

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—In what year?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I think that is 1896, there is relatively no very great change—Brantford, as I say, has a revenue of \$25,638, and the cost of managing the office is \$4,916, or 19 per cent of the amount of revenue collected. Now, Brantford is a city, it was not put upon the footing of cities, it was not dealt with by my hon. friend and those associated with him in the same way as Belleville, and my hon. friend, I suppose, had some reasons for dealing with Brantford in a way other than that in which he dealt with Belleville. Brantford has a larger population and does a very much larger business, and yet my hon. friend provided city regulation in respect to Belleville but he did not do so in respect to Brantford. Was my hon. friend and those associated with him actuated by political considerations and was it because a reformer represented the city of Brantford on that occasion? Will my hon. friend accept, or be willing to have attributed to him and those associated with him in office, the motives which he now attributes to the Postmaster General? Let me take another case. In Brockville the amount of revenue collected was \$24,500. The cost was \$4,470 or 18 per cent of the revenue. Now, look at Belleville. Belleville has a revenue of \$16,235 (or the next year \$17,000) and the cost in 1896 was \$8,827 nearly double the amount that it cost in Brantford where the population was nearly half greater and where the revenue was sixty per cent greater. Now, will my hon. friend say there is any justification for such an expenditure in connection with the post office in Belleville, that it should cost more than one-half the revenues that were collected, while the city of Brantford cost only nineteen per cent of the revenues collected? Why was it necessary to make those special provisions in the city of Belleville and not make corresponding provisions in the city of Brantford? Let me take another case, the city of Guelph. That city was allowed by my hon. friend's government to stand in the position of a town. He did not make those regulations which he says, cities are entitled to; he did not deal with Guelph as he did with Belleville. The revenues of Guelph are \$5,000 a year more than those of Belleville, and the cost of the post office in Guelph was \$5,000 a year,

while the cost of the post office in Belleville is \$9,079 in the past year. Will my hon. friend say there is any justification for that? My hon. friend, of course, is a citizen of Belleville; he is interested largely in Belleville, and, perhaps, if I were to ask for the true explanation of this state of things, I would say that my hon. friend yielded to pressure in meeting the wishes of friends from his good nature rather than act in accordance with those business principles which he himself admits are of importance, and which ought to receive due consideration when this subject is being dealt with. Now, I come to the city of St. Thomas. The city of St. Thomas has a population of about 10,000, and collects a revenue of nearly \$4,000 a year more than Belleville, at a cost of \$4,900, as against \$9,079 in Belleville. Then, take the city of St. Catharines. The revenue there is somewhat less than it is in Belleville—not very much; there is less than \$2,000 difference between them, and yet the cost of managing the post office in the city of St. Catharines is only \$3,560, as against the \$9,079 in Belleville. My hon. friend will see that there is no justification for the continuance of that state of things in Belleville. There were reasons why action should be taken at once in Belleville, and, therefore, my hon. friend the Postmaster General undertook to correct the state of things that existed there, and by that correction, he has saved to the public revenues of this country a very considerable sum of money.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Not much.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Over three thousand dollars. Let me take the next point of my hon. friend's argument, that is, the question of superannuation. My hon. friend says that the Superannuation Act is abused in this case. Let us see what the Superannuation Act provides for. It provides that when you retire parties after ten years service you shall superannuate them if they are no longer required, and if they have served less than ten years, then you shall grant a gratuity, and the amount of superannuation allowance and gratuity are both regulated by the Act. These are important matters, and the only question is whether the Postmaster General was justified in making the reform which he effected in the