

## Non-Canadian Publications

Export of Canadian Books, the revision of the Copyright Act, the gathering of statistics, co-publishing with the private sector, aid to authors, aid to publishers, project grants program, translation grants program, special grants, aid to promotion and distribution, the National Library, and so on. All these involve the government in the expenditure of millions of dollars for the assistance of the publishing industry in Canada.

Yet opposition members are saying that this is not a complete statement on the publishing industry. Of course it is not, but it is not a statement which is made in a vacuum; it is a step in the process. Hon. members who have been in the House for some time know it is not always the case that the government comes forth with a complete program at one time. The whole tradition of the common law, one of the geniuses of the British system, has been the growth from step to step of policy. Once you see it in operation you are then able to build a better structure on it. It is within that tradition that my colleague, the Secretary of State, has been developing his program.

Another of the confusions which has been thrown over the simple point of this bill is the use of extreme rhetoric. I will quote but one example from the hon. member for Calgary North who, we must all admit, is occasionally guilty of this fault.

On page 5889 of *Hansard* he is reported as having stated:

This government has taken over everything else, and now it wants to tell us what we should read . . . To me this is a complete affront and an attack on the freedom of our minds, or freedom in every respect.

Later he concludes his speech, as recorded at page 5890 of *Hansard*, by saying:

The government is guilty of implementing a bill of censorship. It is the worst form of taxation in the history of this country. It is a disgrace to the Liberal party.

I do not know whether or not hon. members opposite this evening would care to defend that statement, but I must admit that when I see such extremes of speech my mind tends to go back to certain earlier incidents, and I recall that when the original legislation was introduced in 1965 the *Winnipeg Free Press* published an article of which it is probably not too proud in retrospect.

In June of 1965 the *Free Press* compared Walter Gordon to King George III "He taxed advertising", to Adolf Hitler "He jailed editors", to Joseph Stalin "He made the press a government mouthpiece", and to Fidel Castro "He exiled editors". It was maintained that censorship of advertising was the same as censorship of editorial news matter, for it interferes with the right of people to inform themselves of what products exist so that they might decide for themselves how to spend their money. This is based on the view that paid advertising has the same rights in our tradition of free speech as pure speech itself. That is not the Liberal view.

The hon. member for Calgary North—I am sorry that he is not here this evening to hear my comments on his speech—was calling for a philosophical redefinition of the Liberal Party. We know what we are about over here, and I propose to tell him tonight, through you, Mr. Speaker, what the position of the Liberal Party is on matters such as this. We welcome the occasion to do this, but it is not because we need the enlightenment.

● (2020)

To come to the fundamental question in this area as to the meaning of civil liberties, which is really what is at stake here, I think reputable authorities will agree that civil liberties in our society are best classified as rights which are at the same time negative and personal. They have these two characteristics. They are ones which are negative in scope. They say "thou shalt not," and at the same time they relate directly to the human person, not to all the activities of the human person but to those which relate most directly to the democratic process.

In fact we might put it this way: civil liberties are those rights which are most fundamentally necessary to the democratic process. If what was in question was an elimination of all advertising in our society or all advertising of a particular kind, there might indeed be a question of civil liberties raised, because one might contend that the elimination entirely of the right to advertise was an unreasonable restraint on liberty which went to the very heart of the question of human liberty in a democratic society.

But when what we are talking about is not that, but is the question of how we are to direct and to limit our advertising, it would be very hard for any impartial observer to understand how this bill could be said to be a detriment to our civil liberties or to be an attack on our fundamental freedoms, as the hon. member for Calgary North has suggested. We restrict advertising, for instance, with respect to liquor, and we limit advertising on television and radio. In fact under the original law in 1965 we put in this same limitation. We are merely applying it to other magazines in this case, three other publications—if there is a third one involved.

But there is nothing new here. This is not a new law. This is a slight extension of an existing law, and the hon. member for Calgary North does not appear to have appreciated the fact that we are already faced with the same situation, and that in our whole society people accept the fact that advertising may be limited and directed by the law in the interests of the public good.

When hon. members such as the hon. member for Calgary North raise a question about what it is to be Liberal, it reminds me of the time when President Eisenhower—I think it was in the 1952 election—said that it was his goal to be liberal in human affairs and conservative in economic matters, but as Adlai Stevenson retorted at the time, the problem with the Republicans was that what they thought was an economic matter, everyone else thought was a human matter. I suggest that the hon. member for Calgary North could well give some further thought to the kind of Liberal philosophy we have on this side.

It has also been claimed that there is retroactive discrimination here, and I object to both parts of that contention. The history of legislation in this area is worth discussing very briefly, because as far back as 1922 the Magazine Publishers' Association requested parliament to impose a protective tariff on foreign periodicals. In 1931 the Bennett government partially satisfied that request by imposing a duty on foreign magazines entering Canada, a duty calculated upon the degree of advertising content in these magazines. The duty proved to be somewhat effective in that 47 U.S. periodicals began printing in Canada