intricate business was purely academic, and who had not the advantage of any association or connection with the experiences of those over whom they were appointed to rule. In the ranks of the service itself could have been found able men, who out of long practical experience with the faults and weaknesses of the civil service system, could evolve sympathetic and practical solutions. In progressive New Zealand, this common-sense principle has been recognized, for the Board of Appeal from the decisions of the Civil Service commissioner in that Dominion is com-

posed, with one exception of civil servants.

### Tenure of Office.

What is the proper and wise tenure to grant to civil service commissioners?

Commissioners are as other men. They are susceptible to the warming and cooling influences of the government of the day. If the commissioners be men of incorruptible probity, an indeterminate period of appointment would be desirable. If they be weak in the knees and flabby in the will-power, a limited tenure is desirable. What is the best general rule?

Friends of the fixed term of office argue that it is easier to drop a mediocre man at the end of a fixed period, than to get him removed for cause. Further they argue that there should be an injection of new blood into the commission, which would prevent its becoming, possibly, too technical, mechanical and bureaucratic.

Those who favour permanency of tenure have a strong argument. This is what they claim. The essential duty of commissioners is to enforce the civil service law with absolute impartiality, and in doing so they will have to run counter to the wishes of the government appointing them, to restrain them from making political appointments and in other ways using the public service for the promotion of their political ambitions. The mere statement that commissioners may be removed by order in council at any time, as in Great Britain, or at fixed periods as in the United States, Australia and New Zealand, carries with it its own condemnation. Commissioners are human. They will compromise with conscience in order to ensure re-appointment. They will permit competitive positions to be arbitrarily placed in the exempt class. These friends of the permanent tenure admit that a safeguard is necessary, and the Illinois statute provides that the