

Non-Canadian Publications

The legislation before us will not prevent people reading *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. The price may go up by 50 cents because they are no longer published here and because there is less Canadian advertising, but whatever the price may be I strongly suspect Canadians will continue to buy these two magazines.

With these considerations in mind, Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister why he has brought this bill before us. What is so important about it that it justifies closure on second reading? What is so important that it should run counter the policy his party has expressed with regard to censorship? What is so important about it as to warrant the loss of so many jobs and so much income in the very province from which his party derives so much of its support? Until we have an answer to these serious questions, I find I cannot support this measure.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I should first apologize to you and to the last speaker for moving between you and the speaker. I know better. I have breached the rule and I can only offer you my apology. I hope you find yourself able to accept it. It is a strange thing that in the world of print we should be telling Canadians what is good for them, whether they want it or not. It reminds me of the time when some of us were a little younger and there were several home cures we were required to take. It took a lot of persuasion and, on occasion, an element of force before the youngster took those remedies. It might have been cod liver oil, or a number of other things. They were certainly not palatable, but taken they were for the good of our health. We now find the government telling Canadians what is good for them. Hon. members can read the bill backwards, forward, or hold it upside down; it still tells us what we are going to read.

● (1820)

It is strange that this should happen, because government is supposed to lead. It is supposed to persuade the people, it is supposed to submit some of its ideologies to the people at election time. It is not supposed to drop on people what has never been mentioned prior to an election and tell them what is good for them. When our scientists at college start to read in their subjects, they read German science, Russian science, British science, French science, even U.S. science. If one were studying philosophy, one would be referred by one's professors to authors ranging from Socrates, and no one would ask the nationality of the author of the article that they were asked to read. They would be told that it was pertinent information to the subject under discussion and therefore they should read it to be properly informed.

If one were to study medicine, one would find oneself finally having to take the Hippocratic oath symbolic of the history and ethics of medicine. One would go from there to what is now considered most modern in medicine on the North American continent, something that is probably getting more headlines than anything else, the Chinese treatment for disease and pain by acupuncture, which in China is as old as medicine and which may be as important as a multitude of other aspects of medical research.

The only field in which Canadians are going to be subjected to an 80 per cent orientation of subject matter is in the printed word and the airwaves of information. We are going to go to the people who most need this information and tell them that castor oil is on their spoon and that they had better take it. The people in my constituency have proven their loyalty to Canada ever since they settled here. They have participated in Canadian affairs, whether they were at home or at war abroad, in a fashion that I think speaks well of them by any measurement of Canadian society. I have had but two constituents say, «I favour this bill», but I have had hundreds of people say, in conversation and in correspondence, that this is censorship, that they do not want it or approve of it. Furthermore, they have continued to say that no matter what we do about advertising placement in Canada, they will continue to subscribe to the foreign magazines they are presently buying. *Reader's Digest*, wholly from the United States perhaps, will still be on their reading table.

At this moment in time *Reader's Digest* is a magazine that is published under certain terms and conditions in Canada. It has a Canadian content. The people of Canada who have been accustomed to reading *Reader's Digest* will continue to read the United States edition—unless the postmaster puts them out of business in the United States too. We are not going to gain anything from laying down new guidelines that we hope will eliminate *Reader's Digest* and *Time* in Canada. We may lose entirely. The government is just rolling the dice and does not know which number will be coming up next. However, my guess is that we will lose rather than gain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at how the Government of Canada and its regulatory bodies have interfered with the media as an example of what it may do to those who oppose it. Since this bill has been presented I have asked many questions about what people watch on television when they have a choice between Canadian and American television and Canadian and American-produced programs. One can praise the CBC as long as one likes, but the fact is that excluding news and sports items, 95 per cent of the viewing in an area where both Canadian and American television is available is of foreign-produced programs on Canadian networks or on foreign networks directly.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. McCain: Someone says "Shame". I say to that person that the shame is on him, because when free choice goes out the window I am reminded of someone watching a hockey game in Cuba for only 30 seconds and then having the program jammed. We are becoming involved too much in the kinds of controls in countries which have governments which no member over there would support, yet they create the very atmosphere in which it cannot be avoided.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it 6.30?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Order, please. Pursuant to the order made on Wednesday, November 5, it being 6.30 p.m. this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

At 6.30 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Special Order.