

Mr. POTTIER: Following the remarks of the last speaker may I say that we have a number of those on the Atlantic coast. I think they are known as prevailing rate employees on the government boats. I think that from the stewards down they were not given the right to come under the superannuation act as amended a few years ago. I believe a number of representations have been made in their behalf, and they may now be given an opportunity of coming in. I gather from paragraph (b) of section 1 that the treasury board will be able to rule, if it wishes, that they be designated as individuals or classes who may be brought under the act. Would the minister when he replies refer to this?

Mr. MAYHEW: I have a case somewhat similar to that which has already been referred to, but it is a recent one. It is that of a gentleman who was an electrician and who retired at the age of sixty-five after having served for thirty years. I brought it to the attention of the department and I received from them the following reply dated the 13th of this month as follows:

I beg to advise you that Mr. Ward, as an electrician, is a temporary employee, and as such he cannot be brought under the superannuation act, there being no provision in the act to cover temporary employees.

This man had been working for the government for thirty years. He was retired at sixty-five. I bring this before the committee as a definite case, but it is by no means a peculiar one or different from many others that we have in the government employ particularly or in the public works department. Then there is one class that is employed at the dry dock in Victoria that I have been trying to get adjusted ever since I became a member. I thought I had become more or less of a nuisance. I have avoided mentioning it in the house before, because I hoped to get it properly adjusted; but a member, when he gets a letter like this saying that apparently because a man is an electrician and doing what might be called manual labour and employed by the month, even though he be employed for thirty years, he is still considered a temporary employee, becomes a little discouraged. I hope that such men will come under the act.

There is another matter to which I should like to refer—I do not know whether it is covered by the bill or not—namely, the adjustments of salaries of post office workers and those in the treasury board, particularly in the customs department. They have not had an adjustment since 1927. There was a commission known as the Beatty commission

which sat in 1929 and which recommended certain adjustments. But the hard years came on, 1930 and 1931, and that recommendation was set aside. There has been no adjustment in the salaries of those people since 1927. Is there anything in this bill to indicate that these men are to be taken care of?

Another class of people to which I should like to refer—I do not know whether they are covered in this bill—is that of men who pay into the fund for a certain number of years. I had the case of a man referred to me just last week. He had been in the civil service for six and a half years and had paid into a superannuation fund something like \$297 when he was obliged to retire on account of illness. The government refused to acknowledge the \$297 he had paid into the fund. Surely he is entitled to at least his money back after paying in for six and a half years.

Mr. McNIVEN: I notice in paragraph (b) of section 1 that there is a reference to a stated annual salary and that in subparagraph (i) of that particular paragraph there is another reference to salary as follows:

(i) is in receipt of salary computed at an annual rate of at least six hundred dollars.

I was wondering whether there was anything contemplated in the different language that is used in these two definitions. Will the minister deal with that angle when he is replying? Along with others may I urge the minister to see to it that the group of permanent temporaries who have been spoken of so frequently here to-night and yesterday shall be taken care of. I do not think we should pass this definition of civil servant until we are absolutely sure that that very large representative group of civil servants who have rendered excellent service over a long period of years are included in the benefits of this act.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It would seem that some hon. members are viewing this bill with a considerable degree of suspicion as to its purpose and what it can do. I can assure the hon. members that it was prepared in a sincere attempt to meet the reasonable representations that had been made by the officers of the various civil servant bodies, and that if it had not been the desire of the government to meet those representations and to give satisfaction to this class of citizens of Canada and to recognize their very efficient and patriotic service to the state, no bill would have been introduced. It was not prepared for the purpose of giving occasion to bring before the house any indefinite number of specific cases; it was intended to meet the situation which had been carefully considered by the officers