

the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Heaps) was one of those who directed attention to the fact that some difficulty might be experienced. It was in the heat of a summer's day that that item was framed and put through this house, as the record will show. It was intended to make it absolutely clear that if the advertising was under twenty per cent, the magazine would come in free. There were also the other types of magazines to which I have referred which also came in free.

But there was another class of publication to which I should direct attention. Item 184d reads:

Periodicals or portions of newspapers consisting largely of fiction and/or feature stories or articles and/or comic supplements, per pound, 15 cents.

I dare say hon. members will recall the observations I made at that time that no one could yet say what the new generation that had been brought up on Mutt and Jeff, on Major Hoople and Bringing up Father, would be like. The government imposed a duty of fifteen cents per pound, and many people thought that this rate was wholly inadequate. This meant that the type of magazine known as the pulp magazine had to pay fifteen cents per pound, and many established plants in this country. But in publishing their magazines here many of them had to vary their output because of our criminal code. It may be contended that the plates were brought in from the United States, but in many cases they were modified in order that they might not violate the provisions of our law. With respect to one magazine, I believe the one having the largest circulation, a separate editorial office was established. The editorials appearing in the magazines were purely Canadian, the only reproduction being the fiction and other articles. That is the position, and it is not for the reason the Minister of Finance has mentioned. There is no desire to suggest that when he gave the intermediate he found it difficult to accept this or that. We have now undertaken to bind ourselves for the life of this treaty to a continuance of a condition that was becoming almost intolerable to the Canadian people. There was a desire to get revenue from advertising, but that would be through the higher corporation tax paid by newspaper corporations because of greater profits. There was no desire to tax ideas or thoughts upon which the progress of civilization might depend; the desire was that foreign publications should make some contribution to the treasury of Canada because of the value received through adver-

[Mr. Bennett.]

tising, and to give a chance to Canadian magazines to expand. The circulation of Canadian magazines practically doubled after this came into force. It is against the binding of this agreement which is detrimental to the Canadian people that I protest.

Mr. DUNNING: Mr. Chairman, of course, there is fundamentally a difference of view between the present government and the leader of the last government (Mr. Bennett) with respect to the principle underlying this matter. My right hon. friend has indicated grave apprehension because of the coming into this country of magazines containing advertising of a type calculated to sell commodities at lower prices and calculated to extol the country in which they are published. He has argued that all this tended so to mould Canadian thought as to impair our national future. But the remedy of my hon. friends opposite was to impose a tax which, according to the article from which my right hon. friend read, had the effect of reducing the weekly or periodical dissemination of these magazines, this great source of national danger, from 1,200,000 copies in boom times to less than 500,000 copies at the low point. These figures illustrate the futility of trying to deal with a great national danger by taxation. The cure is not there. One half million copies of literature dangerous to our national life are only less dangerous in degree than twice that number. With the people as hard up as they have been in recent years, I am inclined to think that the number of readers of these magazines may have increased, due to their being passed from hand to hand, sufficiently to involve as grave a danger to our national growth, our national integrity and our monarchical institutions as formerly obtained when they came in free. I think I am as firm a believer in our constitutional monarchy as any other hon. gentleman, but I certainly do not object to critical comparison with any other system of human government.

Mr. BENNETT: It is unfair criticism.

Mr. DUNNING: In that regard, if I may say so, I think I am in the very best British tradition. As I am sure my right hon. friend has done at times, I have strolled occasionally through Hyde park and listened there to the various expressions with respect to all the institutions of Great Britain and the British empire. I have seen there the majesty of the British law represented—what for? For the purpose of protecting the very fellow who is preaching in many instances the most incendiary sort of doctrine. I do not see that any bottling up of ideas of this sort will pre-