

another principle that has gone to the winds. We have not only the principle of pension and superannuation applied to parties who have served their country faithfully for a number of years, but we have that principle now extended, notwithstanding the opposition of many supporters of the right hon. gentleman. I do not know whether he himself ever voiced their opinions, but a great many of his supporters have opposed the principle of pensions and superannuation altogether.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think I ever said a word on that subject; in fact, I am quite sure I never did. Moreover it is a growing time and if there is a class of officers in the service of the government who are entitled to be dealt with by the government as fairly and justly as possible, I think my hon. friend will agree with me that it is the officers of the mounted police.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be interesting to know how this Act will fare when it goes to the upper House and meets with our old friend McMullen.

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope the curiosity of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will be gratified.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask as to the interpretation of the word 'may' in the third line of subsection 6 of section 3?

The PRIME MINISTER. The interpretation of the word 'may' is explained in the way I stated a moment ago. At the present time an officer of the force is subject to the Superannuation Act. He will have to elect whether he shall remain under the provisions of the present Superannuation Act or whether he shall be subject to the provisions of this Act, and of course, if he elects to come under the provisions of this Act, then, he comes under the disposition of this Act and the provisions we make in subsection 2 of section 4 will apply from the time he has served, and the pension he is paid shall be an abatement or deduction of his pension. I hope I have made myself understood by my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not follow the details exactly, but the point I wanted cleared was whether the use of the word 'may' was to express the privilege on the part of the authorities to extend a pension to a man who had served as a non-commissioned officer or a constable, or whether it will be compulsory.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the man elects to come under this Act it is compulsory.

On section 4,

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he has made any

calculation to ascertain whether this will be adequate to meet the requirements of the fund, or if not to what extent?

The PRIME MINISTER. I suppose my hon. friend means to ask whether or not a calculation has been made?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. To ascertain whether or not this fund will be self-sustaining?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot say that we have made a calculation, but I understand that last year when a similar Bill was introduced in regard to the militia, such calculations were made, and it was supposed that the fund would be about self-sustaining, but I am not sure but that we may have to contribute a sum, but if we have to contribute anything it will not be a very large sum.

On section 5,

Mr. OSLER. That clause, I think, should be very well considered, because a case might arise where an officer in the discharge of his duty, who had served three months, or three days of the time when he would be entitled to a pension, might be seriously wounded and incapacitated for further duty, and under this clause he would be compulsorily retired without pension and be obliged to take a very small gratuity. I think that clause certainly ought to be modified to some extent. It might work a very great injustice to men from time to time who are injured in the discharge of their duty.

The PRIME MINISTER. I see the point of the objection of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) and it is not without being entitled to some consideration, but the hon. gentleman will realize at once that it cannot apply as an objection to this Bill. This Bill provides that no man shall be entitled to a pension unless he has been a contributor to the fund which is created for the purpose, for a certain number of years. It is expected that he will contribute to that fund for twenty years, that a fund will be created out of which his pension and those of his comrades will be paid, and that the fund will be self-sustaining. If we adopt the principle that a man without paying anything at all, is entitled to compensation, that is a fair proposition to consider, but it cannot be considered in connection with this Bill. It would be beyond the principle that we have in view, bearing in mind that the principle of this Bill is the creation of a fund out of which this pension shall be paid. There is, however, a great deal to be said in favour of the