

Mr. ROWELL: The usual form of advertising is first that an advertisement appears officially in the Canada Gazette. Then communications are sent to all the Great War Veteran Associations, because under our law the war veterans are to have the preference. Posters are put up in post offices, public schools and other public places in the district. In cases of local employment, such as I have mentioned, a poster that will reach the public is put up in local public institutions. I am informed that that is the procedure.

Mr. ARTHURS: Who puts up these posters?

Mr. CHAPLIN: It seems to me that advertising for such help as lock tenders is a very roundabout way of doing business. We have in Ottawa a commission who are appointing men whom they have never seen, never expect to see, have never examined and know nothing about. These men may be five hundred miles away from Ottawa, and they are recommended to the commission by somebody in the district. I certainly object to that way of doing things. It was not so contemplated, as I understand it, in the original discussions we had in regard to the matter in the House, and I want to put myself on record as being opposed to that way of doing business.

Mr. BURNHAM: I would suggest that a new examination be held, and that is, into the common decency and morality of the common ordinary man or member. It is quite evident from all the attacks made upon this system that all the wrongdoing is traced down, or supposed to be traced down, to the fact that every hon. member on this side is to every hon. member on that side of the House a wrongdoer and that every hon. member on that side of the House is to every hon. member on this side of the House under suspicion. The sooner we cut a great deal of this out the better, because at bottom it is only commonplace, vulgar partisanship. Let us trust each other, man as man, and have faith in ourselves, and we shall get work done. No work on earth will stand the test when a suspicion such as that exists.

Mr. MCKENZIE: I wish to say a word or two in support of what the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Burnham) have said in reference to civil servants. They brought forward the argument very well that a civil servant who has any grievance has really no person to

whom he can go with his complaint. We were told by the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) that the deputy minister and the Civil Service Commission are at the disposal of the civil servant. Those are just the two parties against whom he would be likely to have a complaint. He might have a complaint that the deputy minister was not giving him a fair show, and in such a case what would be the good of going to the deputy minister? He would be turned down. He might have a complaint that the Civil Service Commission was not treating him rightly, and in such a case, what would be the good of going to it? What he really wants is to be able to lay his complaint before an independent person over whom the deputy minister or the Civil Service Commission has no influence at all. The only person who would be in that position is a minister of the Crown who would be supposed to act absolutely independently between the civil servant and the higher authority. Some minister should have general supervision over the Civil Service, so that they could come to him with their complaints. Then the minister would call the deputy minister, not necessarily of his own department, but of any department, and the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and let this civil servant who had the complaint tell his story, with the deputy minister and the chairman of the commission present to see whether the complaint of the civil servant was well founded or not. The minister, after hearing the facts, would be in a position to deal with the case on its merits, and the civil servant would then be satisfied either that his grievance would be rectified or that he had no case. But under present circumstances he will always have a suspicion, if his complaint is against the deputy minister, that the deputy minister is not treating him rightly, or if his complaint is against the Civil Service Commission that the commission is not treating him rightly. It is surely desirable for the Government and for everybody else that that large body of civil servants should feel that they are being treated fairly and squarely and that if they have a grievance there is an absolutely independent court to which they can go. For that reason I support the contention of my hon. friends that there should be some minister—perhaps the Prime Minister has too much to do—to whom an appeal may be made in cases of this kind.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A good many years ago I was informed that a certain Prime Minister was told by one of his ministers that he made a rule in his depart-