

*Non-Canadian Publications*

know periodical publishing it is no help to the publishing industry.

The prestigious Canadian Authors Association, an organization of about 850 author members, probably every author in Canada, which fought since 1921 and obtained improved copyright laws and other protections for writers, came before the committee, was given a polite hearing, and that was all. What it said seemed to be ignored. Although the resolution it put before parliament of Canada is not included in the minutes of the committee hearings, may I put part of its resolution on record? It is resolved, in the second paragraph:

● (1630)

... that the intended establishment of content guidelines for periodicals published in Canada as a minimum requirement for determining the "Canadian-ness" of these periodicals is anathema to the principles of freedom of expression upon which this country has flourished and without which it will quickly diminish in stature.

They go on to make this next point:

... that the Government of Canada immediately rescind its current actions in seeking to amend the Income Tax Act so as to restrict any periodical—including our daily press which does not, nor could not, meet such requirements—from publishing whatever content it deems most acceptable to its own readers in the firm belief that Canadians are sufficiently mature to reject those ideas and concepts that hold no appeal for them and in the further belief that maturity can only grow—the nation itself grows—through the people's own powers of choice.

They wanted to make it clear to the leaders of our government that the growth of Canadian culture can only be inhibited by censorship and unacceptable ownership guidelines such as are currently being considered by the government for such periodicals as *Reader's Digest* and *Time* and, in fact, that only by exposure to all Canadians of such vehicles can an indigenous culture develop and flourish.

That statement was ignored, as was the statement by the ad hoc group of 27 authors who wrote a letter to the committee asking the committee not to move in the direction indicated by Bill C-58. Among the authors were included Sydney Katz, Bruce Hutchison and Robert Collins, who are prominent Canadians and good writers.

The national fervor, obviously greed for more and more, is exemplified by *Maclean's*, that great, multinational conglomerate, and Southam's, which has vested interests in periodical publications and owns its own television and cable companies. Incidentally, among the top 200 Canadian corporations *Maclean's* ranks as 143rd and Southam's as 88th.

The most interesting example of the motivation for this cultural nationalism is the amusing irony in the recent story about book publisher Mel Hurtig, Edmonton's resident nationalist, the man who headed the "Committee for an independent Canada."

Hurtig, who is perpetually heard crying "foul" about American intrusion into Canadian books and periodicals, provides jobs in Japan and other foreign countries rather than in Canada. He can get his books printed more cheaply abroad. On January 1 of this year Hurtig lost his lucrative *Guinness Books of Records*. The outcry was horrendous. While he does not want foreign subsidiary houses operating in Canada lest they jeopardize his income, he cried "foul" because the Guinness best seller had been lost to

[Mrs. Holt.]

him. It may be the first response to Canadian cultural protectionism, called nationalism.

Hurtig lost one quarter of his income, his "seed money", by the Guinness action. Jamie Portman, reporting for Southam News service, described Hurtig as "hopping mad". Hurtig is reported to have said, "Here it is, happening to me, a Canadian nationalist who has long argued about the way in which we can be affected by decision-making outside our own borders. I never dreamed I would be faced with such a situation myself." Instead of realizing he had created his own disaster he turned his attack on the foreign publishers. They probably knew what he had been doing and were giving him some sort of message. Even the Secretary of State sent a personal letter, I understand—according to Portman's report in the *Citizen* of December 17, 1975—warning Norris McWhirter of the "serious implications this action could have for the future of the Canadian publishing industry." What a strange argument.

Hurtig wrote:

Your decision, to the Guinness group, means that our publishing company will have a substantial drop in sale thus affecting our ability to publish Canadian books. It will mean more of an outflow of profits from Canada to United States each year.

He was writing this letter to a British book company. He went on:

In general, it will be highly detrimental to both Canadian book publishing and the Canadian market as well.

If Guinness books were looking for the world's record for the greatest distortion of nationalism in the world, that would be it.

Let me return to the serious question of this bill and the danger it represents to the entire body of freedom, not just the freedom of self-serving nationalists.

As quoted by Leonard Lyons of *New York Post*, April 1, 1959, Nehru said to Khrushchev in a meeting:

You do not change the course of history by turning the faces of portraits to the wall.

While we cannot change history's course, the patterns of past history have a consistency which warn we are headed on a collision course with freedom. It begins when a state starts tampering with content of publications, with freedom to publish, and the whole business of censorship, which often goes as far as the assassination of publications. How often have I heard that this bill is not censorship! I don't know what censorship is, if this is not censorship.

The most recent and significant demise of a free press in a democracy occurred in India. When Indira Gandhi's troubles began one of her first actions was to manipulate, then totally control, freedom of the press, thus putting India's newspapers under permanent censorship. The bill she put through her parliament last June was described as so far-reaching that no paper will be able to say, for example, that poverty has increased in India. Banned from publication will be accounts of anti-government demonstrations, arrests, opposition activities, and even speeches in parliament.

Yes, it can happen here—and the Secretary of State announced in committee that he had a cultural plan for Canada. That has happened before, with nationalism as the