

Mr. HANBURY: Mr. Chairman, there was another matter I brought up the other day and that was with regard to the question of the number of employees over pensionable age maintained on the payroll. I would like that information.

Hon. Mr. FULLERTON: The question asked is: what number of men are now in the service who are eligible for pensioning and what would their pensions amount to. The answer is 682 men and the amount is \$413,888.

Mr. PRICE: Which pension is that? Is that the Canadian National pension?

Hon. Mr. FULLERTON: All the pensions under all plans.

Mr. HANBURY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with that statement I must take exception to maintaining these men on the National system owned by the government. I am making a distinction. What the Canadian Pacific does is a matter between them and their employees, but this is, after all, a government owned railway, and we are retaining 682 men on the payroll so that there are 682 men who should be on the payroll and are not there. I think that the purpose of this parliament and of the people of Canada in establishing and maintaining a scheme to assist pensions is on the basis and on the theory that when these men have reached a pensionable age they will remove themselves or be removed in order that others may take their place. I am frankly critical of maintaining these men on the payroll, and I would like to have some assurance that the practice will be discontinued.

Hon. Mr. FULLERTON: If I may be allowed to make a statement. Our duty as I conceive it is to make economies—to save money to the country and to the railway. We may have a man who is efficient and has special qualifications for his position. If we let him out we must pay him a pension and we must employ a new man and pay him full wages. As I conceive it, if the man is efficient, if he is able to carry out his duties we should continue him in the service. If the position is to be abolished then, of course, we put him on pension; but that is the present policy of the railroad. If that policy is to be different, of course, that is another question; but our whole idea—at least, my whole idea is to save money, and that is the only reason we continue these men.

Mr. GEARY: And to maintain efficiency.

Hon. Mr. FULLERTON: Yes. Ordinarily I would say that in a sense it might be right to pension every man at 65, and yet I can see many cases where we have men of peculiar qualifications, exceptionally good men who should be continued, it would be a mistake for the railway to let them out as long as they are efficient, healthy and able to do their job.

Hon. Mr. MANION: If you let them out you have to pay two salaries.

Hon. Mr. FULLERTON: Yes, two salaries; but under present conditions I conceive it to be our duty to save wherever we can, and that is the whole object of our present policy.

Mr. HANBURY: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish the chairman of the board to think I am criticizing the trustees of the board. They were put in there for the purpose of effecting economies; but I am going to point out to him that we are a committee of parliament and I believe we are here to give our opinions and to give him, if possible, guidance, recognizing the authority he has in this matter; and I believe it is our duty to give him guidance. I am not going to argue that there should be no exceptions to a rule that a man should be retired after he is 65 years of age; I appreciate the economies of \$413,000 a year which he is effecting; but what I am claiming is that they are not real economies from the national standpoint. I am not talking of the National railways; I am talking of the people of Canada; and my suggestion to him is this, that the people of Canada through their pensions scheme and through the assistance they are giving to the Canadian National railway in their pensions are asking