

conscious trade off between "these effects and the policy objectives of the government". I suggest that it is both callous and Machiavellian when workers become helpless pawns in a trade off by an unthinking and unfeeling Secretary of State.

Just to make my point a little more clearly, Madam Speaker, I am sure other hon. members have received some of the information that I received. I have before me a half page and placed in all the leading newspapers of this country submitted by about 49 companies in the printing trade. The headline is: "A message to the Government of Canada from the Graphic Arts and Printing Trades Suppliers of the Canadian Reader's Digest". These 49 companies represent about 1,500 workers, among them Evergreen Press Limited of Vancouver representing 50 jobs, Century Arts Studio, Montreal Lithographing Limited and so on. The Secretary of State says that these 1,500 jobs are a conscious trade off that has to be made between "these effects and the policy objectives of the government".

Let me say something about the inconsistencies in this legislation. The Secretary of State has made it abundantly clear that there will be a real distinction between the effect of this legislation on periodicals and its effect on newspapers. As a matter of fact, the government has always made it clear that newspapers are not to be affected by this legislation at all. I ask you, Madam Speaker, what in the name of fairness can that mean? It means that newspapers in Canada can use the services of the writers, UPI, and all the news agencies around the world at a fraction of the cost of sending their own correspondents out to get news stories and to write them up.

I would ask the House how this situation is any different for *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. Both those companies are, in effect, using news agencies to gather in their material and prepare it for publication. One of the dilemmas that the minister faces is the freedom of news agencies to distribute their news stories to Canadian newspapers and magazines. This is done on a shared cost basis with other customers around the world. So a Canadian newspaper that buys a story from UPI, Reuters or API buys it at a fraction of the total cost of production. The rest of the cost is paid for by other customers in England, Australia, the United States and other English-speaking countries. No one questions the validity of this practice; it is the only way that Canadian newspapers can afford to provide world-wide news for their readers.

Reader's Digest and, I might add, *Time* magazine have a continuing relationship with the parent companies in the United States. *Reader's Digest* has raised two features which are objectionable to the minister and apparently to the government. First, its profit picture makes possible, indeed inevitable, that dividend payments will flow to the United States company. Second, it makes possible the purchase of previously published articles at a fraction of the cost of production, since they are already "used".

This practice has been termed by the government and some witnesses, I believe erroneously, "dumping". Nevertheless, the relationship makes savings possible, only because *Reader's Digest*, I might add, is a unique magazine both in format and in content as well as audience. However, it is the contention of the government and of some publishers that this relationship constitutes unfair compe-

Non-Canadian Publications

tion, and therefore inhibits the growth of existing periodicals and perhaps prevents the birth of new ones.

For reasons of consistency I wish the government would clear up what it plans to do with the news agencies scattered around the world as they "dump" their news stories in Canada. I would then ask the Secretary of State, who loves to quote Walter Gordon, why he does not quote other passages of Walter Gordon, for example, the statement he made in 1965 that:

The government's proposal asserts no control whatever over newspapers or any other publications. It does not alter in any way the complete freedom of businesses to advertise in any way they choose in existing publications or in any future publication owned by Canadians. It provides no precedent for any kind of government interference in the complete freedom of the press.

Then in a sentence I would like to underscore, Walter Gordon goes on to say:

There is not and could not be any question of interfering with the press in so far as the dissemination of news and opinion is concerned.

Then note this, Madam Speaker:

I know that no Liberal government would ever think of doing so.

● (2020)

Would you believe it: I know of no Liberal government that would ever interfere with that?

There is one final difficulty with this legislation, and that is that this is not in the form of a statute. Members have pointed this out before, as I did when speaking on a previous amendment. It is impossible for writers to operate in an atmosphere of freedom and security when they have hanging over them the Damoclean sword of government regulations and the whims and vicissitudes of ministers making up their minds. The government knows, and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) knows, as tacitly admitted by a statement in *Hansard*, the mistake of drawing up legislation in this present form. The Minister of National Revenue is faced with an impossible dilemma. First he realizes that the bill should include these regulations, and secondly he cannot do this—

Mr. Blais: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member presently speaking was granted the consent of the House to pursue his remarks past the limits imposed during these proceedings. He has now taken over 20 minutes of extra time. I should like the hon. member to indicate whether he has nearly completed his remarks and, if not, perhaps I might raise a further point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. If there is not unanimous consent the hon. member cannot continue his speech. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Madam Speaker, as the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) has stated, just before the adjournment at six o'clock the hon. member had come to the end of his allotted time and the House was asked for its unanimous consent in order that he might continue. That consent was given. I am satisfied that is the case. I know the hon. member will not abuse that privilege in any way, but consent for an extension of time was