

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot give any other explanation than that I have given, and I think it is satisfactory. I say that several employés, appointed in 1882 or before, were, by the theoretical reorganisation of the Departments under that Act, receiving a salary different from the regular salary attached to that class, and in some cases, as in the case of Dixon, last Session, a special vote had to be asked to fill up the difference. We want to get rid of those anomalies. There has been nothing of the kind since the last three years, because the appointments since 1882 have been appointments for such a class as the class to which the salary was attached. That is the reason for making the change. I do not think it can be objectionable, and I know that there is a difficulty in the interpretation of the Act by those who have to do with the working of it.

Mr. BLAKE. If a man is appointed to a class, and his salary for the class regulates his class, and the class regulates his salary, that is, if both harmonise, and this provision is to do away with his class, what is the object of it—what good is to be done?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is simply to make the law clear to those who are interpreting it. In fact the clause means that the present classification of the members of the Civil Service, made in conformity with the Act of 1882 and the Act amending the same, is confirmed.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, but one suspects legislation which is apparently wholly a work of supererogation. When you find a proposal made for which, so far as one can see, there seems to be no reason, then one suspects that there might be some reason—I do not say in the mind of the hon. gentleman, because, of course, he has brought forward this provision because somebody else finds a difficulty in working the Act which he does not find himself. But the difficulty I find is that he should propose a clause to meet the scruples or difficulties of other people. I think if he feels himself that the law is adequate to the occasion, we should act on the law as it is, without proposing this amendment. My difficulty is this—and it seemed to be marked by the language of the clause as it was—namely, that it might be that a person should be by this Act confirmed in a situation in a class, in a rank, to which he was not lawfully entitled, but to which he was entitled *per incuriam*.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not want to do that.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman does not want to do anything wrong, but in carrying out the wishes, and meeting the difficulties of other people, he might make that error.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not see the clause can be objectionable. It may be that the hon. gentleman will find it superfluous, but I do not think it is anything more than what I have already stated.

Bill reported with amendments.

On motion for first reading of the amendments,

Mr. MITCHELL. I have already expressed my opinion about this Bill, and about the whole Civil Service arrangements, the feeling I have is that they are not in the interests of the people of this country, and therefore I intend to test the opinion of the House on that subject. I am not going to reopen the discussion which has taken place on the matter, because it has been already very fully discussed, but I am going to move the three month's hoist.

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will move this amendment on the motion for the third reading.

Amendments concurred in.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. MITCHELL moved:

That all after the word "that" in the motion be expunged, and that the Bill be not now read the third time but that it be read the third time this day three months.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

In doing so I may say that I make this motion from the feeling which I believe pervades the whole country, that the whole Civil Service of the country, based as it has been on the system in England—which exists under an entirely different state of things from those which exist here, and deal with an entirely different class of people—is a system which has a tendency to create throughout this country a special class, hereditary class, perpetuated in the Civil Service of Canada. I think it has not been to the advantage of Canada that the Civil Service Bill has been passed. I think it has added very much to the expenditure of the country, and I think that, step by step, the Governments of this country, and certainly this Government, have tended to perpetuate the powers of an *imperium in imperio*, by giving to deputy heads additional powers, as has been done by the legislation of recent years. This amending Act is a step in the same direction, and without going on to take up the time of the House by going into a discussion of the Bill at any length, at this late stage of the Session, I am simply going to test the opinion of the House on the subject. I am not aware whether anybody will second my motion; I do not know whether there is any person in the House who shares my feelings upon the subject, though I believe there are, but I shall move the motion and allow any person who desires to second it to do so.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I second the amendment.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I suppose there is no need of entering into a discussion of this Bill, which has already occupied the House for several days. The Bill is founded on the principle of giving as much independence as possible to the Civil Service. It is not perfect—far from it—but I think it is a step in the right direction. It is true it takes away a certain amount of political patronage, but I do not see that that is a bad feature of the measure. The opinion of this House has already been taken on the principle of the Bill, and I need not add anything to the discussion that has taken place upon it. I hope, however, my hon. friend will not press a vote on his amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I shall certainly press the vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). In seconding the amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) I do so from a sincere conviction that the Canada Civil Service Act is not good for the civil servants of Canada. It is particularly hard on those who have been a number of years in the service—those who have entered the service with the expectation that they would be promoted according to their skill and ability, and that, so far as the circumstances of the case would warrant, they would be remunerated for their service in keeping with that skill and ability. The Act of 1883 has inflicted on a large number of very estimable officers the necessity of either passing these technical examinations—because after all they are technical examinations—or remaining precisely where they are, without hope of future advancement. This is particularly hard on old officers and I have many such officers in my eye at the present moment, in the Province from which I come, who, at the age of fifty-five or sixty years, are unable to go before the Civil Service Board, or the sub-examiners appointed by that board, and pass the examinations, as prepared by the Civil Service commissioners. I believe in the examination of those entering the service, but when they have once shown their educational fitness by such a test, they should be promoted by their peculiar fitness for the higher grades, ascertained by their superiors by departmental eligibility, pure and simple, but that those who have been appointed since 1882 should be compelled to pass the examinations, but that those who were in the service previous to the passing of the Act should be compelled to pass those examinations is, I think, one of the greatest