

Mr. BUREAU: What is the law to-day? You can put a man out if he does not suit.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is how it stands.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the law to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You have to take that responsibility.

Mr. BUREAU: We always did take the responsibility.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not under the old law.

Mr. BUREAU: We did before you tried to shift it. We are willing to take it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The act of 1908 applied only to the inside service; the outside service was not then under the jurisdiction of the commission. In 1918 the government of the day proposed certain changes in the Civil Service Act for the purpose of placing the outside service under the Civil Service Commission. That was a commendable idea, because in the outside service there are a number of clerical positions, a number of higher positions, that should quite properly come under the operation of the Civil Service Commission. But here is where we disagree: the act of 1918 does away with the responsibility of the deputy ministers in the matter. Under the old act the deputy minister was really responsible for the administration of his department. As it is now, he has nothing to say in the selection of the clerks that make up his staff; he has no say in the matter of promotions, of statutory increases or sick leave, nothing to say in regard to many things that have to do with the administration of his department.

I have no great quarrel with the act of 1918, but that act stipulated—and this is a point that has not yet been touched upon—that the Civil Service Commission should proceed with the organization of the departments and then take up the work of classification. But what was done in that case—and this will appeal to hon. members who sit immediately opposite to me—was to put the cart before the horse; the Civil Service Commission, instead of proceeding with the organization of the departments, proceeded with the classification. That may seem very innocent in itself, but the result is most apparent in the chaotic condition of the civil service to-day, in the turmoil and the trouble and dissatisfaction that exist in the ranks of the Civil Service. This condition, I say, is due to the fact that the commission proceeded with the classification before proceeding with the organization. They should have proceeded with the organization first. That is; they should have said that a

[Mr. Chevrier.]

given department should consist of a minister, a deputy minister, an assistant deputy minister, if the work required it; a secretary; an assistant secretary, if the work required it—so many divisions and so many clerks to take care of the work. Then you say these divisions carried with them a salary of so much; but they did not. Unfortunately the service has grown up in various departments each practically separate one from the other, with an administration different in each, and requirements in the one that could not fit the other, and so forth through all the departments. You could not apply to the departments any rigid classification, any iron rule. There had to be a certain amount of elasticity in the classification, but the foreign experts were unable to see that, accustomed as they were to classify only large industrial concerns. When the classification came down the government found that it could not apply it under the Civil Service Act as it stood then, because the schedules of salary that had attached to the act of 1918 divided the service into certain well defined categories, few in number, with clear-cut divisions in salary: the act of 1919, section 42, was passed for the purpose of bringing in that classification. Whilst I am on that subject, great faith did the legislators of that day have in that act when they had to embody in section 42 that "the Civil Service shall as far as practicable"—note that—be classified in accordance with this classification. But that was not sufficient. They found out that that classification was a monstrosity, and so they proceeded to say:

The commission shall hereafter as it may from time to time deem necessary establish additional classes and grades and classify therein new positions created or positions included or not included in any class or grade and may divide, combine, alter or abolish existing classes and grades.

You would have thought that after all the years that had been spent on it and the enormous amount of money that had been squandered—and I use the word squandered because the results show that that was the fact—they would have brought down a real classification, but we found that the classification was not yet a classification. The last report of the Civil Service Commission for the calendar year 1921 shows this: The classification approved by parliament in 1919 contained 1,729 classes. You would think it was a pigeon-hole business or something of that kind. It has since been found necessary to add to these classes that were established. You would have thought after the amount of time and money that had been spent on that classification, that that would be an end to it, but we find according to the Civil Service Commission's report that