

tions held from November, 1912, to November, 1914, during two years. During that period, 196 appointments were made in the second division, and 419 in the third division, which still means an average of nearly 50/100 of appointments in the second division.

There is no better illustration of the anomalies of such a system than the Department of the Interior, the largest of our departments. According to the last Civil Service List (1914), there are in the inside service of that department—excluding the Topographical, Astronomical and Geographical branches, which are technical—245 officials in the administrative group, and only 298 in the third division.

So that there are in that department—even excepting the technical officers—practically as many administrative officers as clerks assigned to routine and clerical work. It seems self-evident that this is a wrong classification, that is to say a wrong organization. *Ab uno disce omnes.*

In as much as the British Civil Service system is the prototype of our own, I will now make a very short analysis of the British method of recruitment and classification. It will throw more light on the anomalies of our system.

THE BRITISH SYSTEM OF APPOINTMENT AND CLASSIFICATION.

The official reports of the British Civil Service Commission, from 1901 to 1905, establish that during these five years, 148 appointments were made in the First Division (*which corresponds to our first and second division*), and 1,880 were made in the Second Division (*which corresponds to our third division*). And it is to be noted that I do not include in the latter figure the boy clerks and the female typists, which would make the difference still more striking.

These figures establish that the British administrative group represents less than 8/100 of the service. They also show that in the British Service, which is immensely more important and numerous than ours, the Heads of the Departments appoint an average only twenty-nine per year to the administrative group. Still, here, in our service, the Heads of the Departments have, during two years (1912-14), appointed 196 to the administrative group, that is to say an average of ninety-eight per year.

In Britain, there is a deep line of demarcation, a real barrier, between the administrative group and the mass of clerks assigned to routine and clerical work. The First Division (*corresponding to our first and second divisions*) and the Second Division (*corresponding to our third division*) constitute two different and separate careers: the first one being practically all recruited from Oxford and Cambridge Universities, and the second one from commercial colleges.

In England, the young man who enters the First Division, enters it for life, and, on the other hand, the young man who enters the Second Division equally enters it for life. There are two reasons for that: first, only university graduates can as a rule aspire to the First Division, owing to the great difficulty of the higher examination; secondly, the limit of age to enter the First Division is very low, generally 22 years, sometimes 25 years.

Some may say that British and Canadian conditions are different. That reflection is not serious. The only difference is the volume and the complexity. The general principles governing the two services are exactly the same. In Britain, after long years of experience, the authorities have come to the conclusion of simplifying matters by creating two general groups of employees: first, the administrative group and secondly the great group of clerks assigned to routine and clerical work.