

Q. But, wait a moment. According to your system, you would want the Departmental Council to make recommendations to the Civil Service Commission; then the Civil Service Commission would make a decision, and if that was favourable to the applicant, that would be the end of it. But the Government might want to appeal from it. And if the Civil Service Commission made a decision which was unfavourable to the applicant, he would want to appeal, if there was a Board of Appeal. Now, do I understand that from the decision of the Civil Service Commission you would want to go to the Board of Appeal, whose decision would be final and over and above the decision of the Civil Service Commission?—A. I do not understand what you mean really. My position is this:

Q. If you do not understand my question, let me try to make it plain. At present there are in Canada county courts, and courts of appeal, and then there is the Supreme Court of Canada, and then the decision of the Privy Council, and that is the last. Now, starting at the top, there is the Privy Council. Do you want the Board of Appeal to be like that? Do you want a Supreme Court of Canada to represent the Civil Service Commission, and do you want a county court to be represented in a similar way by a local body?—A. The question is, does the Civil Service Commission dismiss the man or does the Department dismiss him, under the present legislation?

Q. I am not here to explain the law. The Minister may dismiss the case; that decision might be taken care of by the Commission or the Court of Appeal, but if you build a court of appeal, will that court of appeal have the right to decide and over-rule the decision of the Civil Service Commission?—A. My contention is that that Board of Appeal's findings shall be final, irrespective of any person else.

Q. Irrespective of the Board of Appeal?—A. Well, when I say final, that is what I mean.

Q. Then we will have to take it as the law is now. Just a moment ago you stated that you had a number of grievances and that nothing could be done to help you out?—A. Yes.

Q. That you had seen Dr. Roche and that the grievances of which you complained could not be remedied. I understood you to say that that was because of the existing legislation. Now, if there are any defects in the existing legislation, which are detrimental to the interests of the Service, you can point them out? Can you say in what way that legislation is detrimental?—A. Well, in the case I illustrated, and it is quite recent in my mind, we have been complaining for some period of time over this position in the Public Works Department, of men being thirty-three years permanent, and other men being thirty-three weeks temporary, and vice versa. Now, we go before Dr. Roche and he tells us nothing can be done because the blanketing laws have expired, and there is no means except through the blanketing laws whereby these men who are temporary can be made permanent.

Q. That is in your opinion one defect in the present legislation, in the present Civil Service law?—A. Sure.

Q. And those who are charged with the administration of that law, must administer it as they find it?—A. Exactly.

Q. Whilst you are on that, are there any other defects in the present law along similar lines, not to go out of the scope of this inquiry; are there any other defects existing in the present law that you would like to see bettered, for the better interests of the Service?—A. Well, seriously, I am not very well posted on Civil Service law; I admit it; I am not. What we do find is that when we take grievances that we feel are justifiable, we hit up against a stone wall in some form, either through the head of the Department not being willing to acquiesce, or through what I choose to call "a game of battle-dore and