

Mr. CAMPBELL: Perhaps not, but the Minister of Finance is in a more responsible position than the Minister of the Interior, and he did accept them. The man was dismissed. The act—I am speaking from memory—gives the treasury board power to deal with cases of that kind, but it did not make it compulsory for the board to pay the man, and I say that if you can deal with cases like the one before us by putting an amount in the estimates to correct an injustice—I am not complaining so much of this particular case because I think it is only correcting an injustice—I say that you should do the same in other cases.

Mr. ROBB: I do not recall the case to which my hon. friend refers, but the treasury board have one rule that they follow, and they are compelled to follow it under the act. If the official was dismissed for irregularities, for theft in office or being drunk on duty or anything of that sort, then under the act we cannot pay him, but wherever under the act we can legally pay him, the treasury board is disposed to deal generously with the public servants.

Another hon. gentleman a moment ago referred to those in minor positions. The Civil Service Superannuation Act provides the same privileges for the lower paid servants as for the higher paid, except that the compensation is based upon the salary and the amount that has been paid in. My hon. friend from Mackenzie has very correctly stated the position. I am not going to argue it at any length, but if hon. gentlemen do not wish to pass this item the responsibility will not be upon the government.

I repeat, Major Bell died on January 13, 1929. Had he died on January 1, 1925, under the law Mrs. Bell would have been entitled to exactly the amount that we are asking the committee to vote to-night, so we are only giving her what she is entitled to under the law.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I say that in succeeding parliaments, innumerable cases of this kind will undoubtedly arise. I have no doubt that a great many civil servants have not taken the precaution of protecting themselves by coming under the provisions of the Superannuation Act, and from time to time parliament will have to do something of this nature to look after such cases.

Mr. KENNEDY: Will they all be treated the same way?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Exactly, as provided under the act. I want to put myself

on record as saying that I am prepared to vote in parliament the sums necessary to compensate these people if through any lack of attention on their part they have failed to take advantage of the act.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Do I understand that Major Bell has paid in sufficient in the way of premiums to warrant his widow receiving this amount of \$1,750 had he not made that slight error?

Mr. ROBB: Exactly.

Mr. QUINN: I have no opposition whatever to offer to this item, but I have a case to submit to the committee. It is that of a man who has served, not for twenty or thirty years, but for fifty-two years. This man entered the service of the imperial government in the year of confederation, in 1867, may I say to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why say it to me?

Mr. QUINN: Because I want the Minister of Justice to pay special attention to this. This man entered the transport service of the imperial army at Halifax and served continuously from that time until the transport service of the imperial government was turned over to the Canadian federal authorities. He continued to serve until 1919. Now here is where I condemn the Tory government, or the Union government, whichever you choose to call it.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): It is all the same.

Mr. QUINN: A rose by any other name would smell as sweet. This man served his government and his country for fifty-two years and nine months as a captain in the transport service at Halifax. He was dismissed with a paltry gratuity of \$900, not \$900 a year, but a lump sum gratuity of \$900. I brought this matter to the attention of the Hon. E. M. Macdonald when he was Minister of National Defence, the very first year I entered this parliament, in 1926. I also brought it to the attention of the present Minister of National Defence, and in all fairness to the minister, I wish to say that he saw no way of providing for this man. He is now eighty-five years of age, and since 1919 he has been living, I do not know how, on this paltry gratuity of \$900. If an item is brought down in the supplementaries under any department, I do not care which, I guarantee to the Minister of National Defence that not a member on this side of the house would oppose it, and I appeal to the minister to include such an item this session. I am suggesting it to the Minister of