

the reclassification of the Civil Service by Young and Company. To-day the Civil Service is fairly seething with indignation and rebellion. As one man told me: "There is no danger of strikes; we won't strike; but you cannot get the work done; the officials are so dissatisfied that they won't work;" and they are dissatisfied in spite of the fact that Young and Company's classification increased the cost of the Civil Service by about \$5,000,000, and that there is to-day a Board of Hearing which has been sitting for months and raising the salaries of those that Young and Company missed. In many cases they put up the salaries of men in the lower grades beyond those of men who were higher in the Service.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: May I draw attention to the fact that neither Arthur Young and Company nor Griffenhagen and Associates had anything whatever to do with the preparation or determination of the Civil Service reclassification. That was done by the Civil Service Commission, and my honourable friend is in error when he asserts that either of these companies had anything to do with any increase in the cost of the Civil Service salaries by reason of the reclassification, because that was not their function.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: Technically, my honourable friend may be right; but it seems to me that Young and Company gave hundreds of men their classification and put up their salaries. I know men who have got increases; there are a couple of men in the service of the House of Commons who got over \$1,000 more than they were getting before.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: My honourable friend must remember that Arthur Young and Company and Griffenhagen and Associates had nothing whatever to do with that.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: I have not mentioned Griffenhagen and Associates yet; I was talking about Young and Company.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I may inform my honourable friend that they had nothing to do with fixing the rates.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: What did they do?

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: They put them in a class that gave them a higher salary, so it is absolutely the same thing.

Then, when they skinned the Government out of all they possibly could, they

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF.

became a little ashamed, I suppose, of taking so much, and had their rights transferred to the Griffenhagen outfit. Is it any wonder that in some parts of Canada the Senate is not looked upon with a very great degree of respect? What can you expect the public to think of the Senate when the Government pays no more attention to it than the wind that blows?

Last Session I had the honour of moving that Canadians be employed instead of Griffenhagen and Associates, and the motion was carried in this House by a majority of ten. But my honourable friends the Minister of Labour and the leader of this House just went right ahead and dealt with Griffenhagen as if the Senate had not expressed any opinion upon the matter. Is it any wonder, I say, that throughout Canada people talk of doing away with the Senate? If the Government has no confidence in the Senate, if the Minister of Labour has no confidence in the Senate, what can be expected from the people of the Dominion of Canada?

In spite of that resolution and the majority on it against the Government in this House, they engaged Griffenhagen and Associates at \$10,000 a month, and for not less than a year. There were eleven of them: three or four principals, the balance being clerks—so they got an average of almost \$1,000 a month. No doubt the chiefs will get two or three thousand dollars a month, and in addition to that, honourable gentlemen, they get travelling expenses and living expenses when they are outside the city of Ottawa; and they have a regular staff of ordinary Civil Servants who know something about the matter telling them what to do. I am informed on what I believe to be good authority that Griffenhagen and Associates, instead of costing \$10,000 a month, will cost, taking into consideration the other expenses for stationery and office room and so on, about \$25,000 a month. That is going on, and we have to put up the tariff to get money for the Government to indulge in measures of that sort.

Mind you, the Civil Service Commission was not allowed to deal with this matter; it was taken from them—and the only thing I blame the Civil Service Commission for is that they did not resign on the spot when they were set aside and the work taken out of their hands. And who did this? It was a Committee of the Council, consisting of my right honourable friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Immigration, the then President of the Privy Council, the Hon. Mr.