

that even with the Conservative Government of which he is the head, this intolerable pressure will sometimes be successful, and that unfit persons will be appointed. And he acknowledged that such would be the case if any other Government were in power, or if any person with a less firm power of resistance to party pressure were at the head of the Government than the hon. gentleman himself. The right hon. gentleman says there should be every possible obstacle placed in the way of exercising pressure upon Ministers and members; that the system should be completely free from political preferences, as is the Civil Service in England, as exemplified by the remarks of Mr. Gladstone. He says it is necessary to remove temptation from Ministers and members; that the correct principle in dealing with the service is, first, to appoint efficient men, and second, to retain them in the service as long as possible. Our system, he said, was better than that of the United States; and in this remark he was guilty of an anachronism. I think that years ago our system was better than that of the United States, for the reason that though we had political appointments, yet dismissals for political reasons were not common. Now the United States have taken a step ahead. Not only have they adopted the English system of making appointments, by competitive examinations, and promotions on account of proved efficiency, but they have also adopted the English system of continuing a man in office during good behavior. The latter principle is an affair of yesterday, and was due to the triumph of President Cleveland at the polls; for he has, since his accession to office, given the assurance that he will adhere to the principles of the Civil Service Act, which has been in force there for some time, and remove no one from office for political reasons and appoint no one to office except in accordance with the rules of the service, as laid down by that Act. We have been wont to boast with pride of our institutions, but we now admit that something should be done to change the patronage system. This has impressed the leader of the Government and everyone else in the country who possesses experience, and if the English example were not sufficient, we have now the example of people circumstanced like ourselves, a Federal Government in a democratic country, subject to all the pressure and temptations to which this Government can be subjected, following the example of our common sense, businesslike relatives in the old country, and taking away from the Government that power of patronage which has been found injurious to the Government itself as well as to the service at large. I was glad to hear the First Minister acceding to this view of the case. He unquestionably approved of the English system, and I intend to afford him an opportunity of supporting an amendment to this Bill, which, if adopted, will make our system, in effect, like that of England, and carry out, the remedy which has been happily applied there. No doubt the hon. gentleman will have pleasure in endorsing his verbal statement by his vote, and inducing the Government which he leads to adopt the system which is at present in force in England, and the adoption of which in Canada was strongly recommended by the commission appointed by himself in 1880. There is one point in the hon. gentleman's remarks to which I must refer before I pass to the amendment which I intend to move. The evil effect of the examinations, as conducted in this country, has been already pointed out, namely, that they lead many young men who have passed the examinations to expect places in the service. The hon. gentleman admitted it; but he said that there must be a similar trouble in England, under the system in force there. Our Act is worst than theirs in that respect. In England, only a certain number of appointments are advertised as about to be filled. The results of the competitive examinations are speedily made known. Those who come

highest in the list secure the appointments. None of those who have failed to get these particular offices obtain positions in the service on account of the examinations to which they have been subjected, and they have no claim on the Government. They are given clearly to understand that fact; and if further vacancies occur, the appointments are not given to those who were candidates at the previous examination, but a new examination is held. So, if a candidate fails to secure an office, he knows he must wait until the next examination, and must then take his chance of coming out at the head of the list. So, there is no temptation to hang round, waiting on Providence for appointments. The candidate knows very soon the result of the examination and whether he has obtained an appointment or not. This provision is framed for the purpose of preventing the formation of a class of young men waiting on Providence for appointments. On the contrary, our system leads to the creation of such a class. Very many of our young people have passed the Civil Service examination, in order thereby to secure appointments. The general impression is that this Bill cannot be such a farce as it seems to be; that if people are invited to pass examinations something is to result. It is not known to the public at large that under this Bill the passing of the examination does nothing towards obtaining office. This should be known to the public, and I hope they will take notice of the fact, and thus save themselves much unnecessary toil and expense. To pass the examinations is not the slightest step towards obtaining an appointment. The first step is to secure political influence. This must be done before any office can be had, and passing the examination is only necessary after this first and vital preliminary work has been accomplished. The difference between the two systems is thus very obvious. Our system tends to create what I might call well-educated young loafers, while the English system prevents the creation of any such class. Coming to speak of the report of the commission appointed in 1880 by the right hon. gentleman himself, I may say that it was composed of gentlemen whose names were calculated to carry weight, whose knowledge of the subject was *primâ facie* large, and was greatly increased by the enquiries they carried out. The commissioners were Messrs. D. McInnis, E. J. Barbeau, J. C. Taché, A. Brunel, W. White, J. Tilton and Mr. R. Mingaye, and Mr. M. J. Griffin was secretary of the commission. They carried out a most complete system of enquiry. They examined a large number of witnesses belonging to all the Departments, in order to obtain the opinion, not only of the leading men in each Department, but of the rank and file, as to the present state of the service, and as to what changes should be made. They were authorised by the Government not only to report on the present state of the service but to make such recommendations as might appear to them desirable. They gave in their report a brief summary of the legislation on the question, and pointed out where it had failed to be effective. They referred to the committee which sat under my own chairmanship in 1877, and performed duties of the same kind, though not to the same extent, and they stated that "this committee examined many witnesses, and that the evidence taken by it had proved of considerable use to the committee in its investigation." I may say that the report of that committee was unanimous in recommending the adoption of the English system of competitive examinations and promotions on merit, in place of the present system. The committee was composed of members from both sides of the House. They go on to note what has been done in England. They say:

"A reform in the administration of the Civil Service of the United Kingdom was inaugurated in 1855, which has been gradually extended and improved up to the present time, without any important opposition having arisen to its progress, or any serious attempt having been made to revert to the system which prevailed previous to that date."