

If we are going to talk about a situation in which foreign publications or foreign material comes into this country to be printed and is subjected to a bureaucratic value judgment we must recognize, that as a subjective position... if bureaucrats do not like something they can censor it 100 per cent... It means there is no debate. A group of people in the bureaucracy make a subjective judgment about a piece of writing, but unless they can produce some unwaivering criteria to support their judgment then there is no formula... The reference to previously published material in fact means that writers from any other country can publish first in Canada and then in a foreign country.

● (2030)

Any material written in another country becomes acceptable if it is first published in Canada, but if it is published in another country and then comes to Canada it is not acceptable. What a lot of hogwash, Madam Speaker! All magazines such as *Reader's Digest* or *MD* have to do is change the order of publication, that is, publish first in Canada and then in the foreign country. Substantially not the same as previously published material simply means the order of publication can be changed and it is within the regulations. This will not protect the Canadian publishing industry. Actually it will simply create a loophole to circumvent the law.

Quite frankly I do not see any better evidence of the position of the government in respect of the so-called new society and the greater degree of government intervention than in this legislation. Clearly the government intends to restrict the entry of written material which it does not like, and allow material that is advantageous to it.

It is the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) who is responsible for this mess. He in turn has dumped it into the lap of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen). I think the Minister of National Revenue would be well advised to dump it right back into the lap of the Secretary of State.

The real issue here is really the right of Canadians to read what they want to read, and they resent the government's increasing involvement in their day-to-day lives. It would seem to me that this is a collision course that the government would hope to avoid. I believe common sense in this situation should always prevail.

The government made a farce of the committee which studied this legislation. When it became apparent that some government members of the committee voiced disapproval, the government responded by moving these dissenters and replacing them with "yes" men. By emasculating this committee the government has exposed the real inability of most committees to do a job in a way that not only would be meaningful and fulfilling to a member but that would also help members in their attempt to contribute to the legislative process of the country.

The minister talked about Canadianism and Canadian culture. He talked about our losing our identity as Canadians. When he mentioned this there was no question in my mind that he was referring to our neighbour to the south. When he spoke of the 80 per cent difference perhaps he should have stressed not the difference but rather the similarity of our two cultures here and in the United States. He should have emphasized the similarity more than the difference.

I said my remarks would be short. I should like to say in conclusion that this bill is not in the interest of the

Non-Canadian Publications

Canadian public. The Canadian cultural industry has already turned its back on the Secretary of State. The federal government is the servant of the people; it is not the people who are the servants of the government. When any government fails to recognize this then it invites political disaster. My suggestion to the minister is that he clean up this mess very simply by tabling Bill C-58 and relegating it to the wastepaper basket where it rightly belongs.

Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni): Madam Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Filibuster.

Mr. Anderson: I am glad to see hon. members over there are awake tonight. It was interesting to listen to the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) when he was discussing competition. I thought that in a very short time, within two weeks, the same people who are discussing Bill C-58 tonight will be discussing competition and Canadianization of our country at a convention to be held not too far from these premises. I wonder if the same people, like the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock, will be saying the same things at that convention they are saying in this House. I doubt it.

The hon. member for Surrey-White Rock made quite a large issue, while speaking for some time, of competition. I do not think any member of this House will be deluded into believing that the hon. member really was talking about competition between Canadian firms but basically was talking about competition in the sense that there is unfair competition. He did not say it, but there was the implication that there is unfair competition in the periodical industry in Canada.

I suggest that in bringing up the subject of competition between Canadian firms and *Reader's Digest* and *Time* magazine the hon. member is creating a smokescreen, because surely the way the law was set up in Canada in 1965 gave a very clear advantage to *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, and therefore there is no competition between these two magazines and the publications we have in Canada. It amazes me how, day by day, things are twisted around. I thought members on the opposite side, being fair, would recognize the fact that there is no fair competition in the way our laws are set up today.

In our law since 1968 we have allowed content, editorial and otherwise, to cross the border from one country to another with little or no input to Canada and at no cost to the firm bringing it in. Then it is said that we want competition between Canadian and American magazines. That is nonsense. How can there be competition when these magazines come in at a distinct advantage?

The hon. member for Surrey-White Rock was a member of the Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts. He heard the periodical people say, time after time after time, that they could not compete with these two American companies because they were too large and had the advantage of shipping their material across the border at nearly just cost.

When the hon. member talks about competition I hope he merely is misled and is not really serious about this aspect of Bill C-58, because I believe any thinking person in this