

One feels that the minister, in presenting the bill and when preparing the speech which he delivered a week or so ago, was desirous of making the maximum impact by clothing his words with an authority which he may have felt might escape him. We do not know who was the speechwriter, but one could imagine that when considering an idea that would work, the adviser perhaps indicated that eons ago a great leader had used ten imperatives, and the minister jumped at the idea. Wanting to know where they could be obtained, he was told it would mean climbing a mountain. The minister's being skeptical concerning whether he should attempt that and whether he should take all that much time out of his busy schedule prompted the speechwriter to say that he did not know whether or not the public would go for ten imperatives, and the minister probably said, "Let us try eight." So that cleared away that difficulty.

One suspects that rather than climb the mountain, they climbed the CNR tower in Toronto and from that great height surveyed all the Canadian publishing empire that the minister and his advisers felt mattered, and the minister came down from the tower with the eight that were presented to the House in the debate on May 8. I do not wish to suggest for a moment that these eight are linked in any way with the original ten. I do not wish to suggest for a moment that they have the same force or commandment or that they will remain in the history of this nation as long as the others have remained in the history of the world. I think we could probably call them the eight no-no's of Canadian publishing, rather than refer to them as commandments. They make an interesting list. I shall not read them all but I wish to draw attention to three of them. The third one reads:

Third, we do not want the continuance of a situation wherein the world view of Canadian readers is being influenced by American periodicals the operations of which in Canada are facilitated by a tax deduction provision primarily intended to assist Canadian publications.

● (1530)

I would suggest that there is a difference between the world view and the universal view. The *Reader's Digest* application to its subscribers for support drew a remarkable response. In spite of the words of the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Raines) whom we have just heard, the response was remarkable. In the brief debate on this bill several hon. members have referred to the size of the response surpassing any similar, mailed correspondence in the history of this parliament.

In the fourth point made by the minister, he said:

Fourth, we do not want the continuance of a practice whereby the stories and articles reproduced in the French language Canadian edition of *Reader's Digest* are usually translated outside Canada.

If we look at the history of these events we find that *Reader's Digest* published its first edition at a time when there was not the same sensitivity to "la langue française vivante" that there is at present in this country. Surely that practice is one that can be easily altered by negotiation between the Department of the Secretary of State and the magazine. In his eighth point, the minister said:

Eighth, we do not want the continuance of a Canadianization progress record which, after thirty years, finds *Time* in Canada still owned and controlled entirely by Time Inc. in the United States and publishing

#### *Non-Canadian Publications*

perhaps 10 per cent Canadian content; and *Reader's Digest* only 30 per cent Canadian-owned and carrying in its English language edition about 25 per cent and, in its French language edition, about 15 per cent Canadian content.

I suggest that in the eighth point in his list the minister has gone a long way toward separating the two publications, although in all the announcements and pronouncements he and his department have made they have carefully twinned the two publications. Considering the facts presented in his own eight imperatives to Canadian publishers, one could have substituted "but" for "and" preceding "*Reader's Digest*" and omitted "only" altogether, because there is a considerable difference between zero and 30 per cent.

Again, I think that this could be a matter of negotiation between the magazine and the department of the minister in terms of increasing the Canadian ownership of the magazine and the editorial direction of the Canadian issue of *Reader's Digest* because surely the editorializing that goes on in that magazine is considerably different from that in *Time* magazine which by its very nature as a weekly news magazine is in a considerably different position to influence the world view of Canadians, if the minister feels that their world view is being so much influenced by that magazine.

I find that in the mailing that has come to me from my constituents they have separated the two magazines very sharply. It should be remembered that *Time* also appealed to its subscribers by way of an insert in the magazine and asked them also to write to their members of parliament. But there is a wide discrepancy between the number of constituents who took advantage of that opportunity with respect to *Time* compared to the many who wrote concerning *Reader's Digest*. They wrote their letters by hand with respect to *Reader's Digest*. They did not fill out a form and sign their name at the bottom; they sat down and wrote to me by hand. They wrote about *Reader's Digest* as one would about an old friend or a relative. They were not worried about its influence on their world view, but they were concerned about some of the universals in terms of conduct, morality and standards that they feel are important.

They gave a variety of reasons why they felt the Canadian issue of that magazine should continue to exist in Canada. One of the reasons, of course, was its Canadian content. A variety of people pointed to specific articles that they had read which they otherwise would not have had the opportunity to read, articles by Canadian authors, articles on Canada and articles that meant a great deal to them. They wrote about it being one of the few magazines left that is safe to leave lying around the house where young children can find it, because they believe it upholds a level of morality and virtue that is difficult to find being upheld in the periodicals that are being sent throughout the country at present. I suggest that the minister, who is so concerned about the state of Canadian and American publishing and who has made various statements saying he does not want to prevent anything from coming into this country, might do a survey of the newsstands, as some of my constituents have done, and look at the nature of a great deal of the material that is coming into the country in vast quantity.