

plucked in our universities to go up to the large universities in the upper provinces and pass with a great deal of credit. History everywhere shows that the smaller the country the better the colleges. Go to Aberdeen and Edinburgh, and where do you find better colleges? They may not have the fame of Oxford and Cambridge, but that is because they have not the population about them, but they have sent out as well-trained and as highly educated men as any colleges in the world. I would not have referred to this matter had not the hon. gentleman suggested that our colleges did not amount to anything. While it is true that some self-made men are better than college graduates—for instance, Elihu Burritt was a man of marvellous learning, though self taught—no man will say but that the college graduate is a better man in every respect and can do his work better than if he had not the advantage of a college training. If you allow teachers and many more in, there is no use in the civil service examination. You must draw the line somewhere; and, in my opinion, there is no better way than to say that a graduate of any university in Canada may be admitted without examination, and that those who have special qualifications shall be given advantages on demonstrating that they have those qualifications. It is only another way of saying that the passing of a college course is in itself evidence of the possession of due qualifications which other men must show they possess by passing an examination.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest an amendment to this section so as to make it read:

The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the head of the department, setting forth that the person to be appointed has special qualifications for the duties to be performed, and concurred in by the Treasury Board, appoint, and so of—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would not like to accept that off-hand. But, let the clause go as it is now, and before the Bill finally gets out of committee, I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) an answer. I quite see the purpose of the amendment—it must be for special reasons with regard to the man and the duty.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and that is the work of the deputy.

On section 9,

Mr. FOSTER. I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to a point which I think is worth consideration. The government seem to be agreed that this is going to rehabilitate the third-class section. To my mind you are doing this: The third-class clerks exist, there are a large number of them, they are in the service, and many of them have been for a considerable length of time. They will be known as third-class clerks. You are superimposing upon

those a junior second class. That junior second class will by its very name take precedence of the third class; so that whenever you come to promotions into the second class and so on, it will be the junior second class division from which these promotions will come.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not necessarily.

Mr. FOSTER. It would naturally be so, as the hon. gentleman will acknowledge. Now, that would be an injustice. If you were now to make a class and put it over the old third class in which there are so many deserving men, it would be an injustice. I think something like this should go in to remedy that:

After the passing of this Act all third-class clerks now in the service shall be styled and known as junior second-class clerks.

There are two things you do by that. You certainly place the third-class clerks where they ought to be, and you get rid of having two classes when one class is quite sufficient.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will make the same answer to that as I did in regard to the other amendment. I will take it into consideration. So far as their substantial position is concerned, there is really no difference between these two classes. I do not attach the utmost importance to the names. I do not think there would be that discrimination. But if the hon. gentleman will allow that amendment to stand, before the Bill finally leaves the committee we will consider that. Now, I would like to call attention to the amendment which I announced in my introductory remarks. Section 10 now reads:

The salary of a packer or sorter, employed either permanently or temporarily in the first or inside division of the Post Office Department, may be increased to a maximum of \$600.

I propose to enlarge that so that it shall apply to messengers also. Instead of applying it strictly to the post office staff, it will apply to the civil service generally and include messengers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was going to suggest that it shall apply to the Customs branch. I think the most underpaid men in the whole service are the men who do the manual labour.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Section 10 will now read:

The salary of a packer, messenger, sorter or porter, employed either permanently or temporarily in the civil service may be increased to a maximum of \$600 per annum, by amounts not exceeding \$30 in any one year, such increase to be granted only upon an order in council passed on report of the deputy head, and concurred in by the head of the department, that such messenger, porter, sorter or packer is eligible for such increase and is deserving thereof.