

vassing the situation, and I wish to help the government to get through so that we may be sure to have prorogation to-morrow. I wonder if you, Mr. Chairman, would permit the minister to outline the work we have yet to do.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It was my intention before adjournment to-night, slightly before midnight, to ask the house to meet at 10.30 o'clock in the morning. The items still undisposed of are: finance, nineteen items; insurance, two items; legislation, which is a non-controversial matter, about ten items; munitions and supply, just two formal items which are not controversial; national defence, mostly routine amounts for militia pensions and so on, which are not contentious; national war services, one item; post office, six items, which we are taking up now; reconstruction, three items; national revenue, eight items, and the supplementaries in all departments. That is the whole list.

Mr. BRACKEN: I wonder if the leader of the government would permit my making a suggestion. I have canvassed the situation, and I think there is an inclination on the part of hon. members on this side of the house to try to get through. There may be someone over there who might wish to continue the discussion after to-morrow, but we would like to help the government to get through. I suggest that we go on to-night until 11.30 o'clock; then we come in at eleven o'clock to-morrow morning and plan to take one hour for lunch. I think there is a general disposition to assure the government that we shall be through here not later than five o'clock. One cannot speak for everybody, but I think there is an inclination to do that. Would that be acceptable?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I think that is a most reasonable suggestion. We will adjourn to-night at 11.30 p.m. and come back to-morrow at eleven a.m. We would have only one hour for lunch to-morrow and finish about four or five o'clock in the afternoon for prorogation.

Mr. BRACKEN: Not later than five o'clock. I hope I have not spoken out of turn.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: We will do our best. This group has not any long speeches to make. If government followers do not make long speeches, I think we could get through by that time.

Item agreed to.

234. Railway mail service, \$14,651,279.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I should like to bring to the attention of the minister the case respecting railway mail clerks with which I have no doubt he is already

[Mr. McLure.]

familiar. These men are the highest class of manipulative workers in the post office department, and they consider they are being discriminated against. I should like to place their case before the minister.

On July 1 of last year post office workers who were receiving sub-standard wages quite properly got an increase ranging from \$120 to \$180 a year, while railway mail clerks got only \$60, thus reducing the differential between ordinary post office workers and railway mail clerks.

I am also informed that railway mail clerks got mileage in their salaries, for the purpose of superannuation; but this did not represent any actual increase. I know that representations were made a year ago to the minister asking that the differential be reestablished. The answer always given is that this is in the hands of the civil service commission, and that until the commission reports nothing can be done about it. Could the minister give me a statement on the matter?

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Postmaster General): Of course, I have no more jurisdiction over these salaries than had my predecessor. The civil service commission regulates these things. However, I may tell my hon. friend that representations will be made very shortly on this point and, as soon as this session is over, I intend taking this matter up with my officials to see what we can do. The hon. member may know that we also have to do something about the war bonus.

I am not ready this evening to state exactly what we shall do. However, we want to be reasonable, and we are going to consider the matter.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I am glad to hear that the minister will do everything possible to reestablish the differential.

Mr. BENTLEY: The little city of Swift Current from which I come has been anxious for a long time to have a postal delivery service. Is the minister giving this matter serious consideration? If this were looked into, it would be greatly appreciated. Certainly all cities of that size have this service. It is difficult for many people to get down to the post office, and I should like to have a definite answer from the minister.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): We are inclined to give mail delivery to all cities in which the revenue is \$40,000 or more. We should like to give it wherever there are a sufficient number of citizens to justify our doing so. However, we have to follow certain rules. We ask that there be a net revenue of \$40,000, and that there be at least 2,000 points of call in order to employ our men.