

in any way that the representatives of British Columbia wish, under any circumstances, to interfere in any degree with any policy which would be conducive to the best interests of Canada, no matter in what part of Canada that policy may be applied.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I ask leave of the House to withdraw my motion for the adjournment of the debate.

Motion to adjourn debate withdrawn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After the strong appeal made by the hon. gentleman, and as I do not want to put them in the position of appearing to make a buncombe motion, I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the words "restrict or regulate" to be inserted in the amendment of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Allen), and instead of the words "into British Columbia," insert "into Canada," because we could not prevent them from coming into British Columbia while we allowed them to come into any other part of the Dominion. If these amendments are made, I would not object.

Mr. ALLEN. I am willing that the amendment suggested should be made.

Amendment agreed to; and main motion, as amended, agreed to.

SUPERANNUATION OF JAMES HEARN.

The House resumed the adjourned Debate on Mr. Kirk's proposed motion for copies of all correspondence, papers and telegrams between the Government or any member thereof, and any person or persons relating to the superannuation of James Hearn, late Preventive Officer at Arichat, N.S., and also all correspondence and telegrams relating to the appointment of his successor and the continuance of the latter in office.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the House rose on Wednesday last, I was offering some remarks in regard to the operation of the superannuation system. I had drawn the attention of the House to the fact that a very large amount of money had been expended during the last year on superannuation, and urged that some consideration should be given to the question with the view of reducing that expenditure. I find that a number of years have been added to the time of service of those who were superannuated last year, and those additions have been made, in my opinion, in violation of the Statute. The third clause of the Superannuation Act says:

"The Governor in Council may, in the case of any person who entered the Civil Service after the age of thirty years, as being possessed of some peculiar professional or other qualifications or attainments required for the office to which he was appointed, and not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service, add to the actual number of years service of such persons, such further number not exceeding ten, as may be considered equitable, for reasons stated in the Order in Council made in the case; and such additional number of years shall be taken as part of the term of service on which the superannuation allowance of such person shall be computed—the Order in Council in any such case being laid before Parliament, at its then or next Session."

I find, among the number superannuated last year, two who do not come within the limits of that clause. Mr. F. B. Austin, who entered the Service when he was twenty-seven years old, and laboured for twenty-six years, was superannuated last year at the age of fifty-three; and four years were added to his time of service—and added, I contend, in violation of the Act. The Act also provides that when any person is superannuated, and a number of years are added to his time of service, the Order in Council adding them shall accompany the Annual Report submitted to the House. This has not been done in the case of the person I have

just named. I find also that Mr. E. C. Barber, who entered the Service when he was twenty-four years of age, was superannuated last year, and the number of years added to his time was seven. These additions are made to the time of service, in order to increase the amount of annuity Civil Servants are permitted to draw after their superannuation, but I contend that the Act has been violated in the both of these cases, because neither of these gentlemen was over thirty years old when they entered the service. Now, the reason urged why the superannuation system is kept in force is, that it is desirable in the interest of the country, and in order to provide for servants who have been a long time in the employment of the country, after they grow old or incapacitated. But, in the case of those who were superannuated last year, there are grave doubts in my mind whether or not that was the moving cause of their superannuation. As I stated before, there were nineteen superannuated when they were only forty-eight years of age. I hold that that argument in favour of this system is not good. I do not think it is right, after a man has been in the receipt of a reasonable amount of wages annually for a great number of years, that the country should provide for him from the time that he retires to the time of his death. I hold that these people are liberally paid while in the service of the country, and that they should be required, out of the sums they receive, to lay by sufficient annually to provide for themselves and their families when they come to old age. I think the system leads to extravagance and recklessness on the part of Civil Servants. I think if they were led to understand that out of the very liberal salaries they receive, they would have to provide for themselves and their families, they would be more economical. These people also have many advantages that other people have not. Bank clerks and clerks in other establishments, and people engaged in other occupations in life, have to pay taxes on their incomes, while these people have not. This circumstance gives them a great many educational and other advantages over other people. I say it is unfair that the country should be called upon, in the face of all these facts, to sacrifice the very large amount we are called upon to sacrifice annually, in order to add so many to the superannuated list. I admit that in some cases men have been superannuated while drawing very large salaries, and others have been appointed in their places at very low salaries. I notice that one man who was drawing \$1,700 was superannuated, and another person was engaged to fill his position for \$400. Well, that would undoubtedly be a case of saving, but I think it proves either one or two things—either that the man drawing \$1,700 was getting more for the duties he was discharging than they were worth, or that the man engaged to fill the position at \$400 is getting much less than he deserves for the labour he is performing. I believe the first contention is the true one, for I have no doubt that the man recently hired for \$400 is getting a salary equal to the duties he has to perform. But I believe the Act is being abused. I believe that in many cases men not at all incapable have been superannuated, in order to make room for others who are anxious to get places in which they may draw comfortable salaries, and live at ease. I believe that has been the case in the past. It will be said, I presume, that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were parties to the inauguration of this measure as well as those on the opposite side of the House; but I do not care who put it on the Statute Book, or who is responsible for it, I hold that it has worked detrimental to the interests of the country, and that a very large amount of money has been annually expended under the operation of this system. I hold that it is our duty to seriously consider the whole question and to abolish the system, as I contend it is not in the interest of this country that it should be continued. It has been abused in the past, and I believe it will be abused as long as it is allowed to remain on the Statute Book; and in