

Post Office Act

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Fairclough) referred to this as an innocent-looking bill, and one might say that the explanations that have been offered for it thus far are plausible. I think, however, most of us know the real purpose behind this bill. I rise to oppose it.

As hon. members know, this is not the first notice we have had of the amendment to the Post Office Act proposed by this bill. Earlier in the session when we had before us another bill amending the Post Office Act an attempt was made during the course of the discussion of that legislation to introduce an amendment which would have included in that bill the provision that is set out in this bill. Hon. members will recall that we were able to make the point on that occasion that as the proposed amendment to that bill went beyond the scope of the measure then before the house, it was out of order as an amendment to that bill. It is quite clear of course that it is now in order, procedurally at any rate, to bring in this proposal as the subject matter of a separate bill. But we are as opposed to this bill now as we were to the proposal when it was made on February 8, as noted on page 1902 of *Hansard*.

The parliamentary assistant to the Postmaster General who introduced the measure today referred to it as one that would make possible the posting of magazines or periodicals, on approval by the department, at more than one place, with the privilege of having at all such mailing points the reduced rates provided for magazines and periodicals under section 11 of the Post Office Act.

Reference has been made, both today and on other occasions, to the desire of some publishers to transport certain quantities of their publications in bulk from the centre of publication to some other centre or centres in order to speed up the distribution of their periodicals to the subscribing public. It might be interesting to include in the record at this point the explanation that the Postmaster General gave us of this matter on February 8, 1954, when, as recorded at page 1902 of *Hansard*, he said this:

For instance, if a newspaper in Toronto is ready for delivery at four o'clock—I am only giving a hypothetical example—and the train leaves at six o'clock, the paper would be delivered in London, for instance, or some other place, only very late that night or even the next morning. Hence the periodicals have made representations.

Another explanation given regarding this measure was in these terms:

For instance, if a fraternal organization with its head office in Kingston has a publication printed in [Mrs. Fairclough.]

Brockville, the publication, with the approval of the Post Office Department, can be posted in either Kingston or Brockville.

That, I may say, was the brief explanation of this bill given to Their Honours in the other place. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no secret about this bill. There is no secret as to the identity of those who are asking for it, and as to why they are asking for it. Indeed, there is no secret to the fact that gentlemen representing certain publication companies in this country have visited Ottawa, as have gentlemen who are opposed to this measure, and that those gentlemen have called on many people here; indeed, they have called on me as well as on other members of this group.

Mrs. Fairclough: I had no calls from anyone.

Mr. Knowles: The hon. member for Hamilton West says that they did not call on her. Maybe they did not feel she would be quite as much an obstacle to this legislation as it was thought I might be.

Mrs. Fairclough: Maybe they thought that I would use some sense.

Mr. Knowles: The hon. member can make interjections like that a little later, if she still feels they are appropriate.

Mr. Lennard: You made one yourself.

Mr. Knowles: It was made clear to me that what was annoying some publications in this country is that there is a law in the province of Ontario which prohibits the publishing of liquor advertising. Some firms which are situated in the province of Ontario, firms which print their publications in that province, have been taking steps to get around that law against the publishing of liquor advertising in that province.

Mr. Rowe: This does not get around it.

Mr. Knowles: The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe says: "this does not get around it". Just to have the record clear, let us note the Ontario law which is section 91 (3) of the Liquor Control Act of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1950, which reads:

No person, unless authorized by the board, shall exhibit, publish or display or permit to be exhibited, published or displayed any other advertisement, or form of advertisement, or any other announcement, publication or price list of or concerning liquor or where or from whom the liquor may be had, obtained or purchased.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because of that law a magazine like *Maclean's*, which is printed in Ontario, which wants to carry liquor advertising, for the money to be had from carrying