

### Non-Canadian Publications

committee, to hear that explanation as he was eager to give us the definition that he provided this afternoon.

There is a point that is basic to all of this, that is, that the Canadian reader is not a masochist; the reader who subscribes to publications knows what he or she wants to read. If he does not find it within Canadian publications, he will look elsewhere for it.

● (1740)

While people might occasionally accept an article which will upset and disturb them, they do not want a steady diet which is upsetting, disturbing, unpleasant, and not worth the price of the subscription. That they will not accept, and in recent times that has been provided by Canadian publications.

We heard a fair amount about lobbies this afternoon from hon. members opposite. Another example of a lobby just arrived on the desks of hon. members. I am sure hon. members received the same copy of a publication called *Owl* with the announcement that it is a new Canadian magazine for children. There are several delightful things about it, but the important thing is the letter which came along with it. It says:

We think it's an example of the sort of new magazine ventures we'll see a lot more of in this country when the proposed *Time-Digest* legislation is enacted.

The benefits to existing Canadian magazines of abolishing the *Time-Digest* tax privileges will be significant.

It goes on to point out how detrimental the 1965 legislation was to foreign based publications, with the exception of *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. It claims that that legislation led directly to the creation of the magazine *Miss Chatelaine* of Canada. It finally says:

We predict first-class, vigorous, new magazine activity all over Canada when the legislation is passed. Please vote yes.

That is a very obvious lobby of the members of this House with regard to Bill C-58. When one picks up the publication which accompanies the letter and ruffles through it, there is not an advertisement in the entire magazine. There is a subscription rate, but no advertising, so we realize something is being offered. However, if we read the fine print at the bottom of the letter we see the publishers are the publishers of *Key to Toronto* and *Toronto Life*, and they sent the whole thing to us.

I think that tells something to the Canadian public who wrote to members of parliament, and certainly to us as members from western Canada something of which we are already aware, and that is that if there is any money which is supposed to be returned to Canada, it is supposed to go to Toronto. It is intended to go to that narrow, limited and self-centred publishing world which is situated in the heart of Toronto and which produces slick publications like *Toronto Life* with the advertising which it carries.

We know that far too many of what are called Canadian publications are really only Toronto publications and offer nothing to the rest of Canada except scorn. I was attempting to point that out the other evening when I ran out of time, and I will not repeat the argument now, but I think it is basic that if Canadian publications publish for a very narrow and limited audience, then they will not ever be able to attract the advertising which depends on a large

[Mr. Johnston.]

readership. That is the basic issue, and that is the challenge to Canadian publications.

If anything, I suspect that the passage of Bill C-58 will limit the role of Canadian publishing in this country and encourage the type of publication which is designed for a fast overturn in large urban conglomerations and which will not provide the quality of reading material the people who wrote in about *Reader's Digest* want and are willing to pay for if it comes to them regularly. People who subscribe to magazines are very loyal, and they like to give them as gifts. But who wants to send a gift to someone of a magazine which uses the next 12 issues to insult, frustrate, and infuriate to the point where the subscription is cancelled or is simply allowed to lapse at the end of the year? That has been the fate of much Canadian publishing.

I urge that Bill C-58 be returned to the committee because I do not think it should be pushed through the House. I expect closure will be used if it is not returned to committee and an explanation will not be provided to us about what enabled *Reader's Digest* to comply. We know what prevents *Time* magazine from complying with the legislation. I think possibly the explanation lies in the remarks made by the hon. member for Spadina. He talked about the differences between a digest and a magazine, and I suspect that it is in that regard that a way has been found. Because of the different nature of the two publications it is easier for one.

*Reader's Digest* should be praised because it went much further to make itself more truly Canadian when it had the opportunity. The task was easier for it. However, that is not quite enough. I join in the general rejoicing that *Reader's Digest* will still be available in its Canadian format and in its French version, which also would have been lost to this country which has two official languages. However, I also join in urging that this bill be sent back to committee so that we can find out some of the facts about this important case, and so that the government will have time either to amend the bill or to make definite what the plan is so that publishers in Canada will know what they will be up against in the years ahead. That is imperative.

[Translation]

**Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency):** Madam Speaker, it is surprising that this House finds it necessary to have such a long debate on this question as I think that its objectives serve entirely the actual interest of our country and that a few days of debate would have been enough. In no other country in the world a measure serving so well the national interest would have been fought so fiercely. In a normal country where people really have the interest of their country at heart a consensus on such an issue would have been very easy. Madam Speaker, beyond the immediate implications of Bill C-58 I think that this debate reveals the mentality of a colonized country and the lack of desire to live as an autonomous community in this country. I am afraid this country does not have exactly the spirit it should have. I think that some people would prefer our country to be nothing more than a poor replica of our southern neighbour.

I do not think it is normal for Canadians to accept to see in the Canadian reality nothing more than the international reality through the distorting prism of news media which are controlled by foreign interests and in this par-