

It is rather too big a leap. There are some offices in the government not worth competing for. With regard to examinations I would favour the civil service furnishing the examiners as far as they could do it. They are the men who are best qualified, other things being equal, if they had the technical knowledge required for any particular department. The main thing is to have it practical, not to have it given in a written examination which can be copied, and which students will elude, no matter how you fix it. The great point will be, those who enter for the competition will be subjected to a practical, thorough examination and in that way the examiner can elicit in a few words, by an oral examination ten times as much as by a written examination which would take half a day. It is the same way with universities and medical examinations, and it is found that one minute of an oral examination will enable you to form a better opinion of the depth of a man's knowledge than reading over pages of written matter. Canada does not contain such a lot of learned men. The number is comparatively small, and I hope the day is coming when the government will furnish educational attractions for young men. The civil service has no attraction now. Any young man who will roll up his sleeves and get to work will do a great deal better out of the service than in it. I hope the government will not require men to come here to compete for positions at \$500 a year where they will have to remain for a lifetime before the salary reaches \$1,000.

The clause was adopted.

On clause 23,

23. When, from a temporary pressure of work, extra assistance in excess of those whose names are on the list of successful competitors is required in the inside service of any department, the Governor in Council may, upon the recommendation of the head, based on the report in writing of the deputy head of the department that such extra assistance is required, authorize the employment of such number of temporary clerks as are required to carry on the work of the department.

2. Every such clerk shall, however, before appointment obtain a certificate of qualification from the commission, to be given with or without examination, as is determined by the regulations of the commission, that he possesses the requisite knowledge and ability

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN.

and is duly qualified as to age, health, character and habits.

3. No such temporary clerk shall be employed for more than four months in any year.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—How does the hon. minister reconcile subsection 3, the four months period, with the six months period mentioned in another section?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—There are times when parliament is sitting when there is an extra demand for clerks. Clause 18 provides:

No clerk supplied for temporary duty shall be so employed for more than six months in any year.

The clause was adopted.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL, from the committee, reported that they had made some progress with the Bill, and asked leave to sit again.

The Senate adjourned until 3 p.m.

SECOND SITTING.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Yesterday, when I was speaking on the power of a Standing Committee of the Senate, the proposition I made was that the committee had not power to kill a Bill, the principle of which had been adopted by the House at the second reading. To make this clear I will cite Bourinot, at page 565, where he says:

Though a committee has full power to amend, even to the extent nullifying the provisions of a Bill, they cannot insert a clause reversing the principle affirmed by the second reading.

Further on he says:

The committee have no power to extinguish a Bill. That power is retained by the House itself.

I think that makes it clear.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Not at all. It is right as far as it goes. The committee could not kill the Bill, but they could express the opinion as to the propriety of killing the Bill and refer that opinion to the Senate, and the Senate could kill the Bill.