

during the last five years? Large numbers of people came into the civil service as temporaries and extras, but they very quickly became a part of the landscape, so to speak. When the time comes for reducing, it is extremely difficult to reduce. As I said a moment ago, every man has his kingdom and he does not want to see that kingdom reduced. Not only is this true absolutely, but it is truer relatively, if I may say so. No department head wants to feel that his department is the one that should be reduced.

What is the moral of this? I submit that the moral is very clear. We cannot expect this economy to come from inside the civil service. Let us consider a few basic facts. Since 1939 the civil service has risen from something under 70,000 to 150,000. I am informed that both figures include more than permanent civil servants, but I am also informed that these two figures are fairly comparable. What has happened is that the civil service has more than doubled in number. While this was going on I think the public feeling was that they had to be very sympathetic, that they must not be critical because things were being done in a hurry, that people had to come in, probably more than were necessary. However, when the war came to an end I think the people had the feeling that substantial reductions should begin. I think they felt that it was quite fair to ask for a very substantial reduction within a year.

What would be a reasonable figure? I find that hard to answer. I am quite sure that some people who have thought about it would consider that the service having doubled from 70,000 to 150,000 perhaps it would be reasonable that within a year we would get a twenty-five per cent reduction. However, I think that is too high. I myself would think that perhaps there should have been a 16½ per cent or even a 10 per cent reduction. If that had happened I would have found it pretty hard to put much heart into any criticism.

What are the actual facts? As I understand it, the actual fact is that there has been virtually nothing done, that there has been a reduction of less than one per cent, in fact only a little more than one-half of one per cent. I am not forgetting that perhaps in the armed services—I believe it is true in the navy—certain work is now being done by a civilian staff which formerly was done by those who were in the services. That is one reason

why I think that twenty-five per cent, or even sixteen per cent, is too high. I think when you come down to ten per cent you have reached a reasonable figure. But I find that nothing has been done—or virtually nothing; because a reduction of 900 out of 150,000 is really nothing. I confess I am alarmed. I imagine the Minister of Finance, with his Baptist background, which I think is more or less similar to my Presbyterian background, likes to think of economy. But I can find no sign that he is doing anything about it. Both at the dominion-provincial conference and in this house last year—I think I am correct in this—there was virtually no reference to economy.

Now, if this is a fair summing up, what does it mean? It means that in respect of continuing expenditures of \$240,000,000, nearly half of our total budget in 1939, we have not been able to cut out a single dollar. Indeed, the actual cost is higher by something like \$800,000. What does that mean? Has the minister lost heart and given up? Is that the reason no mention of economy was made at the dominion-provincial conference or here in this house? I think it is fair to say that the talk was tax, tax; spend, spend; borrow, borrow, but never save, save.

Last December when we debated the matter in this house the minister made a very disarming confession. I cannot quote his exact words but I can give the effect of them. He pictured his lonely struggle in trying to get some economy, a very unequal struggle it appears to have been. I fully sympathize with him, but I suggest to the house that if he fails in this, he is not the one who suffers primarily; it is the people of Canada.

I just want to give a few figures to show what could have been saved. A reduction of ten per cent, which I have mentioned, would have given us \$25,000,000 on the way to tax relief. A reduction of twenty-five per cent would have given us \$60,000,000 on the way to tax relief.

I have brought the matter of the civil service estimates to the attention of the house because I felt that it was bound to be brought up. I feel that when in respect of an item of \$240,000,000 we have had no result whatever there is cause for alarm. I can see no reason to expect any more effective or rigorous scrutiny elsewhere.

There is only one way this problem has ever been dealt with—I mentioned it in this house