

I say to the minister in charge of the Post Office, who comes from a working class family and has some knowledge of what a trade union means to the ordinary worker, that the decision to suspend the publication of the CNTU could only weaken the lines of communication between the elected officials of that organization and its 200,000 to 250,000 members. The difficulties faced by the CNTU in settling strikes may in some degree have been aggravated by its inability to communicate with the membership. Almost every day we have an illustration of these difficulties. We see the former employees of Lapalme, who were members of the CNTU, demonstrating on Parliament Hill. I shall not go into the rights or wrongs of that strike, but I shall simply say that I believe that kind of thing was helped by the effect on the CNTU publication of the decision of the government to increase the postal rates.

I have made a very reasonable request, Mr. Speaker. I have simply asked the minister and the government to table the letters and telegrams received from organizations of the types I have listed, informing the minister that as a result of the increase in the cost of mailing they would have to give serious consideration to suspension or curtailment of publication. Surely, this is not an unreasonable request to make from a government led by a Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who speaks so frequently and eloquently of participatory democracy. Participatory democracy must mean more than the Prime Minister or his ministers lecturing the people of Canada. Surely, it means that the people of Canada have the right to express their views and to feel that those views are known and shared by others. I can see no reason, Mr. Speaker, why the former minister or the present minister should object to my motion which would require the government to table letters about this matter which were received by the minister from organizations of the type I have listed.

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, the motion introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) reads:

That an order of the House do issue for a copy of all letters received by the Postmaster General from churches, professional organizations, trade unions, co-operatives, credit unions and private organizations, indicating that as a result of the increase in postal rates they intend to discontinue or curtail their publications.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North introduced an identical motion, No. 85, on March 4, 1969, during the first session of the twenty eighth parliament. When the motion was called in the House on March 26, 1969, the following reply was given:

This notice of motion asks for a copy of all letters received by the Postmaster General—

I need not repeat the exact wording of the motion. I continue reading the reply:

● (5:20 p.m.)

If this motion were adopted it would be necessary to make a review of hundreds of files because letters were not segregated on the basis of whether or not they suggested an increase in postal rates would result in either the discontinuance or curtailment of the publication. Such a review would be costly. In

#### *Increase in Publications Postage Rates*

view of this fact, perhaps the hon. gentleman would be willing to withdraw his motion.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North refused to withdraw the motion and it was transferred for debate according to Standing Order 48(1). The matter was never debated, and therefore with the end of the first session it was dropped.

In the second session, the hon. member for Winnipeg North introduced a similar motion and the following answer was given when that motion was called on December 10, 1969:

The motion is not acceptable as the information requested would necessitate a review of over 5,000 files. It is estimated that several hundred man hours would be expended in drawing files and searching for desired correspondence without taking into consideration time expended in copying such correspondence. The expense of such a project is not considered warranted.

Again, the hon. member for Winnipeg North did not wish to withdraw the motion, and again it was transferred for debate. It was never debated, and therefore with the end of the second session it was dropped.

The hon. member came back with this motion on November 4, 1970, on which occasion I replied in the House as follows:

I think this is the third time this motion has been presented and the reply to it will be the same as on the last occasion, namely, that the motion is not acceptable as the information requested would necessitate a review of over 5,000 files. It is estimated that several hundred man hours would be expended in drawing files and searching for the desired correspondence without taking into consideration the time expended in copying such correspondence.

The hon. member again refused to drop the motion, which was transferred for debate, and now we are debating it. Basically the situation has not changed. It would be very costly to produce the required papers. The time involved is estimated as 544 man hours, more than a quarter of a man year, at an estimated cost of \$2,025. In addition to the answers previously given, Mr. Speaker, we have great reservations about how meaningful the results would be to the hon. member if we spent the time and money to locate the requested information.

I would like to inform the House on how this question of the birth and death of publications was dealt with in a couple of studies. The first is the Royal Commission on Publications which reported in 1961, and I quote:

Births and deaths of magazines are a general indication of the profit—or lack of it—in the magazine-publishing field.

The Mass Media Report, or Davey Report of 1970 reads:

It has been suggested that a number of publications in Canada expired because of the postal increases. Although this may be true, it is just as likely that this incremental cost was simply the straw that broke the camel's back; they might have died in any case for any number of marketing or product reasons.

Now, I wish to give a few figures that will show the number of new publications that were registered as second class mail, and those that ceased to be published from 1967 to January, 1971, according to our own records. However, we have no record of association papers which may have ceased publication after April 1, 1969. Since that date these publications have not had to