

who says "not through legislation". The legislation the CRTC brought in on Canadian content vis-à-vis American programs has been very successful. We live in a country that is squashed up against the United States; we have all the pressures historically from the United Kingdom which I mentioned earlier, so I certainly believe there are times when we must legislate to assist the industry.

I think something that has been a little bit missed in all this argument—and there is reason for it because the magazine industry has been so poor—is that somehow it looks as though we are sitting here trying to sell *Maclean's* magazine. It is a pretty fair comment really, because at the moment I suppose it is one of the few national magazines we have.

I should like to point out to members opposite what I hope will happen with this kind of legislation. What I think would happen is that in the next five or ten years we would see magazines in Canada, particularly English Canada which has the biggest problem, that we do not have today. I have no way of forecasting what entrepreneur or what person may decide to go into the magazine business over the next decade, and I do not think anybody else has, but I think we make a mistake if we presume that *Maclean's* magazine is suddenly going to replace *Time*. It will not, because *Time* will still be on sale. The president of *Time* magazine has said as much, and presumably he knows what he is talking about.

● (2050)

I think we must remember that we are trying to encourage a new industry, one that we have not had before. Who would ever have thought 10 or 15 years ago that the city of Toronto would be an important producer of animated cartoons for the advertising industry, or for that matter, a recording centre for the musical industry? Many performers today come from New York City and do their recording in a Toronto recording studio. We have some of the best facilities in the world in Toronto, and it has become a very important industry. I do not think anyone foresaw this when we decided to develop the Canadian music and entertainment industry.

If there is another point to be made in all of this, Madam Speaker, I think it is this. We have the Canada Council, and we have done quite a lot for artists, painters, and those who are the backbone of our culture. We talk about a few writers and mention a few names of painters, photographers and so on, but really we have done nothing. I hear an hon. member opposite laughing; obviously he does not appreciate culture. As I said, it is a subjective thing. If he personally does not find any value in it, it is perfectly all right with me, but I think it has value.

I remember as a boy that during the war the people to whom we first looked to raise national and patriotic feelings were people of culture—writers, painters, and people like that. I do not think we do enough for them in this country. Many members of this House older than I will remember the surge of patriotism that there was during world war II and much of this was kindled by writers, painters, and other people in the cultural arena.

I was recently looking through the WPA work projects under the federal relief policy in the United States during the early thirties and at the rather unique way in which

Non-Canadian Publications

they considered artists, writers, and those kind of people to be so important that they had projects they were paid to do. This was at a time in the thirties when money was hard to get. They did an enormous number of projects under that relief program. The United States administration during the time of President Roosevelt certainly recognized the value of artists and culture. It was a war against poverty in those days, yet it was appreciated that without those people upon whom a country depends for its identity there was no way in which such a program was going to work.

As the minister mentioned in his speech this afternoon, what we are talking about today are the recommendations of the O'Leary commission made in 1961. This was a commission established by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) who spoke so strongly this afternoon and gave us the balance sheet of the *Maclean-Hunter Publishing Company*. He conveniently, I thought, forgot to mention when he gave us those figures that *Maclean's* magazine as an entity has been losing money for years. I do not carry any brief for *Maclean's* magazine, but I found it a little contradictory that the right hon. member, who established the O'Leary commission in the first place which made the recommendations that we are acting on today, felt so strongly about Mr. Newman and *Maclean's* magazine.

Mr. Saltsman: He wrote a book about him.

Mr. Stollery: Yes, I understand that. I thought that was a little unfair because, after all, it was Senator O'Leary who first suggested that a genuine Canadian periodical press can exist only if it has access to a fair share of the advertising revenue.

I do not think any more remains to be said, Madam Speaker. Until Bill C-58 is passed, the Canadian periodical press will not have a fair share of the advertising revenue in Canada.

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Madam Speaker, may I say at the outset to the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Stollery) that if his assessment of this entire debate is simply related to *Reader's Digest* and *Time* magazine and to the length of the debate, then I want to tell him that I will be brief. I want also to tell him that I have no intention of discussing *Time* and *Reader's Digest*; I want to discuss the more fundamental principle of concern to me and to other publications which will be affected by this legislation. They have been mentioned in the past.

I have grave concern with this legislation because of what I interpret as editorial interference, or interference in the editorial policy of periodical publications. Unfortunately this is frequently done in the name of cultural sovereignty, Canadianism, Canadian spirit, or whatever happens to be the appropriate word on a particular day.

I listened very carefully when the minister spoke in this House on May 8. He implied, as I understand it, that there would be no government interference with the editorial policy of periodical publications, yet on that same date there was a news release from the minister's office. I should like to quote from it:

The amendments mean that if certain foreign periodicals now being published in Canada expect to continue to benefit from the provisions