

corporations, the publishers, the mail order houses, the businessmen. The Postmaster General has already announced increased rates for third class mail to become effective November 1. The inference has been that this will eliminate a lot of junk mail, or at least force it to pay a larger share of the costs involved.

This is fine; if the new rates do eliminate a lot of this nuisance mail, I will be the first to congratulate the Postmaster General. But my concern is for the legitimate mail order houses, those firms that have played such a large part in building rural Canada, and are even yet an integral part of the Canadian way of life. Under these new rates they get a double jolt—the double whammy, as my colleague from Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) so aptly put it. The cost of mailing their catalogues will show a large increase, and the cost of mailing merchandise orders to their customers will be increased approximately 50 per cent. Now, how will they absorb these increased costs of doing business? I suggest to you, sir, that they will not absorb them but instead pass them on in increased prices to the consumer.

So here we have it: No matter how you try to camouflage it, the end result will be the same. In the final analysis, the public pays. Let us not try to fool anyone. The net result of this bill will be to increase the cost of living to those who can least afford to pay it—the average consumer. This is why we on this side of the house feel so strongly that this bill should be submitted to a committee for a full and complete analysis of all the problems involved. We cannot understand the minister's great haste to ram the bill through the house. Why does he not want a thorough study of the department? To return again to the editorial from which I quoted earlier:

Further, Mr. Kierans does not seem to want to have these points brought to light by committee study. In spite of repeated opposition demands he has steadfastly refused to refer this matter to a Commons committee where all this would be revealed.

Canadians have long wanted a majority government which would be a strong government. Is this an indication that instead of a strong government they have an autocratic government?

The Postmaster General's argument seems to stand on one premise—that every department of government must pay its own way. I submit that this is a false premise. There are certain services that every Canadian is entitled to, and if necessary these must be subsidized out of general revenue. This government, and every government before it, has

### *Social Security*

recognized this principle in the case of the C.B.C., the C.N.R. and the Department of National Defence. Can the government now say to the Canadian people: "You can only use the postal services if you are able to pay for them"?

After listening last night to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), it is apparent that this government expects the small wage earner to pay the whole cost of the just society. But surely he should have some choice as to how his money should be spent. Let the Postmaster General prevail upon his colleagues to cut out some of the waste and trash from the C.B.C. The millions saved could be applied to the postal deficit, and he could earn the thanks of thousands of Canadians.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. It being five o'clock p.m. the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members business, as listed on today's order paper, namely notices of motions, public bills.

### SOCIAL SECURITY

#### EXTENSION OF EXEMPTION PERIOD FOR MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

**Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should consider the advisability of extending from 25 to 40 days the exemption period for social security, unemployment insurance deductions and taxation deductions presently allowed in the case of migrant agricultural workers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to a motion which has very important implications for that part of the country from which I come and, indeed, for all employers of agricultural labourers and workers throughout Canada.

In speaking to this motion, Mr. Speaker, I should first like to review very briefly some of the background that led up to the regulations with which this motion is concerned. In the 1930's massive unemployment swept across our country, placing hundreds of thousands of workers in a very unenviable position and causing them undue hardship. As a result, Mr. Speaker, successive governments sought some means whereby this hardship could be prevented from recurring, and in their wisdom in August, 1940 a system of unemployment insurance was introduced in Canada. The unemployment insurance commission was set up to administer the plan, Mr. Speaker, and in July 1941 employers began to make the required deductions from