

Act altogether. Now, from that construction I expressly dissent, and dissent most strongly. In the first place, I ask the hon. gentleman to look at his own Act. So far from these people being inspectors or superintendents by virtue of former Acts, the office did not exist at all and has no statutory status whatever. Let us see what section 120 says:

The Governor in Council may appoint to such branch an officer to be called "The Controller of the Railway Mail Service of Canada" together with such superintendents, railway mail clerks, transfer agents and other employees as are deemed necessary; and such controller, superintendents, railway mail clerks, transfer agents and other employees may be appointed from among persons now in the civil service.

It is thus entirely a new office and not an old office. Why, the very wording of the hon. gentleman's Bill destroys his contention.

And, in such event, such appointments shall not, within the meaning of "The Civil Service Superannuation Act" or any other Act, be regarded as new appointments, but shall be regarded as mere transfers from one branch of the civil service to another.

Language could not make it clearer. It is entirely a new branch of the service. The duties performed under the previous section are not the duties they were liable to perform under the previous state of affairs at all, but the hon. gentleman has constituted a new and extraordinary office. If these officers are to be protected, they must be protected by statute, and if there is going to be a satisfactory administration of this Act, their duties must be defined by statute or else the substitutory course taken of authorizing the Governor in Council to make regulations.

Mr. MILLS. If the superintendent relieves, as I understand he does, the post office inspector of some of his work, and a superintendent is taken from the service, there must of necessity be some work left undone by the superintendent in his former capacity. Then there will be a vacancy which must be filled and will consequently entail an increase of the number of officers. If the inspector is relieved from a portion of his work and that portion is done by the superintendent, and the superintendent is taken from the service, somebody must fill the superintendent's place, and this is all at the discretion of the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General may go outside of the service to get the superintendents. The word "may" in this section when it applies to the Postmaster General cannot, by any manner of means, be interpreted as meaning "shall," but he may go outside of the employees of the service to get some one to fill the position of superintendent. I cannot see how that coincides with what the Postmaster General tells us that there is to be no increase of officers. The officers must be in-

creased if this Act is carried out. Now, as regards the number of the superintendents, I suggest that the country be divided into districts. The Postmaster General says that, according to the constitution of the service, that cannot be well accomplished. I cannot see, if Canada cannot be divided into districts, why the number of superintendents cannot be defined and regulated, so that there will not be too many. I look with suspicion on this measure, and I shall tell the committee why. It looks to me as if it created a sort of congestion of power into the hands of one man, and taking into consideration the fact that in section 3, which will come up for discussion later, the word "four" is struck out in the second line of section 61 of the Postal Act, and the word "eight" substituted, which is an increase of time, this congestion of power and increase of time looks to me as if this Bill were on the same line as laws we passed recently in the province of Nova Scotia. In that province there was passed recently a Railway Act called "the Railway Development Act" or some such name, which gave power to the executive of that province, not only to bonus a road, but also to incorporate it without going to Parliament at all. All the applicants for incorporation have to do is to go to the executive and convince them that a road between certain points is necessary, and they have the financial ability the executive have power to incorporate that road at once, and not only incorporate it but bonus it at the rate of \$3,200 per mile, without going to Parliament at all. This Bill looks very much like these Nova Scotia Acts. Then in Nova Scotia, at the very last session, they extended the duration of Parliament from four years to five years. Instead, therefore, of having an election every four years as formerly, they need only have a general election every five years. It is just as if instead of having a mail contract to last only five years, Parliament shall provide that it shall continue eight years. There was a great cry against the late Government for renewing contracts after the four years had expired, which is their limit of duration under the law. Now, however, when a contract is passed, it will last, by this amendment, not four years but eight years. It is on account of these things that I look with suspicion on this Bill and with that suspicion that amounts to certainty on clause 2 and 3.

In clause 5 there is an element which I am inclined to favour. I think myself that the railway mail service of Canada is of sufficient importance to have it stand separate and apart from the postal service of Canada, but I am inclined to criticise considerably the details of clause 5, and I am of opinion that it would be in the public interest if the Postmaster General would allow the Bill to stand until next session and not force it upon the House at this late stage. The department will suffer no in-