

necessary, and I hope that my hon. friend will fully state the case because it lays down a principle of long standing in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hon. gentlemen will find that chapter 16, section 81, of the revised statutes of 1906 provides:

Any member of the civil service may be appointed private secretary to the head of a department, and may be paid an additional salary not exceeding six hundred dollars a year whilst so acting.

2. No salary shall be payable to any private secretary unless the amount has been voted by parliament.

That was the law as it existed prior to 1908. In 1908 the Civil Service Amendment Act was enacted, section 39 of which reads as follows:

Any person chosen by a minister to be his private secretary may, without examination and irrespective of age, be appointed for a period not exceeding one year, and paid as a clerk in subdivision B of the second division, and after one year's services as such secretary he shall be deemed to be appointed to such rank.

In 1912 by chapter 15, section 1, that section 39 was repealed and the following was substituted therefor:

Any person chosen by a minister to be his private secretary may, without examination and irrespective of age, be appointed a clerk, for a period not exceeding one year, in subdivision B of the first division or in subdivision A or subdivision B of the second division, and shall be paid a salary not exceeding the maximum salary of the subdivision to which he is appointed, and after one year's service as such secretary he shall be deemed to be permanently appointed to the inside service at the salary which he is then receiving as such clerk and with rank in such subdivision.

So, from the very first it has been recognized that the case of the private secretaries was a special one and that they should be given permanent employment in the service after having acted as private secretary for a certain length of time.

The objections to the law of 1908 and of 1912 were that after a year of service as private secretary to a minister the private secretary was a permanent officer of the department and the minister could then appoint a new private secretary who, after one year of service, might also be appointed permanently to the civil service. There were certainly objections to a system which would have allowed a minister to appoint many persons to the civil service permanently after having first served him as private secretary for one year. So that section was repealed in 1918, but it was found afterwards that it was necessary to give some permanency to

the private secretaries acting bona fide for a minister of the crown as such, and that is the reason why the amendment of 1929 was enacted. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is advisable to substitute three years for one year, but after my experience as a member of the government for a few years I really believe that it is good policy to make an exception of all the private secretaries, and I am therefore supporting the amendment.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The amendment will not carry unanimously. I desire to register my most emphatic protest against it. All I desire to say in conclusion is this. I see no good purpose in helping out one or two or three undoubtedly well-deserving and well qualified employees, at the same time ruining the hopes and destroying the ambitions and forever wiping out the legitimate desires of a large body of civil servants just for the sake of giving a few a reward which could well be given in other ways.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Mr. Chairman, having listened to the debate and given the matter some considerable thought I wish simply to state my opinion. Both from personal knowledge and from what I have been able to learn from men better qualified to speak than I am, the private secretaries are men who must be exceptionally well qualified, and must give excellent service or they would not hold their positions. Further I realize that they have qualifications which, in a sphere suitable to their training, would fit them for services to their country. But, Mr. Chairman, while I believe they should receive recognition I do not believe they should receive it at the expense of four or five times their number, at the expense of men who may have given equally good service, and have developed expectations to which they are entitled, and which have kept up their morale and ambition. By reason of the appointments they would find these positions nullified.

As I have said I believe some provision should be made for them, but not at the expense of four or five times their number, not at the expense of men whose further advancement would be blocked, and who would have to renounce positions for which they were qualified and to which they had looked forward so long. For these reasons I shall oppose the amendment and support the section in the bill.

Amendment agreed to: Yeas, 44; nays, 21.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 12 agreed to.