

had been drawing a salary of \$1,600 per annum. I think he was superannuated at \$1,400 per annum, and he is living to-day, hale and hearty.

Hon. Mr. MACINNES (Burlington)—The Government cannot possibly superannuate improperly any officer without breaking the law, so that the Government are liable to be pulled up if they do so. I had occasion to look into the civil service superannuation question about ten years ago, and I found that so far as the practice of superannuating improperly was concerned the sin lay at the door of the Mackenzie Government quite as largely as at the door of the present Government.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—I do not see that it would be at all profitable to enter into that discussion now, but if the hon. gentleman would like a few facts in connection with the record of his own party, I am quite prepared to give them to him. I do not propose at the present moment to defend every act of ours, although I think we have been just about as perfect as could be expected of human beings under the circumstances, but I have a list here that would rather astound the hon. gentleman, of superannuations from 1874 to 1878. However, I do not desire to enter into that question, because it is not pertinent to the subject, and would only lead to acrimonious political debate, which I know hon. gentlemen would desire to avoid as much as possible. It does not always follow that the full amount of the superannuation which is paid annually is actually a charge upon the public funds, for this reason—speaking of my own department, which may be a little egotistical—in the large cities where you superannuate a gentleman who is receiving probably \$2,000 a year, the next officer under him would be appointed probably at \$1,600, and taking the different grades down, men would be appointed at lower salaries, so that when you come to balance the account it is not really as onerous a tax as appears on the face of it. That is one of the points to which I forgot to allude when I was addressing the House before. If the hon. gentleman had read the debates of the House of Commons he would have been—I was going to say better instructed—because I furnished tables to show, taking the city of Quebec as an illustration, that where I superannuated two

or three officials some of the positions were not filled at all, and others were filled at a lower salary, so that when you put the saving in salaries against the amount paid to the superannuated officers, there is an actual gain to the revenue, while taking the statement as it appears in the Auditor-General's and the Receiver-General's Report, it would appear as if just the amount charged to the superannuated fund had been added to the expenses of the country. I do not say that that is the case all the time. There may have been improper superannuations, but if so, I think I am safe in saying that the sin and iniquity of such work does not lie altogether on the shoulders of the present Government. I hope under the new law, whoever may be in power will carry it out more rigidly than in the past.

Hon. Mr. READ (Québec)—I think this Bill is a very great improvement, because we know the enormities of the old system, and we know also where people who had paid for a length of time into the fund happened to pass off, their families were not in any way provided for. This is a great improvement on the existing state of affairs.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—While I admit that this Bill is a great improvement on the present superannuation law, the principle of superannuation is entirely wrong, and I entirely dissent from the views expressed by the hon. members from Halifax and Québec. I believe that superannuation is a fraud. I see no good reason why a civil servant should become a pensioner on the Treasury of Canada. They are paid as much and in most instances a great deal more than they would get in any other calling or position in the country. They would not remain twenty-four hours longer in the civil service than they could help if they could get better positions outside. I think they are well paid, and this only encourages them to live, not only up to, but in many instances beyond, their income, and the quicker the Government of Canada, I do not care whether it is Grit or Tory, wipe that law off the Statute-books, the more independent and self-reliant the civil servants of this country will become. I do not see why they should be superannuated any more than clergymen, school-teachers and others who are advancing the material and moral welfare of the country. I am totally opposed to superan-