

of insurance. Both Houses would get tired of passing Acts of Parliament if one was required for each increase. If the members of the government want to protect themselves against this constant nagging for increases, that is one way, and I should be glad if some provision were made whereby civil servants knew that they got a minimum salary when they entered the service, and got increases from time to time, and that they need not look to anybody else for special favours or for occasional increases.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman ought to know that that is the law on the statute-book at the present moment. When the civil servant is appointed he enters the service at a certain minimum salary or whatever may be recommended at the time, and that there are to be annual increments; but notwithstanding that fact the salaries are increased and parliament sanctions the increases and the Auditor General passes them, of course, because they are authorized under an Act of parliament and he cannot help himself. This clause is no protection whatever, because if they cannot do it one way, they can by another. The suggestion of my hon. friend from Calgary makes it clear when he says 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act or words to that effect.' But just before that there is a provision by which they can do all that by introducing a Bill in parliament.

The clause was adopted.

On clause 41,

44. If a person dies while in the public service, after having been at least two years therein, an amount equal to two months of his salary shall be paid to his widow or to such person as the Treasury Board determines.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Is there not a proposition to increase that sum?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—There was, but the Finance Minister said the superannuation fund was based on this assumption that a certain portion would fall in, that if an official dies while in the service so much was added to the fund, and pro rata reduced the annual payments the survivors made. That was the basis on which the

whole thing was predicated. I should be exceedingly glad if we could see a way of increasing it, but if you change it you change the whole basis of superannuation, and it was thought advisable that that should not be done just now because it would lead to complications. If it stood isolated, and not as a precedent for other cases it might be done.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The policy which has been in existence for a great number of years under both governments was to grant to the widow or the heirs of a deceased officer two months' salary. There have been cases where an officer had been in the employment of the government, say a postmaster for instance, who had been paying into the superannuation fund for 25 years and died suddenly. Of course neither he nor his family receive any benefit from the fund. A suggestion was made that in cases of that kind the government should be empowered to grant, instead of two months' salary as at present, six months or in proportion to the length of time that the officer had been in the service. I can understand very readily the difficulty in adopting a system of that kind, because we all know that the payments which have been made into the superannuation fund have not been sufficient to meet the demands upon it, and, consequently, they have to draw from the exchequer a sufficient sum to make up the deficiency, and I can understand very well the difficulties in establishing the principle of paying a large amount to the relatives of those who die suddenly and reap no benefit from the money paid into the fund. The answer to that is that if they retire from the service and live eight or ten years they would be drawing a sum proportionate to the amount of their salaries and the length of their services. Still, there are a great many hardships. I could individualize if necessary, and I was in hopes the government would adopt the grading system and deal with the widow and the family in proportion to the length of services rendered by the official of the government. However, the government have decided not to do that. I can see great objection to establishing a precedent of that kind, but I should have been