

appointed in the results of the work of this subterfuge masquerading under the name of Civil Service reform.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot escape the impression that my hon. friend's views respecting classification are largely formed by reason of the fact that he seems to be very much prejudiced against the secretary of the commission.

I offered to bring the secretary of the commission and my hon. friend together; if I could have arranged that I have no doubt that I would have satisfied my hon. friend. The secretary of the commission is a very capable public officer, interested only in performing his public duties. My hon. friend makes this mistake in judging of the classification: He thinks it is the personnel of the service which is being classified and the compensation of which has been fixed. But it is not the individual who has been classified; it is the position. Now, the experts go to the Printing Bureau and they find that salaries there are arranged on a wrong basis—and I have no doubt that they were able to find that. At any rate, they come across a position there filled by a man known as "Supervisor of Composition." It does not matter whether that man was efficient or inefficient; he had certain duties to perform. He had under him 378 men and the weekly payroll was \$9,119.80. Another person was filling a position known as "Supervisor of Press Work;" he had under him 116 men, and the weekly payroll was \$2,330. The Civil Service Commission very reasonably assumed that the responsibilities and duties of the man having under him 378 men were greater than the responsibilities and duties of the man who had under him only 116 men; and there was the further consideration of the difference between a weekly payroll of \$9,000 and a weekly payroll of \$2,300. Surely these are factors in determining the compensation to be paid to a man having supervisory duties.

My hon. friend refers to the report of the committee of printers. I, too, might take a strong attitude and say that the judgment of these gentlemen would not influence me in respect to the classification, as indeed it would not, I care not who the men are. If the duties pertaining to the position of Supervisor of Composition are inefficiently and extravagantly carried out, that should be corrected. If he has fifty per cent more men under him than he should have, that fifty per cent should be removed; and when that is done and the duties and responsibilities pertaining to that office changed, the Civil Service Commission can establish new compensation rates. The Civil Service Commission always have in mind the duties and responsibilities attaching to a given office and the ability and talent necessary to the proper discharge of those duties. It may not be a perfect system of fixing compensation, but it cannot be any worse than the system which prevails to-day; it must be better. The classification raises the compensation of those in the Civil Service who are receiving a fairly low rate of pay; it does not change very much the salary range among those who are getting from \$2,000 up to \$3,500, because in many instances men were given increases annually, not by virtue of the duties they were performing but simply in order to give them increases. That is the difficulty in the Civil Service at the present time, men are not paid according to the responsibilities and duties attaching to their work. This is at least an honest effort to put the system on a proper basis. If it is not perfect now, I hope that it will approximate that condition at some time in the near future.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 9.42 p.m., until Tuesday, October 14.