

People will still buy them and, hopefully, some of the money which is now going into the advertising coffers of those two publications will find its way into Canadian periodicals, not simply *Maclean's* but a number of others located outside Toronto, contributing to the birth of a healthy and vital, Canadian-owned, Canadian-controlled and Canadian-written magazine industry.

**Mr. MacLean:** Would the hon. member permit a question? It stems from his reasoning, which I followed with a great deal of interest. He argued that *Time*, *Reader's Digest* and other foreign magazines designed primarily for a foreign market should not be granted any tax benefit in Canada simply because they set up plant for the physical productions of their magazines in this country. Would he apply that same reasoning to automobile manufacturers—General Motors, for example—who design a car primarily with the United States in mind and then set up manufacturing plant in Canada? Should these corporations be deprived of Canadian tax benefits?

**Mr. Broadbent:** The question is an entirely reasonable one and I hope my answer is a reasonable one also. The hon. member has put his finger on two aspects of publishing; first, the location of plant and, second, the origin of content. I am supporting the legislation because it says that conditions covering each of these aspects have to be met. In the case of the automotive industry, I accept it would be desirable to embody a requirement in the Canada-United States agreement specifying that a certain percentage of the research and development work would have to be done in Canada. In other words, we would not become merely an assembly plant operation. I have stated this publicly on a number of occasions. I, for one, would favour the adoption of requirements to ensure that a substantial portion of the creative part of the industry would be undertaken in Canada. Thus, I believe my position is a consistent one.

**Mr. MacLean:** And that automobiles should be designed for the Canadian climate?

**Mr. Broadbent:** Certainly.

**Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser):** Madam Speaker, I should like to take part in this debate for the purpose of opposing the legislation which has been presented by the government. What we have here, to my mind, amounts to non-tariff protection for two or three magazines, primarily *Maclean's* and *Saturday Night*, neither of which I consider makes much contribution to the periodical press of Canada or to the advancement of Canada generally. We have problems in the periodical press industry, but I do not think this legislation is going to solve them. I suppose the basic one is that our population is fairly small and that it is divided into two major language groups. Of our 22 million people, approximately 6 million read in French and the other 16 million do their reading in English. To compound the problem, the English part of the industry is centred in the city of Toronto.

As a result, the product of that industry is not as appealing as it should be to Canadians of the English tongue across the country. It can also be said that the product of this Toronto media centre is probably not too appealing to those who live 50 or 60 miles outside the city. There are

#### *Non-Canadian Publications*

many in Ontario who do not feel that Toronto is representative of their aims, desires or feelings about this country. Most Canadians are not concerned about the problems which are discussed on Bloor and Yonge streets.

As far as I am concerned, *Maclean's* claim to be Canada's national magazine is entirely fraudulent. I know they make an apparent attempt to show they have input from all parts of the country. Take, for example, Heather Robertson who has participated in articles for that magazine. She claims to come from the province of Saskatchewan, and I suppose the magazine hopes to impress Canadians by having a Saskatchewan point of view through looking at her output. But I would suggest that when you employ that type of person, she is really ashamed of the area from which she sprang. Some of her output, particularly the book "Grassroots of the Prairies," I would say was written by a person who is ashamed of the area from which she sprang. She brings that attitude toward her writings in *Maclean's* magazine and I think this is one reason it is not as popular as it should be.

Therefore, what we find in *Maclean's* and *Saturday Night*, as the two main English publications in the popular English press, is a rather parochial product appealing to a very limited number of people. It is important for the country as a whole to have access to events abroad, which these magazines have not been very successful in providing us with, and it is important to have the very best type of writing done with regard to our own Canadian affairs. I have always found these things in the Canadian section of *Time* which, I am happy to see, has recently been expanded. I suppose the government can be congratulated in that regard, because if it had not brought forward legislation to encourage improvement, perhaps we would not have seen that expansion. There should be government action to improve and expand avenues to good news reporting about this country and the world at large for Canadians. I think *Time* magazine does an excellent job. *Reader's Digest* also provides this window on the world which is important to Canadians.

● (1600)

Let us look at the product of our own publications. I have with me today the November 17 issue of *Maclean's*, the most recent issue of this newly-structured magazine that now appears twice a month in anticipation of the passage of this bill. It is of interest to note that in this magazine there are in excess of 25 full pages devoted to liquor advertising. I do not often agree with the premier of Manitoba, but I do agree with his recent call for taking away the privilege of allowing as an expense the cost of liquor advertising.

However, I do not know what *Maclean's* would do without all its advertising revenue. Certainly, liquor advertising is the largest single category of advertising in the magazine. Of the 92 pages in the issue, including the four cover pages, over 25 pages are devoted exclusively to the advertising of liquor. This indicates the dominant role which that industry will play in the future of *Maclean's* magazine. I do not think it is a healthy one, one that should be encouraged, yet apparently the government wishes to encourage it by reducing competition from other magazines.