

tion? Is it not rather the rule? The law is honoured more in the breach than in the observance. Now, could the minister tell us how many are being provided for in these three items in open violation of the Civil Service law? The Civil Service Commission did not think it was a rare exception when they drew attention to the frequency of this phrase 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' to the contrary, they thought it was an abuse that ought to be remedied. We ought to know how many are going to be provided for out of these votes.

Mr. GRAHAM. The best way to reply to that would be to read the names and the salaries of these people in this item of \$38,630. The list contains some 35 names. Out of this number there are only two who are paid from two departments. Murphy, electrical engineer, we pay \$1,500, and the Railway Commission pays \$1,500. McLaughlin, photographer, gets \$1,700, we pay \$850 and the Public Works Department pay \$850. Johnston, inspecting engineer, gets \$3,000; Douglas, hydraulic and bridge engineer, gets \$2,600; Spence, chief draughtsman, \$2,400; Bowden, \$3,400; Leslie, \$2,200; Morrison, \$2,300; Massey, \$1,200.

Mr. BERGERON. Are these all on the list as permanent employees?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are not on the civil service list.

Mr. BERGERON. Then what is the use of saying 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act?' If they are not permanent employees, they are not under the Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. In some cases these words would not be needed at all. These are permanent employees, but they are not under the Civil Service Act: McCart, private secretary to the deputy, \$1,200; Cook, \$950; Carr, \$800; Toole, \$750; Bott, \$750; Mann, \$750; Tessier, \$750; Graham, \$750; Clarke, \$750; Martineau, \$750; Jamieson, \$700; Stewart, \$700; Bennett, \$700; Desjardins, \$650; Robinson, \$600; Cameron, \$550; O'Regan, \$550; Lafèche, \$550; Harris, \$500; Pelletier, \$700; Smith, \$650; Gauthier, \$650; Bott, \$650; Skinner, \$500. Then there are some temporaries that we employ in the rush of work.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that all the salaries they get?

Mr. GRAHAM. Except in the two cases I have mentioned where they are paid by two departments.

Mr. SPROULE. Many of these could be employed under the Civil Service Act, others could not. The Civil Service Act provides that certain places shall only be filled by men who have passed the qualifying examination, unless they are technical officers, and I take it that some of these could be employed without passing the examination. I see several of these officers get \$3,000—

\$1,500 from one source and others \$1,500. It is to avoid the possibility of paying men from two or three sources that the Act provides that they should be paid from one source only. The other provision of the Civil Service Act was to secure a guarantee of qualification for the civil service. When the applicant passes the qualifying examination he comes under the provisions of the law. Now we are violating the Act so often that we might as well abandon it entirely and fall back upon the old system, and put in any one you like.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not quite clear upon this point. It strikes me that the Civil Service Act provides for the classification of clerks into the classes known as chief clerks, first-class clerks, second-class clerks, and that kind of thing. You can appoint a man to a first-class clerkship who did not pass the examination if he has technical knowledge, and technical knowledge is required in that first-class clerkship, but the maximum salary would not allow him to have the salary that this gentleman is getting as inspecting engineer. As I remember, the Civil Service Act would not allow you to appoint an officer requiring the salary that you have to pay to this officer. My recollection is that you can appoint a technical officer to any of these clerkships, who has not passed the examination but he would be subject to the salary of the clerkship to which he was appointed. This engineer, Mr. Johnson, has been there for a great many years, he is not appointed under the Civil Service Act, and he must be paid outside of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not the few technical officers to whom I am referring but it is the large number you have on salaries ranging from \$600 to \$1,200 a year. Here are thirty that are being paid in open violation of the Civil Service Act. There must be an exception sometimes, they should be few in number, but in this case it is the very reverse. In this case the exception proves the rule.

Mr. LENNOX. We have drifted away from the very important matter brought up by my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). We did not get a satisfactory statement from the minister. There were two suggestions neither of which met the case. One had reference to the question of franking. The question of franking is not involved. The other suggestion of the minister was that literature sent out, say speeches made in this House, was quite legitimate. That question is not involved or settled by what the minister says. My hon. friend from East Lambton says that, as he is informed and understands, in the Department of Railways and Canals, a portion of the staff were employed in folding, addressing and sending out literature or documents to be used for campaign pur-