

pointed two bodies of experts. One body of experts went through the Bureau to determine whether it was efficiently managed; another body of experts were put in to find out what salaries should be paid. The second body of experts, being theorists entirely, and having none of the quality that the member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) spoke of as practical experience, do not even seem to think it necessary to examine the expert report made by three of the best qualified commercial printers in the Dominion of Canada with respect to the efficiency of the Bureau but they apparently find that the supervising compositor has eight departments—one of those departments being a place where they stack type that is not in use. However, this is what the practical experts who examined the Bureau said, and I put their report in a phrase: "This composition department is 57 per cent efficient, and the press department is 98 per cent efficient." The proposition of these theoretical experts is that the man who is running an absolutely inefficient department should get \$200 more than the man who is running an efficient department. I submit that no person can have any respect for a classification which is prepared on such a basis.

The report of the three commercial gentlemen, Mr. Slack, Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Tarte, is to the effect that \$165,000 a year is being wasted in the composition department, and they propose that the cost of that department be reduced \$165,000 a year. They report that the press department is operating under ideal conditions. And yet these so-called American experts want to give the supervisor of the inefficient department more money than the supervisor of the ideally conducted department. Upon my word, I do not think anything more than that is necessary to convince any man that Parliament should give more consideration to this classification than it has yet received. I know it is idle for me to protest, that this is all cut and dried and is going through, but at the same time I want to express my opinion. This classification will increase the salary of the inefficient man over that of the most efficient man.

Mr. COWAN: Is that inefficiency due to the man or is it due to the inefficiency that politics forced on the man? That is the point with me. If it is the fault of politics you cannot blame him.

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not know whether it is the fault of politics or of the man. But I submit that a department running at

[Mr. Hocken.]

\$165,000 a year more than it should be run for ought to have its staff reduced by 165 people, which will then bring it down to a staff very little larger than that engaged in the press department, which is being run under ideal conditions. As I say, I know it is perfectly futile for me or anybody else to oppose this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. HOCKEN: The only reason I have been able to discover why the supervising compositor gets more than the supervisor of pressmen is because he is a personal friend of the secretary of the commission, and the secretary runs the commission with an iron hand. Whatever he says goes. If his friends want increases they get them. When they want to get in the Service they get in. It has been said in the corridors of this House and elsewhere that there is a back door to Mr. Foran's office, and if you go there and give him the high sign you can go through. He handles the commission and does what he likes. I am not attempting to go into details, but they can be given, especially by the member who declared, not on the floor of the House but in this building, that he had knowledge of the back door methods adopted to get employment in the Civil Service. The whole thing is a fraud on the people. The people have been kicking about the way appointments have been made. Appointments made on the recommendation of members of this House are a great deal better than are those that are being made now. What the people did complain about was the handing out of contracts and the purchasing of supplies on a patronage basis, and that is something that really might be corrected. But this whole proposition is a fraudulent deception of the people, and they will discover it some day when the Service is staffed with high school boys and girls and completely run down. It is running down every day of the week. If you speak to men who have been in the Service for fifteen or twenty years, they will tell you that the Service is not as good now as before the commission took it over. The class of employees now being engaged may be able to pass examinations, but they cannot do the work, they have not got the necessary stability, and a good many of them have not got character. In a word, the commission is filling up the service with a lot of inefficient juveniles. And that is what they call Civil Service reform! If that is the kind of thing that is being done, then I think the people will be sadly dis-