

vice, on the one condition that the amount to be provided by the Government should not exceed \$100,000 in any one year. That, briefly, is an outline of the Act. At that time, of course, this was something altogether new and the men regarded it as a great advantage to them. Men have been retired year by year and have received \$20 per month as retiring allowance, and I think they still have to pay a certain proportion per month out of that to the Provident Fund. Now in 1907, and up to 1912, or possibly 1914, \$20 a month was a fair amount of assistance to an old man who had been retired from the service, but to-day, as we all know very well, this sum is nothing but a bagatelle to a man who has a family to support. There are a number of old men in that section of the country receiving \$20 a month and that is practically all they have to live on, and they are drifting around almost on the town. To-day I received a long letter from a railway man. He does not happen to come from my constituency, although I know the man very well. He used to be in Moncton and now lives in the town of Truro, and he sets forth some ten or fifteen different complaints in connection with this matter. It is not necessary for me to take up the time of the House rehearsing them because we all know what they are. I realize that the Government, until they make some change in the Act, are helpless in this matter. They are bound by the Act that was passed in 1907, but to-day we are passing pension Acts and providing superannuation allowance for different men in the Government service, and there is no reason why a class of men like these should not receive some consideration. There are a great many of them, and a large percentage of them are not living at all, but only existing, on this pittance. I am not in a position to make suggestion as to what my hon. friend should do, but I do think that the Government, who are responsible, should devise some measure by which these men, who were trusted and efficient employees in their day, may get fair treatment. They are getting pretty old, and a number of them are being retired from time to time. I think they should be given the same consideration in view of the high cost of living, as is given to men who are similarly circumstanced. The men have talked this matter over with me many times, and I hardly go through Moncton without coming across one or more of them. They always ask me to do something in the matter, but my hands are tied; and I realize that the

[Mr. Copp.]

Government's hands are also tied until something is done to change the present statute. I know that my hon. friend and every other hon. gentleman in this House is sympathetic towards these men, but the point is that we should get something done through the Railway Department in connection with the Provident Fund officials themselves. They have a set of officials who work along with the Government and something should be done to provide for these men a fair retiring allowance. I trust that the minister will during the recess take this matter up and try, with his staff, to work out some arrangement, which will be reasonable and fair to these men.

There are many things in connection with the Government railways that I could refer to but I do not want to impose upon the good nature of the House. I have brought these matters to the attention of the minister with the best intentions and not in the way of criticism entirely. I think hon. members from the Maritime Provinces must realize that portion of Canada is not getting its fair and just desserts in regard to railway and other accommodations. It is only our duty, if it cannot be counted a pleasure, to bring these matters to the attention of the minister because this is the only avenue through which we can bring them publicly to his notice.

There is another matter that I regret very much to have to take up but I want to bring it to the minister's attention and see if he is in a position to give me some assurance because I do not wish to take up these very voluminous documents which I have before me—they refer to the dismissal of a certain railway official in the city of St. John in 1917—unless I am obliged to. This matter, as I understand, has not as yet been before the House. It has been before the department on different occasions. In going through the file I find that no less than two Cabinet ministers have taken it up and that one, if not two, private members in St. John have been before the Department of Railways in regard to it. The matter now has been placed in my hands. I have taken it up with the department privately but I have been unable to get redress for the gentleman on whose behalf I speak. I am very glad to see that my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Wigmore) is here. The matter that I speak of has reference to the dismissal of Mr. Carvill, who had been ticket agent of the Canadian Government railway for eighteen years and who was summarily dismissed after four days' notice. I would like to say to the minister that I do not