

ing, and equivocating all over the riding like the infamous generals of Hitler after World War II. He will probably complain that he was only following orders from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). Well, we all know what happened to those generals; and I would suggest that the Secretary of State will get some of his own back in the next election. The road to electoral defeat is paved with those members who thought, going into a campaign, that people never remember what happened a few months or a couple of years before.

The worst effect of Bill C-58 will not be the demise of *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. No matter what we do here with respect to those magazines, both *Time* and *Reader's Digest* will survive, not only in the United States but in the multitude of countries around the world where there is still freedom of the press, and where people still have the right to decide what they will read. The total effect of this bill will be, in the long run, the denial to the people of Canada of right of access to the periodicals of their choice.

If the real purpose of Bill C-58 is the protection of the Canadian periodical industry, then there are two reasons why this bill is out of contact with reality. In the first place, magazines such as *Maclean's* will not be made better or more prosperous for their owners by the act of eliminating their chief competitors. When I spoke earlier on this bill I described *Maclean's* as a tender flower which needed much nurturing in order to survive. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I now have had some cause to change. I think this tender flower could be more aptly described as a carnivorous man-eating or plant-eating plant in the sense of devouring its smaller and less successful competitors.

It may be that *Maclean's* will be the octopus of the Canadian periodical industry. *Time* and *Reader's Digest* have never been any real competition to *Maclean's* for the simple reason that they are not even in the same league. In my view that is like trying to protect the egg market in Canada by prohibiting the importation of apples from Oregon.

In the second place, because the bill cannot possibly affect the economic health of these two magazines, the real effect of the bill is to introduce censorship of a section of the media in Canada. I do not believe this censorship will end with these two magazines. I believe, and other members including the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway believe as I do, that if parliament allows the government to exercise censorship in the case of *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, we will be opening Pandora's box.

We will see this same censorship being exercised again and again by the Secretary of State, or perhaps by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen). This is simply too much power to place in the hands of a minister, any minister, and especially a minister who has proven that he would use this power to work out a grudge against a particular magazine. Will it be a particular newspaper next or will it be *Maclean's*, the very magazine that Bill C-58 is designed to promote? *Maclean's* has lately adopted a policy of publishing laudatory articles about the Liberal government and pages of profiles of Liberal ministers. What if *Maclean's* should begin to write articles that tell the whole truth about the government and its ministers? Would the Secretary of State lower the boom?

Non-Canadian Publications

The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton revealed another flaw in Bill C-58 when he pointed out that under both federal and provincial law 51 per cent or more ownership in any company in Canada or any kind of property constitutes ownership. He pointed out that even in the case of the recent laws governing foreign ownership of Canadian corporations the law states that ownership is Canadian if 51 per cent or more of stock in such company is owned by resident Canadians. If this is so, Mr. Speaker, then why is it necessary to single out two magazines, or why is it necessary to single out a particular kind of industry and say that the law does not apply?

Why is it important to us to insist that *Time* and *Reader's Digest* show 75 per cent or 80 per cent Canadian ownership to qualify as Canadian? I still have not been given the answer to that question, and I still have not found out what happened to the motion moved by the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton.

● (1610)

Speaking of answers, I would like the Secretary of State to come clean on at least one aspect of this mess and tell us about the sweetheart deal the government made with *Reader's Digest*—or possibly it should be the Minister of National Revenue. I would like to know exactly what was arranged between *Reader's Digest* and the ministers in question. We have already heard the Minister of National Revenue say on national television that if Bill C-58 does not kill the Canadian edition of *Time* magazine, then perhaps he would have to consider bringing in much stronger legislation. We have been told that the sweetheart deal made with *Reader's Digest* could not apply in the case of *Time*. Why? I would like to know the answers to these questions, and time is running out—no pun intended.

The plain fact of Bill C-58 is that it is directed against the majority of Canadians, people who have expressed their wish to have *Time* and *Reader's Digest* remain as they are. Those people know what they like, they know what they want, and at this point in time they are well aware that their wishes are not important to the Secretary of State or the government as a whole.

In conclusion I should like to refer to a statement made in 1760 by Edmund Burke, one of the greatest of all parliamentarians and a staunch foe of oppressive government. In a paper he wrote in support of the repeal of the Popery laws he said, and I quote:

A law against the majority of the people is in substance a law against the people itself. It is not particular injustice, but general oppression.

That sums up my opposition to Bill C-58. It provides me with two excellent reasons for voting against the bill. First, the bill denies the majority of Canadians the right of access to periodicals of their choice. Second, it opens the door to government censorship of the press in Canada. I challenge hon. members on the benches across the floor to find as good a reason for voting for Bill C-58. I challenge them to vote against the bill and fully support the amendment of the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen).

Mrs. Simma Holt (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, having spoken before, my fear over content control and the ramifications of such tampering and manipulation of regu-