

but I would like it much better if it were CFOS or CKOS, or if its communication letters were of any Canadian designation and subject to the regulations of the CRTC, not the FCC, however honourable that body and KVOS may be.

● (1750)

Why do I feel strongly about this matter of television access? Why am I concerned, for example, that KVOS projects such a large profit this year, even if they have proposed to share half that profit with the emerging new station in Vancouver, Western Approaches Broadcasting, should the KVOS proposal be accepted?

Let us talk about places in this country that cannot luxuriate in multi-channel television access. Unfortunately there are still many parts of this nation that have no access to radio, let alone television. There are some that have no access at all and others who have one channel. At best they may have two. They have created together a transmitter which they have put on a mountain top and which receives a signal sometimes five times transmitted. This has been done by ordinary people like we are, or should be. These people cannot gain access for one reason. Access is not available because there are not sufficient funds in the broadcasting industry of this nation.

How can hon. members expect a person such as myself, who represents thousands of people without access to television broadcasting, and similarly hundreds who have not even radio, to get disturbed about someone who has access to ten or 12 channels? I can get disturbed, however, about that amount of advertising dollars given to a foreign television station when the people who sent me here are seeking primary access to broadcasting, access which has been denied due to revenue creeping across the border. Those dollars, all of them, belong here in Canada, enhancing the opportunities of Canadian broadcasters presently in operation and, it is to be hoped, new and enterprising groups of broadcasters in the future who will add to the Canadian cultural dimension in every corner of our country.

I hope to live long enough even to see the day when our children's and our role patterns will reflect something that is more Canadian than Rhoda, Maude, Phyllis, and Mary Tyler Moore. In respect to the hon. minister who is in charge of the status of women in this country, who has just entered the chamber, I will bow to the other gender and trust that future legislators will ensure other role models than Kojak, Petrocelli, McCloud and all the rest of those violent men, who inhabit our TV, but that is another question.

This is a simple matter, my fellow members. Magazines and broadcasters presently obtain tax privileges without being subject to any of the criteria of Canadian magazines. Foreign broadcasters can obtain special tax privileges without the slightest nod to the CRTC. Here I refute what was said by a member opposite, that special privileges do not exist. Special privileges exist, as in no other country on this earth, for two magazines and some border broadcasters of a foreign nation. In my opinion, we owe it to Canadians to change that injustice to them.

Because this is a very complex issue I wish to make a couple of final remarks. I do not want to leave any doubt in

Non-Canadian Publications

the minds of members opposite. The contribution made by *Reader's Digest* is appreciated; however, Canada has finally grown up and must have its own advertising dollars to continue growing in publishing and broadcasting. The government has no intention of doing away with, or unfairly penalizing, *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, and as for border television stations I submit they made their hay while the sun shone. The government's intention, as I have stated, is simply to remove them from an artificial tax advantage which they have enjoyed since 1965—which is awarded by no other country in the world—and to provide encouragement to the Canadian magazine industry and Canadian broadcasters.

I wish to make a last, simple, unclouded statement. Canadian firms advertising in Canadian magazines are allowed, in calculating income tax, to deduct advertising costs up to 100 per cent. Under the present law they can do the same for the cost of their advertisements in *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, which are foreign magazines. The government proposes to eliminate the latter deduction. The government has recommended to the House a similar amendment to the effect that no deduction against income be permitted for advertising time on any non-Canadian broadcasting station for an advertisement directed primarily to a market in Canada. These are very simple solutions to the clouds of protest that we have experienced these last few days.

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether my clouds will be thunder, rain, or snow. I agree with a lot of the comments of the hon. member for Skeena (Mrs. Campagnolo), but I must take exception to at least two. One is the distress over the part of the legislation having to do with "substantially different". The hon. member said that this bill only amends the amount of ownership that is required to become a Canadian magazine. The amendment is to the Income Tax Act. In the Income Tax Act it says "substantially different". The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) said that the substantially different part would be 80 per cent. It is to that we are objecting.

The other part is censorship, a word used by the hon. member. It is necessary that I repeat what the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Holmes) stated about the word censorship. He said, and I quote:

Perhaps the most overworked and misunderstood word in this entire debate has been censorship. I have listened to the charges and countercharges over this particular word and this particular issue. The minister and the government in defending the bill have repeatedly stated that censorship is not being employed as part of government policy.

The government is correct in saying that the regulations in the strictest terms are not censorship, and yet it is their attitude and their response to the charge of censorship that alarms me and, frankly, should alarm all Canadian people.

This should not be taken out of context. It must be kept in context. The people of Canada are of the opinion that this amendment will eliminate *Time* and *Reader's Digest* from the market. They are afraid of that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: Next the minister will want to get rid of multiculturalism.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!