

# THE CIVILIAN

VOL. V.

MAY 17, 1912.

No. 2

## Would Superannuation Pay ?

Is it in the best interests of the people of Canada that a well-devised scheme of superannuation for civil servants should be placed on the statute books? The answer is yes, provided such a law will make for efficiency in the service body and economy in administration, and provided nothing else can be substituted therefor which will result in greater efficiency and economy. While much has been said on both sides of the question, the fact remains that in practically every civilized country (and in some which we sometimes think scarcely civilized) those responsible for efficiency and economy in civil service administration have replied by maintaining on their statute books superannuation schemes for their employees. While it is possible that some other arrangement might be made to attain this desired end, human ingenuity has not yet fallen upon it, and until some better arrangement is devised the only reasonable and sensible course to follow is that which is known, which has been proven, to be the best.

Those who oppose superannuation in their zeal for efficiency and economy—principally the latter—do so out of ignorance of the civil service system. The greatest source of inefficiency and consequent over-expenditure in the civil service is the retention of aged employees in the service at full pay long after their usefulness has fallen far below what the standard ought to be. There is simply no help for this without a scheme of superannuation. Mr. H. D. Brown in his report to the U. S. Government says: "The majority of executive officials are undoubtedly too tender-hearted to dismiss a subordinate whose only faults are attributable to his weight of years. The result is that he is allowed to remain, quite unfit to perform all his duties, practically a pensioner, and the work he is unable to do is divided among the younger clerks." But it may be said why not have a law requiring the dismissal of employees when they become unable to properly perform their duties through weight of years? The fact is they have such a law in the United States, but everyone brought up under democratic institutions knows that a law cannot be enforced when it imposes hardships on innocent individuals and produces results which are repugnant to human instincts.

During the last session of Parliament a member of the House called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that one of the elevatormen was so old and shaky that he was unable to do his work properly, that people were afraid to risk themselves in the elevator with him. What did the Minister of Public Works say? "I never dismissed a man on account of old age. I will have to see what can be done." Did any Opposition member take up the matter in the interests of efficiency and economy? Rather not. Did any city paper refer to the Minister's stand in any other than a commendatory tone? Not so far as we are aware. On the other hand had the Minister dismissed the employee in ever so quiet a way, there can be little doubt that he would have brought down no little obliquity on his head. Opposition members, and members of his own ranks, too, would be only too ready to champion the cause of the fallen.