

Post Office Act

estimates, and if I do not get the C.B.C. estimate reduced, as a responsible minister of the Crown, I will resign.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I noticed on reading the minister's comments last night that he did not take too kindly to one of the points I made earlier in this debate. I want to say that I have not changed my position by one iota. The fact that a table is provided for our use is no proof of the truth of what is contained in that table. I maintain that, not only in connection with this department but in connection with other departments, we have a right to examine the criteria upon which estimates of revenue and cost are based. We have a right to question these things because, after all, as I have indicated, the burden is on the minister to prove, not on the opposition to disprove.

I want to hear why small newspapers outside the exempted class should have to carry the full weight of the increase in the cost of transporting them, especially when they ordinarily do not have any important volume of carrier sales or street sales. Take the average newspaper in a city; only a relatively small proportion of its circulation is carried by the post office, and in future these papers can spread their increased postal costs over the whole of their operation.

Newspapers such as the church press are in a different position. They cannot cushion the effect of this proposed increase. The whole of their circulation is handled by the minister's department, and the effect of the increase will be subscription rates out of this world. I do not know what the minister's answer will be. If he tells us that the church press must absorb the total cost of the new rate in the same way as a daily newspaper in one of our major cities, a paper which carries hundreds of thousands of inches of lucrative advertising per month, I can only reply that this represents a great disparity in treatment.

Since we are faced with a time element I shall touch only briefly on one particular question I raised the other night having to do with the reduction of mail service in urban areas, and the effect which can be expected on certain people who seek to meet legal obligations. I refer for example to the immigration regulations, or to the white paper on anti-dumping and the draft bill dealing with that subject—and the minister was one of those who approved it.

If the minister would look at these measures he would see there are provisions by

[Mr. Woolliams.]

which the period allowed for appeal to parties interested runs from the date a decision is made. Now comes the question of communications—communication by mail. As the result of the minister's proposals, those who live in cities will lose three or four days as compared with those who live outside. I do not understand how the minister can discriminate in a way which affects legal rights—and these are legal rights. At an appropriate time before the passage of this bill I should like to have the minister's answer on this point.

Mr. Kierans: My department has already been in consultation with other departments, for example with the Department of National Health and Welfare, to make sure that city dwellers are not harmed in any way by, for instance, the late arrival of welfare cheques which might arrive on a Saturday, when there would be no city delivery. We hope they can be mailed a day or two earlier to make sure they arrive on a Wednesday, Thursday or Friday. I am grateful to the hon. member for having brought this aspect to my attention. My officials have already taken note of the point he has made. We shall certainly contact the department of immigration to ascertain just what are the difficulties outlined by the hon. gentleman, and what we can do to offset them.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The minister will need to get in touch with virtually every department, because there are any number of regulations containing provisions similar to that which I have described, provisions which are "made in Ottawa" with no consideration for the rest of the country. This is a consequence of the bureaucratic mind at work.

Mr. Kierans: We shall do something about it.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Let us mitigate the effect and not add to it by the type of action the minister proposes to take.

Mr. Kierans: Agreed.

Mr. Orlikow: I wish to comment briefly on a question I raised yesterday, one which I believe to be important—and I do not intend to blame this minister for mistakes committed by some of his predecessors and colleagues, in days before he came to the house. I refer in particular to the tremendous injustice to the Canadian publishing industry which was done by the fancy footwork which permitted