

with his resignation. They have been brought down and I have that return here. I do not wish to take up the time of my hon. friend to any great extent, but I wish to point to the case of Henry Goodrick as an example. Goodrick had been three years letter-carrier in Westmount. Westmount is an important municipality near Montreal and a sub-station. There never has been any complaint against him of any kind. In Westmount there is a very large mail. At the time I got the information I am now referring to, there were only five letter-carriers. There is a considerable population, there is considerable mail and it has been positively asserted to me that the number of five letter-carriers is quite insufficient to distribute the mail within the time assigned for these letter-carriers. They have delivered the mails time and again, as I am informed, up to ten o'clock at night by lamplight and as an instance of the overcrowding of the mails in that locality, and of the insufficiency of the delivery staff, I may say that mails arriving at Westmount on the 27th December were detained in part and delivered only on the 3rd of February following. On the 12th February of this year Goodrick was removed from Westmount where he had been for three years during which time his conduct had been perfect, and during which time he had been living in the neighbouring municipality of Mount Royal Vale. He was removed to Point St. Charles without any reason being assigned to him therefor. There appears to be no reason in this letter that I have before me. Goodrick was ill. I refer to papers Nos. 33, 34, 27, 29, 30, 31 and 32. From these documents produced I find that he furnished a satisfactory certificate given by a licensed practitioner, Dr. Day, as to the cause of his absence which was the serious illness with which he was afflicted and which appears to have been caused in part by over work. That certificate was placed in the hands of the postmaster, but his salary was not given to him for the time during which he was absent. What better proof could the postmaster have of the cause of the absence of this man than the certificate of a respectable doctor of the locality showing the grave nature of the illness with which he was afflicted. About a month after Goodrick had been removed from Westmount to Point St. Charles, an inquiry was held into the cause of dissatisfaction that might exist against him. He had asked for an investigation, he had inquired as to the cause of his removal which under the circumstances appeared to him to be more or less of a disgrace. In the month of April Mr. Beausoleil, the postmaster of Montreal, instituted an inquiry. He made an investigation, to which Goodrick was not a party and of which he was not notified, into the report unfavourable to him which had been made by the postmistress of Westmount.

Mr. MONK.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend but I want to ask him whether he thinks this is the proper occasion to discuss a question of this kind, because it is quite impossible for me to take it up now. I have none of my officers here. We are now discussing a Bill to amend the Post Office Act, and if the hon. gentleman wants to discuss a matter involving departmental action the proper time would be when we are considering the estimates, and when I would have my officers here to inform me of the facts. He is now undertaking to make an ex parte statement, an extreme one, and one which is incapable of explanation at the present time. Surely his own sense of propriety will tell him whether this is a proper occasion or not. It can be productive of no good on this occasion..

Mr. MONK. The question of the pay of the officers of the department and the particular question of allowing pay to those who are ill is a question under which the discussion of Goodrick's case comes up.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think it is quite out of order.

Mr. MONK. There are several sections of this Bill bringing up the question of the pay of superior officers and my contention is that sufficient consideration is not given to the minor officers of the department. It is possible that my hon. friend the Postmaster General may not have the officers of the department here to assist him but I have only a few words more to say in reference to Mr. Goodrick's case, and my hon. friend can have the statement which I have made and explain it when the opportunity seems suitable to him. This ex parte investigation by the postmaster was conducted a month after the removal of Goodrick from the walk upon which he had been engaged, and although he was an old employee of the department and although this investigation was one to which he must be a party he received no notice whatever of it. Under these circumstances I think there is proof in this very return that whilst my hon. friend the Postmaster General is anxious to secure proper treatment for the superior officers of his department those in minor positions are not given sufficient attention. Of course, as the hon. Postmaster General said, there is no special knowledge required by a letter-carrier, but it is a position of trust of responsibility and of hard work, and if a man has been in that position for six, seven or ten years he is entitled to as much consideration as any other men of the civil service. In conclusion I find from this return that ample proof was given of the illness from which this man suffered. He was removed without cause being indicated to him from Westmount to Point St. Charles and an investigation ex parte was started