

becoming infirm enough to get the benefit of the Act, but Providence was too kind to them, and allowed them to die in harness. I think another system different from the present system—it is perhaps premature to state it just now—would do justice to that class of officers and their families, and also to the other class of officers who are about to retire, and would, above and beyond all, do justice to the public, who are no doubt interested in the efficiency of the service. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman should have brought these resolutions on to-day, and stated that they would take only a few minutes for discussion. To my mind that opened a very large question—a question of policy of the practical operation of the existing policy which has been on trial for some time, with results, it appears to me, eminently unsatisfactory. At a subsequent stage of the Bill I hope we will receive full explanations of the views which induced the Government, with the experience they have had, to propose, not a change in the Civil Service Act, but an extension of the application of that Act in its present objectionable form.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no intention on the part of the Government to confirm any doubtful cases, but simply to secure to the parties the rights they had under this Act before the amendments were made. The hon. gentleman referred to this being an insurance company, and to the advisability of its being conducted on the same principle.

Mr. BLAKE. Not an insurance company—but the hon. gentleman has stated that the principle of insurance applied to it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not that the principle applied entirely; because it will be borne in mind that, when this Bill was introduced, it was stated distinctly that it was for the purpose of placing the Government in a position to replace, by active, energetic men, those who are worn out in the service, whom the Government would hesitate to dismiss without giving them a retiring allowance. This is the basis on which the Act was introduced, and the men who had been twenty-five years in service, and had reached the age of sixty-five or seventy years, obtained, in many cases, immediate benefit from the operation of the Act. Though, to a certain extent, the Act is on the principle of insurance, it is not based on the general calculations on which insurances are based. At the time the Bill was introduced, it was thought that the amount to be obtained by the Government would be sufficient to pay pensions, without creating any loss to the Treasury; and after the Act had been a few years in operation it was found that the amounts received were in excess, and there was a universal feeling in the House that the amount to be paid by the Civil Service should be reduced. The Government were not quite of that opinion, but still the returns showed as if the Government would be justified in making the reduction, and there was a unanimous feeling, on both sides of the House, in favor of such deduction. Whether the statement of the Commission is correct or not, there are a great many items that do not appear on the credit side of this account, but which go to reduce the amount paid in excess of the amount received. It is quite possible that the calculations of these hon. gentlemen may have been made somewhat erroneously to show there has been a saving in the operation of the Act; but I do know that men are superannuated who have passed their term of usefulness and are replaced by younger and efficient men at lower salaries in many cases. I know that in New Brunswick, three officers of the Customs, with salaries of \$1,000 and \$1,200 per year, have been superannuated and their offices not since filled, thus effecting a saving. When the Bill is taken up for consideration I will be prepared to show—not to the extent, perhaps, the Civil Service Commission has shown—that there is a very large amount saved, and to the credit of this fund, by the superannuation of officers not required, or whose services were not

efficient, and that we have had the benefit of efficient officers at lower salaries.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). Will the hon. gentleman give us some idea of the contents of the resolution now proposed, as regards the different Departments?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is to place this matter just about where it was under the old Act, as acted upon by both Governments. Under the Act of last Session we can only apply it to three Departments.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The Bill does not apply to every person who has been in the employ of the Government for ten years.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. All those who are employed at a yearly salary as permanent officers of the Government, may, outside of the three Departments I have referred to, be brought in. We did not take all the Departments before, and this will have about the same effect.

Mr. BLAKE. It was in the discretion of the Government whether they will take men in or put them out. There was some question about penitentiary chaplains, when one Government took one view and another Government another. That indicates there is that power on the part of the Government to act as they think proper, and we do not know to what extent the list of those entitled to superannuation may be increased.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government took the power under the Act. They did not take all the employes of the penitentiaries, but only certain employes. The proposition in this is, that by an Order in Council the whole of the employes receiving annual salaries may come under the operation of this Act.

Mr. BLAKE. When we acted before we were acting with reference to a new experiment, and it was a question whether it should apply to the whole service. Rightly or wrongly we gave the Government discretion to decide to what classes it should apply; and to-day the Government ought to be able, after the experience of ten or twelve years, to determine what classes of public employes should be brought within the range of the Superannuation Act and what classes should be left out, and in consolidating and amending the Superannuation Act these classes should be defined.

Resolution to be reported.

KING'S COUNTY (P.E.I.) ELECTION.

Mr. BLANCHET moved that the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections respecting the last Elections for the Electoral District of King's County (P.E.I.) be now concurred in.

Mr. HALL. The previous discussion of this case in the House was directed principally to the duties and conduct of the returning officer and the law applicable thereto, but as the Committee of Privileges and Elections to whom the matter was referred has had before it all the evidence, both as to that subject and as tending to show which of the candidates is rightfully and permanently entitled to the seat, it was thought advisable by the Committee that a short abstract of this evidence should be given to the House, in order that hon. members might more easily follow the arguments that will be adduced both in support of and against the Committee's report. As seconding the motion for concurrence, therefore, I take the opportunity of submitting a brief abstract of the testimony which was adduced, and of the legal conclusions that were based thereon. At the last General Dominion Election, of the candidates who presented themselves for the constituency of the Fourth Electoral District of King's County (P.E.I.) were Dr. J. E. Robertson, and A. C. McDonald, Esq., and of the votes that