

The *Hamilton Spectator* had the following heading: "Hamilton Mayor Studies Callup for Emergency Mail Deliveries."

The *Globe and Mail* of August 27, 1966, had this to say about the threatened strike:

A postal strike is a great calamity; it invades the life of every citizen, brings the economy virtually to a standstill and robs the public of millions. It cannot be lightly undertaken.

The *Sherbrooke Daily Record* of July 27, 1965, had an editorial dealing with this matter headed, "Government inept in mail strike."

In its editorial of November 8, 1966, the *Edmonton Journal* castigated the Government for allowing the strike to continue. Among other things, it said:

But it must be remembered that, thanks largely to the intervention of the Pearson government in wage disputes, recent pay increases, directly or indirectly concerned with public funds, have been greatly in excess of Mr. Sharp's guideline.

I am sure you all know what Mr. Sharp's guidelines were. The editorial continued:

For example, St. Lawrence seaway workers (seasonal) were given 36 per cent; Expo 67 and other Montreal construction workers, 35 per cent; railway workers, 18 per cent over two years (interim); armed services, 14 per cent over two years; RCMP, 14 per cent over two years.

Perhaps a reasonable solution would be to treat the postal workers as well as the armed services and RCMP and give them an increase of 14 per cent spread over two years.

As you will have noted in the press today, the Canadian National Railway employees have been given a 28 per cent wage increase. The public is beginning to wonder to what extent these increases should go in settling strikes. Of course, a strike can be settled if the employees are given all that they demand. However, as I said a moment ago, I believe there must be some other way of settling strikes, whereby through arbitration or other means the contending parties can get together and agree upon a solution without the employees going out on strike and interrupting the comfort, rights and necessary requirements of the people.

**Hon. A. K. Hugessen:** Honourable senators, I should like to see this bill go to committee. It does establish a rather important principle,

and I think we should be quite certain what we are doing before we pass it

I have had a chance to look at the bill only during the last few minutes. In some ways it is a good deal broader, and in other ways it is a good deal narrower than I had anticipated it would be. It allows relief to a person who has suffered damage as a result of interference with normal postal services, only in cases where there is some limitation of time prescribed in any law of Canada. It does not in any way interfere with any conditions contained in a private contract between individuals, in which you must give 14 days' or 28 days' notice, or anything of that kind. So, to that extent, it is really very limited.

As I understood from the speech of the mover, there is something in the Patent Act which requires certain specific delays, and it is primarily for this purpose that the present relief bill is introduced. Am I correct in that?

**Hon. Mr. Denis:** I am afraid I did not understand you. Would you please repeat your question?

**Hon. Mr. Hugessen:** It is primarily in connection with the Patent Act requirements as to certain delays being necessary that this bill of relief is being introduced?

**Hon. Mr. Denis:** The main reason for the introduction of the bill is because such instances have arisen in connection with the Patent Act. The Patent Office has reported a couple of dozen such cases, and others might arise.

**Hon. Mr. Hugessen:** On the other hand, the bill does go a good deal further than dealing only with the postal strike of 1965, because there is reference in section 2 not only specifically to the postal strike of 1965 but to any subsequent interruption of normal postal services in Canada of more than 48 hours' duration. That invites speculation as to all sorts of possible interruptions of normal postal services.

**Hon. Mr. Brooks:** It even mentions embarrassment, I think.

**Hon. Mr. Hugessen:** Yes. For instance, some town might be surrounded by floods for two days. Would this bill then apply?

**Hon. Mr. Denis:** It could be a storm.

**Hon. Mr. Hugessen:** Yes, but I was thinking of occasions that my friends from British Columbia know about, when the Fraser River overflows its banks and Vancouver is isolated