

*Non-Canadian Publications***Or pornographic**

—book and what isn't a dirty book.

Mr. Robert Stanfield said this legislation is not acceptable to anyone who still believes in the fundamental principles of a free democracy. Mr. Stanfield is right. The government should withdraw Bill C-58 and review its 80 per cent content rule.

I support the subamendment proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. If Canadians want *Maclean's*, they will have to buy it. We do not need the Liberal government ramming it down our throats. The *Montreal Star* said much the same in an editorial on January 29:

The federal government's Bill C-58 has one thing in common with Bill 22 of the Quebec government.

Each of these laws is controversial. I continue:

Each is framed in ambiguity and therefore open to whimsical or dangerous interpretation by bureaucrats—

The editorial further says that one official interpretation so far is that "substantially the same as" means that 80 per cent of the contents must be reported, edited, viewed and otherwise originated by Canadians. As I said earlier, this means that most Canadian newspapers or periodicals at one time or other will not, under this definition, be considered as Canadian. The *Montreal Star* says:

What kind of future interpretation will be delivered by bureaucrats who for purposes of their own or the government that hires them decide that specific Canadian newspapers aren't friendly and therefore must cease publication because they do not qualify? Bill C-58 has reached its present stage without benefit of full cabinet debate. It is ill-conceived in the form in which it now appears. It is a threat to civil liberties. It is, moreover, politically dangerous for a Trudeau administration which has already become enmeshed in a distasteful controversy over a possible increase in government intervention in business affairs and habits of Canadians. There can be no excuse for adding to the conflict by inviting the kind of bureaucratic meddling that might violate fundamental democratic values. Bill C-58 has no reason for passage.

As another contributor to a certain Toronto magazine says, if the Liberal government passes Bill C-58 in its present form, "it will be the last editorial viewpoint in this magazine that will be written and published free of government editorial control." That is terrible.

**Mr. Symes:** The hon. member has not considered certain aspects.

**Mr. Darling:** The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) is commenting. He thinks that anything to do with free enterprise is distasteful, as do many members on my left. Those hon. members want more government ownership, more government intervention, more government control: that is their goal.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** And jobs for the boys.

**Mr. Darling:** I suggest that the majority of the members of this House and the vast majority of Canadians are not ready for that kind of control.

**Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, having listened to many hon. members speaking in this House, my admiration has been strengthened for government supporters who had the courage of their convictions and spoke as representatives of those who voted them into parliament. They clearly outlined their reasons for opposing this bill even though most of their backbench colleagues support

[Mr. Darling.]

the government, disregard the effect of Bill C-58 on the majority of Canadians and forget that there was little, if any, consultation between the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) and the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) and their counterparts south of the border.

Canadians ought to remember that we have a good neighbour south of the border. If we continue treating our neighbours in this manner, there is no guarantee they will remain good neighbours. Anti-Americanism is popular in Canada these days; but let me impress on the House that one need not be anti-American in order to be pro-Canadian. There is room for both countries on this continent. As one country grows, so will the other: we must remember this. If we are to become strong as a country, our neighbour south of the border must also be strong.

Have the Minister of National Revenue and the Secretary of State considered what our Canadian publications would lose if our good neighbour to the south retaliated in like manner? How much would our publishing industry lose if it no longer carried glossy advertisements of products made south of the border? Our advertising arrangements should be reciprocal. We all understand that the United States is bigger than this country: it has ten times our population and is ten times as strong. Let us remember that almost every publication sold in Canada carries advertisements of United States products and services to do with liquor, cigarettes, real estate, vacation spots, cosmetics and countless everyday consumer products.

● (1630)

Even the Canadian Periodical Publishers' Association must be aware of that fact, but perhaps it, too, can afford to ignore the individual's welfare and point of view, as the Secretary of State did with regard to other representations made to the House committee. That association seems to be the sole interest, vigorously defended by the Secretary of State. That is strange, yet interesting, because this government is well schooled in overlooking suggestions, submissions, personal petitions and pleas by Canadians from every area of our land, regardless of the number. I guess that can only be construed as another interpretation: this government and its ministers find an interpretation to suit their objective, turning a deaf ear, flaunting authority and discounting all intelligent reasoning emanating from outside their own sanctum. Unfortunately, power begets power. I do not think it would be at all far-fetched to say that nothing destroys democracy as rapidly as power and the greed for more power.

This legislation, if left unamended and if no consideration is given to this amendment, will discriminate in favour of publications which concentrate on events within this country as against those which report extensively on international affairs. Most Canadians read daily or weekly newspapers in which all important Canadian news is printed, without restriction, interpretation or discrimination. Magazines or periodicals which contain information and educational or other specific informative material may no longer be permitted to serve Canadians as a result of the decision of the Secretary of State. While giving lip service, has the government given enough thought to publications such as *MD of Canada* which provides an important and necessary service to our physicians? The entire content of this medical journal is valuable information. It