

willing that justice should be done to them; but I think that in place of perpetuating such a system as this, seeing the operations of the Act, seeing how much money has been paid out for the last twelve years at the expense of this country, and seeing the manner in which the Act has worked since its inception to the present time, it would be very much better to abolish it altogether and to introduce a more equitable system whereby those who are disposed to contribute to a fund out of which they may be permitted to draw when they retire from the service, should be able to draw in proportion to the amount they had contributed, and that the honest and efficient clerk, the man who, for a great many years, had faithfully discharged his duty, should not be compelled to pay for the drones and those that are inefficient. Under the present system their family is robbed by the amount they should have coming to them on account of the annual deduction made from their salary. I admit that in England there may be some reasonable grounds for the continuation of this system. In that country the Civil Service officers have not the same opportunity of investing their money to advantage as they have in this country. I hold that if the Civil Service of this country were made to understand that they would have to provide for themselves they would be much more economical in their habits than they are now. I contend this system rather leads them to recklessness than to economy. If there was no law under which they expected the country to provide for them they would lay aside more money annually. There are plenty of opportunities for good investments, such as real estate or bank stocks. Now, I would draw the attention of the House to the manner in which these 406 men are distributed over the Departments. There are fifteen now employed in the office of the hon. Minister of Justice, and his percentage of those who are on the retired list would be ten, who are drawing the sum of \$4,680 annually. There are twenty-seven in the office of the hon. Minister of Militia, and his percentage of those who are on the retired list would be eighteen, and they are drawing \$8,424 annually. There are forty-one in the office of the hon. Secretary of State, and his percentage of the 406 who are on the retired list would be twenty-seven, who are drawing the gross sum of \$12,636 annually. There are eighty-eight in the office of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and his percentage on the retired list would be fifty-four, who are drawing annually \$25,272.00. There are thirty-two in the Department of Indian Affairs, the percentage would be twenty-one, and they are drawing \$9,828. There are eighteen in the office of the Auditor General, his percentage on the retired list would be twelve, and they are drawing \$5,716. There are forty-six in the office of the hon. Minister of Finance, his percentage would be thirty, and they are drawing \$14,040. There are twenty-eight in the office of the Minister of Inland Revenue; his percentage on the retired list would be eighteen, and these are drawing \$8,424. There are twenty-nine in the office of the hon. Minister of Customs, his percentage on the retired list would be eighteen, and they are drawing \$8,424. There are 161 in the Post Office Department, the percentage on the retired list would be 107, and they are drawing \$50,076. There are forty-two in the office of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, his percentage on the retired list would be twenty-eight, and they are drawing \$13,104. Those gentlemen who are drawing those sums are strutting round doing nothing, and living at the country's expense of course. There are thirty in the office of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, his percentage would be twenty, and they are drawing annually \$9,360. There are thirty-two in the office of the hon. Minister of Public Works, his percentage on the retired list would be twenty-one, and they are drawing \$10,206. There are twenty-seven in the office of the hon. Minister of Railways, and his percentage on the retired list is eighteen, and they are drawing

Mr. McMULLEN.

annually \$8,424. There are 406 altogether on the retired list, and to these the yearly sum of \$189,978.98 has got to be paid. Now, I think this question deserves the serious consideration of this House, and it is time that something should be done. Not only in the interest of the country, but in the interest of the faithful and efficient servants, some system should be adopted, if any system of retiring allowances is necessary, whereby the country would not be called upon to lose the enormous sum we are now losing annually and to provide that the faithful servants should not be so unjustly treated as they are by the provisions of this Act.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the hon. member followed up his proposition with a resolution it would be to repeal the Act; he does not believe in the Act, that is quite clear. I doubt very much whether Parliament is prepared to accept his proposal and repeal the Act. In 1871, or earlier, when this law was enacted, twice the amount was required to be paid by the members of the Civil Service, as compared with that exacted from them to-day. I recollect perfectly the great interest taken by a prominent member on the other side of the House, Mr. Joly, who took up the question, brought it under the consideration of the House, and produced such an influence and effect on hon. members that the amount paid by Civil servants was reduced one-half. Two remedies are suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) if the Act were repealed. One is, that a certain percentage of the salary of each member should be placed in the Treasury bearing interest, and be paid to him on his retirement from the Service. When this Act was passed we found a great many aged men in the service who were utterly unfit to discharge their duties, and the Governor came down to the House and asked, in the interest of the service more than to benefit the men themselves, that they should have power to superannuate officers and give them something on which to live. Suppose the propositions of the hon. member were adopted, that is that the Civil servants should pay 2 or 4 per cent. of their salaries into the Treasury and receive the interest thereon, and obtain the amount with interest, upon their retirement, it would not have reached the cases of men who, at that time, should be superannuated, having been twenty-five or thirty-five years in the service, and who took the benefit of the Act at once. Then the hon. gentleman suggested that the lives of the Civil servants should be insured, in order that their families should receive an amount on their decease. That scheme is somewhat popular in the Civil Service, namely: That instead of getting a retiring allowance, there should be a certain life insurance. But this again did not meet the case. The object of Parliament was to provide for those men who were not efficient servants, in order that there might be efficient men secured. You would not reach these cases by a system of life insurance, for, while the family would obtain the benefit in the event of the father's death, he would be turned out of the service without a shilling. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has devoted a good deal of time to the preparation of the statement which he has submitted to the House. Some of them, no doubt, are correct; but he must be mistaken, notwithstanding the emphatic manner in which he reasserted it after some doubt had been expressed on this side of the House, in his statement that 15 per cent. were superannuated on an average service of six and a-half years; that they paid \$2,900 and received \$6,000. That must be a mistake, because the Act strictly provides that an officer shall not be superannuated until he has served ten years, except for causes stated in this Bill, which in this particular is a repetition of the old Act, as follows:—

"If any person to whom this Act applies, is constrained from any infirmity of mind or body to quit the Civil Service before the period at which a superannuation allowance might be granted him, the Governor in Council may allow him a gratuity not exceeding one month's pay for