

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Before the honourable leader of the House takes that stand, I would point out that there was more than one opinion in the committee about this very matter. The question was considered by the committee, and we heard the deputy ministers of two of the departments with regard to it. So far as I am personally concerned, I think that the deputy minister ought to have some say in the matter of promotions. As the head of the department he is responsible for the administration of the department's affairs, and I cannot see how he can keep his department working up to full capacity and at the highest notch of efficiency if he is not in a position to say who is fit for promotion, provided that the person recommended has the qualifications required by the Civil Service Commission. This particular subsection, I think, takes too much away from the deputy minister and leaves too much to the control of the Civil Service Commissioners, who cannot, so far as I can see, be personally in touch with the whole work of the department, as the deputy minister ought to be. The Deputy Minister of Finance stated before the committee that he feared there would be great difficulty in handling some of his staff on account of this provision. We had before us also the Deputy Minister of Justice, who pointed out certain objections that he saw in this particular clause, and I think there was quite a strong feeling in the committee that it was not wise to allow this clause to pass in its present form, although I do not think that any amendment was actually proposed in the committee.

The danger which I see in this Bill is that in our desire to abolish patronage in the Civil Service we are going too far, and we may wake up one day to find that we have put too much power and control in the hands of the Civil Service Commission. One honourable gentleman has said that he feared patronage would be exercised by the deputy minister; but the deputy minister is responsible to the minister and the minister is responsible to Parliament and to the country. On the other hand, we appoint Civil Service Commissioners for ten years, and, as I understand, the only way they can be removed is by an address of both Houses of Parliament.

I think that the amendment proposed by the leader of the Government is a very desirable one if the ministers and their deputies are to exercise proper control over their departments. I think that we are in

great danger of going too far in this matter in our desire to do away with patronage. We are going to the other extreme, and if the Bill goes through, the chances are that we shall have to amend the Act at a later date.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: I agree with the leader of the Opposition. I think it is absolutely impossible for the Civil Service Commission to make promotions in any department, and at the same time absolutely ignore the head of the department.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: They do not ignore him.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: Then, why not insert the words, "on the recommendation of the deputy head?"

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: That is a different thing altogether. There is a great distinction between the two.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: The Civil Service Commission conduct an examination. According to this, you may have promotions in a department against the wish and the interest of the man who is charged with the administration of the department.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: We want to destroy nepotism.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: The commission would kill nepotism. The deputy might say that three men were open to promotion.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: That is not a recommendation at all.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: He can recommend three as well as one.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Their fitness for promotion is shown by the efficiency reports.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: He may say they are efficient and make no recommendation; he may recommend one man, or he may recommend ten.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: The record of a man's work is better than a recommendation of a deputy minister or any one else.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: How do you get at it? You have to find out from the head of the department.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: A record is kept.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: You have to have a coroner's inquest on a lot of books and papers.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Sometimes a coroner's inquest is not an undesirable thing.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED.