

Such increase shall be made unless the deputy head makes a report in writing, which is concurred in by the Commission, that such officer, clerk, or employee is not deserving of such increase; and such officer, clerk or employee shall be entitled to be heard before the Commission concurs in such report.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: That is satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I do not know to what extent you are weakening the authority of the head of the department or the deputy minister. There must be some discipline and order in the department.

Hon. Mr. GIRROIR: I understand that the civil servant may appeal to the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes; that is to say, if he desires to be heard before the Commission, he shall have the opportunity of being heard.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: In view of the position we have given the deputy ministers in all our civil service legislation, I think we are making a mistake in allowing the employee to go past the deputy minister. If there is to be order, there must be a head of the department, and the head of the department is the deputy minister. If the deputy minister does not do his duty properly, the Government ought to see that he is removed. If persons employing labour placed themselves in such a position that when the foreman wanted to dismiss a man he could not do it, I would like to know what control he would have.

Hon. Mr. POPE: Men come here to enter the Civil Service for life, and surely you are not going to put them out without a hearing.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It is not a question of dismissing a man. It is a question of increasing his pay. Who is the best judge as to the services rendered by an officer or an employee? Who is the best judge as to his behaviour during the twelve months preceding, if not the deputy head? My idea is that the deputy head should make his list of increases when he feels that employees are entitled to them. In that way it will be far easier to get his judgment on the work of the whole staff than by limiting him to entering an objection to an increase which would go if he did not object. If he has to send to the commission a list of the employees and of the statutory increases, he is face to face with the duty of following the services of all of those employees and of giving his opinion as to the work that they have performed. It is my impression that you will

not have his full opinion upon the staff if you change that and force him to object to some particular person being given an increase.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: The commission will not overlook the position occupied by a deputy in such a case.

Hon. Mr. POWER: The point made by the honourable gentleman from De Lorimier (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) is that the allowing of an appeal from the deputy head to the commission has a tendency to diminish the authority of the deputy head, and to deprive him of that respect and deference that he should have from his subordinates. I do not think that the clause before us makes any serious change in the existing law; but I would call the attention of the honourable leader of the House to the provision in subsection 4 of section 37 of the Civil Service Act of 1903, which it is true applies only to certain special increases, but which I think ought to apply to all increases. It says:

The said increase shall only be authorised by the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the head of the department based on the report in writing of the deputy head and, in the case of officers, clerks, and other employees of the second and third divisions to whom a further increase is recommended, accompanied by a certificate of merit from the Commission.

I think these increases should be limited to persons who are recommended by the deputy head.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I venture to say that it would be a great mistake to depart from the principle enunciated in the Bill. Some of my honourable friends opposite still favour the old system under which the minister decided what increases should be granted. Honourable gentlemen will remember what numbers of letters they had to write, and how impossible it was to refuse to many people who asked for recommendations for increases. What would be gained if recommendations of that kind, instead of being addressed to the minister, were addressed to the deputy minister? There would be exactly the same trouble, except that the matter, instead of being dealt with by the minister, would be dealt with by the deputy. Thousands of recommendations would be asked for and given every year, and the deputy minister would be the man who would administer the patronage. I take it that the spirit of this Bill is to get rid of patronage. You want now to establish a system under which a man who goes into the