

*Non-Canadian Publications*

This debate has concerned itself with two publications, *Reader's Digest* and *Time*, both of which are entirely separate magazines. They have nothing in common except that until now they have been branch plant operations in Canada, based in the United States. I think any attempt to try to confuse these two separate operations is misleading and is based on fallacy. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, the idea that we should not have fair and equitable tax legislation in Canada is very difficult to understand. It is simply fantastic to suggest that more time than 11 years is needed to straighten out this inequity. The suggestion simply lacks credibility.

I did not want to take long to put these few remarks on the record, but having spent the last month or two listening to complete fabrications and to uninformed comment, may I thank you, Madam Speaker, for giving me the opportunity of putting what I consider to be the facts on the record.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Is the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock rising to ask a question?

**Mr. Friesen:** Yes, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Would the hon. member for Spadina allow a question?

**Mr. Stollery:** Yes, Madam Speaker.

● (1720)

**Mr. Friesen:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate and thank the hon. member for Spadina for giving us this lengthy explanation as to how the regulations work. I should simply like to ask him how his explanation now is different from his explanation when we were in the committee?

**Mr. Stollery:** As far as I am concerned, Madam Speaker, we could have finished with this business some time ago, as I do not think the position has changed since we were in the committee.

[Translation]

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Madam Speaker, it is not my intention to extend this debate which has been long enough, but I think it is the duty of members of Parliament to consider Bill C-58 very closely. However, before the House gives this bill third reading and before it is definitively adopted on third reading, I wish once more to express my views on the bill and also on the various events that took place in committee when this legislation was studied, both at the report stage and on third reading.

Madam Speaker, I remember quite well that during the second reading, I said to this House and to this government that I could not understand how it was possible that an act which had been presented in 1965 by this same government, this same political party, could be put again in 1971. In 1965 and 1971, it seemed right to grant some privileges to Canadian advertisers announcing in supposedly American magazines which were published in Canada, and which in some ways could be considered and were then considered as Canadian publications and magazines.

Madam Speaker, during that discussion, I had simply brought to the attention of the government that Canadian publications were defined so that they did not come under

[Mr. Stollery.]

the rule established by the department. As a matter of fact, publications owned in a proportion of 75 per cent by Canadians were considered Canadians.

However, there was an exception for periodicals which in 1965 were written in whole or in part in Canada, and that was the case of both magazines mentioned in Bill C-58. At that time, I had simply suggested that the government apply the law as passed in 1965. That seemed to meet the aspirations of Canadians and also satisfy the people running those magazines. Why come back on that question? We were told that it is to allow Canadian advertisers to have the benefits of that act, those exemptions, and at the same time invite Canadians to publish more magazines in Canada that would also be entirely owned by Canadians.

I think that the act of 1965 which was introduced in this House by a member of the Liberal party must have been considered at that time and examined even in the caucus of the Liberal party. There was agreement to introduce that legislation in the House and that it was entirely reasonable at that time, in 1971. So, why that about face in 1976? That is what I am seriously wondering about, Madam Speaker. What occult powers intervened so as to force the hand of the government to introduce an entirely different legislation and be in opposition with the legislation passed in 1965 and 1971? Furthermore, I wonder quite seriously about the fact that in the course of the discussions on Bill C-58, a great deal of representations were made to Canadian parliamentarians of all parties by the leaders of *Reader's Digest* magazine to urge them to fight this bill because they considered it unfair to them and they should by all possible means oppose its passage.

Madam Speaker, I am surprised that in the last few days, the leaders of that same magazine seem to have changed their attitude without any change being brought to Bill C-58. According to the statement by the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Cullen), they now seem to be satisfied with that legislation and we are now being asked to give it our support and pass it as soon as possible. Madam Speaker, I cannot change my mind as quickly as that. I am a responsible parliamentarian who must consider very carefully all legislation introduced in this House and receive in a very objective way the representations made by people or groups about such or such a legislation. It is our duty to take those into consideration and I do not accept anything unless we are given valid explanations that we should be asked at a certain moment on third reading of this bill to give it our support and accept it as such.

Madam Speaker, I am convinced after listening in this House to the speeches made by members of all parties who express themselves freely, and even on the government side, we saw a truly serious position being taken that goes against passage of this bill. Madam Speaker, I said: or the government side. I may not have expressed myself clearly, because power does not always mean majority. The Liberal party may have a majority in the House but that does not necessarily mean that they are in power, because I have often felt that the real power was in the hands of persons outside this House, with the result that stands are sometimes taken which are not always in accordance with true ministerial responsibility, and the real responsibility that power entails, from a strictly democratic point of view.