

to appoint 'Hansard' men for the House of Commons, we put the candidates in the gallery of the House while a debate was in progress and asked them to report three ten-minute sections of the speeches. We asked them also to pass a written examination in the constitutional history of the country, the theory of parliamentary institutions and other things which they must know in order to be able to do their work. We asked them to take a page or two of 'Hansard' and give us the gist of it in one-fifth or one-sixth the space. When it is a case of that kind, I say, we would have the candidates do in examination exactly what they are to do in the positions of the Service which they are to fill. But when it comes to the case of an engineer of the Transcontinental or Hudson Bay Railway, working in a department in which he has to pass on that sort of matter, obviously it is different. You cannot take the engineers who are candidates into a room and ask them to build a bridge, nor can you assemble those who seek a position as geologist and ask them to survey a section of the Rocky Mountains. In such cases we require that these men shall take an adequate technical course. In other words, they must be graduates of the scientific side of some recognized University or College in Canada, Great Britain or the United States. Occasionally, when we have no Canadian graduates who have been trained in the particular line to be filled, we have to get people outside, for the simple reason that there is nobody in the country who can do the work called for, or if there is, he is probably employed by some firm or company at \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year, while we offer only \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year.

"We ask all the applicants to pass an educational test, to furnish us with the degree taken at these uni-

versities, and the question of the equipment of the university for that work is one of the things taken into account. We then ask the applicant to account for his time from leaving the university up to the time he makes application; who employed him, at what work, and so on. We then write these people, stating that Mr. So-and-so, an applicant for such-and-such a position (usually including in the letter the advertisement of the position) claims to have worked with you, or under you, or for you, in such-and-such work, and in the interest of the country we ask you for reliable and truthful information about his career. If he has worked with two or three people we get two or three accounts; if he has worked with one, of course, we can only get one. We then get references as to his character and we verify all that he has said. We then ask usually: Under whom is this man to work, who is going to be particularly responsible for the work that he turns out?—because in the natural order of things that official will want to get the best assistant he possibly can. We therefore ask him to come down and go into these papers with us. We ask him—not, mark you, as a member of the department under the control of his minister or of his deputy—but as we ask our outside examiners, to come and examine the papers as a specialist in that line, who knows the work and what he wants. Now, in nineteen cases out of twenty, after we have gone over these applications together, we find that we have no difficulty in coming to the same conclusion. Occasionally, of course, 'A' may be first in one case and 'B' in another. Then we go into the matter and thrash it out. We take the sole responsibility for the appointment and announce it to the department. That is the process in open competition.

"Now, the alternative is nomina-