

*Non-Canadian Publications*

before those gentlemen their concern, not only at what Bill C-58 will do but at the legislative technique the government is now about to use to bring to an end debate on the second reading stage of this bill.

I sincerely hope they would have the presence of mind to go to those ministers and say, «We were wrong. Withdraw the bill. Let it die a natural death, let it get the decent burial that it does not really deserve, and let us end debate on this question». No good purpose is being served by this debate, so let us get on with other issues of greater importance to this country at the present time, such as the economy and the postal strike, to name just two.

I hope the backbenchers of the party opposite still have some clout in the councils of government and that they tell the ministers on the front benches, who are so out of touch with Canadian life and reality, that this is not an issue with which Canadians are concerned. Canadians do not want to see the passage of Bill C-58. They do not want to see the time of parliament taken up by this debate. Rather, they want to see Bill C-58 ended here and now. I am sure some hon. members opposite want us to continue to debate this bill in the hope that it will be withdrawn from the order paper because it is taking up too much legislative time. I suggest we allow people who want to publish in Canada to do so, and that we allow those Canadians who wish to buy these publications to continue to buy them.

**Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth):** Mr. Speaker, I suppose I have had as much mail as any member of the House on the issue of Bill C-58. From looking at this mail and reading it carefully, I have ascertained there were 352 letters, at the last count, against the legislation and seven in support of it. This is an issue that has gripped many people, and I am very sorry that the government has seen fit not only to gag its own caucus but to bring in closure to close off debate on the bill.

**Mr. Paproski:** Shame.

**Mr. Kempling:** It is not only a shame, it is somewhat disgusting. I should like to refer to an article that appeared in the *Montreal Star*, entitled "Incendiary". It had this to say:

A group of enthusiasts calling themselves the Canadian Liberation Movement lit a merry blaze on Parliament Hill the other day and burnt copies of *Time* and the *Reader's Digest*.

The bonfire, no doubt, was intended to symbolize at once the destruction of a dreaded enemy and the sacred flame of nationalism.

● (1730)

**An hon. Member:** You should stand up over there and make a speech.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)):** Order, please. The hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling) has the floor.

**Mr. Kempling:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was reading from an article in the *Montreal Star*. As I said the article is entitled «Incendiary». It reads:

The bonfire, no doubt, was intended to symbolize at once the destruction of a dreaded enemy and the sacred flame of nationalism. Whether a revitalized Canadian magazine industry would rise, as some believe, from such ashes is decidedly unlikely. Book-burning has an old and

[Mr. Epp.]

dishonourable tradition behind it; Canadians can live, and sustain their culture, without it.

I read that article particularly because this is an example of the type of high feeling there is in our country at this time. In my riding, the most prominent daily newspaper is the *Hamilton Spectator*, a Southam publication, a reasonably moderate paper. It ran an editorial in this vein:

In order to be considered «Canadian», *Time* and *Reader's Digest* should be prepared to surrender heart and soul to Ottawa, federal revenue minister Ronald Basford has decreed.

In what seems to be a blatant attempt to administer the *coup de grâce* to the Canadian editions of the two magazines, the minister now not only wants to clamp controls on ownership but also content.

Then it goes on to describe the nature of the content, and in conclusion states:

Taking away tax advantages from business and industry which advertise in magazines that are «domesticated» but still have a majority foreign ownership might be a partial answer to the problems faced by Canadian magazines. But, as we have argued here before, in the end it is still the reader who decides which magazine he wants to read. The advertisers will go where the largest readership is, regardless of ownership.

Making things difficult for the competition is no guarantee that «pure» Canadian magazines will suddenly improve in quality and attract all those who now buy *Time* or *Reader's Digest*.

A few weeks ago I was talking to an old gentleman who raised this matter. I asked him how he likes *Maclean's* magazine. He said, «Great». I asked him if he thought the content was good. He said, «Great. Give them a little more time and they will be almost as good as *Time*.» In other words, *Time* to him is the best magazine, and he thought that if *Maclean's* were given a little more time it might be as good. Why should we have to take second best? I have a letter here from a constituent. I wish the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) were here because I am sure he would be interested in this. It says:

I have just learned of the recent legislation which will seriously jeopardize the publication of one of Canada's finest magazines. This is the rescinding, next year, of section 19(2) of the Income Tax Act which allows Canadian companies to claim as a business expense advertising placed in the *Reader's Digest*.

In this day of trashy publications and second-rate writing, the *Reader's Digest* is a bright and shining star—

This letter goes on at some length; it contains quite a few paragraphs.

**An hon. Member:** Continue.

**Mr. Kempling:** You want me to read it all? All right. It goes on to say:

In this day of trashy publications and second-rate writing, the *Reader's Digest* is a bright and shining star, invariably wholesome, educational and vital. Its scope and appeal are largely dependent on the range of magazines from which it is able to select its outstanding articles. What kind of digest would we be left with if it could glean material only from Canadian magazines? We have two major magazines to choose from — *Maclean's* and *Chatelaine* — and a few more limited ones like the *United Church Observer* — all good publications, but certainly not adequate for a magazine composed entirely of extracts.

After all, many Canadians already subscribe to *Chatelaine* and *Maclean's* as we do, and if *Reader's Digest* had to rely on such repetitive content it would have little appeal.

Then it continues by stating that this is one magazine that is available, above reproach, and so on. The last paragraph reads: