

in their official capacity, they are called upon to administer.

The motive which prompted those in authority to extend this privilege is beyond dispute in its generous intention, but I look upon any such extension of our privileges with grave misgivings. I cannot imagine efficient and faithful public service, of the character we are expected to render, associated with active political partisanship. The very essence of our service to the State is inseparable from impartial and undivided loyalty.

Whatever political party may be in constitutional power, and whatever policy that party represents, in our capacity as servants of the State we must adopt that policy, and no other. We are there to carry it out. It is not possible for us to divest ourselves of our identity; if it be attempted the direction of drift is certain. We will very properly be looked upon with suspicion as partisans and as unworthy to be trusted with the administration of policies to which we have expressed our hostility. We will be at the mercy of any irresponsible, blatant comrade, and, sooner or later, will find ourselves discredited.

We have at least one illustration of the revulsion of public sentiment, which expressed itself by depriving the civil service of the right of citizenship—the right to vote. That, after all, in political matters, is the most important privilege, and in its exercise we give full effect to our personal views of public policy.

Opportunities in the Public Service.

Some men achieve success by the aid of opportunity, but I could never clearly ascertain whether opportunity makes the man or man the opportunity. There are times when chance exercises some fortunate influence over one's future, but that is the exception and not the rule.

There is no method of work in our own or any other service which is not capable of improvement. Each and every officer may achieve notice by

earnest and original effort even when engaged on what may be considered the minor details of work. The opportunity of usefulness has so wide a range that none may willingly remain outside its boundaries.

Notwithstanding all the provision for the better regulation of the public service, by the aid of acts and attendant statutory rules, the abolition of patronage, and the shifting of the responsibility from one authority to another, we cannot get away from the personal element in good or bad management. If an office is distinguished by efficient and good business methods, you will find it is the man in charge, who is exercising an influence in the right direction. If, on the other hand, there is waste, idleness, careless work, and slovenly methods, there is only one execution necessary, and that is *that of the man in charge*.

Twenty years ago I was called upon to report upon the management of an office in which serious irregularities had taken place, where supervision was lax, and discipline conspicuous by its absence. The officer in charge in many respects was an estimable man, and, in certain directions, possessed of considerable ability; but he was weak and irresolute. It was impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than that the scandalous state into which an important public department had drifted was directly traceable to the incapacity of its manager. Amongst other conclusion which I had to report was *that he rarely rewarded a good officer, or punished a bad one*. There can only be one opinion as to the consequences of such a policy.

A few years later I took part in a formal farewell to a highly esteemed and very able officer. By his own personal influence he transformed the slack and casual methods of a Government Department of the old school into a high state of efficiency. In parting with his officers he said: "If his administration had been in any way successful, and if he had raised