

whole of the nominated and elected members (to decide procedure on general lines) was held, I had decided that I would supply reports of meetings to the "Katipo" after submitting them to the Postal Board. Now that it has been decided to afford facilities to service journals to compile reports of meetings, this will not be necessary, except when the Board might sit at a place where the "Katipo" has no recognised agent, or where from any cause the agent might be unable to attend the Board room.

Regarding publicity, Elmer L. Curtiss, Massachusetts state commissioner says, "every time an attack was made in the papers it got a reply and in each reply we took pains, not to criticize the criticism, but we took the opportunity to explain something of the underlying system."

President Gallagher of the New York commission says, "I do entirely agree with Mr. Curtiss, that the Civil Service Commissioners ought to meet any criticism that may be made in the public print in just the way he suggests."

\* \* \*

#### Relations with the Service.

Dr. Charles W. Eliot, president of the Civil Service Reform League of the United States, in his address at the annual meeting of the league in Boston on Dec. 12th, said:—

**All civil service associations national, state, and municipal, should stately give the public, both by speech and writing with the aid of the public press, knowledge of its actual conditions.**

Dr. Eliot is the highest authority in the world upon civil service. He is at the head of a league that safeguards the merit system to 600,000 people, and this number is increasing. His dictum as to the necessity of a body of civil servants stating "actual conditions" is a sufficient warrant for the present dissection of the record of the Ottawa commissioners, were such warrant deemed indispensable.

The need, the excuse and the justification of the present articles have their inspiration in the one word pub-

licity. The commission is supposed to be a check upon the spoilsmen, but from their reports it is impossible to learn of their "battles, sieges, fortunes," or of their victories so that we may render them the homage due. The present writing will therefore necessarily deal with acts of omission and commission as such appear to the "civil servant on the street." A recital will be given of conditions in certain phases of our commission government. There will follow, in certain cases, a line of conduct pursued by other commissions and commissioners. These comparisons may serve the purpose of a counter-poise or counter-irritant according to the point of view.

The commissioners have not attempted in any way, so far as can be learned, to attach to themselves the sympathy of the service or to gain its support in the battle for the merit system. There have been no confidential or social relations established between the commissioners and the association of the service, and the fault does not lie with the service. The Ottawa service (the service most concerned at present) has as its association representatives, officers and executive, a fine lot of men, who, either in themselves or their predecessors have been studying the knotty problems of civil government for years. Excepting when the association has sought interviews with the commissioners, there have been no meetings between the two parties.

The commissioners seem to have depended from the outset, and to be at present depending, upon the information received from the employer rather than from the employee. This policy is laid down very plainly in their report of 1909, to wit:—

"After making as careful study as the time permitted of the acts relating to the civil service and of the previous and existing conditions of the service, and after several interviews with the deputy heads of various departments, the Commissioners drew up a memorandum."