

in relation to the applicant; (e) the power to make such further order as is necessary to enable the applicant to do any thing or exercise any right, within the time limit provided under any law of Canada.

Finally, section 4 authorizes the judge of the Exchequer Court to require that public notice of the hearing of the application be given, so that any interested party may be heard.

Honourable senators, I do not think I can add anything to the few remarks I have just made—and I hope they will not tend to complicate the consideration of a bill which is quite simple, as I said. I do not know whether the honourable senators will find it necessary to refer the bill to a committee, but they can rest assured that I will comply with their wishes.

As the Yuletide season is at hand, I wish to take this opportunity to express to all, to you, Your Honour, to the honourable senators, to the officials and to other members of the staff, my best wishes for a healthy and a happy New Year and, as we say at home, Paradise at the end of your days.

[Text]

Hon. A. J. Brooks: Honourable senators, I wish first to congratulate our honourable former Postmaster General of Canada for his explanation of this bill. As he pointed out, it is "an act to provide relief in certain cases against loss or hardship suffered as a result of interruptions of normal postal services." He mentioned only one particular type of case, such as would come under the Patent Act.

Hon. Mr. Denis: That was just one example, but it is a common occurrence under the Patent Act.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: There must be many other cases that would come under the Patent Act. As a matter of fact, just before coming into the house, I received a copy of the honourable member's speech, and I noted that it emphasized that this bill was being introduced to overcome difficulties relative to the Patent Act. His explanation of the legal aspects was both clear and understandable but it does seem to me that there must be numerous cases other than those under the Patent Act which would come under this legislation. For instance, I think of contracts which are confirmed by mail, and the interruption of normal postal service could result in considerable loss.

Honourable senators will note that the bill contains the words "loss or hardship," and

aside from financial losses one can readily imagine many other hardships arising from the fact that people fail to receive their mail. I have no doubt that when this bill is passed there will be many applications for relief under its terms.

As can be seen in the bill, it is introduced as a result of the postal strike in 1965—a year and a half ago. Perhaps the honourable sponsor (Hon. Mr. Denis) can explain why we have waited so long for a bill of this kind, particularly in the present situation where persons seeking relief are advised to do so almost immediately if they expect to get any results.

However, honourable senators, in my view strikes that give rise to the necessity for this kind of legislation should not happen. There must be some unfortunate lack of responsibility somewhere when civil servants, such as those in the Post Office Department, can strike and cause serious trouble and hardship to the public of Canada, as is pointed out in the bill. I am not now referring only to civil service bodies, but also to the employees of other branches of the Public Service, such as crown corporations, the railways and others. I think the time has come when adequate machinery should be set up to prevent such strikes, and also to ensure that civil servants get the fair wages and fair treatment due to them. Surely there is some way this can be done.

It has been said this is not a very important bill. Possibly it is not, but I can see where the results of these strikes can have very serious consequences. I have here some press clippings which deal with the postal strike of 1965 and subsequent strikes. Parliament was not sitting in July and August of that year, hence there was not as much publicity as there might have been had it been sitting. On August 3, 1965, the *Montreal Gazette* had this to say:

A situation that could have been settled with much public sympathy has been forced into a position of facing settlement only amidst public indignation. The injury done to relations between the public and those who serve it will be long in coming back to that mutual respect that need never have been lost.

That is quite a severe criticism.

The *Sun-Times* of Owen Sound, of Wednesday, July 28, 1965, had as its heading in the editorial column: "Must Resolve Postal Department Trouble." It then went on with a long dissertation against a strike of this nature.