

as previously reported and which is on record in *Hansard* and available to all, is \$9.3 million. The hon. member was quoting the total revenues which the department received two years ago from the parcel post rate.

The hon. member said:

(Translation):

—parcel post rates have gone up 90 per cent.

(Text):

The English translation is:

...parcel post rates have increased by 90 per cent.

The actual increase is 44 per cent. The hon. member says that the department's publication "Postmark" printed my picture 70 times. In 1960, even if you throw in all the members of parliament, my parliamentary assistant and myself, there were only 13 occasions on which our pictures appeared. More significantly, in 1960 some 1,642 postal employees' pictures appeared in our little magazine that is devoted to telling our staff what their far-flung organization is doing.

The hon. member for St. Denis said there was no French version of our public relations pamphlet "Letter Perfect". Such a version, which is an exact duplicate, is available on exactly the same basis and for the same purpose as the English one. I have it here, and I might mention in passing that to the best of my knowledge it was mailed to the hon. member with the same letter that went out to other hon. members of the house. I am looking at other hon. members over there and I am appealing to their honesty. They will know they received the French version of our pamphlet in the mail. Let them deny it.

The hon. member for St. Denis says that this year there were more thefts and more money involved in those thefts. In my opening remarks I pointed out that there were 295 post office break-ins in the past fiscal year as compared with 366 in the previous year. For the first 11 months cash and postage supply losses were down from \$162,000 to \$92,000, so the hon. member was wrong again.

There is no point in continuing with this recital of his discrepancies and errors, and I do not intend to do so. I merely point out that this is not a matter of differing opinions. This is a simple case of mathematics and facts being completely and absolutely wrong. His entire remarks with regard to the post office bristled with factual inaccuracies and wrong conclusions.

Now let me deal with a few of the other points raised by hon. members. First, automation and mechanization. We find that the Liberal party is against it. We find that the C.C.F. party favour it, each according to their remarks. We find the hon. member for St. Denis saying this on the subject:

(Translation):

He should at least wait until there is less unemployment before thinking about replacing men by machines.

(Text):

The translation is, and this is significant:

We should at least wait until there is less unemployment before thinking about replacing men with machines.

This is one of the fundamental differences between the hon. member for St. Denis and the whole Liberal party and myself and my party. We are looking ahead. Our work and our studies are not being carried out for the next two or three months; they are being carried out for years ahead. Our plans in the Post Office Department are for years ahead. The concept that you should wait until you are faced with a disastrous situation before doing anything about it, which is exactly the concept put forward by the hon. member for St. Denis, is of course completely wrong. The hard facts are that we have to think ahead. Machines must be developed if we are to continue our efficient operation with the increasing volume of mail and the increasing size of our cities. We must do this to keep postal rates reasonable and extend our services as members of parliament have asked us to do.

Look back over past history. We started off with men clearing letter boxes on foot and carrying the mail in bags over their shoulders. We mechanized with horses and wagons, and then with trucks. Do you want us to go back to the days of men clearing mail boxes on foot? We originally started off hand stamping every individual letter in order to cancel the postage stamp. Today we have machines for that purpose. Do you want us to go back to employing hundreds of people at rush times in the post office, who will be standing there stamping one letter after another and handling the mail? We used to have men carry bags from one point to another. It is a rough, difficult task. We put in conveyors to do it, to try to dignify people and free them to do other jobs which make a greater demand on their human intelligence.

I have no apologies to make for that sort of thing. Perhaps the best present example of how foolish is this argument against automation is that just within the past year, by the development of automated accounting processes, we have been able to pay our 8,000 revenue postmasters across this country twice a month instead of only once a month. This is something for which they have been asking for years and years. When I asked them if they would like to go back to a one pay a month system their remarks were not too complimentary, and I can understand why.