

the dissatisfaction and trouble that exist in the service to-day. The present unfortunate conditions are the direct result of the poor legislation under which the commission proceeded to work, and under which the Civil Service is administered to-day. There is very little more to be said with reference to the act of 1918, except that, coming into force ten years after the act of 1908, it increased the salaries in the various grades.

Then we come to the act of 1919. There was a reason for bringing in that legislation, and it was because the government of the day had proceeded to classify, or at all events had given the Civil Service Commission instructions to classify, the Civil Service before proceeding to organize it. Under subsection (d) of section 4 of the act of 1919 the commission was given power to obtain the assistance of competent persons to assist them in the performance of their duties. Proceeding under that subsection, the Civil Service Commission asked, I suppose, for assistance to classify the service, and as a result of that demand or of something that passed between the commission and the government of the day, an Order in Council was passed placing \$12,000 at the disposal of the commission for the purpose of engaging extra assistance. The only reason I have been able to find why this was done, although there may be others, is that set out in the report sent in to Council by the chairman of the commission to the effect that "the time of the secretary of the commission and his limited staff is now fully occupied with the heavy work placed on the commission by the administration of the new act, and it will therefore be necessary to secure the services of outside experts for such re-organization." Instead of proceeding there and then to re-organize the service, they proceeded to classify and to disorganize it.

Subsequently, after Arthur Young & Company had been engaged in this classification, another Order in Council was passed on May 31, 1920, in which I find this:

Arthur Young and Company have transferred to Griffenhagen and Associates, Limited, that branch of their work which especially has to do with the organization of municipal and governmental services.

Then I find this in the same Order in Council:

The committee referred to have no hesitation in commending in the strongest possible way the work of Arthur Young and Company.

They might have asked the Civil Service of Canada if they, who were the victims of the Griffenhagens and Arthur Young and Company, could recommend this company. We are now faced with this concrete fact, that as a result of the work of the Griffenhagens and Arthur Young and Company, there were six thousand appeals taken in the city of Ottawa, where there are about ten thousand civil servants, by those who were dissatisfied with their classification. Yet we are told that the committee had no hesitation in commending in the strongest possible way the work of Arthur Young and Company. This firm, after having proceeded a certain length of time, brought in a report, and it was discovered that in that report there were fifteen hundred mistakes. I give this credit to the Civil Service Commission, that they were responsible for correcting over six hundred of those mistakes. Now let us take the act of 1919 and compare it with the previous acts. The section with which we are more concerned is section 38:

The examinations held by the commission to establish lists of persons eligible for appointment may be written or oral, or in the form of a demonstration of skill.

Section 43 provides that appointments to the Civil Service shall be upon competitive examination, and yet we find this:

Whenever a vacancy in any position in the Civil Service is to be filled the deputy head shall request the commission to make an appointment. The commission shall thereupon appoint the person.

Now that is subversive of all principles of responsible government as I understand responsible government to be. The responsibility is taken away from the minister; the responsibility is taken away from the deputy minister: The responsibility, or I should say the non-responsibility is vested in the Civil Service Commission of Canada who are not even responsible to this Parliament. The Civil Service Commission is supreme, it is independent of this Parliament, it can make any appointment it sees fit and nobody can question it. But there is a certain section in the act which says that a deputy minister may, within six months, repudiate any person that has been placed in his department. If the Civil Service Commission sends a man to a deputy minister and he does not care to take him he may keep on refusing, and refusing, and refusing until he has exhausted this list. Is that in accordance with the principles of Civil Ser-