

*Post Office Act*

Now we have made our case. We have said that the inadequacy of the committee of the whole for the examination of this measure was clear. A combination of parties in this house representing 53.1 per cent of the voters of Canada has indicated the belief that this very important matter, in the light of the great protests, should have been examined by a committee. This has been denied us. We have to accept the massive vote of those who represent 45.2 per cent of the voters of Canada. We recognize we will have difficulty in dealing in this particular forum with this measure in the way we think it should be dealt with.

I have noticed in recent weeks, since this postal matter has come to the fore, not only a great deal of correspondence but a type of representation which has disturbed me, and which should impress the Postmaster General and concern him. There are suggestions from many parts of the country that the type of service being rendered by the Canadian post office is questionable. The other day I had a letter from a Boston relative—every mariner has a relative in Boston—that he had received a postcard mailed from the Cabot trail when he was on a summer visit. This was not too bad: But it was the summer of 1966 that he had been on this visit.

Similarly, some extremely important and attractive material was sent out from a certain political headquarters under second class mail on October 11. It arrived in Vancouver on the 19th, 20th, 21st and 22nd. One thousand of these same attractive and important items were sent under first class mail on October 11 as well, but did not reach Vancouver until the 21st. I would not call that "all up" at all; I would say that was "all down". I hear from the people in various post offices that there is a little anxiety. Then, of course, although the minister was quite unperturbed about it, I have heard from many places that the flood of mail arriving in order to beat the minister's deadline has in fact caused delays.

Unfortunately we have reached the stage, unless someone invites protraction of the debate, where there is no need for protracted discussion of this bill. If an invitation is issued implicitly, then we will be prepared to accept it. I should like to say I am sorry that the government house leader found it necessary last night to use the expression "filibuster". This is not the kind of thing that makes for good parliamentary operations. We have had this matter before us for five days. On one of those days we had only one an hour

and twenty minutes to discuss it. On another, we had a little over two hours.

This is a very important matter which affects every single Canadian. Some of these people do not know today how much they are going to have to pay. They are working under forced draft. We have a deadline here which, as I said before, is presumptuous. After certain changes were announced, we have had further changes. I do not know that the minister has assured us what kind of service we are going to get from this semi-Saturday business. I represent a constituency that is three quarters urban and one quarter rural. About one quarter of my people will get mail on Saturday, while the other three quarters will not. A great many of these people live in suburban areas but work in the city. They live in a sort of rural area, so I suppose some people will get mail on Saturday while others will not get mail until Monday. At the same time, their place of interest and their place of work is, in fact, an urban area.

We have been upset by the fact that all arguments from the press, and from the learned journals, have been turned aside. We have to face the fact sadly that, while we believe we represent in this instance a majority of the people, because of the realities of the parliamentary system our point of view is not going to prevail. I should like to say, very simply and very briefly, that in the light of the decreased service, the imposition of increased rates at this time is not a good thing. I should like to say that the minister's approach to this problem is highly improper. His lack of sensitivity and concern for the feelings of the people in many areas, as well as his imperturbability, will create a great many problems for the Post Office Department in the months ahead. We have warned him, we have told him of public reaction. It is incumbent upon him to listen or not to listen. If we are not as loquacious in our arguments as we could be, even if we are a minority in this house, this is not to be construed for one moment as any weakening of our opposition to this most unpopular, this unnecessary measure.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 4—*Canadian newspapers and periodicals.*

**Mr. Kierans:** In so far as clause 4 is concerned, Mr. Chairman, we have taken account of the many statements made in this house by members on all sides and have accepted also the fact that the changes suggested in the