

1927 that they made an application to the tariff board. I listened to them at that time and I believe every argument which could be advanced in favour of a duty on magazines was brought forward. They told us of the handicaps under which they laboured, of the relative smallness of their circulation, and above all they emphasized their desire to save the youth of this country from the danger of contamination by magazines coming in from the other side of the line. They referred repeatedly—they had all sorts of evidence to support their contention from women's associations, boards of trade and other organizations—to the claim that these magazines were salacious, that they were a deadly menace, and that our homes were imperilled by reading of literature from the other side of the line. I looked over these magazines and I failed to find anything in them that was very bad. Then I recalled the fact that to the pure in heart all things are pure. So I suggested to a lady of mature years and cultured mind that she look over some of these magazines and tell me if in her opinion they would be dangerous to a girl of Sunday school age. She made a careful study of them and brought in her verdict. She said that to her there was not even the appearance of a kick in them, that the only thing they reminded her of was the Pansy books which she had read in the days when she attended Sunday school.

The government of that day did nothing with regard to magazines. I do not know what report the tariff board brought in, but one result was that the department of customs classified these magazines as books, which were dutiable at that time. They might just as well have classified a buck saw as a seed drill; it would have been just as reasonable. I appealed to a committee of the cabinet and argued the question. I do not know whether they heard me, but they did not act. I quoted definitions from the dictionary and I produced letters from Funk and Wagnalls and the publishers of Webster's dictionary, in which they said that as far as they could see a magazine was a magazine no matter whether it contained fiction or non-fiction. However, they threw both dictionaries through the window and let the judgment stand. If that had happened under my Conservative friends I would not have been able to find language strong enough to condemn it, but as it was done by my Liberal friends I shall be meekly silent or at least discreet. I shall say nothing except to express the hope that they have since learned the dangers of such autocratic and despotic action. Then we had a change of

government. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, (Mr. Bennett) did not wait or hesitate about it; he plunged right in and placed a duty upon magazines.

Mr. BENNETT: Upon advertising.

Mr. DEACHMAN: Upon the advertising which was in the magazines. The result was that a number of these magazines were published in Canada. And what happened? All talk of their salacity disappeared. All was well in the best of all possible worlds, because now some of these magazine were published in Canada. A made in Canada article could not be impure. I should like to refer to something that happened prior to this. The late Mr. Robb granted a drawback upon the paper which entered into the production of magazines in Canada. That proved a great stimulation to the magazine publishing business, and, more important, it lifted the tone of mind and thought in connection with our Canadian magazine publishing business. They then studied the situation a little more carefully and for a time they wondered which side they were on, whether they wanted a duty on magazines or whether they wanted a reduction in the duties upon their raw materials. Then the Conservative government came into power and withdrew the drawback. The publishers now come out with the statement that they want the duties upon their raw materials removed, that they want to produce magazines in Canada under freedom instead of under restrictions. One of the reasons they advance, one which I have heard before, is that the Canadian public demands a magazine as high in quality as any produced by the American publisher, and that they cannot possibly meet this demand if they are hampered by restrictions upon their purchase of the raw materials which enter into production. I submit it is absolutely unfair to the Canadian publisher that you should be able to bring in ten tons of Saturday Evening Posts and pay no duty, whereas if you brought in ten tons of paper similar to that upon which the Saturday Evening Post is printed, you are penalized by having to make a contribution to the dominion revenue. I should like to read one statement the publishers make; they still have a little of that lofty conception for the development of a Canadian industry for which I give them credit. They say:

The preservation and growth of Canadian unity, Canadian ideas, Canadian industry and Canadian institutions demand that the government of Canada take adequate action to give Canadian periodicals equal opportunities in their own country.