

of superannuation. For several years, I have given considerable study to the operation of the Act, and I have endeavoured to expose the objectionable operation of that Act upon the public expenditure of this country. Last year, at the urgent request of the First Minister, I consented to allow this Bill to stand over, on the ground that the Finance Minister was not in the House at the time, and I did not get another opportunity of bringing it forward. On this occasion, I would gladly consent to the proposition made by the Finance Minister had I positive assurance that I would have another opportunity of moving the second reading; but, owing to the manner in which I was disappointed last year, I think I should embrace the present opportunity to go on with the Bill. I have endeavoured to point out, from year to year, the manner in which the Superannuation Act has operated. I have proved that the country has lost a large amount of money by the continuation of this system. The Act was brought into force in 1871, when Sir Francis Hincks was Finance Minister in the Government headed by Sir John Macdonald. Had the Act been allowed to remain on the statute-book as it was first introduced, by which 4 per cent was deducted from salaries of \$600 and over, and 2½ per cent from salaries under \$600, the fund would have been self-sustaining. In fact, had it been honestly administered, as I will prove later on it has not been, it would have been more than self-sustaining. But, after the Act had been in force some three years, Sir Leonard Tilley, when Finance Minister, introduced an amendment to it, providing that the sum deducted from the salary of civil servants should be reduced—on salaries of \$600, and over, from 4 per cent to 2 per cent; and on salaries under \$600, from 2½ per cent to 1¼ per cent. That cut down the receipts under the operation of the Act, 50 per cent. The result was that, owing to the large number of civil servants who were superannuated from year to year, the superannuation fund became a drain upon the country's resources, which grew worse and worse from year to year. Now, I will give the receipts and expenditures on account of the fund for each year during its operation:

Year.	Receipts.		Expenditure	
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.
1871	49,470	50	12,880	49
1872	53,213	80	38,842	81
1873	54,757	30	53,026	12
1874	34,620	18	64,442	84
1875	36,678	71	71,371	85
1876	38,476	00	101,627	16
1877	40,890	26	104,826	99
1878	41,856	62	106,588	91
1879	41,959	20	113,531	63
1880	43,531	80	116,391	75

Years.	Receipts.		Expenditure	
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.
1881	44,295	80	147,362	10
1882	46,426	39	160,319	95
1883	46,372	03	186,236	67
1884	51,882	21	192,692	70
1885	52,701	33	203,636	21
1886	57,075	43	200,655	25
1887	62,600	96	202,235	35
1888	62,945	72	212,743	72
1889	63,031	46	218,933	65
1890	61,513	05	241,764	66
1891	62,824	60	241,110	49
1892	63,862	79	253,679	58
1893	64,433	27	263,710	15
1894	63,974	67	262,302	00

This shows that during the time the Act has been in force, some twenty-two years, the total receipts were \$1,239,094.08, and the total expenditure, \$3,770,963.83; or a net loss to the country of \$2,531,869.75. The number on the list of superannuated officers at the end of 1893-94 was 351. The gross amount paid to them is \$262,302. The average amount to each is \$476. The total amount contributed by those now in the Civil Service during the last year is \$63,994.67. The total number on the Civil Service list last year who contributed to the fund was 4,685, and the average amount contributed by those who are now in the Civil Service is \$14.10 annually. I contend that the Act has been very much abused. Had it been administered as originally intended, the amount which the country has been called on to pay would not have been sacrificed. The Act, however, was only in force a few years when it was used as a means to remove civil servants from the positions they occupied and place them upon a retiring allowance, in order that room might be made for others who were pressing their services on the Government. Now, to show the position in which the Civil Service now stands, and to prove that there is no necessity, from a financial standpoint, why superannuation should be continued, let me give the figures from a return that has been placed before Parliament, of the number of civil servants in the employ of this country on the 30th June, 1894, and the average salary paid. It will be found that we have in the inside service in the city of Ottawa, 898 employees altogether. They draw a gross salary of \$1,095,723.50, or an average salary of \$1,220 each. Then we have the outside service, consisting of 3,787 employees, who draw a gross amount of \$2,830,063.30, or an average salary of \$747. Taking the inside and the outside service together, the average salary of all the employees of this Dominion, on the 30th June, 1894, was \$838. Now, I contend that the Civil Service are fairly well paid. There is no other class in this Dominion who get an average salary of \$838 per year. School teachers do not get that much,