

Non-Canadian Publications

regulations which affected every other non-Canadian magazine.

What happened to the magazines affected by that 1965 legislation? Did they evaporate? Did they disappear, as hon. members opposite would have us believe that *Time* and *Reader's Digest* will disappear? No. They are all still available in Canada, either on the newsstands or by subscription, in exactly the same way as *Time* and *Reader's Digest* will continue to be. They will be as available and widely read in Canada once the proposed legislation comes into effect as the honest competition of Canadian publications given an infusion of advertising dollars will allow.

The government's action will not put *Reader's Digest* and *Time* out of business. It will simply remove from them their artificial status as Canadian magazines and the financial advantages accruing to them from that status. Discontinuing their Canadian content is not the same as removing these magazines from circulation in Canada. Both magazines will still be freely available and, as I said, Canadians will still be able to subscribe to *Reader's Digest* or to *Time*.

May I now read one of the many letters I have received in favour of this legislation, to answer the parade of Tory speakers who implied that only negative views were brought to our attention. The writer of the letter says:

I most certainly am not in favour of *Reader's Digest* and *Time* magazine receiving preferential treatment. I sincerely hope that Hugh Faulkner does not 'give in' to the request of these two publications.

Before I left for central America, I subscribed to *Time* magazine, hoping to receive news of Canada. When *Time* arrived, it was the U.S. version with the Canadian section omitted. I wrote *Time* complaining but received no answer.

I also hope the women are able to get some just laws enacted.

Good luck.

Mr. Paproski: Who?

Mrs. Campagnolo: She was referring to women members of this House.

Mr. Paproski: Read another letter.

Mrs. Campagnolo: The federal government has, in introducing this legislation, weighed the economic and cultural value of the Canadian content of these magazines against their economic and cultural drawbacks. It has been decided that, in economic terms, the money the magazines and television stations on the border spend in Canada does not outweigh the revenue gained for them by their special status and, in cultural terms, that the contributions they have made do not outweigh the stifling effect their dominant position has on Canadian magazines. Development of new broadcasting outlets in this country is similarly stifled.

Having made this assessment the government has decided to remove the special legislation which discriminated in favour of the two magazines. This is a decision which, as I said earlier, has been deliberately clouded by hon. members opposite with the absolutely outrageous distortion created by their false and misleading introduction of the idea of censorship.

Some hon. gentlemen opposite were trying to describe this debate with one word. I must say some of them were very witty. Let me try to coin a capsule description, as a

[Mrs. Campagnolo.]

new and inexperienced member who has not yet learned to keep her mouth shut. Let me say that irresponsibility is the word which comes to mind to describe, in capsule form, the remarks of hon. members opposite.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Campagnolo: "Irresponsibility" is the only word applicable for such careless manipulation of the public mind. No one is judging the merits of these publications, as to wholesomeness or lack of it; no one is talking about offensive broadcasting. There is no question of censorship in all this.

Hon. members may recall that several years ago the government imposed regulations, similar in intent, on recorded music in Canada. I was a member of the organization of broadcasters who were involved at that time; I was involved with the broadcasting industry and I assure you we struggled as mightily, as ferociously as do *Time* and *Reader's Digest* today, because we were sure we should be totally annihilated by the government's "iniquitous" rule. Do you know what happened? There are actually people who profited by the government's decision. There are now Canadian producers in this country, and talented Canadians who are making their names in this country, and not across the border.

When the government imposed those regulations on the broadcasting industry of this country there was considerable concern. But that concern was met head on, just as the present concern will be met. However, in fairness to Canadian content legislation, I must say that it has not prevented our hearing American music or any other music. And we have gone a long way to creating a strong Canadian recording industry in both classical and popular music fields, and to developing Canadian talent. I am convinced that the same will happen in the next few years to our Canadian magazine industry, our writers, publishers and broadcasters, without causing distress to readers of *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, or viewers of border stations; and I am speaking of stations which were originally set up to serve some other commercial market than ours.

One member of the official opposition yesterday intoned stentorally on Wednesday that "if they can't hack it on merit alone, it's too bad." He spoke of merit alone. Mr. Speaker, if one company can project a profit of \$8 million from Canada alone this year, merit alone is not involved. How does merit alone involve the Canadian station just starting, out and anaemic from lack of money, because it cannot attract the required advertising dollars, the border stations having attracted all the business?

For a moment let us look at the broadcasting industry. Large, slick, American border stations erected scant miles from the major southern metropolises of this country cynically and deliberately planned to do one thing—make a healthy profit. There is nothing wrong with a healthy profit. What is wrong is that our tax act has enhanced that profit.

In this case the words of hon. members must be examined in the context, say, of KVOS-TV, a station situated near Vancouver, B.C. It is, in all respects, a decent corporate citizen, and honourable entity, in addition to being an appreciated signal within our borders. Its audience ratings are fantastic. Its BBM'S read like magic-time. I like KVOS,