

3. No appointment or promotion shall be made under the provisions of this section after the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-four.

That is that after that date no such appointment might be made. Some years after that there was another Act of a similar character passed to enable the government to place upon the permanent list those who were temporarily employed from year to year. Speaking from memory there was a similar provision that in future this system should not continue and that applicants must, when coming into the civil service, be qualified by having passed the civil service examination, unless they were technical officers.

This question was brought up in the House with reference to an item in the estimates of the Department of Public Works. I have here the 'Hansard' of 1906, containing the discussion that took place. Mr. Hyman was dealing with his estimates and the following item was read :

Engineering branch—salaries of engineers, inspectors, superintendents, draftsmen, clerks and messengers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, \$94,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you make this exception with regard to the Civil Service Act?

Mr. HYMAN. These are technical officers and the object is to be able to pay them a greater sum than the minimum allowed by the Civil Service Act.

Well that would be a reason. They could be employed as technical officers under the Civil Service Act, but I do not know whether they could be paid a larger salary. The next item was :

Temporary clerical and other assistance, inclusive of services of all persons required who were first employed after July 1, 1882, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, \$45,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought nearly all these temporary clerks were put on the permanent list.

Mr. HYMAN. There has been no change made in the department with reference to these matters for a great many years.

Mr. SPROULE. We were certainly told a couple of years ago that the government intended to make these temporary clerks all permanent and place them regularly under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. HYMAN. I made no such statement as that.

Mr. SPROULE. Your predecessor did.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is right to some extent.

Admitting that I was right. It was the Minister of Finance who made the explanation to the House.

There were in some of the departments quite a number of clerks described as 'permanent temporaries' and they were transferred to the regular list with the rank of first class. That did not apply to this department.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that this change was to cover all the departments. If

these were technical officers there might be a reason why they should be on the temporary list, but I understand a great many of them are ordinary civil servants.

Then I went on to refer to it :

Mr. FIELDING. The change was made in several departments, but I have no recollection of the statement being made that it was to be a matter of universal policy.

It was made in several departments in harmony with the policy which was enunciated to the House and it was said that it would not occur in future. But we commenced the same system immediately and the proportions are growing larger and larger each year until to-day there are three items, one of which contains the names of thirty employees who are permanent as far as we know but who are outside the pale of the Civil Service Act. What is the use of a Civil Service Act if we are going to violate it in that way? We placed that Act upon the statute book for a good purpose. We provided a means of taking in all who were outside the pale of the Civil Service Act and we declared that :

No appointment or promotion shall be made under the provisions of this section after the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-four.

That is that all those who have not passed the civil service examination would be ineligible for promotion or appointment, and yet we are going on and making promotions and giving employment in the same old way. I think this is an abuse which should not be continued for ever. If the Act is wrong we should amend it and make it right. Let us have a civil service founded on the principles of equity and then we will know who they are, what they are, whether they are getting pay from one or more sources and the exact amount that each gets. As it is to-day, we are doing the very reverse. I think it is time that we made a change. The Civil Service Commission drew attention to this vicious principle and they suggested that an improvement should be made, but the government, in so far as we know, have made no effort to improve it. Have they arranged for it in their Civil Service Act? It is to be hoped they have, because it is high time they did something to get the civil service upon a more permanent and equitable basis, one that all would have to live up to. No parties in connection with the government of the country are more responsible for the continuance of this system than the ministers themselves. I think they ought to take note of it and try to live up to the requirements of the Civil Service Act as closely as possible. I think the minister ought to give us some information about these officers. Why does he require so many of this lower class of clerks to be employed without any examination? How many have passed the ex-

Mr. SPROULE.