

ing with two specially supported magazines in Canada, *Time* and *Reader's Digest*.

Some critics proclaim that most of their letters on the subject oppose Bill C-58. Of course they do; that is the kind of negative mail members learn to expect on any subject. But the polls were not opposed. Neither the professional polls nor small, private polls of the kind conducted by members showed that the people opposed Bill C-58, despite *Time* and *Reader's Digest* having mounted one of the biggest, most intimidating lobbies and publicity campaigns in Canadian political history. Last spring I conducted my own newsletter survey in Halton riding. Despite the work of the lobby, only 34 per cent of those answering opposed Bill C-58. About 44 per cent were in favour of the bill, and 22 per cent had no opinion. Even more significantly, fewer people answered this questionnaire than had answered other questionnaires. Clearly, the power lobby has created less interest in this issue than exists with regard to crime and labour strikes.

Some people take the pessimistic view that even if foreign competitors are helped less, Canadian magazines like *Maclean's* will remain bogged down with poor quality, little sales appeal and remain hapless nationalistic efforts. To some extent past criticisms were warranted. Articles and sections were weak, frivolous, dilettante, irrelevant, in bad taste or otherwise unworthy. Oddly enough, the bad stuff has existed side by side with good quality stuff. All the same Canadian writing and reporting has shown enough promise to warrant our support, and this is especially true at present. The new *Maclean's* news magazine format is a substantial improvement. I commend its capsule news highlights called "Preview", its large more comprehensive "Canada" section dealing with current events, its good international coverage in the "World" section, and the balance of feature articles, freewheeling interviews with important Canadians, and special subject sections.

Saturday Night has also made a strong comeback as a specialty magazine. Recently, a fine news magazine, *Canadian Review*, has begun publishing from Ottawa. These are truly Canadian magazines which will continue to grow and develop with our support and constructive criticism. I point out that already, in this new climate of interest and support, the Canadian magazine industry announced recently that it has enjoyed its best year ever. One of these days, our Canadian publishing industry and other media, like TV, may not need special support from our people. That will be a great day. Right now, our media need such support, which we will not hesitate to provide, without exceptions. Canadians will watch expectantly for results which will justify this support.

One of these days, Mr. Speaker, Canadian doubters and apologists will be proud and anxious to claim credit for Canadian media which have become distinctly Canadian, sovereign and as good as any in the world. They will be as proud of our media as they are of our Canadian film and music industries, Expo '67, the forth-coming 1976 Olympics and many other Canadian achievements. The fact is that *Time* and *Reader's Digest* will continue to function and to be welcome here, Canadian editions or not, Bill C-58 or not. Just this afternoon I received a telegram from Mr. Stephen LaRue, the president of *Time* magazine, as I am sure other members did, complaining about the 80 per cent

Non-Canadian Publications

Canadian content rules announced by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) here in this House of Commons as far back as October 23, 25 days ago—a dubious, last-minute manoeuvre on a very important subject. I read it and I must say that it did little to change my mind on the subject.

● (1630)

It is a privilege and an honour to speak in support of Bill C-58 and Canadian progress.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, this matter has caused considerable debate, not only recently in the bringing forward of Bill C-58 but in the whole development in recent years about the degree to which Canadians can exercise some autonomy and activity within their own communications industry. One cannot be overly optimistic that this action by itself is going to bring the utopia that many people would like to see occur in terms of increased opportunities for Canadian self-awareness and opportunities for Canadian craftsmen and various aspects of the magazine industry to make their impact felt to a greater degree.

While the substance of this bill is extremely short in terms of amendments to the Income Tax Act, the implications and the symbolic value to Canadians are obviously great. If the minister were asked the question today, I think he would indicate that no issue with which he has been identified during his time in office has generated more public concern, mail and heat, both outside and within his caucus, than this particular issue. I am sure he is well aware that while the action itself, in terms of legislative change, is not overwhelming, the implications and repercussions are great.

This is a kind of classical Canadian situation. We are in an attempt, if you like, to redress a balance which has swung increasingly against us as a people. We take a means of communication which has been popular for many decades, that of magazines. We realize that increasingly we have lost the ability to publish and communicate among ourselves in this country, not through any diabolical intent on the part of any individual, organization or government but simply in a general situation which continuously confronts this country, that of being neighbour to and closely associated with the most powerful nation in the world, not in just a military and economic sense but in the way in which the American people have excelled beyond any other in their ability to communicate and to register their ideals and ideas.

In 1961 I took a trip around the world. I visited some countries that I thought were far removed and underdeveloped. I remember in particular one sunny afternoon travelling through the back streets of Bangkok. I thought that surely to goodness nowhere in the world, on that day, could be further removed from the civilization that I knew than these little water streets, canalways, that existed in the back areas of Bangkok in Thailand. Can you imagine my surprise when I looked inside a little thatched hut on the water's edge and saw two things that reminded me of the sheer weight and energy of the American civilization from which I came, a bottle of Coca-Cola and an American television set. There was an instant awareness in that Thai household of a whole value system, a whole sense of