

*Non-Canadian Publications*

The supporters of the bill have also exaggerated to a great degree. They have greatly overstated the case about the future influx of foreign publications into Canada if the bill is not passed. It is nonsense to say that without this bill our cultural identity would be in danger. It is also nonsense to say that there is a privilege involved which is extensively abused by some publishers. When it is said that this bill really does not propose significant restrictions on anyone, and that it is a minor tax bill, that is an exaggeration.

I think the answer, and the reasonable position, lies somewhere in the middle—where Liberals normally are but from where we have badly shifted with this legislation. The minister and the government have never accepted consideration of any middle-ground position. When I consider the type of mild amendments which were refused by the government—even amendments which would have been useful without detracting to any great degree from the bill—I am obliged to feel that the minister operated from a point of total inflexibility; I might even say bad will. I do not intend to be mean to the minister, but on some subjects no person is more Liberal to the point of probably being libertarian. That is why it is tremendously difficult for me to understand his inflexibility in this instance. I suppose it is always those who shout the loudest for freedom and liberty who are the first to deny them to others.

I will vote against this bill because it is totally contrary to my Liberal principles and my party's principles. It is not easy to vote against the government of which you are a member, but more than ever I am convinced that a government cannot override a person's or a party's principles. I voted against the Petro-Can bill because that was strictly socialist legislation. I am not a socialist and neither is my party. If I had wanted to support socialism, I would have joined the NDP, not the Liberal Party. I will vote against Bill C-58 because it is against my party's principles, and in my view it is a retrograde piece of legislation.

If only the minister and his officials could have found the Liberal middle-ground which would not have totally offended worthy segments of the publishing industry in this country and the principles of the Liberal party. Instead, I am afraid this legislation demonstrates total lack of imagination and I wonder if that lack of imagination is not intended in order to have the effectiveness of the legislation rest upon departmental interpretation rather than on the legislation itself.

This point was totally confirmed when accommodation was found for *Reader's Digest*. The opposition has contended that there is something shady about this accommodation, and in light of the previous inflexibility there might well be; I do not know. But it would have taken a mind completely isolated from reality not to recognize eventually that *Reader's Digest* is not a news magazine like the others. What troubles me deeply is that we are continuing a trend in the cultural field to perpetrate all sorts of inequities and injustices, and treating citizens and groups unfairly in the name of a nebulous, broad principle, while at the same time disregarding other equally or more important principles regarding the rights and opportunities of individuals who are the backbone of Liberalism. As a Liberal member of parliament, my affiliation requires that

[Mr. Roy (Timmins).]

I should support the bill. As a Liberal member in principle and philosophy, my decision is not to support the bill because those principles cannot be compromised except for very serious reasons for the public good, and this bill does not address itself to any such serious problem.

There have been many arguments pro and con during this debate, but just let me discuss some of the meaningful points which argument and exaggerated and artificial verbiage or positions cannot change, and which clearly demonstrate the undesirability of this legislation. The objectors see a great deal of censorship in the bill, and the supporters see none at all. I think everyone will agree that there are at least some substantial restrictions which would be consequences of the bill. If there were not, there would be no need for the bill and its proposal in the House would be a sham. So there are restrictions which will be imposed by this bill. To whom will these restrictions apply? Most, or all, foreign publications cannot comply with the bill and will not, likely, distribute their publications into this country in any event except from outside the country. So who will the bill affect? It will affect Canadian publishers because the law will be on the books for Canadian and foreign publishers alike. Our Canadian publishers will be restricted, and let us not forget that they have no other country to run to.

It may well be that the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) and his officials will look the other way when a Canadian publication is involved. Indeed, if they can wring out of their interpretation an accommodation for *Reader's Digest*, they can surely wring one out for a Canadian publisher. However, the fact remains that our Canadian publishers will have to face this legislation always; and it may be they who will be hurt by it, and not foreign publishers.

What about the discriminatory aspect of the legislation? There is no changing that, in spite of all the debate and arguments. Newspapers and broadcasters are not covered by this bill. The news and editorial content of newspapers and broadcasters can be totally similar to a foreign publication and nobody will say a word. Why could we not come up with a bill which at least does not discriminate between competing media elements? Surely no Liberal principle can tolerate this type of discrimination. Another fact which cannot be changed is that no other country has this type of legislation on its statute books. Are we the only government so lacking in confidence in our people and our institutions that we must be protected by such negative legislation? Are we so weak and do we place so little value on our Canadian culture that it is threatened by foreign publications? Are we slowly isolating ourselves onto an island of culture which runs away from the rest of the world? If one is to take this bill seriously, the answer to all these questions would be "Yes." Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree. I think we are badly misjudging the strength of our Canadian culture by measures such as this.

● (1630)

A big case was made with regard to dumping. If the 80 per cent "dissimilar in content" interpretation was not part of the bill, it would allow a continuance of the terrible dumping that now exists. We have seen the arguments stretched to the ridiculous point of comparing publications and written material with manufactured goods, and calling