

PUBLIC BUILDINGS FOR BRANDON.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk) enquired, Whether the Government have received a petition from the residents of Brandon, Manitoba, respecting the erection of a building suitable for Post Office, Customs Office and Dominion Lands Office combined? If so, what action has been taken, and whether it is the intention of the Government to place anything in the Supplementary Estimates this Session, towards the construction of such a building?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A petition was received from a number of the residents of Brandon on the 26th of February last year, in favour of the erection of a building. Telegrams were also received to the same effect. The matter has been considered, but I am not in a position to say what the Government will do about it.

PROTEST AGAINST MR. TEMPLE.

Mr. BLAKE enquired whether the Government was aware of the following telegram:—

OTTAWA, 17th March, 1884.

"C. W. BLACKWITH, Esq., Fredericton.

"No use of delegation coming while protest standing. I want to help Railway, and was doing all I could to get subsidy. Since Saturday's news of protest, it is impossible to impress Government, and while President of Railway is fighting me in this way.

"THOMAS TEMPLE."

Whether the decision of the Government as to the Railway subsidy referred to in the telegram, is to be in any way dependent on the withdrawal of the protest against the election of Mr. Temple for York, N.B.?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government had no knowledge of the telegram read by the hon. gentleman having been sent, and the decision of the Government as to the Railway subsidy referred to, will be in no way dependent upon the withdrawal of the protest against Mr. Temple.

Motion agreed to.

SUPERANNUATION OF JAMES HEARN.

Mr. KIRK in moving 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, said: The principle that provision should be made for the superannuation of Civil Service employees who are incapacitated through old age or otherwise from properly discharging their duties, is one in which all parties, apparently, are agreed, but that the present system, as applied to Civil Service employees, is not thoroughly or justly worked out, is, I think, in too many cases, evident. The Government have large discretionary powers in applying the system—powers which may be used to the advantage of employees or otherwise, powers which may be used to their injury, and which may be used to unnecessarily burden the Treasury, and consequently the people. When this system was introduced, it was generally supposed that the allowance which was to be received from the salaries of employees would form a sufficient fund to pay any calls or demands required to meet the superannuation allowances under the Act. This has been found not to be the case. The amount received from this source, does not anything like pay the amount of the superannuations. We find that the average annual increase of expenditure on account of this service amounts to considerably over \$12,000 per annum. We do not receive half the expenditure from the fund of which I have just spoken, and we are asked this year to appropriate \$200,000 to pay the superannuation allowances for the current year, that is \$10,000 more than was voted last year, or than was required last year. I

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

think that the system has been very unfairly and unjustly applied, and, consequently, has worked hardship upon the Civil Service employees in the case of many of those who had been superannuated. Officers, sometimes, I fear, have been superannuated who are quite capable of performing their duties, and we have reason to believe that they were superannuated for the purpose of creating positions for friends of the Government who had given them their support in the elections or on other occasions. This is, I believe, the case especially in the matter relating to which I have made this motion. The appointment of Mr. Hearn of Arichat, as Preventive Officer took place at the time of Confederation, in 1867. He was about that time appointed at a salary of \$150 per annum. We have reason to believe he was a good and efficient officer, and as about two years ago, the present Minister of Customs increased his salary to \$300, it is evident he was a good officer, or his salary would not have been increased. However, in August last he was superannuated with an allowance of \$150, and another was appointed in his place. Mr. Hearn was superannuated, ostensibly for the reason that he was too old to perform the duties properly. I am told—I have not the pleasure of his acquaintance—that he is about 60 years of age, and for a man of that age, is exceedingly active, and that he was at the time he was superannuated quite an efficient officer, and is equally as capable to perform the duties to-day. I am told he is an active member of the Arichat Cricket Club, and I should suppose a man who was an active member of a Cricket Club could not fairly be said to be not fitted, so far as his physical qualities are concerned, at any rate, to perform the duties of Preventive Officer. In the North Sydney *Herald*, which every hon. member here from Nova Scotia knows to be a paper that warmly supports the present Government, and a paper that is a warm supporter of the hon. Minister of Customs, and I find a paragraph in that paper in its Arichat correspondence which says, on date August 15th, 1884:

"James Hearn, Esq., who was recently superannuated from the office of Preventive Officer, is an active member of the Arichat Cricket Club." I notice that the same paper reports that the Arichat club played a match game about that time with the Sydney cricket club. Therefore, I take it, that it could not be for the reason that he would not be able to perform his duties on account of old age that he was superannuated, and I take it, furthermore, that he was superannuated in order to make place for some other man—for the one who received the office. Mr. Hearn was superannuated, I am told, with an allowance of \$150, and another man is appointed in his place with a salary, I presume, of \$300. Probably it has been increased; I have no means of knowing that; but certainly his salary is not less than that of the late Preventive Officer. We are told, too, that this officer has been appointed and holds the office contrary to a well-known rule of the Department. I believe it is a rule of the Department that a Preventive Officer or Customs Officer shall not be permitted to hold or retain a municipal office of any kind. I am told that the successor of Mr. Hearn is a Municipal Councillor; I am told that he is more than that, that he is the Warden of the Municipality as well as a Municipal Councillor, and that he holds these two offices in direct violation of the rules of the Customs Department. I am told that the Minister of Customs, knowing the fact, asked him, through the Collector of Customs at Arichat, to resign his offices or he would have to resign the office of Preventive Officer. I do not know if this is the fact or not, but I am told it is so; I am told that the Minister of Customs was informed of the fact that the successor of Mr. Hearn held these municipal offices, and that he was asked through the Customs Collector to resign his position in the Council or the office of Preventive Officer, and that he has done neither; that he still holds the office, and holds it in defi-