

each year of his service; and if any such person is so constrained to quit the service before such period, by reason of severe bodily injury received without his own fault in the discharge of his public duty, the Governor in Council may allow him a gratuity not exceeding three months' pay for every two years service, or a superannuation allowance not exceeding one-fifth of his average salary during the then last three years.'

The hon. gentleman has somewhat reflected on the service. His principle objection is that drones contribute equally with active men. But each man contributes according to his salary. When the hon. gentleman, in reflecting on the Civil Service expenditure, says that Civil Service servants seem to be considered as the sons and heirs of the Government, I do not hesitate to say that in the public interest Civil servants should be fairly remunerated for the work they perform for their country; and I will say more, if I had a dozen sons, even with the large salaries of which the hon. member complains, I would never advise one of them to enter the service. I would prefer that they should go into shops, stores and banks, where they were not so well paid, according to the hon. gentleman, but where they would have a chance to rise. Here an officer at \$600 or \$700 a year with a family, has nothing left at the end of the year, except, perhaps, debts; he is in a hopeless position, and is able to obtain only a bare living. Whereas, a man entering trade and commerce, though he might meet with mishaps, might ultimately make something, which an honest Civil servant can never do. I hold it would be a great mistake to go back to the position occupied before 1871, and neither this Government nor any other Government would vote for a return to the position under which officers were removed, after giving faithful service for twenty or thirty years, without receiving a shilling. It does not appear that we are repaid the whole sum, but there is a very considerable saving effected, which compensates for the amount paid under the Civil Service Act, and there are other advantages to the public service which flow from a continuation of this policy of providing something for a man who has spent his life in the service, and who has not been able to lay by anything for himself or his family.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I quite agree that it is very desirable, in the interest of the country, that the Civil Service should be made as efficient as possible, and it cannot be made efficient unless the officials are reasonably well paid; but I remember cases when men contributed under the superannuation arrangement, a certain sum from their income every year, which they could ill afford, and, because they died during the time of their service, their families did not obtain a return of any part of the money paid in. I understand there is a proposal to establish a life insurance system, but that would never meet the case, because if it were established it would be an additional amount which the Civil servant would have to pay. If an officer dies within one year of the time when he would be entitled to superannuation, his family receive nothing. That is not a fair or reasonable thing; and I would like to hear from the hon. Minister if any arrangement could be made by which that very grave injustice could be remedied.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If this Bill is objectionable from a financial stand point, it would be still more objectionable if the suggestions of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) were adopted. I think the members of the Civil Service are perfectly satisfied to take their chance in this matter, because if we were to pay back to the family the money which every officer had paid in, it would involve a very considerable amount; and that was one of the grounds urged by Mr. Joly for reducing the amount paid by the Civil servants namely, that their contributions would not necessarily come back to them.

Mr. BLAKE. The proposal of the Administration, in the first instance, was, that this fund should be self-sustaining, and they were of the opinion that the contributions,

which originally were nearly double what they are at present, would produce that result. It is very clear from the figures, that if the original proposal would not have produced any such result, still less the diminished proposal—a proposal as my hon. friend from Muskoka will observe, was for an insurance against particular risks, and for insurance against the risk of their becoming disabled and infirm while in the service, and the insurance money is paid as insurance money against that particular risk. But it is not adequate insurance money for this purpose, because the country has to pay four times as much as the whole of the Civil servants pay, in order to carry out the obligations imposed on them, even for that limited risk; and if, in addition, the country was to undertake to pay under any events, under any circumstances, of course, the financial results of the measure would be still more onerous, as the hon. Minister of Finance pointed out, than they now are. I obtained a return from the hon. Minister of Finance a while ago. It was only a partial answer to a return which I had applied for, and the whole figures of which it was impossible to bring down, but it was numerical, and I may say it showed that since the Civil Service Act was passed the numbers are not very unequally divided between those superannuated or retired upon a gratuity under the Civil Service Act and those who died while in the service. There is a slight majority—I cannot remember the exact figures, but I think the number was 11,000 or 12,000 altogether, and there was a majority of seventy-five or thereabouts of those who got some benefit from the Civil Service Act practically, and of those who died while in the service—and therefore the hon. gentleman's observation that there is a very large proportion—and I think rather an increasing proportion than otherwise—as far as it has worked into its normal condition, although perhaps there has been too short a time yet to toll about it—of those who contributed to it and never got any practical benefit from it. Against this particular risk, another risk, which comes to us all sooner or later, happens to them, and they die in the service. I am not objecting to the second reading of the Bill because it is a Consolidation Bill; and I presume that nobody, however much opposed to this system in the beginning, and, however much convinced as I am that it requires modification in the future, would propose that Civil servants who had entered office or retained office for ten or eleven years under its operation, and who had changed their condition in life with this inducement existing, should be deprived of what may be called fairly by that much abused name sometimes—a vested right. I do not think that it would be fair or reasonable to persons in that position, even if the policy of the country should change upon this subject, to say to them: "Gentlemen, you have been ten or twelve years in the service, you have paid your subscriptions to the fund, and you entered and continued in the service under the idea of having the benefits of this provision; but we have changed that policy now and will cut you off, and return you your money." I think that any change that takes place in the policy of the country with reference to the persons who have been for any reasonable, any appreciable time in the service, must be a charge, optional as far as they are concerned, and not be compulsory upon them to their disadvantage. It is an old observation, as old as the time in which Burke introduced his great economical reform, that it is the duty of those who propose economical reforms in the State, to remember that the State is perpetual, while the lives of its servants are, after all, but of brief duration. We should not propose to do an injustice to the individual in attempting to make a public benefit. That principle was carried, in my opinion, in the particular instance to which I refer, in consideration for pensioners, a great deal further than we would be disposed to carry it, but the general principle to the extent to which I have indicated seems to me quite sound. I think that this Bill contains details of