

ernment and the various departments feel that it will work no injustice to anyone, but that it will benefit some individuals and, in certain cases, lay the basis for a departmental reorganization satisfactory to all parties concerned.

There is a wide difference between such information as I have and the picture painted by my honourable friend from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck). So far as I am aware there has been no opposition by civil servants to the proposed change. I should think that in these circumstances we would not undertake to vary the relevant clause of the bill without first calling witnesses before a committee and making a careful survey of the situation; and I submit that is altogether impractical just now, with prorogation a possibility for tomorrow.

I oppose the amendment of the honourable gentleman from Toronto-Trinity.

Hon. Mr. WHITE: Can the honourable leader inform the house what attitude the Civil Service Association has taken?

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I am unable to answer that question.

Hon. JOHN T. HAIG: Honourable senators, to my mind the leader of the government (Hon. Mr. Robertson) and the senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) are arguing on different points. So far as I personally am concerned I am willing to let any civil servant who so desires to retire when he or she reaches the age of sixty. Let us be clear about this. If that is all the bill does in this regard, I am not opposed to it, but I am afraid that the senator from Toronto-Trinity is right and that the bill does more than that. In the circumstances I would ask permission to adjourn the debate until tomorrow morning so that I may have time to study the legal meaning of the phraseology used in the bill. As I see it now, it appears that the bill would compel every civil servant to retire at the age of sixty-five, and I object to that.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: My honourable friend thinks that the bill reduces the compulsory retiring age from seventy to sixty-five?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I am quite prepared to take the word of the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) on that.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: That is a feature I do not like. For some months the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada has been having hearings into the application of

all Canadian railroads for an increase of 30 per cent in freight rates. No one would ever charge our big railroad corporations with engaging pink-tea artists to represent them at such important hearings, and I want the house to know that the lawyer employed as chief counsel for the railways has passed his eightieth birthday.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: May I make an interjection? Gladstone conducted the Midlothian campaign after he was eighty.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I know that, but let us get back nearer home. The Board of Transport Commissioners has held hearings on this important case all over Canada and it has now resumed them right here in Ottawa; and the man who will appear again next Monday as chief counsel for the railroad corporations has passed his eightieth birthday. And, believe me, he is "some" counsel. If a man or woman wants to retire from the civil service at sixty years of age, I am all for it, but I am opposed to giving the government power to dismiss people at sixty-five. Before we vote I want to know what the bill does mean. The honourable leader thinks that retirement at sixty-five would be only permissive.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: But you were not sure.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: May I draw attention of honourable senators to circumstances which might supersede the provisions of this act or any other act. It seems to me there are two points to be kept in mind. The bill provides for permissive retirement at sixty and compulsory retirement at sixty-five.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I am afraid so.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: But what would happen in the case of individual civil servants who are indispensable in their positions and are specially requested by the government to continue working after sixty-five?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: They would have to get out at sixty-five.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: Do they have to get out at seventy now?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: I know, as does my honourable friend, of innumerable cases where civil servants have been retained beyond seventy.

Hon. Mr. WHITE: From year to year.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: Yes.