

Mr. VENIOT: While this is statutory and the amount is fixed as an estimate of what it may cost, I consulted with the legal authorities and I was advised that the amount had to be inserted in the estimates and voted, because the statute reads: "Not to exceed \$100,000."

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: This could not be in any way considered a second \$100,000?

Mr. VENIOT: No.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: We seem to be voting \$100,000 in the act and another \$100,000 in this estimate. To my lay mind I could not understand how they could be one and the same.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I raised the same question at the time, and I was informed by the Department of Justice that the amount had to be voted.

Item agreed to.

Governor general's warrants, 1928-29—payment of expenses, Manitoba natural resources inquiry (governor general's warrant of August 1, 1928), \$15,000.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the total cost of the Manitoba natural resources commission?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think it would be possible to give that information at the present time. The accounts are not all in as yet.

Item agreed to.

Governor general's warrants, 1928-29—to cover cost of testing cows and destroying such as are diseased (governor general's warrant of October 18, 1928), \$100,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Why is it necessary to have a governor general's warrant for this purpose? I understand it has always been the policy of the department and the government to cover the cost of testing cows and destroying such as are diseased. Surely there must be an item in the estimates for the purpose. Why was it necessary so early after the session last year to have another amount provided by governor general's warrant?

Mr. ROBB: The question raised by my hon. friend is on a parallel with the criticism made of the Minister of Agriculture the other night in connection with delay in the payment of compensation for cattle and swine destroyed under the act. It is only fair to the Minister of Agriculture to say that when he was preparing his estimates for last year, the treasury board reduced the estimate that he put in. In August or September the

Department of Agriculture represented to the treasury board that they wanted an additional \$200,000 to meet compensation payments owing to an epidemic. We compromised by giving them \$100,000.

Item agreed to.

Civil Service Commission—Contingencies—further amount required, including \$1,500, to meet the cost of entertaining delegates to the National Assembly of Civil Service Commissions of the United States and Canada, which will be held in Ottawa in September, 1929, \$16,500.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am not going to delay the committee at all, but I wish at this stage simply to make a suggestion to the government. It arises out of the discussion that took place on the civil service and civil service matters this year, when we discovered that an apparent injustice is being worked on many people who apply for position and pass an examination. While the act provides for a reasonable probationary period, under a ruling of the Justice department the deputy ministers and the ministers have the power of dismissing without a fair trial the person appointed.

Mr. VENIOT: Not dismissing.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Of refusing to accept them; it is the same thing exactly. All I am going to do at this stage is to ask the minister in charge to consider favourably the introduction next session of an amendment to the Civil Service Act which would provide for a fair trial before dismissal, in order that this injustice may not occur again. I went to the trouble of drafting an amendment which I now put on Hansard for the minister's guidance. Section 24 would be amended to read as follows:

24. The deputy head may, at any time before the expiration of six months, reject any person assigned or appointed to any position under his control or direction, provided such person has been given a fair trial therein, or he may extend the period of probation within which such person may be rejected for another six months, and the cause of rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation, shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission. Provided further that, the commission may, at any time before the expiration of six months, cancel the appointment of any person who has been assigned or appointed, if it be discovered that such appointment was made without a full knowledge of the essential facts, or under circumstances which involved misrepresentation.

I put in the proviso in order to protect against the possibility of misrepresentation by the applicant, or the possibility of facts arising which would justify dismissal; for example, it might be discovered after appointment that the appointee had a criminal