

to the Civil Service Commission or any other agency, it results, I believe, from the fact that fair and just consideration has not been given to the employees of the library. An invidious situation arose at the time of the last general increase to which my honourable friend has referred. Unfortunately, the employees of the library have been the "poor relations" of the Civil Service—

Hon. Mr. Reid: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Lambert: —and consistently so. Until recently, as regards salaries, these men, from the chief librarian down, were ignored and neglected, and some of them are not yet at the salary level to which they are entitled. If anybody is at fault, it would seem to be the Civil Service Commission or the committee which has been dealing with this matter, in that we were not made aware of what was coming before us today. In the interests of justice there is every reason for better treatment for the staff of the library. I have been for sometime a member of the Library Committee, and I have a good deal of daily and weekly contact with the staff, so I know whereof I speak when I say that they have been the victims of a great deal of injustice in connection with rulings on the part of the Civil Service authorities.

The Hon. the Speaker: May I ask honourable senators to bear in mind that at the moment there is nothing before the house, and, unless with unanimous consent, the discussion cannot be continued.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Let me ask, is it possible for the house to sit tomorrow?

Some Hon. Senators: No.

Some Hon. Senators: Surely.

Hon. Mr. Haig: My question is directed to the Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald). My friends and I are willing to sit tomorrow. While I cannot withdraw my objection, I do not wish to hold up this matter unnecessarily.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: The Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) has asked me if it is possible for the house to sit tomorrow. There will be no other legislation before us this week.

The honourable senator from Vancouver South (Hon. Mr. Farris) has suggested to me that after the items on the Order Paper have been dealt with the house could adjourn for half an hour, to give honourable members time to peruse the report. Then the house could reassemble and take whatever action it sees fit. Does that suggestion meet with the pleasure of honourable senators?

Hon. Mr. Haig: That is all right.

The Hon. the Speaker: The report stands.

POST OFFICE BILL

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. W. D. Euler, Acting Chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, presented the report of the committee on Bill 168.

The report was read by the Clerk Assistant as follows:

The Standing Committee on Transport and Communications to whom was referred the Bill 168, intitled: "An Act to amend the Post Office Act", have in obedience to the order of reference of February 17, 1954, examined the said bill and now beg leave to report the same without any amendment.

THIRD READING

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: With leave of the Senate, I move that the bill be read the third time now.

Hon. John T. Haig: Honourable senators, as I did not have all the facts before me at the time I did not have much to say during the debate on the second reading of this bill; consequently I should like to make a few remarks at this time. The bill was thoroughly examined by the members of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications this morning. The meeting was honoured by the presence of the Postmaster General, and a very able presentation was given to the committee by the Deputy Postmaster General. The committee was informed that there are two or three main reasons for seeking to increase the postage rates on first-class mail. The first reason is the loss of revenue following the abolition of stamps on cheques. These were supposed to be excise stamps, with the revenue going to the Department of National Revenue, and it was only when postage stamps were used on cheques that the Post Office Department derived any money. I understand, however, that the loss in revenue to that department from the removal of stamps on cheques amounted to approximately \$7 million.

Another reason given the committee for seeking to increase the rates was the institution of a five-day forty-hour week, which goes into effect on April 1 and will make necessary an enlarged staff. Then there is a further loss owing to an increase in salaries and wages to Post Office employees.

As to the loss of revenue following the removal of stamps on cheques, the removal was announced last year without any suggestion that it would result in loss of revenue