

at the meeting, whether members of the committee or not, to ask all the questions they desired.

With regard to the objection made by the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig), I may say off-hand that I think his argument is almost unanswerable. In the discussion the principle has been laid down that those who use a service should pay for it. If the Post Office Department is losing \$15 million or \$17 million a year, through the carrying of second-class mail, I think we can hardly deny that the rates for this class of mail should be increased, so as to pay for the service that is being rendered. I cannot for the life of me see why an ordinary letter writer, who puts a four-cent stamp upon his letter now, should have to pay an extra cent in order that papers and periodicals may be carried free. It has been mentioned here today that papers published in towns of not more than ten thousand population are carried absolutely free within a radius of forty miles. I think that is wrong. In committee this morning when the Leader of the Opposition asked a question with regard to this, it was said that if the post office made a charge for this service the smaller papers would be forced out of business. I rather doubt that.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Euler: But, even admitting that to be true, I do not see why the rate for first-class mail, which yields a profit to the department, should be increased in order that newspapers may be carried free or at less than cost. As a matter of business I do not think it is fair at all that you should charge one class for a service that is rendered to another.

I listened with interest to my friend from Lethbridge (Hon. Mr. Buchanan). He is in the newspaper business, as I used to be. However, I am not in that business now, so I have no particular interest in it. What he says about daily newspapers is correct. I do not think the Post Office Department suffers much loss through the carrying of daily newspapers in either small or large cities, because in these places the papers generally are delivered by carrier boys. And to outlying districts—this applies to cities of the size of Lethbridge, and certainly also to cities of the size of Kitchener—papers are carried by trucks and distributed by local people.

I conclude by saying that I do not think that we are adhering to the principle that has been laid down in this debate by a number of senators, and particularly by the senator from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Hayden), namely, that those who use a service should

pay for it, and I repeat that for the life of me I cannot see why first-class mail should pay for the losses incurred in the carrying of periodicals and second-class mail generally.

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald: Not having spoken on introducing the bill for third reading, I presume I have the right to say a few words now.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Not to close the debate?

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: No, not to close the debate.

Honourable senators, I have been very much interested in what has been said here this afternoon, as also I was in what took place at the committee meeting this morning. That meeting provided us with a lot of valuable information. I wish to say that I agree with the honourable gentleman from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler), who was the chairman, that every opportunity was given to all senators present there to ask questions. No restrictions whatever were imposed; in fact, one honourable senator present, who was not a member of the committee, was invited to ask questions.

I do not intend to speak for any length of time on this matter. I thought that when the bill was reported from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications without amendment it would go through this house without further discussion. However, some objection has been taken to it. The Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) suggests that as the five-day week will be instituted by the Post Office Department in April, this legislation will give legal effect to the five-day week. Surely he knows that is not so. Does he suggest that at present there is any legal obligation on any one to work six days a week? Is there any six-day-week legislation in effect at the present time in this country? There is certain legislation which prevents people from working seven days, that is, from working on the Sabbath day, but surely parliament is not going to dictate to people and tell them how many days a week they should work. Surely parliament is not going to say that everybody has to work six days, or that people are to be allowed to work five days only.

We must be realists in this matter. The Post Office Department has to recruit a staff. How could it induce men to work six days a week in communities where everyone else is working five days? It just could not be done. The department has not been forward in bringing in the five-day week; it is merely falling in line in communities where the five-day week has already been put into effect.