

*Civil Service Superannuation*

who are not permanent but are temporary and may or may not be on prevailing rates. They need not necessarily be permitted to enter the superannuation fund, but will have to contribute under the retirement allowance provision, so much being deducted from their pay, without assistance from the government. There is a provision in the bill in this regard which can be discussed when we come to the relevant sections, whereby, upon recommendation of the treasury board, they may be brought in either individually or as a class to partake of the privileges of the superannuation fund.

I would point out how unfair it is to have employees working side by side under different arrangements, with different rights and different privileges upon retirement. One matter which has come to my attention and to which I should like to refer is an illustration of other conditions of a similar nature. Many of our returned soldiers of the last war were privileged to secure employment under the soldier settlement board in 1919. In that branch of the government they were not entitled to become permanent employees or to partake of the privileges of the civil service superannuation fund, until that privilege was granted to them in 1932. They were then permitted to receive the benefits of the civil service superannuation fund upon the condition that they would pay into that fund what they would have been required to pay if they had been permanently employed since 1919. These sums have been deducted from their salaries since 1932 to meet the total payments which they would have made from 1919.

Another situation with them which I think is particularly undesirable at this time is that, even though they thereby get their superannuation arrears paid up to date, when the time comes for their retirement on superannuation it is governed by the ten-year period preceding their retirement. Yet in the government service at the present time are employees other than these returned soldiers who entered the service of the government prior to 1932—say, in 1923, 1924 or 1925—who were allowed to subscribe to the superannuation fund, and whose retirement allowance is measured on a five-year rather than on a ten-year basis. This means to say that their superannuation allowance is calculated upon an average of the last five years of their service to the crown. So that others who were not returned soldiers and entered the government service in 1923 or 1924 under different conditions have the advantage of the five-year period, whereas returned soldiers who came in in 1919 and were allowed in 1932 to participate

[Mr. Boucher.]

in the fund were placed on the ten-year basis. In my humble opinion that is discrimination. I believe it is definitely unjust, because it makes quite a bit of difference, particularly if civil servants earn promotion. If that promotion comes within the last few years, instead of close to ten years from the time of their superannuation, it makes a big difference in the amount of superannuation allowance they can get. I suggest that the government would be well advised to take this matter under review.

There is another matter which perhaps does not come exactly under this bill, but it certainly is pertinent to it, namely, that of temporary employees who remain for many years under the status of temporaries, although to all intents and purposes, other than that of statutory enactment, they are permanent employees, or their jobs are secure to them from year to year, and there is no definite reason to give why they should not be permanent.

The other matter to which I wish to make reference is that of classification. I do not think I should go into the subject of classification to-night, but I feel that it is something that we as a parliament should be very considerate about. The dominion experimental farm is located in my county. There are men working there as temporaries and classified as labourers who have been doing skilled work, even to the tune of building machines for particular purposes, doing particular handicrafts, having worked up a particular skill in these handicrafts in their years of employment. I believe they are still classified as labourers. If they had been working for an industry other than the government they would merit promotion by reason of their skill. They would have served their apprenticeship and would have qualified for that more advantageous classification and higher rank of pay and better benefits under the act. I do not wish to delay the house in giving second reading to the bill, but I felt that I should at least point out the two things in the civil service that should be attended to at this particular time.

In closing, I should like to urge that we as a parliament should clean our own house; we should thoroughly clean our own house by administering our own affairs with our own employees with the utmost fairness to give an example to the whole country to follow. I believe that it would be only a matter of giving the lead and it would help materially to advance a more human era than a material one. I am pleased indeed to give support to this bill in every way I can. I think the