

list at present is \$468; but owing to the number of years that have been added to the service of these men, the country is now paying annually \$8,494.00 more than it should be required to pay under the terms of the Act. The average annual increase of payment on account of this fund since its inception, has been \$12,141.41. The entire sum paid out since the introduction of the Act, is \$1,108,539.40; and the entire sum contributed by the Civil Service has been \$526,876.62, leaving \$581,662.78 as an absolute loss to this country, by the operation of this system during twelve years. The next point I desire to call the attention of the House to is the average salary paid. Of course, it is said that these people, having been in the service of the country so long, and receiving only a moderate salary, should be provided with something in the shape of a retiring allowance in the event of their becoming incapacitated from discharging the duties devolving upon them. There are in the Department of Justice, fifteen, with an average salary of \$1,431; in the Department of the Secretary of State, there are forty-one, with an average salary of \$1,028; in the Department of the Interior eighty-eight, being five of an increase this year, with an average salary of \$1,172; in the Department of Indian Affairs, thirty-two, with an average of \$978; in the Auditor-General's Department, eighteen, with an average of \$1,066; in the Finance Department, forty-six, with an average of \$1,262; in the Inland Revenue Department, twenty-eight, with an average of \$1,275; in the Customs Department, twenty-nine, an increase of three this year, with an average of \$1,136; in the Post Office Department, 161, an increase of thirty-nine this year, with an average, of \$876; in the Department of Agriculture, forty-two, an increase of nine this year, with an average of \$1,205; in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, thirty, an increase of five, with an average of \$1,166; in the Department of Public Works, thirty-two, an increase of ten, with an average of \$1,294; in the Department of Railways and Canals, twenty-seven, an increase of one, with an average of \$1,601. The average salary of the entire staff is \$1,191, and the total increase this year, 118. My reason for giving the average salaries in the several Departments is this: Of course, the reason why the superannuation system is kept in force is, as I have already said, that it is thought desirable, on the part of the Government, that some retiring allowance should be made for those people after they have labored for a considerable time in the service of the country. My reason for making an average of the salaries is to show that those gentlemen receive in return for their services, annually, salaries as large, if not in excess, of those usually paid to bank clerks, clerks in wholesale houses, school teachers, or any other class. I do not think there is any other class better paid than the Civil Service. Under these circumstances, I think it would be only right that those people should be required to provide for themselves out of the very liberal allowance they get, in place of their being made a charge on the country. From what I have gathered from the operation of the Act, the Civil Service rather take the position of being heirs or sons of an estate than servants. It appears that, once a man becomes a servant of the country, he has a right to expect—in fact, the Government admit he is entitled to be supported by the State for the balance of his life. Should anything happen to him he has to be provided for. I think this is a very wrong principle. We have a right to expect when a man is hired to discharge any duty in connection with the Department in which he is employed, that he should be engaged on the distinct understanding that so long as he efficiently and faithfully discharges his duty he can reasonably expect to hold the position, but that when he fails to do that he must expect to be dismissed. That is the rule in the case of banks, and all other cases, and I think it is wrong that the public should be led to suppose that because a man is placed

on the list of the Civil Service he must count on being provided for during the balance of his life, as if he were an heir or a son. I find in this list there are sixty-one Deputy-Heads of Departments and assistant clerks that get an average of \$2,640.00. My reason for putting the question I did, in the first place, with regard to the report of the Civil Service, was to find out on what grounds the hon. Minister would attempt to show that the operations of this Act were advantageous to the country, and that the report was correct. I took the opportunity myself to examine into the working of the Act. I took two or three cases as an illustration. In the first place, if you take the case of John Wilson of the Inland Revenue Department, you will find he was superannuated the 1st March, 1872, when he was drawing \$900 per year, and he was granted a retiring allowance of \$193.72. He lived eight years and four months during which time he drew a total of \$1,656. Had he remained that time in the service he would have drawn \$7,500, thus leaving a difference between the two of \$5,844. In his case the office was closed and no one appointed to take his place, and the Civil Service report declared that the country made \$5,844 by superannuating him when he was not wanted and from an office that was not refilled. If a business man were to adopt this system, and in the event of his failing, bring before his creditors a report stating that by the removal of certain clerks whom he had hired, and who had nothing to do, he not only saved say \$400 a year—but that he had made a clear profit during that year of \$400—I fancy such a statement would be laughed at. On the 1st of March, 1872, E. D. Scott, when he was getting \$1,400 a year, was superannuated on an allowance of \$380.80. He lived nine years and four months, in which time he drew a total of \$3,551.13. Had he remained in office all the time, he would have drawn \$13,066. Deduct from that the amount he drew as retiring allowance, and you have a balance of \$9,511.87. That is another case in which the Civil Service report cited as a case in which the country made \$9,511.87 by removing this man, and not putting another in his place. I do not think any gentleman who carefully examines the basis on which those calculations were made, would risk his reputation for intelligence and accuracy and careful calculation, by saying that they are based on a proper, equitable, fair, and just calculation. I was surprised to find the names I did of the gentlemen attached to that report of the Civil Service. In the next place, I find that all those in the Civil Service drawing a salary of \$1,000 a year have to pay 2 per cent. of that salary towards the fund. Now, I hold it would be more in the interest of the Civil Service of this country if that 2 per cent. was set aside at interest and that the sum should remain at their credit, to be drawn out when they left the service. I think it would be more just to the service than the system now in force. From my examination of those on the retired list, I have come to the conclusion—which I think will be concurred in by every member of this House—that a great many have been taken into the service who never ought to have been admitted, and that, in order to get rid of inefficient servants, they have been superannuated; and the result is that the faithful and efficient servants who have discharged their duties well for a number of years, are called upon to pay a certain sum annually out of their salary in order to provide for those who never ought to have been admitted to the service. I believe great injustice is thus done to the efficient servants; and that if the question of the continuation of this system were submitted to a vote of the service to-morrow, they would reject it and prefer some system of insurance. I do not mean, for a moment, to say that those who are now in the employ of the country and have contributed toward the fund, should not be permitted, if they choose, to reap any advantages they may be entitled to draw from the fund at some future time when they may become unable to discharge their duties. I am