

granting any other class of the service, and in any case where the increase of \$120 is proposed, there will be deducted from that amount any partial consideration received by any class since 1924.

Mr. BENNETT: The actual increase in those classes would be \$5 a month?

Mr. RINFRET: This year, but \$20 a month since we began adjusting the salaries in 1924 or twice as much as any other class in the service will get. I cannot stress this point too much because it has been stated in some telegrams that the increase would only amount to \$42, which I do not think is a fair statement at all. Last year these men were granted a special consideration of \$18 which they would not have received this year, and therefore the amount added to their salaries is fully \$60, because the \$18 would not have been available anyway; it was the remnant of the bonus and would have disappeared. Again I take the stand that whatever consideration these men deserve and however hard their work, standing by this revision alone I claim that there is no class in the service getting more consideration than these very classes which complain.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister allow me to see if I have this right, in regard to the case of the letter carriers? If my information is correct, in 1921 the salary and bonus of a letter carrier totalled \$1,558, of which \$1,260 was salary and \$298 bonus. In June, 1924, when the revision took place, the figures became \$1,440 salary and \$18, the remnant of the bonus. The announcement made a few days ago that there was to be a flat increase of \$120, which of course is \$10 a month, gave the impression that railway mail clerks and letter carriers were to receive that amount, and I think the public generally were satisfied that that would be a reasonable increase under the circumstances, but the way the thing has worked out gives an actual increase to a letter carrier or mail clerk of only \$42 per annum or, as the telegrams received by hon. members show, about 78 cents per week. Naturally this is a tremendous disappointment to those classes of civil servants, and I think the minister should reconsider the question of the flat increase of \$10 per month which was originally proposed in this House, before we were aware of the limitations placed upon that proposal. I remember asking at the time if this proposed increase applied to letter carriers, and the intimation was that it did. Therefore we cannot wonder that that impression went forward from the statement made by the minister. In reality, however,

[Mr. Rinfret.]

the railway mail clerk or letter carrier receives only the somewhat insignificant increase of 78 cents per week, or \$42 per year. I think, Mr. Chairman, that that amount is too small to offer these civil servants at present. All they ask is a flat increase of \$10 per month, which would not involve any enormous sum of money, and which I think is justifiable under the circumstances. The whole increase could be paid out of the vote of half a million dollars which we passed last night for a building in Washington. I think these men are entitled to the consideration of this House and I hope the Secretary of State will reconsider this proposal in regard to that hard-worked class of officials, the railway mail clerks and letter carriers, and grant them the \$10 per month increase which they imagined they were going to get when the announcement was first made.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister—

Mr. RINFRET: I have not finished my statement yet. When I made the announcement to the House I gave a list of the exceptions, and exception (d) referred to those classes which were increased by \$180 per annum or more in the salary revision of 1924. I wish to point out to the leader of the opposition that they were so well aware of the fact that they were in that excepted class that wires were immediately received with reference to that paragraph. They may have expected \$120, but they certainly could not expect it from the statement I made in the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The statement was misunderstood, I grant that.

Mr. RINFRET: This is only a technical point anyway. I was just going to say when my hon. friend got up that we could not consider separately the increase that was granted these classes this year. We had to consider the cumulative increases that have been granted since 1924; and I insist again that in any other class where an increase has been granted, this will have to be deducted from the \$120 flat increase this year. So there is no discrimination at all in that respect, only to the extent that these special employees are getting twice as much through this revision as any other class in the service. May I point out, as I did in the case of the preceding class that there are other ways of improving the position of the men. Some may be reclassified, others may be promoted; there is no finality in adjustments of this kind. But as Secretary of State, having studied the prob-