

Civil Service Superannuation

Mr. ROBB: My understanding is—and I am bound to say that I am speaking only from memory—that the other schemes will be merged with this one. There are now a certain number under the other schemes. It will be a matter for the civil servants themselves to consider; I understand that they are willing that all shall be merged. The memo I have is that if all transfer, the annual cost to the country in respect of future service will be \$1,435,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister say that the total civil service list of Canada comprises a pay-roll of only \$28,000,000?

Mr. ROBB: I have not figured it up. That is the memorandum I have from the Superintendent of Insurance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not looked it up for some time, but I think the minister is wrong there—

Mr. ROBB: We can thresh that out in committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —I think he is not only wrong, but very far wrong.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister tell us how it is proposed to handle this? For example, we are told that all classes of civil servants will be included. Of course it would not apply to military pensions; they are not in the nature of superannuation. But apart from the military pensions there are a large number of military superannuations. Would they be brought under this scheme?

Mr. ROBB: I would not think so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They would be kept out. Then we have the judicial superannuations; would they be brought in?

Mr. ROBB: I would not think so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Again, we have the old scheme which has not yet run out, in connection with which there is, I think, a balance of \$1,200,000 odd. On what basis will that be brought in? How can it be brought in? Can the minister give us some general idea as to how we can bring into a new scheme which has no balance to its favour a fund to which the civil servants have been contributing in the past for a large number of years, and now have as a trust fund standing in their favour and amounting, if my memory is right, to \$1,200,000 odd?

Mr. ROBB: It can only be brought in by the government appropriating an amount equal to the amount that is in those funds now.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is what I would think. So that, in addition to the charge of \$1,435,000 there would also be an initial payment equal to the sum which is now to the credit of the civil servants in those funds.

Mr. ROBB: A book-keeping payment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would really be more than merely book-keeping. It would be an obligation.

Mr. ROBB: It would be an obligation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: An obligation just as real as those Canadian National Railway bonds; it would be something real. My hon. friend says it should be doubled. Why doubled? Would it not depend upon the ratio between those already covered by the existing schemes and those coming into the new scheme? I would not think you could handle it by the rough-and-ready way of doubling the balance.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend might be right about that. There is Superannuation Fund No. 1., with 614 contributors, and salaries of \$1,443,668; and Superannuation Fund No. 2 with 189 employees, and salaries of \$416,980. The total of the Retirement Fund approximates, \$12,000,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think the mere rule-of-thumb of doubling the figures would work.

Mr. ROBB: The committee will thresh all that out.

Mr. STEVENS: Before this resolution goes out of the committee, there is one point that I think should be considered. If I am not mistaken the legislation based upon this resolution must conform with the resolution in principle. Now the resolution only provides for the introduction of a measure: First, to provide superannuation, second, to provide for contributions by civil servants; and third, to provide for payments out of the consolidated revenue fund, and so forth. But the resolution does not provide that under the new system to be inaugurated by the bill there shall be power to consolidate any of the old funds. I do not think it should be made obligatory, because those interested ought to have some option in the matter; but at least there ought to be provision in the bill making it optional. Now the question is whether this resolution is broad enough to provide for that contingency.

Mr. ROBB: I think it is intended to be.

Mr. STEVENS: But it is not, if I understand the procedure correctly. As I understand it, you cannot introduce a principle in-