

shake his head and sneer at that remark, because we are told distinctly by the Commissioners that clerks have been continued in office, unpunished for misconduct, purely for political reasons. Some clerks enjoying the friendship of the Government can act as they please, regardless of the Deputy-Heads. The power of discipline should be in the hands of the men most interested in its maintenance and in the good working of the various offices.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The principle proposed by the clause is not a false one. Surely the Head of a Department should have the right to suspend an officer himself, without begging the co-operation or assistance of the Deputy-Head.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. But the Deputy-Head cannot suspend except his principal be absent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Certainly not. If the Head is absent the Deputy has to administer the Department, and if he finds an officer misbehaves himself he may suspend him and report to the Head his action and the reasons therefor. It will be for the Head then to consider the proper final action.

Mr. CASEY. Of course, in such extreme cases as personal insolence on the part of a clerk, suspension should be exercised by the Head of the Department; but in ordinary cases the power should rest with the Deputy-Head. I suppose while he is present in the office, if insulted, the Deputy-Head must come and ask the Head if he can suspend the officer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Why not?

Mr. CASEY. Because in many cases where the Deputy-Head has asked the suspension of a clerk, the political Head has refused on political grounds. The power of enforcing discipline should be in the hands of the Deputy-Head, whether the political Head is present or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the first time I have heard of the Head of a Department acting in that way.

Mr. CASEY. Instances were given in evidences before my Committee. With regard to the fines mentioned in the sub-section, one day's pay is a very trifling penalty.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the burden of the punishment will consist in the shame cast upon the offender.

On clause 46,

Mr. BLAKE. There may be cases in which additional remuneration should be paid to a Deputy-Head, but it ought to be specially stated in the Estimates that a sum is voted for such remuneration, so that Parliament may know to what officer the money is given.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is the intention, and to make it more clear I would suggest adding the words: "for that special purpose" to the clause.

Mr. BLAKE. The third sub-section may be construed to mean that an officer who has obtained leave of absence to attend to his private business during three months or more, may continue drawing his full salary, while a junior officer, who performs his work, will receive additional salary. The clause should be altered to prevent any such construction.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is right. I would suggest that "through illness" should be substituted for "or by illness."

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 47,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved to insert the words "including the office of the Auditor-General" after the words "there shall be kept in each Department."

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 49,

Mr. COSTIGAN. It appears that, under this Act, second-class clerks will be entitled to only a biennial allowance, while first-class get an annual allowance of \$50.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is changed now, and second-class clerks get an annual allowance.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I suppose it is the intention that the clerks in the Department may continue to receive the emoluments they now receive notwithstanding the passing of this Act.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated just now that the position of an officer is not changed, in so far as he receives emoluments.

On clause 51,

Mr. BLAKE. This, I observe, is a sort of amendment of the Superannuation Act, and perhaps the hon. Minister will explain the changes proposed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is an improvement on the Act. To-day, the Treasury Board makes an enquiry, but it is not bound to make it as fully as is here prescribed. For example, an officer in a Department becomes old or unfit for work by reason of paralysis or accident, and it is in the interest of the Department that he should be superannuated. The Head of the Department so reports to Council. The case is referred to the Treasury Board, and that Board reports that the officer has been so many years in the service, that he is in a certain position, and that his superannuation would amount to so much per annum. Then the first thing the Treasury Board would look into would be whether the person proposed to be superannuated was eligible and within the Act, and then whether his superannuation would result in benefit to the service and be in the public interest. There is a guarantee here. After the Minister has reported the Treasury Board may find that the Head of the Department was not cognizant of certain facts with which they were acquainted, and they were therefore in a position to say whether they would recommend his superannuation or not, because it might be found, by obtaining an additional medical certificate, it might appear that the officer would recover after a short period.

Mr. BLAKE. I know there have been great abuses in connection with the Superannuation Act, and anything that would tend to remove abuses would be desirable; but this proposal in its practical operation will not be very different from the existing law. Enquiry is made at present by the Treasury Board. There have been cases in which it has been difficult to understand upon what principle the superannuation has been directed. I wish to refer to another point in connection with this question. One of the greatest abuses that has resulted from the system of superannuation has been in the addition of years to the ten years' clause. The addition is not, as a rule, based on the services the officer has rendered. The law does not contemplate that. The law contemplates that the addition shall be made in the case of those who enter the service late by reason of special qualifications existing, which could not be acquired by those of younger years. Motives of compassion often decide these cases, as the hon. Minister will find, if he enquires, irrespective of special or particular qualifications. I would suggest that the Treasury Board should decide when such an officer is appointed, whether an additional number of years shall be added, and if so, how many; as I believe that would largely do away with the abuses which undoubtedly occur under the ten years' clause.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. gentleman will see that his remarks do not apply to the inside service, and with regard to other officers, I think it is a great deal better to leave the particular cases to be decided when they