

vice, however, that the law (Civil Service law) has not solved, and that is the problem of superannuation. Without provision for retirement of the aged officeholder a law which in practical operation insures him a permanent tenure of office works an injustice to the Government, since it permits the retention in the service of many who have outlived their usefulness. It is true that the law does specifically provide for the removal of the incompetent on the proper record of the existence of incompetency, but such a provision has proved to be inadequate where incompetency is the result of old age."

From the Nineteenth Report of the Civil Service Commission: "Under it (the Civil Service law) any employee can be dismissed at any time. . . . In order to secure justice in making such removals it was provided . . . that the appointing officer must give his reasons, with proper notice and an opportunity for answer, to the person proposed to be removed, and that removals should only be made for such reasons as would promote the efficiency of the service. . . . But it is (also) true that from humane considerations appointing officers will be reluctant to dismiss those who have become superannuated or otherwise incapacitated when hardship is entailed upon the person so removed, and especially in cases where the employee in question has served the Government faithfully for years."

Along with the foregoing may be read an extract from testimony given in 1904 by Adj. Gen. F. C. Ainsworth, then Chief of the Record and Pension Office, War Dept. "As a rule, to which there are but few exceptions, the value of an employee bears an inverse ratio to the political and social support which he brings to bear in his own interest. It is at best difficult to bring about the discharge, to resist the importunities

of his friends and supporters for his reinstatement."

How then can it be expected that a faithful employee of long service can be removed when overtaken by invalidity or infirmity unless he is provided with a liberal allowance?

Mr. Brown adds: "The majority of executive officials are undoubtedly too tenderhearted to dismiss a subordinate whose only faults are attributed to his weight of years. The result is that he is allowed to remain, quite unfit to perform his duties, practically a pensioner, and the work he is unable to do is divided among the younger clerks. . . . Many of them are past 80, and non-agenarians have occasionally been on the Government pay roll. Paralytics are sometimes brought to office in wheeled chairs, and it frequently happens that a wife or child escorts the head of the house to his desk each day."

Mr. M. O. Chance (1910) formerly auditor for the P. O. Dept., says: "An unusually large proportion of the employees in this office are persons who have passed the age of greatest usefulness. . . . On account of their infirmities, both they and the service would be better off were they honorably retired on adequate annuities and their places given to younger and more active men."

Hon. Franklin MacVeagh, Sec. of Treasury, in his 1909 report says: "It seems to me that the conclusion is unavoidable that a really efficient service is out of the question without a method of honorably and justly retiring persons whose efficiency is seriously impaired. . . . The service is blocked in many instances by the unwillingness of the officials in charge to throw out of place worthy men and women who have given the best of their lives to the work of the Government. So that, in a very imperfect and wholly unsatisfactory manner, practically a pension system is and long has been in operation. . . . And though