

kind of future *Reader's Digest* can expect in this country. I submit that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) was correct when he said that this is just not good enough. This is not the way to treat a company that has been a good corporate citizen of this country and has provided Canadians with good reading material for the past 30 years.

In my view this bill is not aimed at *Reader's Digest*, and I do not say this merely because of the accord entered into with that magazine. It is aimed solely at *Time* magazine. And what will it achieve? If passed, the bill will be instrumental in displacing from their jobs 45 Canadians who are with *Time*. It will do away with the Canadian section of *Time* magazine, with all its faults; if that is not counterproductive I do not know what is. More particularly, and I think this explains the government's persistence with this bill, it will satisfy Senator Keith Davey and the publishers of *Maclean's* magazine, and nobody else.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander).

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Madam Speaker, I had not intended participating in this debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: My hon. friends opposite can jeer, hoot, yell, and scream all they want. I tell them that since coming to the House of Commons I have never received so many letters on any subject, if one excludes the tax reform legislation, as I have on this subject.

An hon. Member: You've got to be kidding.

Mr. Alexander: I hear an hon. member say, "You've got to be kidding." I tell the hon. member I have received many letters indicating that the vast majority of Canadians dislike the government's approach to the subject, do not like what the government is doing, and resent what the government is trying to force down the throats of the people.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It's a cruel and unusual punishment.

Mr. Alexander: I admire the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt).

Mr. McGrath: She's a good member.

Mr. Alexander: She's an excellent member because she stands up to be counted. She is not like the rest of her colleagues who run and hide their heads in shame behind the curtain.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Stand up to be counted.

Mr. Alexander: Her subamendment makes sense. She will have nothing to do with content, an unworkable concept which can destroy most Canadian periodicals, magazines and newspapers overnight.

Mr. McGrath: Especially magazines like *MD of Canada*.

Non-Canadian Publications

Mr. Alexander: As my hon. friend from St. John's East says, especially magazines like *MD of Canada*. Adopting the content approach would bring disastrous results to such magazines which serve the medical profession and others. The government's approach could destroy these magazines.

An hon. Member: When did you last read *MD of Canada*?

Mr. Alexander: Motion No. 4, as amended by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway would read:

That Bill C-58, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, be amended in Clause 1 by adding immediately after line 14, at page 1, the following.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of this act or regulations, a periodical shall be deemed to be a Canadian issue of a Canadian periodical if 75 per cent of its directors and ownership are Canadian and its editing and publication functions are controlled and conducted in Canada.

No member in his right senses will fault that. Any who fault it sit on your right, Madam Speaker, with one or two exceptions.

Why have hon. members opposite not supported the significant contribution the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway made in moving her subamendment? It seems to me that the government is trying to save certain periodicals operating in this country. This bill will not save Canadian periodicals. I will explain why.

The other day the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik), who has been involved with this bill from the beginning, put on record significant statistics relating to Canadian advertising dollars. If I am not mistaken he said that only 2 per cent of advertising dollars in Canada is directed to periodicals, whereas 6.5 per cent of the advertising dollars spent in the United States is directed to periodicals. He said that 20 per cent of the advertising dollars spent in this country is directed to radio, television and newspapers. In effect he said that if Bill C-58 passes, there will not be much future in Canada for Canadian periodicals. That point we cannot escape or ignore.

● (2110)

Something else that bothers me involves the lack of interest in consumer concern. No matter how you put it, this is cultural censorship, a denial of free access to information which includes that given by *Reader's Digest* and *Time* for over 30 years. It has unquestionably been of significant benefit to Canadians. They like it and they want it. The letters that I received registered that concern without any equivocation whatsoever.

We talk about equity. The backdoor deal and the hanky-panky of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen), which saved *Reader's Digest* but gave the axe to *Time*, are discriminatory, unprincipled, heavy-handed and callous. This is surely an inequity. If the government moved in such a way to save *Reader's Digest* there should be some effort on the part of the government to recognize the plight of *Time*. However, the government believes in discrimination in this regard.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) is unbending. The Minister of National Revenue is unbending. He has now set up the Cullen tribunal whereby interpretation of "substantially the same as" is now within his hands and those of the bureaucrats. It is not within the purview of the courts of this land. That is another important issue. A principle