

Mr. CHEVRIER: The Civil Service Act of 1918, was amended by chapter 10 of the statutes of 1919, second session. That, is, this act may be cited as the Civil Service Act of 1918, amended in 1919.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is the one we are operating under, and that act—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The act of 1918?

Mr. CHEVRIER: It is called the 1919 act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, it is just a rose by any other name. There is no section 16 in this act. Section 16 of the act of 1918 is headed "promotion," is it not?

Mr. BIRD: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If the hon. gentleman will look at the amendment passed in 1919, he will see that the government of that day repealed sections 15 to 21, namely, those referring to professional and technical positions, and those sections do not now apply.

Mr. BIRD: What is the hon. gentleman's opinion as to section 13?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Section 13, which is now carried through this act, the act under which we are now working, covers simply the matter of probation. That is all right; I have no quarrel to find with that. When the Civil Service Commission send in an appointee, the minister has a right, within six months, to disapprove his appointment. But that does not refer to promotions; it does not refer to anything but the power to refuse within six months. Section 13 of 8-9 George V is now carried through the present act, which is the same as the act of 1918, except that sections 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 of the act of 1918 were repealed in 1919, and those sections are not now in force.

I come now to the technical positions. These positions should be under the jurisdiction of the deputy minister himself, because he has a knowledge of the requirements of the situation. He knows just what is wanted. Let him assume the responsibility of placing in that position the man or the woman
10 p.m. who, he thinks, is best suited for the purpose. If he does not select the best one out of the list of eligibles, then he is accountable to parliament. I think I have made my stand clear on that point.

There remains but this. Promotions should be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the deputy minister, and transfers should also be under the deputy minister. Why? How

do the Civil Service Commission make these promotions to-day? Do not let hon. gentlemen run away with the idea that the Civil Service Commission do everything in an angelic mood or manner. I do not think they are moved by any sentiment; I give them credit that they do not want to do anything that is wrong; but they are good artisans working with very poor tools, which do not give them the power they should have. Are hon. gentlemen aware that these promotions are made by the Civil Service Commission, who have no means of inquiring into the various positions except that they must rely to a very large extent upon the reports of the heads of the various branches. In very few cases do they get first hand information. They send experts; they send clerks of their own to investigate, and they report upon the recommendation of the heads of branches. The deputy minister can do nothing; but the head of a branch, if he wants to be dishonest, if he wants to boost a friend in that branch, can make the recommendation to the Civil Service Commission and the Civil Service Commission, in the exercise of its greatest good faith, may make that recommendation for promotion, acting upon that fraudulent representation. In that case you have a miscarriage of justice. On the other hand, if a deputy minister looked after his business himself, he would have knowledge of what was going on in his department, and he would make the proper recommendation. In matters of transfers, why should all this red tape and loss of time and money and energy take place? If the Minister of Finance is satisfied to take a clerk from the Minister of Public Works, why should he not be allowed to do so, if both are satisfied? To-day the Civil Service Commission has to examine into all the details, consider the positions, make reports, recommend transfers. This takes weeks, months. You cannot blame the commission for that, for to-day they are in possession of this cumbersome and unwieldy machine. There is no better way of illustrating the point than to say this. When I was in the Civil Service in 1907, in one of the largest departments, it took one clerk about a day and a half to prepare the list for recommendation to council of those who were entitled to statutory increases once or twice a year. Now it takes two clerks thirty days to make up the list because of the unwieldy machinery which the Civil Service Commission has to work with and because the experts in efficiency turned everything upside down in the service. For each and every clerk in the department—and there are 1,400 of them—a large sheet, on which are questions just as