

**Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, it is my particular pleasure to speak on this bill today. I wish to indicate to the House that I have received over 200 letters opposing the bill and possibly only ten letters in favour of it. Thus far, that is the input of my riding of Kootenay West.

On examining the bill and hearing the genuine concern expressed in the contributions to the debate by members on both sides of the House, I find it very difficult to come to any other conclusion than that this bill is both foolish and a pack of nonsense. The minister is demonstrating no concern for the facts and no concern for the Canadian employees of *Reader's Digest*. He is not really concerned about the tax dollars which will be generated; he is concerned about the tax shelters which he would supposedly remove.

● (1520)

**Mr. Paproski:** He is not even here today.

**Mr. Brisco:** I noticed that, and that happens frequently. He has not concerned himself, nor has he indicated to the House any concern about the revenue generated by *Reader's Digest* for the Post Office—and the Post Office needs all the revenue it can get nowadays. The minister has not said anything about freedom of the press, unless it is the Heritage press. What has happened to the Bill of Rights? What is the minister trying to do for the Canadian magazine industry? The Toronto-based Liberal mandarins and eggheads want to build their left wing empire on the backs of Canadian taxpayers, and if not by government grant then the minister will build it by grant of government legislation.

What does the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) have against *Reader's Digest*? He was not satisfied just to introduce Bill C-58. As an interesting aside, it should be noted that he had to tangle his department in a web of confusion and intrigue with the Society for the Study of the Heritage of Canada, and he showed not a shred of conscience over the creditors of this bankrupt, so-called non-profit society. Not only has the Secretary of State not demonstrated any concern for these creditors, but neither has the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Basford), the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Buchanan), the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet), and so on. But what has that to do with *Reader's Digest*? There is an organization in France called the Foreign Study League. The Foreign Study League is a creditor of the Society for the Study of the Heritage of Canada, to the tune of \$106,000, and the Foreign Study League just happens to be a subsidiary of *Reader's Digest*.

I wonder what else the Secretary of State can dabble in besides this mess. He talks about 80 per cent Canadian content. I can only imagine that about 40 per cent of this Canadian content will be heifer dust cranked out by a mindless amateur in the office of the Secretary of State. Let us go back to the very basics of the *Reader's Digest* confrontation. Let us go back to the people who really demonstrate some concern, the average citizen, more particularly the senior citizen and his \$3 per year subscription to pleasure. One of the beauties of this particular magazine is its variety of content and the contributions by

#### *Non-Canadian Publications*

authors and writers from around the world. Some say it is not very factual and there are times when the medical profession finds *Reader's Digest* to be the bane of its existence, when patients come in with a new set of symptoms which they have diagnosed from the pages of "Joe's Liver" taken out of *Reader's Digest*. But beyond that it is a gentle magazine which is easily read and thoroughly enjoyed, particularly by senior citizens.

It probably is of no consequence at all to the heartless Secretary of State, but I wonder how many senior citizens across Canada buy a subscription for a grandchild, son or daughter. It is an inexpensive Christmas gift, and God knows senior citizens can ill-afford anything but an inexpensive gift. I wonder why the minister is so concerned when all the senior citizen wishes to demonstrate is a monthly reminder of love and affection.

This fiasco of Bill C-58 reminds me very much—sickeningly so—of the attempt of the British Columbia government to grab a so-called educational television channel for its own use. I cannot help but feel that with this bill the federal government seeks to impose itself again upon the public, against the will of the public, leading them blindly down the garden path with soft chatter, vague innuendos and platitudes and saying that everything is all right, but that the government wants to be damned sure it knows what we are going to read and it has to be something of which the government approves.

I wonder why the government does not demonstrate the same concern with regard to *Playboy* magazine and magazines of similar type. We have not heard anything from the Secretary of State about those. I wonder if he considers them to be highly educational. I am awaiting the suggestion by the minister that we remove sex instruction from the schools and buy all the students subscriptions to *Playboy*. That seems to be a very liberal proposal.

I would also like to draw the attention of the House to the intelligent Liberal opposition to this bill—the only Liberal speeches which, in my view, have made any sense. Obviously, those hon. members are demonstrating their concern that the new philosophy and the new policy is porno first and intellect last. What an epitaph for a government! Next week I suspect that a magazine which is now on the stands, *Nous* magazine, with the blessing of the Secretary of State will lift the maple leaf from the nether regions of that full page fold-out of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I saw an hon. member over here who was smiling but concerned. He was shuddering to think what would happen and what would be revealed upon the lifting of the maple leaf. I am not going to address myself to that, nor will I suggest, as one hon. member did, that we might find there the presence of Michael Pitfield. Indeed, I will not say that. I shudder to think what would happen to the *National Geographic* magazine if it were to publish in Canada. I can just see the Secretary of State insisting upon a full page fold-out of his own anatomy.

● (1530)

I have heard very little about the French issue which is now heavily in debt and operating at a loss. On the one hand, the minister says no subsidies by tax benefits, but if the *Digest* is to subsidize the French Canadian issue that is