

Mr. Epp: Why are they afraid? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker. They fear that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in his annual bestowal of parliamentary secretaryships and other goodies, will pass them by.

Mr. Paproski: He does not even do that any more.

Mr. Epp: Consequently, they remain silent. How will the 80 per cent content rule affect Canadians? How will it affect our daily newspapers?

Mr. Paproski: They will be next.

Mr. Epp: I am concerned, as I am convinced that the government's action could involve the censorship of our daily newspapers. They receive news stories from United Press International, which is not a Canadian news dispensing service, from Reuters, from independent writers and from Canadian Press. How is the content of some daily newspapers to be 80 per cent different from, say, that of their counterparts in the United States? For example, must the content of a Windsor newspaper be 80 per cent different from the material printed in some newspaper across the river, in Detroit? At present, the 80 per cent rule affects only *Reader's Digest* and *Time*. But when will it affect others? After all, why should not the government, which will close this debate, not take the next step?

What about television? Let me tell hon. members something that happened in my riding. For several years, near one extremity of my riding, people were able to receive the television signals of station KCND, situated near Pembina, North Dakota. That was the only television signal available in the area. What happened? Suddenly, that television station was called a pirate. Why? It was situated in the United States and was beaming signals into Canada. Manitoba advertisers were advertising on that television station and people in the southeastern part of the province picked up the television signal. What happened? The hon. member for Skeena (Mrs. Campagnolo) called the station a pirate, said it took our money and was against it. I point out that the CBC did not provide service in the area.

Mrs. Campagnolo: The CBC could provide service if it had more money.

Mr. Epp: Let me tell you what happened. Certain influential people said that television KCND was siphoning away Canadian advertising dollars and that advertisers on that station should not be able to deduct their expenses for tax purposes. In the end, the television station was sold. Another station, CKND, beamed programs from Winnipeg; only the call letters were changed. In the end, southeastern Manitoba was without television coverage. Station KCND had been called a pirate. After all, it was American and we were not to watch it. It was sold. So far the CBC does not provide television coverage, either in English or French, and the CTV network does not cover the area. In the end, we presented two petitions, one to the Secretary of State, who answers in this House for the CBC, and one to the CRTC. What were we told?

Mr. Paproski: Tell us.

Mr. Epp: We were told, yes, we could get coverage. But before hon. members leap for joy, let me tell them when it

Non-Canadian Publications

is to be. In 1978 there is to be an application and—just perhaps—we shall be given television coverage by 1980. I raise this issue to show what government interference can do. The same can happen under this bill. I will not mention what is happening to cable; that is another topic.

The question is, if *Reader's Digest* and *Time* in their present forms are discontinued, will Canadians buy more Canadian publications? Is that the way to build the Canadian publishing industry? Clearly, a magazine's major competitor for advertising revenue is not another magazine; it is the other forms of the media. I suggest that radio and television siphon off a much larger proportion of advertising dollars than some hon. members are willing to admit.

● (1700)

When making a comparison with other countries we find that magazines in Canada receive a smaller percentage of the total advertising dollar than those of other industrial nations. In Canada, this is approximately 2.3 per cent of the revenue generated by advertising, in the United States it is 6.5 per cent, in the United Kingdom 8.5 per cent, in France 16.8 per cent, and in West Germany 27.9 per cent. I sincerely question whether the Canadian publishing industry has in the past been publishing the type of material Canadians want to read. In a free enterprise system such as we have, whether or not you are going to sell a product depends primarily on whether people are willing to buy it. They will only buy your product if they feel it is useful or will enhance their quality of life.

I believe Canadian magazines today are not struggling because of *Time* or *Reader's Digest* but because Canadians, individually, think those magazines are not worthy of their support to anywhere near the degree the magazines expect. Legislating *Time* and *Reader's Digest* out of existence does not guarantee that the revenue will go to other Canadian magazines. Quite likely, a lot of it will just dry up. A larger amount will go to other of the media, such as television, if the CRTC does not have a hand in that. If the CRTC is the watchdog of Canadian television, why does it not say to these terrible multinational corporations that the NDP spout about so often, that this is non-Canadian content and therefore should not be used for tax purposes? This can be carried to ridiculous extremes.

What is needed is a Canadian publishing industry that will develop its own magazines in the way that other businesses develop. It should promote the sale of its product and build a reputation over the years. That is how to sell a product; it is not done by asking the government to legislate you into existence by legislating someone else out of existence. In particular, closure should not be used to bring them into existence.

What about the contribution made by *Reader's Digest*? I believe it has made a very significant contribution to Canadian writers. Stories by Canadian writers have appeared on a frequent, regular basis. For example, Farley Mowat, a writer from Newfoundland, is known right across this country. I believe this is partly because of the coverage he has received in *Reader's Digest*. In addition, Canadian writers receive recognition through the international connections of *Reader's Digest*: it publishes in many countries.