

way that same concept by a rule from the Department of National Revenue.

To this purpose, comments have already been made by certain experts, like Mr. Harold Fox in *The Canadian Law on Copyright and Industrial Designs*, second edition, who says in this regard on page 106, and I quote:

It is obvious that there are two distinct copyrights in all works written by several authors, one covering the work as a whole the other covering each contribution by the individual authors. The author, and therefore the holder of the copyright for the whole work, will be the one who composes and edits the compilation unless, of course, he is employed by another person. Also, the author of each individual contribution to the collective work will be the holder of the copyright for the part he wrote, unless he is himself employed by another person.

Thus for a periodical such as *Reader's Digest*, the editors of the American equivalent of the Canadian magazine would hold the copyright regarding the title and the whole publication. The copyright for each article belongs to the individual authors. As Fox says in his book, on page 304, the right to reproduce a book under licence is probably limited to the reproduction of that book in a form substantially identical to the original edition.

The consequences of this regulation are as follows: The holder of an author's permit cannot use the literary work covered by the permit as he pleases. The reproduction of the work for which the permit was granted must be under a form substantially the same as the original. Therefore any provision which grants Canadian publishers the right to use, as they see fit, a work under an author's permit, must be worded in such a way as to protect the royalties of each individual author.

This is why it has been suggested that clause 19 pertaining to editing or publishing rights should allow Canadian publishers complete freedom when it comes to publishing a work covered by a permit provided the notion of copyrights is not tampered with. That is what the Canadian publishers of *Selection* mean by complete freedom. I will not indulge in vacuous oratory and shall leave the House with those legal comments so that the minister may consider them and make the necessary decisions to make the task of *Reader's Digest* easier, as we must admit it deserves a little consideration.

In conclusion, to keep a valuable perspective of the overall scope of Bill C-58, I would like to say once again that the purpose of Bill C-58 is to prune section 19 of the Income Tax Act to give it the original intent its promoters had in mind, that is solely to promote the creation of an industry of original Canadian publishing.

Therefore, I believe that Bill C-58 deserves careful consideration, for it calls for sound Canadian nationalism, but while showing such nationalism we should protect certain rights acquired by concerned people, by providing them with the same weapons as their local competitors, thus maintaining our reputation of referee and not that of killjoy.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I listened closely to the remarks of the hon. member who just concluded on Bill C-58, dealing more particularly with *Reader's Digest* and *Time* magazine.

I think he is quite right on the importance of measures to safeguard Canadian values and introduce a nationalist note. When we read the bill, it is clear pressures were

Non-Canadian Publications

brought to hear on the government to prevent Canadians from being caught, to help magazines such as *Reader's Digest*.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, *Reader's Digest* is wholly Canadian. It is an international magazine that is read throughout the world, millions of Canadians read because it gives courses on orientation, history, geography, administration, literature. It is a complete magazine which Canadian readers are most interested in. It would therefore be, and I think it is most unpopular among a very large majority of Canadians to cause the conveniences to the people who advertise in *Reader's Digest*. I said and I repeat that everybody runs for *Reader's Digest* every month, because it is not a magazine which attempts to impose the American ideology or any other kind of ideology. It is an objective magazine, which does not aim at any kind of political partisanship. *Reader's Digest* informs people.

Time is another cup of tea. *Time* seems to establish guidelines or consider itself the leader of public opinion, especially in the United States and Canada. You can read *Time* in other countries, but it is quite different. *Time* is different from *Reader's Digest*, but *Reader's Digest* employs and maintains thousands of Canadians who spend their money in Canada, who earn a living through the revenues from that publication, and I think, Mr. Speaker, *Reader's Digest* deserves as much consideration as any other magazine published in Canada. We do have magazines in Canada. Unfortunately, we have none of international scope. We have *La Chatelaine*. We have seen magazines like *Relations* which were restricted to the province of Quebec, and were edited by Jesuits.

We had, I believe, a magazine called *Maintenant*, which has probably disappeared by now. We have *Maclean* which is just as American as *Reader's Digest*. So why go for one magazine especially? Why should we try to cut down the rights of advertisers, the rights of people, or the rights of editors who work or co-operate with *Reader's Digest*?

Mr. Speaker, I think Bill C-58, considering how it is presented now, is discriminating. I understand we have to put an end to our recurring discussions in the past few years on that matter, namely whether we should boycott those so-called foreign magazines in Canada. So, when you have the number of employees who worked on a magazine like *Sélection*, one must be somewhat tolerant and admit that those people, the Canadians who are attached to it, our fellow citizens, do not work against the interests of Canada, do not work against the interests of advertisers, but work together to maintain a worthwhile magazine.

I said earlier that that *Reader's Digest* is a source of information that one does not find in other magazines. This does not mean that the other magazines are absolutely useless, no. Some are good, others not so good. But when you know *Reader's Digest*, I think there is not a single member in this House who does not read articles in *Reader's Digest* every month. Why? Because you learn something. That magazine serves educational purposes in many areas. That magazine acts as a yardstick or a barometer for economic gains or economic changes by informing us of what is happening in other countries while we have it available directly.