

*Post Office Act*

fell swoop? Why can rates not be increased over a general period of five years or more? I think this could be done. I believe the minister is so determined to prove he is an efficient administrator and is so anxious to get things done that he believes he should proceed full speed ahead, and damn the consequences.

When we talk about an increase in rates I am very curious as to how the minister can explain and justify what I consider to be some very peculiar effects of his proposed increases. I shall try to quote exactly from the financial statement and the details of this proposed rate adjustment which the minister sent to every member of parliament. Here we have a page headed "Summary of Volume Revenue, Cost and Deficit, Second Class Mail, 1967-68". The deficit in respect of delivering daily newspapers is estimated to be \$5,637,000. The percentage of the cost for delivering daily newspapers which we collected is 30.1 per cent.

The minister is proposing some very drastic increases. The deficit under his proposal will be reduced from the \$5,600,000 to a figure of \$1,600,000. He proposes to cut this deficit by \$4 million in one year. The average costs which will be collected for delivering daily newspapers under the new rates quoted by the minister will be 79.8 per cent. In other words, from 30 per cent, he goes up to almost 80 per cent. That is a very substantial increase.

I am sure the minister is aware of this, but I should like to bring to the attention of members of this house that Mr. Ryan, the editor of *Le Devoir*, one of the best newspapers in this country, has stated that if the minister proceeds with his various proposals the position of *Le Devoir* will be almost completely untenable and that the possibilities of its continuing in existence are pretty slim. That is sufficient comment about what the minister proposes in respect of the newspapers. The minister shakes his head. If I am mistaken and if Mr. Ryan has been misquoted I would be very happy to hear anything more the minister may have heard from Mr. Ryan.

I should like to turn now to some publications which are very important to this country. I have in mind *Reader's Digest* and *Time* magazine. In this regard I should like to quote again from the same statement. The amount the post office has collected from *Reader's Digest* for mailing this magazine to subscribers across Canada is, percentagewise, just half of what is collected from the daily newspapers. In other words, we have been

[Mr. Orlikow.]

collecting 15.7 per cent of the cost and we had a deficit which the taxpayers of Canada paid in the amount of \$982,000. Under the new proposal we will collect the grand total of 31.3 per cent of the cost. From the newspapers we will collect 80 per cent, but from *Reader's Digest* we will collect 31.3 per cent. I mentioned that previously the deficit was \$982,000. It will now be cut to \$800,000. I wonder what magic *Reader's Digest* has, that it is to be allowed to retain this very favourable position.

Let us turn now to *Time* magazine, that great organ of the Liberal party of Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Last year *Time* magazine paid 21.8 per cent of the cost of delivering its magazines to its subscribers in Canada. The deficit last year, according to the Postmaster General—these are not my figures; they are the minister's figures—was \$864,000. Having proposed these Draconian increases, what does the minister propose for the daily newspapers? *Time* magazine, the organ of the Liberal party, will be paying a fantastic amount. They will be paying 34.7 per cent of the cost of mailing *Time* magazine, compared to 80 per cent for the daily newspapers. Last year the deficit in respect of delivering *Time* magazine was \$864,000. This year the minister says we will only lose \$721,000.

**Mr. Woolliams:** It is still ridiculous.

**Mr. Orlikow:** In reply to the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings the minister spoke of the difficulties of the magazines. This is true. The *Canadian Forum*, the *Canadian Commentator*, and the *Queen's Quarterly* are in great difficulty. I did not realize, however, that the *Luce* publication and *Reader's Digest* were in such difficulty that they needed a handout from the Canadian people. I believe in free speech and I believe in freedom of the press. If *Time* magazine wishes to portray the Prime Minister as a new Messiah, that is its right. If *Time* magazine wants to say that we never had a better government than the present Liberal government, that is its right, but I object to the taxes gathered from the almost 50 per cent of the Canadian people who voted against this government—my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre says the figure is more than 50 per cent—being used to pay a subsidy in order to get Liberal propaganda into the hundreds of thousands of