

else, given the same party. Again, here is a factor that we have never been able to get over. We assign two people to the same general office. One of them is selected and put at fairly onerous and difficult work; in other words work that gives an opportunity to realize. The other is put into purely routine work and that person is buried, no matter what his capacity is. When later these cases come back to us to determine the certificates for promotion, of course we have to ask what the two men have been doing and how they have been doing it and we find that one has been doing nothing but routine work and the other good work. He has had the opportunity to go up. And so we cannot put these two any longer on the same level although in reality they represent the same brain power and efficiency and capacity. All these differences enter into the problem. Further there is in one office the opportunity to go rapidly up by reason of death, promotions, enlargement of work and the consequent assignment of people to new work; whereas in other Departments there is stagnation; the men at the heads are young, capable people, there is no opportunity to go up, and therefore no opportunity to show quality. When a man has been assigned to a certain office and has got his experience in it, you cannot transfer him to another office where an experience of several years in a particular line in which he has had no experience is required. Therefore when it comes to a question of advancing men from one office to another it can only be done with advantage in the same line; you can transfer a man from one Department to another in the Accounting Branch but you cannot put an accountant into other work in another Branch because he is a technical man. Therefore it comes to this in our experience that when the question of promotion is up there is first of all the question of who has been selected, and that selection may be on various grounds. It may be political; it may be personal; the question of relationship, temperament and all these things naturally come in because after all that is the raw material you have to work with and you cannot get away from that raw material. You might as well tell me that a man can build a house as well on muskeg as on rock as to say that you can get the same results from the employment of men who have totally different temperaments and mental development. No mathematical processes of routine or rules will ever get you above that.

I thoroughly agree in the desirability of following up as well as you can what can be done on the mathematical and mechanical lines. But what do we find? We have to go and sit down with the people in that office; we have to ask, if any question of promotion arises, who is the man immediately responsible for this man's work? Secondly, who is the man responsible for that other man's work? That is the second removal. Finally we have to go to the Deputy Minister who has charge of the Department, and we get reports from all of these people. We sometimes go into the Deputy Minister's office and he calls in the heads of Departments under him and we have a conference of the different heads who are interested in these different people. We thresh the whole thing out there, asking all kinds of questions. After eight years you come to know your men. You come to know the men on whose judgment you can rely, because you find that results justify their judgment. You come to know the men who are swayed by temperament, by qualities which are not consciously revealed, and so you have to form your judgment—it comes back to the Commission. So you never can get away from the element of personal judgment—and the whole history of the world indicates to me that it is futile to attempt to get away from it. I have read Plato's scheme for organizing the State with the best man at the top and the next best man next to him and so on down to the lowest element, and what did he appeal to for the selection of the best man? The only efficiency record that you can ever appeal to in