

## Post Office Act

**Mr. Trainor:** Is the hon. member inferring that the declaration on the masthead, "Published in Montreal", in this case, is a false declaration?

**Mr. Knowles:** It is one of those things that it may not be possible to call false but it has a purpose that seems to be misleading. They have an office in Montreal, so far as I understand it, and they declare—

**Mr. Trainor:** Have they an editorial staff in Montreal?

**Mr. Knowles:** I do not know whether or not they have an editorial staff in Montreal. I do not believe they have. I believe their editorial staff is in Toronto, except for one distinguished member of that editorial staff who is situated here in Ottawa. I hope they do not put him in jail.

**Mr. Trainor:** That would be a good thing to find out. How do they define "published"?

**Mr. Knowles:** My hon. friend will have to ask a lawyer for the answer to that question. All they say is that is the point at which it is published; and, having declared Montreal to be the point of publication, they get the cheap rates that are provided under section 11 of the Post Office Act. I think the situation is fairly clear. I am grateful for the various interjections that have been made. They make the discussion all the more interesting, and I think they have helped to bring out the point that what is involved here is not a discussion of the rights or wrongs of liquor advertising. I could go into that matter also.

**Mr. Martin:** Don't do it.

**Mr. Knowles:** I could talk about the corrupting influence of liquor profits. However, I will not go into that matter today. It is not a temperance issue, interested though I might be in that question. The issue at stake here is whether or not we are going to pass a federal law, the purpose of which is to enable people to circumvent, to a certain extent, a provincial law. *Maclean's* magazine is now circumventing that provincial law to a certain extent. They print the magazine in Toronto. They truck all of it to Montreal and mail it from there, thereby getting around the law that says they cannot publish in Ontario their magazine carrying liquor advertising. Once this bill passes—if the house does put it through—a magazine like *Maclean's* and any others that are in similar circumstances will be able to mail, as I say, all of their copies that go outside of Ontario, from Toronto, and get the cheap

rates from the two points, and still technically get around the provisions of the Ontario liquor control act.

There is another aspect about this matter on which I want to make a comment. I think the way in which this whole matter has been handled has been rather odd. The Postmaster General (Mr. Cote) did not tell us of these aspects of the matter when he introduced the legislation or when he tried to introduce it on February 8. The parliamentary assistant to the Postmaster General has failed today to touch on the aspects of the matter which I am discussing. I read with interest a debate to which we are not supposed to refer in this house, and I find that Their Honours in the other place made no reference to this aspect of the matter at all. Yet, as I say, because some of us raised questions about this matter when it came into the house previously, representations have been made to me as well as to other members of this group—and, for all I know, to other members of the house—that we should let this legislation go through in order that certain magazines might be able to carry this liquor advertising and not have to put out this extra money for trucking costs and, to put it in their terms, thus be better able to compete with American magazines. They have gone on and said to us: "We want to develop Canadian culture." I do not go for this idea of developing Canadian culture on the basis of liquor profits, whether they turn up in the form of advertising revenue, donations to dominion drama festivals or what have you.

**Mr. McIvor:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Knowles:** I am glad to hear my friend the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McIvor) say "hear, hear". I hope this is one occasion on which he will oppose a measure brought in by the government he supports.

**An hon. Member:** He will walk out.

**Mr. Knowles:** As I say, Mr. Speaker, there has been an attempt, or at least it appears to me that there has been an attempt to cover up the real purpose of this legislation by reference to matters that are not important at all. It has been said to me, for example, that under the proposed bill it would be possible for copies of the *Financial Post* to be mailed in bulk from Toronto to Winnipeg, Calgary, Vancouver, Halifax and other places to be mailed from the post offices in those cities and thus reach the subscribers more quickly than is at present the case. When I inquired as to the extra costs of this project, it was admitted to me by the gentleman