

*Non-Canadian Publications*

along religious and political lines, and then indiscriminately. It was said by Heinrich Heine in 1834 that since the Exodus, I presume from slavery in Egypt, freedom has always spoken with a Hebrew accent. Perhaps I feel differently about this bill than some here because I have a different heritage.

This legislation, drafted to set a percentage on content by regulation and with no recourse to the courts for a test of its legality, is designed in the name of nationalism. I still say freedom itself, and the structure of democratic initiative and control by the justice system are threatened.

We probably will survive this, but when and what steps will be taken next in the cultural plan? I return to government interference with the right of the public to buy, to read, to watch what it wants, whether the parent company is Canadian or American. That is a step away from freedom.

And that phoney line: "We'll still get *Time* magazine" is specious. We will not get it in the way 500,000 Canadians have enjoyed it because content is controlled. Somebody said four Canadian pages. I do not care if it is four or six pages. I thought it was seven or eight. However, it is a balance of national news. There are 500,000 Canadians who have enjoyed its balance of content. If we do not want it manipulated and controlled so as to drive it out of the country, we will get an all-American edition as we do with the other imports.

The jobs in the west will go. *Time* says that it may keep some jobs in Montreal. It is possible that they will take their magazine and with it all the materials bought in Canada, move across the border and export in the same way as *Newsweek* and other magazines.

Both *Time* and *Reader's Digest* have said that they do not seek special exemptions, special status, or special privileges of any sort. It is the right of the people to advertise where they choose. Lest there be any doubt about the matter, they do not seek a competitive commercial advantage.

I would like to see *Maclean's* put out a quality news magazine that can compete. I would love to see it become such a good magazine that *Reader's Digest* would lose some of its circulation. That would be great. However, all they are into is a vindictive, narrow, Toronto-based nationalism that ends on Bloor Street.

● (1650)

In any case Bill C-58 is an assault on the right of the citizen. If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose that freedom, said Somerset Maugham. And the irony of it is that if it is money that is valued more than freedom, that too will be lost. We can only be losers in this attempt to push through Bill C-58 which represents a start toward an objective we can only fear.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, first I should like to say that this will be the last time I shall speak in this House under the leadership of my hon. friend, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), who legally, I suppose, will cease to be the Leader of the Opposition in

[Mrs. Holt.]

some five or six minutes time. I am delighted, however, that he intends to retain his seat in the House and I hope he will carry on in public in future the way he does in private, so that the country at large will be able to benefit from his wisdom more than it has in the past.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McKinnon:** I should also like to compliment the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) on the well-prepared speech she has just delivered. She shows an independence of spirit which is very rare. I do not say it is very rare only on the government side. It is very rare on both sides of the House. I compliment her on this, but I warn her that if her philosophy develops along the line it has taken in the last three or four weeks there will be other issues on which she will find herself at odds with the government. From reading her speeches closely I would say there is very little in common between her and, for example, the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner). Freedom is not limited to the printed word or to the electronic media. So I suspect the hon. member will be joining with members in various corners of the House in future in opposition to other legislation of a nature similar to the bill before us today.

**Mr. Blais:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member but perhaps I might obtain some information from the deputy House leader of the Conservative party. There was some indication at the time negotiations were going on between the parties to offer the Conservatives the extra hours, this evening and tomorrow, that debate on the bill before us would be terminated by five o'clock and the Conservatives could hold their convention in peace. All members would now agree, I imagine, that for the past week at any rate the debate has been repetitive and superfluous.

I would point out that an amendment has been presented which was not contemplated earlier, and this indicates some reluctance on the part of the opposition to make an effort along the lines suggested. I wonder now whether it is intended that the debate should be wound up before five o'clock. Should this not be the intention of the opposition I can only say that the government will seriously consider moving to obtain extra time in the immediate future to make up for the time which has been lost as a result of the agreement.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the hon. member should raise at this point, a few minutes before five o'clock, a matter which he and I in the course of our duty as deputy House leaders had been discussing previously. I recall that I was once chastized, very rightly, by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) for making a statement in the House with respect to a matter which had been discussed among House leaders. I felt so strongly about breaching what I considered to be the traditional protocol which governs these matters that I went to the President of the Privy Council and apologized profusely to him for my breach of etiquette.

I want to say with respect to what has happened today that this is an equally bad-tempered breach of parliamen-