

does not offer competition to any other journal or magazine in this country; it is published, printed and edited in Canada—yet Bill C-58 would eliminate it.

Did the Secretary of State also decide to disregard the 1,000 Canadian writers because he was so bent on hearing only the periodicals' association? What has happened to the right of the individual? I am sure many of those writers are just as professional as members of the association in question—perhaps more so than the sponsors of this arbitrary piece of legislation—and perhaps could do much more to put Canada on the world map in a more meaningful and brotherly manner. Maybe it would be wise for the respective ministers and government supporters to read the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) once again. I am as pro-Canadian as anyone, but before you have a good neighbour, you first have to learn how to be one, and the policy of this government certainly lacks the premise of being a good neighbour as far as relationships exists with the United States.

Did members of the NDP realize what they were doing when they spoke in support of the government on this bill? Does the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes), for instance, want to become part of this about-face of the Minister of National Revenue and the narrow and biased outlook of the Secretary of State? Did not the constituents of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) express their feelings about this biased legislation? Are they not "men of the cloth" to whom Canadians look for justice at every level? I believe that if they reconsider their stand, especially when government MPs have, they will have the courage to stand up for what is right, rather than to be led around by the nose. How can NDP members, or any member in this House, respect ministers in their individual interpretations and single-minded decisions?

We have heard about the Cullen rule. If this minister does not change his stand, perhaps we will hear about the Cullen funeral. There is no reason why he has to be tagged with this legislation. It was handed to him by his predecessor. If he wishes properly to represent those who elected him and all other Canadians, he will have to take another look at this question. We must ask ourselves whether we want government by interpretation rather than by statute. Government supporters who are supporting the two ministers in this legislation should recognize that these ministers may not hold their positions for very long. Perhaps there will be a new government. I hope so. If that happens, there will be two new ministers. Unless changed, this legislation will be in place and open to interpretation. Therefore, if this legislation passes it will be a great disservice to the Canadian people and the freedom that has been given to us by those who went before. We should be careful about giving away that freedom to the interpretation of ministers.

This bill has gone beyond a simple income tax measure. *Reader's Digest* can perhaps continue to publish within Canada, and the future of *Time* is not yet known—so how many Canadian publications will actually reap benefits from this measure as far as income is concerned? We know the facts. The figures have been given to this House. It is within 2 per cent or 3 per cent of the amount used for

Non-Canadian Publications

advertising that is put into magazine advertisements. This legislation will surely not change the amount that much. The inherent danger in Bill C-58, and I would think that every democratic individual would realize this, is the fact that the government is interfering in what is to be published, namely, the printed word. Perhaps the next step will be infringement of our freedom to worship. Economic freedom in this country has already been implicated because of government restrictions.

How can any conscientious MP of any party profess to be concerned about our veterans, our former prisoners of war, senior citizens' well-being, our prisons and their inmates, and child care—to name a few—and yet defend a measure which takes away one of our basic freedoms by interpretation? The printed word, after all, is a form of freedom of speech. Not many countries in this world have the opportunity of exercising that freedom. We should certainly do it at every opportunity. We must make sure that freedom of speech is protected in order to maintain a degree of stability.

I feel sure that every MP who has the courage and integrity to think for himself will realize he cannot support this bill. Members opposite have been very active in their support of the O'Leary commission recommendations concerning Canadian periodicals, but it was very noticeable that their support did not mention one very significant fact. At no time did the O'Leary report suggest that government should become involved in the interpretation of what Canadians should or should not read. It should be left up to Canadians. They are intelligent people. If they do not like what they see, they do not buy it. However, they cannot read what is not printed. When the Minister of National Revenue or the Secretary of State interferes with what is to be printed, there is created an element of political bias. It is an infringement on the rights of the individual.

There is no reason why we should allow this bill to pass. I hope there are enough members on all sides who will stand up and be heard on this very crucial issue, because once in place it will be very difficult to change. Let me emphasize that that which is put in place should be put in place by statute, not by interpretation. Because of the disagreement in the course of second reading, committee stage and report stage, there is a great variance in opinion. The government has no right to decide what should be available for reading or what can or cannot be printed in this country.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it has become apparent from what one reads and hears in the media of this country that journalists in Canada, newspapers in Canada and most thinking Canadians, have come to realize as this debate has gone on the danger of this bill with its so-called Cullen rule and its principle of government by interpretation rather than government by statute. What the government has proposed, and what it persists in doing by refusing to reconsider its position, by setting on its own embarrassment a greater value than the principle upon which a free society and free democracy is established, is in point of fact violating everything we have ever been taught about responsible government, in the parliamentary sense, acting through our parliamentary institutions.