

for the first time the British Parliament attempted to make it an abatement of the salaries of public officers in order to meet the Superannuation Fund. This they did by retaining two per cent upon the salaries amounting to 100 pounds and not exceeding 200 pounds and five per cent on all above the last quoted figure. In 1824 this law was repealed, and 90,000 pound sterling voted for the purpose of repaying the public officers for the losses they had sustained by paying to the Fund. In 1829 there was another effort to enact a superannuation law similar to this which failed, but in 1854 was more successful and became law. In 1857, however it was withdrawn, since which time the whole expense of superannuation was borne by the Government without one copper from the salaries of the officers themselves. Further provisions were made for the case of men dying in harness, or officials leaving their wives and families in difficulties, which were a lasting tribute to the liberality of the British Government towards their public officers.

Now he did not ask this Government to be quite so liberal as that; all he wanted them to do was to make such changes in the law as would enable the families of their officers to reap the benefit of the overplus amounts they had subscribed to this Fund, in case of their death before 60 years of age, or if they only lived to enjoy their superannuation for a year or two. It would not be fixing the average of a man's salary too high who had been 25 years in the service of the Government to place it at \$1,000 per year. It would even be a low average. Neither would it be at all wide of the fact to say that a man begins to pay into the Fund at 25 years of age. Then let this man be taken as the average in all respects. By the time he is 50 years of age, his contributions to the Fund at four per cent upon his salary, without counting interest and compound interest would amount to \$1,000.

By looking over the tables of Life Insurance Companies he found that the same yearly sums would secure \$2,666 to a man's family in case he died at 50; whereas in the other case his family or himself never got a cent's worth of good for it. It would be quite out of order in him to introduce a motion recommending the Government to apply certain sums of money to certain purposes, either as to life insurance or increase of superannuation allowance. He would simply consider it as an act of justice for this House to take into consideration the wants of civil officers, the expediency of ceasing to apply the hard-earned money of those officials to the purposes of the country, and the desirability of having these sums employed for the use and benefit of the widows and orphans of the men who thus contribute the money.

He also said he would approve of the establishment of a mutual benefit society on the principle which, in the establishments of all extensive employers, had been found to work so satisfactorily and with such good results. He moved that the House go into Committee on the resolutions he had submitted. (*Cheers.*)

Hon. Mr. TILLEY hoped the hon. gentleman would allow the matter to stand for a few days. The Government had the subject under consideration, and they had not been able, however, to take the same view as his hon. friend in reference to the distribution.

After careful consideration they had arrived at the conclusion that, if Parliament was not prepared to assist in providing for aged civil servants, the present rates were not too high. His hon. friend had pointed out that they had passed the maximum amount required from the fund, but if he would look to the estimates he would see that \$11,000 more was placed in the estimates for 1873 and 1874 than for 1872 and 1873.

Mr. JOLY said that his argument was that the amount estimated for 1873-74 would be more than sufficient to supply the demand for that period, and therefore the surplus of \$50,000 would still remain to the credit of the public funds, and therefore that amount ought to be divided among the Service.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY thought the hon. gentleman was mistaken in supposing that they had arrived at the maximum. The number in Canada, superannuated, was small compared with the number who would shortly arrive at an age when it would be necessary to superannuate them. If the Government felt that the surplus would not be required they would gladly consent to some measure by which the Service would get the benefit of the amount, but after giving the matter very careful consideration, they could not arrive at such a conclusion.

The whole question of salaries of public officers had received their attention. It was quite probable that before the House would rise a measure would be brought down dealing with the question. Such action was necessary, inasmuch as it was an acknowledged fact that a pound would not go so far now as it would have done a few years ago. He, therefore, hoped that the matter would be allowed to stand.

Mr. SAVARY seconded the resolution, as he had done on a former occasion. The superannuation deduction was a compulsory one, and was felt by the Civil Service to be a hardship. The object of the Act was not in the interests of the Service, but of the Government, and there was not a doubt that many useless or almost useless officers would have been kept in the Service for years to come had the Act not been passed. The salaries were so low that it was impossible for them to insure their lives, and then a deduction of four per cent was taken from their already low salaries.

Many of the Civil Service were far more desirous that provision should be made for their families than for themselves. A member might contribute for a large number of years, but if he should happen to die before 60 his family would get no benefit from the funds. He was glad to hear from the Minister of Finance that the question of salaries generally throughout the Dominion had been taken into consideration by the Government.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS thought the matter should be left in the hands of the Government. The great objection he had to the motion of the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Joly) was that he (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks) most distinctly objected to providing for the widows and orphans of public officers. It was not in accordance with English practice. There was a public policy in providing for