

Maguire of Toronto. He has written in these terms to the editor of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*:

I thought you might find interesting the following extract from the Pro-Quidnunc column of the *Irish Times* of May 28—

What I am about to read is so devastating that it will shake this House out of its stone boots. The article states—and keep in mind that this is an Irish newspaper:

There's something odd, all right, about the postal services from Canada, and some support, perhaps, from Quidnunc's theory that they are beginning to send the stuff over to us by Indian canoe, instead of by air. As you'll remember, he noted last week that a letter from Stratford, Ont., posted on Dec. 5, did not arrive in Dublin until the middle of May.

Can you think of anything slower than that letter from Stratford to Dublin? The next paragraph reads:

Since then, five other correspondents have written in, recounting similar experiences. A letter from Toronto on Dec. 6, one from Montreal on Dec. 7, one from Ontario on Dec. 8, one from Calgary on Dec. 9—all arriving in Ireland on or about May 18.

That must have been a red letter day in Ireland, but it was hardly a red letter day for those who posted their mail in Canada. The letter continues as follows:

The answer is simple, you may say: they all went off in the same bag, and the bag got mislaid. But that theory doesn't account for the fact that there's another letter, which at the moment holds the record for delay, that was posted in the town of Vernon on Oct. 8, so it could hardly have gone into the same bag as the others. No, I prefer the Indian canoe explanation.

I suggest that the time has come when we must recognize that the task is so large it cannot be performed with as much efficiency as in the past or that it cannot be performed efficiently at all. In other words, there must be a relation to Murphy's law, which has been kicking around since the 1920s, which suggests that if anything can go wrong, it will go wrong. There must be another law applying to this situation, namely, that because of the size of the postal service it is inefficient and cannot be operated efficiently. That is probably the explanation. If that is the situation, we must face the possibility of change. For these reasons I am prepared to move that this measure be hoisted for six months. I do so without any qualms.

I do not ordinarily take exception to government services when I can find an explanation for deficiency therein. When dealing with the Post Office Department I cannot think of any reason for its not operating as it did ten years ago. Millions of Canadians are becoming dissatisfied with the postal service and wonder why it is not efficient. Let me quote from a letter written by Mr. Paul D. Silver of Halifax. I have corresponded with this gentleman and he has replied in these terms:

Mr. McCleave, may I ask what has happened to the old boast of postal authorities that "the mail must go through"?

I can tell members what has happened to that old boast. It has been replaced by a modern theory invented by men involved in the public relations game. What they say to us is exactly what is being said by the Postmaster General in this bill: in some mysterious way we must put our faith in that great god of computer accomplishment and we must be happy with the service we are getting.

Post Office Act

I shall make one or two more points and then I will have satisfied my compulsion in this regard. I should like to think that the Post Office Department has an obligation to service charities in this country. I have in mind the War Amputees, the tuberculosis society, and the like. Representatives of these associations have written asking for concessions in respect of mass mailing. They solicit through mass mailing and an increase in mailing charges as anticipated by this measure will mean a substantial increase in their costs. Therefore I would like to think their points are given some heed. As I said on second reading, I do not think we have to tie our hearts or our minds to a very strict formula; I think we should be allowed to give consideration to their position. If they cannot get it one way they will get it in another, and instead of asking us for \$10 they will ask for \$11 or \$12. That is one point.

The second point is that I wish the Postmaster General, in whom I have some confidence—I cannot say that I had as much in his predecessor, the hon. member for Duvernay (Mr. Kierans), although he was a charming man and could speak with the tongue of men or of angels, as the mood presented itself—were not so much tied to any hang-up that involves the mail service or the amount that he will charge for that service as a strictly utilitarian service that has to be paid for. I do not think the public looks on it that way either. For example, I do not think that the person who may enjoy a newspaper being delivered to his door necessarily wants to see it for the news it contains. He may want to find out the price at which golf balls are selling across the country, the price of lawn chairs or the price of something else. So there is that aspect to be considered.

People do not look on mail that is delivered to their door from the standpoint of its classification as first class, second-class or third-class. They do have some regard for what they want to receive at their door or what pleases them. For that reason I think the Postmaster General and his department may be somewhat strict when they say that first-class, second-class or third-class mail should pay its way. I think they are not being sufficiently flexible, because mail is probably the most important connection any person has with his government. I think it is the most immediate contact which we have for about 300 days of the year. There are some things about the relationship between the government of Canada and the people who receive this special service which have to be considered apart from the setting of rates. Because I feel strongly about this bill, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale):

That all the words after "that" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"That this bill be not now read a third time this day, but be read a third time this day six months hence".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.