

*Time* Canada president, Stephen S. LaRue, is right when he says it is unreasonable to assume that news can be manipulated to meet a content formula, though perhaps a better way to put it would be that news can be so manipulated, but at peril to the public weal. Indeed, news is being manipulated in many countries, but Canada has not been one of them, and for us to join the list would be bad business.

LaRue says news is what actually happens, and you can't make it 80 per cent different by official decree.

That is the whole point of this debate. I am sure hon. members opposite have received the same kind of correspondence as we have. I do not believe for one minute that hon. members opposite have been receiving bags full of mail telling them to push this matter forward, to invoke closure, and so forth. I think they have been receiving the same mail as we have, and I hope they will have the courage to say so at committee stage, because obviously right now they are gagged; we have not heard a speaker on this bill from the government side for quite some time. They are obviously gagged and have been told not to speak. That is one of the sad things which happens in this parliament and in many of these debates. We hear some fire from the government, and suddenly someone says, «Shut up. Don't speak any more. Let the opposition do all the talking; the bill will eventually pass.» That becomes a parliamentary tactic. It is sad, on an issue of this type, to see hon. members opposite sit there and not have the courage to enter into the debate.

**Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I suppose that in about two minutes I will be the first to speak in this extended time, our penance for taking time off on Monday. I am not sure whether that is an honour. I really hold no brief for *Time* magazine. In fact, I rarely read it unless I am on a plane going somewhere and it is handed to me. I do not have any real support to express for *Reader's Digest*. I read it regularly and have done so for some 35 years. I remember it from before the time it carried advertising. I enjoyed it then and I enjoy it now.

On the other hand, I want to express a great deal of support for Canadian publications such as *Maclean's*. I want to see Canadian magazines such as *Maclean's* grow and prosper and become better magazines, although frankly sometimes it is a little tough to read a Canadian magazine when the cover and feature story is about an American football player who seems to feel that the greatest thing in Canada is having a good looking blonde waiting in bed for him when he comes home, whatever the time of night, with fresh fruit and that sort of thing.

I am as much a Canadian nationalist as anyone. Recently I took a trip with the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works. The then deputy chairman of the committee, who is sitting across from me, will remember this, I am sure. I spent no little amount of time pointing out to the committee that not only did I support Canadian products, but I also supported products from Hastings riding.

● (1800)

For example on that trip my socks, my shirts, my jacket, my coat and even my cufflinks were all made in the riding of Hastings, and those things which were not made there were bought there. I made sure everything was Canadian-made. I wonder how many hon. members opposite go out of their way to make sure every article of their apparel is

#### *Non-Canadian Publications*

Canadian-made. Of course, we have a little more incentive in regard to some apparel on this side of the House. I will not mention any manufacturer's name, but we might have greater interest in one brand of underwear. How many people in this House go out of their way to make sure the products they wear are Canadian? If I am interested in making sure the things that I buy and wear are Canadian, would it not be reasonable to think that I want this issue settled in what the government gives us as «the Canadian way»?

The government has not justified Bill C-58 and it certainly has not justified closure on second reading. What possible reason is there for that? I do not intend to go into statistics here. The hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling), the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and other speakers who preceded me have given all kinds of statistics to justify not putting this legislation through. The hon. member for Provencher read a number of editorials. Frankly, I have forgotten the one that came from Barry McCullough of the *Belleville Intelligencer* in opposition to this legislation. It is not often that he and I agree, but we do this time.

A number of speakers mentioned censorship. I would like to think that is not a policy of the Liberal government and that by and large they would not be in favour of it. If they are not in favour of it, however, why would they impose this bill on us? I cannot see any reason for it. I look to the Minister for an ulterior motive and cannot find any. He is a neighbour of mine and in no way could be called stupid or lacking in imagination. Anyone who says that about someone who has his roots as deep in Belleville as the Hon. Hugh Faulkner is going to have to fight me. We do not turn out that type of person. The Faulkner name is enshrined in Hastings county; what used to be the Glamore museum was originally the Faulkner house. Why would he bring in this legislation? The question keeps coming back. Why would he impose upon the country the obvious loss of jobs?

**Mr. Faulkner:** You have to go back to the O'Leary commission to understand why.

**Mr. Ellis:** You have to go back further than that to understand what you are doing. I am sure the good senator would not countenance this at all. We talk about the loss of the publishing industry and the loss of jobs, in Quebec particularly. I ask, without being partisan, why does the minister wish to impose that kind of income loss on a province from which the Liberal party receives a good deal of support? Surely the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) is not overly anxious to collect a few extra tax dollars. Considering the speed with which tax money is spent, I do not think the few extra dollars will last long. That cannot be the government's purpose, nor does the bill suggest it is. The House was told that only 19 per cent of the additional revenue will accrue to Canadian publishers and most of that will go to the Maclean-Hunter organization which, surely, is better able to look after itself than any other Canadian publishing group.

Hon. members may not know that I spent a couple of years publishing a magazine. I was in the concrete business and had a good deal of fun publishing a small quar-