

against him a month later, the result of which investigation was communicated to the department. I contend that he was entitled to an investigation and to the opportunity of answering the charges made against him by the postmistress of Westmount and by some other letter-carrier who had made a report unfavourable to him. He asked for an investigation. He received none. My hon. friend can take communication of the return brought down and of the remarks which I have made already in respect to Mr. Goodrick's case, and I am sure he will find that Goodrick, although he has tendered his resignation since he has found that he cannot obtain justice from his immediate superior and from the department, is entitled to an investigation even now and my hon. friend should grant the investigation that has been applied for.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) referred to the wage paid to letter-carriers as being \$2.25 a day. I understand that under the Act there are three or four different grades. A few days ago I met a letter-carrier on the street in Toronto, a man whom I have known for a number of years. He has been in the employ of the Post Office Department as a letter-carrier for at least ten years, and I think he said fifteen years—I am not sure. He has been engaged in that capacity for ten years at any rate. He said that he was getting \$1.60 a day. I know him to be a very good man, a worthy man in every sense. He cited an instance of another man who was appointed only five years ago and who was getting \$2.25 a day. Would the Postmaster General say who does the grading?

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. If the hon. gentleman will give me the particulars with the names of two officers, I will give him full information, and I am sure he will find there is a satisfactory explanation.

Mr. KEMP. Who does the grading of letter-carriers?

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. They are graded by Act of parliament.

Mr. KEMP. Yes, but I was under the impression that it could be done outside an Act of parliament, that is not right.

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. A letter-carrier when appointed enters in grade 'A.' The statute provides when he may be transferred to grade 'B' and to another grade, and in every case a man is transferred unless he has done something to disqualify himself for promotion. Of course the postmasters in each city are anxious to recommend men for promotion and the promotions stimulate officers to perform better services. If a letter-carrier does not get promotion, it is his own fault.

Mr. KEMP. It is in the hands of the postmaster?

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand from the Postmaster General that if a letter-carrier elects to come under the provision of this new Act, chapter 28 of the Statutes of 1902, he does not lose the superannuation to which he was entitled under the Act of 1882-3 if he entered under that Act?

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. I have tried to make it as clear as possible, by reading the statute. When an Act says that nothing in that Act shall affect the status of an officer under some other law, how can the new law operate in conflict with what it expressly provides?

Mr. CLARKE. That is true, I must admit that; but I laboured under the impression that if the letter-carriers accepted the provisions of the hon. gentleman's Act, they barred themselves from the advantages of the Superannuation Act of 1882-3. I think a great many of the letter-carriers also were under that impression.

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. When the Bill of 1902 was under discussion, my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) whom I see in his place, put this question to me, and I read the section dealing with it. That hon. member acquiesced in the sufficiency of the words for he made no answer after I read them.

Mr. HAGGART. If the letter-carrier accepts the provisions of the new Act does he not abandon all rights which he had under the old Act?

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. No.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand he abandons none of them. The law of 1902 provides for five grades. These men may be graded down again.

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. Yes, so may any officer.

Mr. CLARKE. Suppose that an officer has been graded down, and that he has been paying into the superannuation fund the required percentage of the salary paid in a higher grade than the one to which he is reduced; and suppose that he has been reduced from grade 'E' to 'C.' In grade 'E' he would receive \$2.25 per day, but in grade 'C' \$1.75 per day. When such a man comes to be superannuated, under what grade would he receive his superannuation allowance? He may have been paying under the higher grade into the superannuation fund for years, but at the time of his superannuation he may be in the lower grade.

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. It is quite competent for the Governor General in Council to lower the status of any civil servant.