

Mr. LAPOINTE: Two years ago. This work is costing a good deal less.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I think there has not been a revision in Ontario for many years.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Same way here.

Item agreed to.

To increase the salary of J. E. Tremblay, secretary-clerk to \$3,960, \$600.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is some more invasion of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In the Justice department, in order to get a promotion, a man has to be a lawyer. This is a special case of a very old employee who has given his services for a very long time, and I feel it my duty to propose this.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I certainly have nothing to say against Mr. Tremblay. He is an efficient man, but I do not know why he cannot abide by the Civil Service Act the same as anybody else.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He could not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose he could not get any more money.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He could not get a promotion as law adviser or chief adviser in the Justice department as he would have been able to do in some other department. He is not a lawyer and he is precluded from promotion. He is a valuable man as any one who has had anything to do with the Justice department knows, and I think it is only fair to grant this increase.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A valuable man.

Item agreed to.

Penitentiaries—

Kingston.. . . . .	\$419,000
St. Vincent de Paul.. . . . .	385,500
Dorchester.. . . . .	241,500
Manitoba.. . . . .	203,600
British Columbia.. . . . .	151,000
Alberta.. . . . .	3,000
Saskatchewan.. . . . .	245,000
General.. . . . .	1,400

\$1,650,000

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I would like to bring to the minister's attention in connection with this item a matter we have already discussed once or twice; that is the question of a few employees who have served a great many years in the penitentiary and who, if they elected to come in under the Superannuation Act, would have to put up more than they can possibly spare. For example, some of them would have to put up \$1,400 or \$1,500 in a bulk sum in order to qualify under the

[Mr. Meighen.]

Superannuation Act; or to qualify by payments from year to year, say ten, twelve or fifteen years; they would have to put up \$300 or \$400 a year. That is a hardship for men who have served 20 or 25 years. The situation with regard to these men is peculiar, in that while they have not been under the Superannuation Act, they have been in a position where they would get a gratuity; but that gratuity is also in a peculiar position in this way; that they might put in 25 or 26 years good, faithful service, and by some little slip would lose the whole gratuity which they believed had been accumulating for themselves or for their widows or children. I think there are two or three similar cases. For instance, there is now under item 398 an allowance for the widow of the late John L. Berrigan. He had served in the penitentiary for a very long time. He was taken ill, and died suddenly. His widow is now being given a compassionate allowance of about \$900, whereas had Mr. Berrigan lived he would have been entitled to \$1,800. There is also the case of another man who served a great many years; he would have been entitled to \$1,800 but while his papers were going through he died. I draw the minister's attention to the fact that to-night there was a small vote put through, item 489, in a similar case. If this can be done in one department, I think it should be done in another. In this case the widow gets \$3,240 gratuity as a matter of compassion, because her husband died while the papers for his superannuation were going through. I would like the minister to take into consideration these few old employees who must now lose superannuation or else be able to put up a bulk sum of \$1,400 or \$1,500. Could the minister not suggest to the commission that, as there is a gratuity now which would amount to about \$2,000 for these employees, about \$1,500 of that should be laid aside, to be contributed to the superannuation fund as their share, and permit them to share in the benefits of the fund?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As to the employees referred to, my hon. friend spoke to me about them, but I am afraid that under the law as it stands we cannot come to their assistance. They have everything they are entitled to. We are giving the children half of what the father would have been entitled to if he had resigned under the law. This is according to precedent, what had been paid by my predecessor in the department under similar circumstances. I think Mr. Doherty recommended this practice when he was in charge of the department.