

with the views of the hon. gentleman, I think it should be done.

MR. MILLS, of Bothwell, in a lengthy speech continued the debate. If the Bill were reprinted and presented to the House, it would be a new bill, and in support of this argument he cited the Redistribution of seats Bill, of some few years ago. He objected to the principle of the Bill. Like every other Bill introduced on this subject it aimed at shifting the responsibility of the Minister on to somebody else. If this were not so, and there was a misprint in the Bill circulated amongst the members, then the Secretary of State had asked the second reading of an imperfect Bill.

HON. JOHN COSTIGAN explained that he only asked the second reading of the Bill "*pro forma*," and would explain the amendments he wished to introduce. He complained of Mr. Laurier's moving the six months hoist.

MR. LAURIER was only proceeding on well established Parliamentary principles. The hon. gentleman could withdraw the present Bill, and introduce a new one.

MR. O'BRIEN. The Government would act wisely if they withdrew the Bill altogether. The Bill is objectionable on principle, it is impossible in practice and it is a Bill that will degrade and humiliate the Civil Service. It will be impossible for any man retaining his self-respect to remain in the service, or for any such man to enter it, if the provisions of the Bill are carried into effect. It is not only open to the objections taken by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which are most serious objections, but it is unquestionably a method by which Ministers will endeavour to escape the responsibility due to this House and the country. It is part of a system by which we are gradually endeavouring, in all sorts of ways, to escape the ministerial responsibility. It is not only apparent in this measure, but in a great many others. There is not a member of the Civil Service who does not object to the Bill. There is no Bill brought in this session or any previous session, open to the number of objections to which this Bill is liable. I object to the principle of it, and to every detail of it, and so far the explanations of the Secretary of State do not appear to make the Bill a particle better than it is now. If the Government are wise, they will withdraw the Bill altogether, and endeavour to bring, another session, if they must bring down such a measure, a Bill that will not be liable to such numerous and insuperable objections as can be presented against the present one. It is not only objectionable in detail but objectionable in principle, and I cannot believe that members of this House who have taken the trouble to read it and consider its effect on the service, can possibly support it. I am very certain I do not stand alone on this side of the House in objecting to this Bill.

MR. COSTIGAN. If the House will allow me, I will withdraw the motion for the second reading.

MR. LAURIER. Certainly.

MR. COSTIGAN. I can move the second reading another time when the amendments are prepared.

MR. LAURIER. When you choose to do so.

MR. COSTIGAN. I move that the Bill be read the second time to-morrow.

MR. CHARLTON. Will to-morrow ever come?

Motion agreed to.

Thus died the Civil Service Act of 1893.

There is a good tale told of "Silver Mackay" when in Paris. General Grant was there at the same time, and Mackay asked him to dinner. The millionaire wanted to illuminate the "Arc de triomphe" for the General's benefit, and afterwards said he would "buy the concern" if Grant would like to take it home with him as a souvenir.

A Junior Clerk's Lay.

Respectfully dedicated to the Superannuation Bill.

Air—The Vicar of Bray.

Fill up the pipe, fill up the bowl,
Let smoke and drink abound,
And every grievance of the soul
In merriment be drowned.
What reck's if we are poor or rich,
When 'tis by statute stated,
If we but live to sixty-five, we're
Superannuated.

Throw care aside to-night my boys,
And thus we quaff our glass;
The trouble that to-day annoys
To-morrow o'er may pass.
For should our years reach sixty-five,
And we to live are fated,
We'll lay back on the Government,—as
Superannuated.

There was a good old book at home,
That once I loved to read,
Which told that men of olden times
Lived very long indeed.
I wish that Civil Servant's lives
Were by these figures rated,
And that I was Methusaleh, and
Superannuated.

But let our years be what they will,
Our pay be what it may,
To-night let not one anxious thought
Cloud o'er the coming day.
And when we reach that silent shore,
O'er the dark valley freighted,
That best abode may we all gain—none
Superannuated.

THE JUNIOR CLERK.

Presence of Mind.

A genuine English sportsman was out shooting with a friend one frosty day, when they came to a very wide ditch that had to be crossed, for somewhere on the other side they had marked down a snipe. The friend, a little man of some nine stone or so, went over first and reported that the ice would bear; but because it was strong enough for nine stone it does not follow that it was strong enough for well on the way to nineteen. The big man, however, determined to venture, and first took one step and then another, while his little friend on the opposite bank held out a helping hand; but just as the welter weight was stretching for it, up went the bird with its cry of "Scape, scape," and the light gunner turned hastily around and blazed away, whilst his huge companion slipped, crack went the ice, and he disappeared into some five feet of black mud and slime as the gun went off. Presently he emerged, and having cleared his eyes and mouth and shaken some water from his dripping clothes, as he clamored up the steep bank, he simply enquired, "Did you get it?"

Sporting and Dramatic News.

Tam on foot to Jock in horse and cart.—"Whae ye gaun, Jock?" Jock—"Um gaun tae the station for forty pianos." Tam—"Ye mean a pianoforte." Jack—"Well whats the differ?"

Von Moltke was credited with having once said, "I have five different plans for invading England, but I have not been able to discover one for getting out of it."

The Superannuation Bill.

The Government Civil Service Superannuation Bill was read a second time in the House of Commons on Monday, March 27th. In moving the second reading Hon. Geo. F. Foster, answering Mr. McMullen made the following statement:—

MR. FOSTER. If my hon. friend, and the House will listen to me for about ten minutes, I think I can make clear what the position and intention of the Government is with reference to this matter. In the first instance, I must premise what I say by this observation: That the Government takes it up wholly with a desire to making the superannuation system—which it does not propose to entirely abolish—less burdensome on the funds than it has been up to the present time. As I said before, the present superannuation system commenced in 1870, and, remaining up to this date, it has not been a system which has been fairly tried upon its merits, and for two reasons. One reason was: That, although when the measure was introduced it had a fair abatement from the salaries, namely, 4 per cent on salaries of \$600 and over, and 2½ per cent for salaries under \$600; in a fit of mistaken sympathy, the House, some years afterwards, reduced that abatement to 2 per cent. on salaries of \$600 and over, and 1¼ per cent for salaries of less than \$600. That immediately reduced these abatements below the percentage which was necessary to carry even the best managed superannuation system. Again the system was begun with overloading it at the first end, and in this way: In 1870 we had a large number of civil servants who were then upon the list, and in the service of the country. They were landed upon the superannuation system, and the most of them paid nothing, or at least a very small proportion, into the superannuation fund; but they became entitled to the benefits of the superannuation fund, and have been charges upon it from that time up to the present. I desire to call the attention of the House to some figures in that respect which would show very clearly the amount of overloading of the fund, of which I have been speaking. I have in my hand a statement of persons who are to-day on the superannuation list, who were in the service in 1870, and who have been superannuated gradually from that time up to the present, and who have paid very little into the superannuation fund:

Of those who were superannuated in 1871, there are to-day eight living of an average age of 84 years, and drawing out of the fund \$3,265.72 per year; some of them paid nothing into the superannuation fund, and the others paid from eight months up to one year and six months superannuation abatement. That is, with regard to these eight persons drawing that amount of money from 1871 up to the present time out of the superannuation fund, nothing was paid by two, and but an average of one year superannuation abatement was paid by the other six.

Of those superannuated in 1872, two are still living with averages of 78 years, and drawing \$1,172.52 per year out of the fund. Of these two, one paid an abatement for one year and eleven months, and the other for two years and eleven months.

Of those superannuated in 1873, there are thirteen upon the list with an average age of 79 years, drawing \$4,101.88 out of the fund, and of these not one paid more than three and a half years abatement into the superannuation fund.

Of those who were superannuated in 1874, four are upon the list with average ages of 74 years, drawing \$1,057.88 out of the fund per year, and of those not one paid more than four years and seven months abatement into the fund.

Of those who were superannuated in 1875, thirteen are still upon the list, with average ages of 74 years, drawing \$5,442.99 per year out of the Treasury, and