

made in a business manner, after appraising the educational and tactual equipment of the candidates.

Speaking educationally, it is generally understood that there are two general types of people: those who respond to mental tests—the intelligence quotient, if you like—the sum of the qualities making for the mental personality; and those whose physical personality is the primary essential. The latter is adjusted more to responses due to ability to learn to do things in a physical way—for instance, to learn to ride a bicycle and make a good errand boy; whereas by intelligence tests you select and determine the mental efficiency of an applicant. Consequently we must consider the question from the standpoint of psychology.

Let me say as a new member that I have found the most efficient and courteous services rendered to us by every civil servant whom we have approached in the House of Commons and the houses of parliament generally.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Hear, hear.

Mr. HAYHURST: So we feel that some good has been accomplished through the merit system. At the same time we believe that in regard to the appointment of persons whose work requires tactual skill, the selection is best made by a committee which will test the tactual ability as well as give consideration to his personality from the point of view of the mental qualities required in the particular position.

Certainly we should not overthrow the merit system. The civil service requires an entirely different personality from political life: I believe that a politician would be about the last person who could successfully pick out candidates to fill certain civil service posts. I wish to place myself on record as being fundamentally in favour of the merit system, with probably some additional consideration given to the type of person required for jobs other than those in which mental capacity is most important.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) with his usual alertness, has placed the rest of us at a great disadvantage, because he came down to the chamber to-day prepared to make a detailed and comprehensive speech, whereas all the rest of us are taken by surprise. In fact, as he was speaking on personality, I could not help feeling that he would be certain to get one hundred per cent of the marks for that quality, no matter who might be the examiner.

[Mr. Hayhurst.]

It was my privilege last year to serve on the special committee to consider the civil service of Canada. We went into the matter very thoroughly. I believe we held over fifty meetings. Some of them were exciting. Certainly they were all interesting. The members who served on the committee learned a good deal about the civil service. But the committee meetings lasted so long that a report was not brought in until a day or two before the house closed and there was no opportunity to consider the report. It was our understanding, however, that the government at this session would afford an opportunity very early in the proceedings of the house to discuss the report. I suggest most earnestly to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that he provide an opportunity for the discussion of last year's report before going on to set up a new committee. If the former report were considered many points would be cleared up and the work of this year's committee would be greatly simplified. No doubt, the Prime Minister will see what advantages would follow from such a course, merely from the discussion that has taken place here to-day.

My impression was quite different from that of the hon. member for Temiscouata with regard to the findings of last year's committee. There were many things on which we did not agree, but I think that the civil service commission came out of a most searching investigation with flying colours. We were unable to consider the examination branch, and yet to-day the member for Temiscouata has attacked the work of that branch without the committee having considered it in detail last year. I think he will agree with me that this is correct. It is most unfortunate, and I am afraid that such an attack hurts our civil service. I do suggest to the members of the house that the merit system, instead of being inefficient, instead of having broken down, was shown by last year's investigation to be so good that it should be extended. For example, it should be extended to the employees of the national harbours board. It should be extended to the small post offices which were taken out some years ago.

I do not agree with the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lawson) that the positions of cleaners and helpers should be removed from the operation of the act. We debated that point in the committee last year. We fought over it for a long time and in the end the majority opinion was that the positions of cleaners and helpers should be kept under the act where they are at the present time.