

him to carry out the intent which is that men who reach the age of 65, and there is no particular or special reason why they should be maintained in the service, should be retired so that other men who are to-day walking the streets and are being maintained by the people of Canada may have an opportunity to gain employment for themselves.

Mr. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to what Mr. Hanbury has said, and I was just wondering if it had occurred to him that there are some of these men who are over 65 years of age who wish to be retained.

Mr. HANBURY: They all do.

Mr. PRICE: I do not know whether he would be a better judge as to whether they should be retained than the management of the road. As Mr. Fullerton said, there are instances where men reach an older age than 65, are capable men and the railway may wish to retain them. I am somewhat familiar with railway matters, as I live in a railway centre, and I do not think there are many instances where men have asked for retirement when they have not got it when they are fully entitled to it.

While I am on that subject there is a very unfortunate position that some men who, through some small technicality, are kept out of their position. I know of several instances where there has been a slight break as it is termed in the service—it may be a month or two—and it has caused that employee some trouble. I have known of stenographers—one in particular—who was kept out of a pension on account of some technicality. I know of instances where men have served the required time and who have not reported back inside of one year and the management have taken the ground that they automatically dismiss themselves. Even if on sick leave, they automatically dismiss themselves, and their case cannot be taken up. Now, on the other hand, there is another situation: we have instances where pensions are granted where there is no rule or regulation for the granting of those pensions. We have cases of men with breaks in their service, and if they happen to have the favour of the management of the railroad in certain quarters and a recommendation is made, these men are given a pension. It may be small, but they are given a pension. Now, they are not entitled to pension through the Interecolonial and Prince Edward Island provident fund; they are not entitled to the pension through the Canadian National Railways superannuation fund, but they are given pensions. Is that not a fact? That is going on while there are a number, as I say, who through some slight technicality are kept out of their pension. That is unfortunate. I do not know what is the policy of the management in that regard, whether that is to continue; but it certainly gives wide powers where the management have that privilege. There are cases where you have a man in the service whom they think is entitled to a pension although he is not entitled to one, and where he has had breaks in his service, yet he is given a pension.

Hon. Mr. FULLERTON: I may say that we have certain pension rules that have been laid down, carefully considered and passed. Those pension rules are adhered to strictly. Any question of a break in a man's service is considered by a committee that considers each case carefully. After a case is dealt with it has to go before the board and all the facts are threshed out. There is no suggestion of favouritism. I do not know—I cannot speak for what happened before—but as far as I know there is no question of favouring any man. We do this; we occasionally grant a small gratuity—not a pension by any means—but there are some cases where, for instance, a man is killed and his wife and family are left in very poor circumstances. That has been done and is done in hard cases. But as far as the pension rules are concerned, as far as I know they are strictly adhered to.