

city of Toronto will adopt the eight hour clause, and the wages prevailing in that district will be paid for that class of work.

Mr. LADNER: Last year a discussion took place between the minister and hon. members on this side of the house with regard to the question of letter carriers' salaries. I think the minister's attitude can be summed up in the statement that he was favourable to an adjustment of salaries of letter carriers in the lower amounts. He made the statement that he had made every effort to convince the Civil Service Commission that the salary increases were necessary, and his final statement was that the Civil Service Commission had turned down his plea for increased salaries, and that as a result he was powerless. Some hon. members on this side of the house thought he was not quite as powerless as his assertions would have indicated, and that the necessary legislation might have been passed.

I wish to place on Hansard a statement contained in a letter received by me which shows the point of view of a letter carrier in regard to the matter of salaries. I have not been authorized to use this statement, although the writer did not state that I should not do so.

Mr. VENIOT: What is the name of the author of the statement?

Mr. LADNER: I do not purpose to give that.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Chairman, it is not fair that statements of this kind should be put on record when the hon. gentleman says he will not give the name of the author. We are not in a position to know whether the person writing has knowledge of what he writes.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member will give his word.

Mr. VENIOT: No, no.

Mr. BENNETT: He will take the responsibility.

Mr. LADNER: The statement is not of a violent nature, and it is not intended to create trouble or to stir up prejudice.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not afraid of it.

Mr. LADNER: If the statements contained herein are not correct it will be the privilege of the minister to correct them. The opinions stated in the letter are in accord with my own ideas. The letter is, in part, as follows:

Letter carriers' work embraces all divisions of the manipulative postal service and yet letter carriers are rated much lower than those who work on only one division, and who are seldom if ever called upon to work without supervision, or to make decisions—

Mr. VENIOT: That has just been read by the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. MacLaren).

Mr. BENNETT: It shows unity of effort.

Mr. LADNER: If it has been read there is no use wasting the time of the house, but it is in the man's handwriting. I think I shall continue reading:

—or acts on their own initiative, all of which are a daily occurrence with the letter carriers, and when such are satisfactory, all is well, but when they turn out to be wrong, then the carrier is at fault, not the system. Again, as the last handling of mail between the government and all the public, the letter carrier must stand the blame for all mistakes which he fails to detect, no matter if the mistake be foreign or domestic in origin. It was submitted to the experts who classified the service in 1919 that the duties and responsibilities of letter carriers were greater and certainly more exacting than any other branch of the manipulative staff of the postal service. The carrier is the ambassador between the postal department and the public, and he performs in part all duties attached to the following classes in the department:

Has that been read?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, exactly the same.

Mr. STEVENS: Go on and finish reading it.

Mr. LADNER: It continues:

Registration clerk, record keeper, information clerk, C.O.D. parcel and insurance collector, stamp vendor, inquiry clerk, adviser to the department, and financial collector to the department and business houses. Additional duties have been recently imposed, such as delivery of householders, cartons, et cetera, which largely increase his burdens. The letter carrier is the only man in the postal service who acts as a combination post office and information bureau. Yet he is rated considerably lower than other branches of the postal service who perform but one duty with less responsibility. In 1924 Hon. Charles Murphy, Postmaster General, requested the Civil Service Commission to increase the salary of letter carriers to a maximum of \$1,560. The commission granted a maximum of \$1,440 and cut off the bonus, which was a reduction in place of an increase. The result that followed was another strike of some duration in several of the larger post offices. In 1928 the Hon. P. J. Veniot, Postmaster General, recommended to the Civil Service Commission an increase of salary for letter carriers. The commission again refused the request but added \$60 to the \$1,440, making the maximum \$1,500.

During the past session in parliament the Postmaster General recommended to the commission a further increase in salary for letter carriers, and this request the commission refused to consider, and the present Postmaster General is reported in Hansard as making the statement on the floor of the House of Commons that had the letter carriers been properly classified in 1919 they would now be drawing a salary that would make them contented.

Why do the commission reject these recommendations? The answer is that powers, under