

should be seriously considered. That granted their expenditure of \$12,000,000 or \$14,000,000, or even \$20,000,000 or \$26,000,000 in the United States on rural mail delivery, they are not expending one dollar more in proportion to the total expenditure in the Post Office Department for rural mail delivery, with vast benefit to the people of the United States, than they are for the service and the convenience of the rest of the population. Then take the receipts. The postal receipts in the United States last year were \$143,000,000, one-sixth of that would be \$24,000,000. They have expended in the United States a matter of \$12,000,000 on the rural service being one-half the rate of expenditure elsewhere pointed out by the Postmaster General—and I hope our Postmaster General has read it carefully—they have vastly increased receipts from almost every source by reason of rural mail delivery. The mails are carried to every man's gate notwithstanding the idea of cross roads which the hon. gentleman put forward. Wherever a route is established the service is carried, and the necessity of each man going to a rural post office is dispensed with. The letters are deposited there for him and he deposits the letters that he wants to have mailed, not only to the country generally, but even to his neighbour. The man registers a letter with the carrier, he can get a registered letter from the carrier, the carrier will take a letter to any person within a mile of the route on the payment of an additional postage, or a money order, or a money parcel, for a postage of eight cents. The whole service has been estimated as costing an average of eight cents a mile, and the proportionate revenue from these 13,000,000 people is not less than \$24,000,000. So if you take the total expenditure which is contemplated in the current fiscal year in the United States, you will find that the system will be self sustaining. There were several other minor matters that the Postmaster General referred to, but I will not take time to reply to them. He talks of a protest, and makes insinuations against the honesty and integrity of the Congress of the United States. Why would not the members of Congress of the United States, as members of parliament here, be heard in protest if there is anything that is wrong, just as we voice our protest against this government when it does wrong? It may be, as the Postmaster General says, that they were silenced; but for my part I believe there is as much honesty and integrity among the people of the United States, man for man, as there is in other countries; and if there were in the United States this giant wrong, this hydro-headed monster which the minister spoke of, we would hear a protest raised against it by the public men and people of the United States.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. FOSTER. I had not the pleasure of being in the House when the Postmaster General finished his remarks. I had hoped that the Postmaster General would have given us a concise statement of what the results have been in the United States, not only in extension of the delivery and of the routes, and the increased cost of that extension, but also, if the Postmaster General's reports in the United States give the data for it, and I imagine they do, to find out what had resulted from this movement, so that we could have had both sides of the account so far as it could be given, and know how it stood financially, as to whether with the large extension and large increase in the expenses for these routes as extended, there was also a corresponding increase, in revenue and what the total amount collected out of this rural delivery route amounted to, so that we could trace a comparison between the expenditures and receipts. Now I think, though I am not expressing any opinion on the advisability of introducing rural delivery into Canada, still this much is true: The people of the United States who live alongside of us are making very extensive, and I will admit, some very expensive experiments in rural delivery. They have gone from 1897 to 1905 and 1906 and have increased the expenditures very largely, showing that they are not playing with the matter, the indications going to prove that they are going to make still larger operations, and it looks as if they intended to make it permanent in the United States. Now it is impossible for us in Canada living alongside of the United States and finding the farmers and the people living on the other side of the line having all these advantages of rural delivery and free delivery—I say it is impossible for our people here to be content unless there is some earnest attempt made to collate the facts, and if it does not involve too great an expenditure, to give to the farmers and dwellers in rural sections of Canada the same advantages that the rural populations have in the United States of America. The hon. Postmaster General will see what I mean; that an experiment of that kind cannot be carried on for a series of years and which is at present going on as if they intended to make it a permanent advantage and privilege to the people of the United States without the people in Canada demanding the very same thing. We will find that we will have to give this to the people of Canada provided it can be done without too great an expense in proportion to the added revenue which will come from the extension. However, I had hoped that the hon. Postmaster General would have been able to give us a concise and comprehensive statement as to both sides of the question, as to what the added revenues were as con-