

some of these younger men have striven to do their work, looking and hoping for promotion. In the very nature of things promotion is naturally slow, because we have a very small service. . . I think there is no branch of the public service in which there should be a greater endeavour, and particularly as it is a new branch, at least to leave in the minds of those entering the service as a career, that there is an opportunity of promotion which may lead them to occupy positions of importance. It should be understood that those positions are not reserved for those who have rendered services, politically or otherwise, but that they would be the meritorious right of those who have really rendered service in the department. Such promotion I believe will ensure a better service, and certainly a more contented one. (1)

Mr. King endorsed this:

In regard to the desirability of having a diplomatic service so constituted that men entering the service may look forward to a permanent career therein and to recognition by way of promotion for merit, I am in entire agreement. (2)

Conclusion

Thus, the unwelcome precedent was avoided in Paris and in Tokyo of automatic resignation or recall on a change of government in Ottawa, of formerly appointed diplomatic Heads of Mission, leaving room for new patronage appointments. (The case of Washington and London were exceptional, because of the vacancies then opportunely existing. Mr. Massey had surrendered his post in Washington; he had been appointed to the London post, but had not taken up his duties there.)

(1) H. of C. Debates, May 26, 1938. II. p.3260.

(2) Ibid.