

Various polls and surveys have been taken and I should like to quote one. According to a survey conducted by Canadian Facts, Inc., in January, 1975, of Canadian advertising executives, the Canadian publishing industry will not benefit substantially from the removal of tax advantages for advertising in *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. Only 19 per cent of the revenues freed by this measure will go to the publishing industry. Of this 19 per cent, 58 per cent will go to Maclean-Hunter publications.

Maclean-Hunter will effectively control at least half of the advertising revenue obtained by the magazine industry. It currently controls 42 per cent of the total. I think it is a very dangerous thing to have one magazine in Canada controlling far more than half the advertising revenue. We have seen the effect in other fields where we have monopoly enterprises. They would be able to control the price of the advertising that goes into that type of journal practically without opposition. I worry about the long range consequences. There would be no need for them to put out a decent magazine and to hold down the price of advertising. They would have a monopoly, and I think all of us would as soon avoid that.

Many of my constituents have written to me and every letter is exactly the same—I do not mean that literally but they stress the same points—they want to have their reading material cleaned up. They say such things as, "If the CBC is any comparison, if such a book did appear on the market shelves I would give it a try and if it matched the CBC standards, which I think are sick, I would never buy another one."

Another one asked me to use my influence to have them appeal this bill saying:

I am in protest of this movement and ask that the Honourable J. Hugh Faulkner rescind the above-mentioned section.

I am Canadian born and want this magazine as it is. I enjoy it—all of it! How narrow can Canadians become?

Mr. Woolliams: That is why he had to grow a beard—to cover up.

Mr. McKinnon: Another writer says:

In my opinion, the *Reader's Digest* gives us very clean, intelligent, informative reading, with thoughts to ponder indeed. It is wonderfully honest and fair to all countries in the world, and is my main source of wide perspective.

Everybody in this world does not like the same thing, but the elitists on the other side of the House have a habit of thinking that what they like must be good for everyone. This is my first experience in three years in this House of being faced with closure. I do not look forward to them having chosen this—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): They do it in Britain all the time.

Mr. McKinnon: Does the hon. member for "St. Bonimouth" wish to take part in the debate?

Mr. Woolliams: "Bonimouth" is right!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I will.

Mr. McKinnon: I thank the hon. member for his interjection. As so often happens, it was made sitting down

Non-Canadian Publications

instead of standing up. We seldom hear him speak standing up.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): At least you can hear me.

Mr. McKinnon: I did not get the gist of what the hon. member had to say.

An hon. Member: You did not miss anything.

Mr. McKinnon: I thought he had reformed when they made him whip. The extra money he gets for that job seemed to have a salutary effect on him, and I thought it was money well spent if it kept him quiet, but I guess we cannot be lucky in every respect.

● (1740)

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) delighted me with his courage because in speaking for my friend, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt), he proved himself a very brave man indeed. Without question she can speak for herself, and there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that she will when she returns from the battle of British Columbia.

An hon. member opposite said recently during the debate that this is a bill affecting fundamental civil liberties in this country. It seems to me that the hon. member was somewhat heated over a simple amendment to the Income Tax Act.

This debate began with hon. members opposite making valid points, with many of which I agreed. But as the days wore on, something happened to my opponents opposite. The clouds began to gather; they became bigger, darker and heavier, and suddenly we began to hear obfuscation and then suggestions of a cover-up. We heard another big word, censorship. When that was uttered it created the biggest cloud of all. Indeed, we even heard of the burning of books! But I will not continue in this vein because I would be making complex something which is very simple.

Bill C-58 seeks simply to remove the special tax advantages currently enjoyed by *Time* and *Reader's Digest* magazines and certain foreign broadcasters, and that is all. This is an important issue, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on the government's reasons for its proposed action.

In this country we happen to have a law called the Income Tax Act, section 19(2), of which permits the deduction, as a business expense, of advertising placed by Canadian companies in *Time*, *Reader's Digest*, and certain foreign television stations. The federal government proposes to remove this privilege so that advertising placed by Canadian companies in all non-Canadian magazines will no longer be tax deductible.

This is not a new policy. In 1965 the federal government passed similar legislation but decided to exempt *Time* and *Reader's Digest*—I believe in tribute to the good corporate citizenship of *Reader's Digest* on the one hand and, no doubt, to the outstanding corporate muscle of the giant *Time*. In a sense the 1965 legislation discriminated in favour of these two magazines, exempting them from the