

per cent of every revenue dollar stays in Canada. It employs directly, in its Canadian operation, between 460 and 490 people and provides employment for 1,000 others through suppliers. I could go on and on. The point is that ever since 1943 the magazine here has made a positive contribution to this country. It has become a good Canadian corporate citizen. The Reader's Digest Association of Canada says in a news release:

● (1710)

We are proud of the fact that:

- five out of a board of six *Digest* directors are Canadian
- all of the officers of the company are Canadian citizens
- all 500 of our employees are permanent residents of Canada and the company gives work indirectly to at least 1,000 other Canadians
- our two magazines are fully edited in Canada for Canadians
- we employ some 80 editors, graphic and production staff on our books and magazines
- both magazines have substantial Canadian content, amounting to an annual average of 24 per cent English and almost 15 per cent French
- almost 80 Canadian freelance writers, researchers and artists look to our books and magazines as a market for their work . . .

We have respected Canadians' expressed wishes in many ways. One has been to make some 32 per cent of our common stock available to Canadians through a public issue, the only *Digest* company in the world to do so. Shareholders, of course, bought their stock with the understanding that the company's operations were not under any threat. At the time the stock was issued, we had that assurance from the government.

Surely we are not going to break a commitment we gave this company when they endeavoured to release their stock so that Canadians could purchase it. However, that could well be the effect of this legislation if it is passed in its present form. I again quote:

Despite our record of good Canadian corporate citizenship, we apparently have been tried by the government and found wanting. Surely we can expect to be told what further standards we should meet, with at least a fair opportunity to meet them.

As the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) pointed out, when this bill is before the committee it should be given a fair opportunity to meet whatever conditions are possible to allow the company to remain in existence as a Canadian entity with a Canadian edition in both English and French. It is not only important that we give our point of view and that of *Reader's Digest*. We should also put on record what some of our constituents have said to us regarding this legislation. It has been suggested that because *Reader's Digest* wrote their subscribers and asked them to write their members of parliament to make them aware of their personal views about the magazine, this was unfair and should not have been done because it was an endeavour to promote the writing of letters to members of parliament.

Quite often I write my constituents asking their views about various things happening in this country. I only wish that on every occasion I write my constituents I could get a response as overwhelming as was the case with my constituents writing about *Reader's Digest*. I would be very impressed if on some other proposition my constituents wrote in the same way they have written to me about *Reader's Digest*. If the subscribers had not been written to by *Reader's Digest*, many of them would not appreciate how dangerous the situation is, as far as the magazine's

Message from the Senate

existence is concerned, if this legislation is passed in its present form.

I wish to put on record what some of my constituents have written to me. I will not take up too much time of the House. I have some very bright constituents, not just because they have elected me on eight separate occasions but because they produced the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) whom I consider to be the finest man in this nation at the present time, from the leadership point of view. This is what some of my constituents have written to me:

We have always felt that the *Reader's Digest* has had the interests of Canada at heart, has been fair and conservative and a bastion against communism.

For the past 42 years I have been a subscriber to the *Digest* and it is like a friend who keeps me in touch . . .

I am writing on behalf of the magazine that I have taken and read for over 30 years.

We really enjoy this book.

I always look forward to the *Reader's Digest*: I think it should be left alone.

I, too, think it should be left alone.

This is to voice a protest, as loudly and clearly as I can, the government's announced intention that threatens to deny me the enjoyment, relaxation and education which the *Reader's Digest* has provided me over a period of many, many years.

If I lose it, I'll be losing a friend.

To a great many Canadians, that is exactly what will happen. I believe the Canadian people want parliament to guarantee that *Reader's Digest* will be allowed to continue to exist in this nation. They want us to do that in no uncertain terms. Maybe we will have to go down the road a way to find the right set of rules and regulations to govern publications in this nation. Personally, I am not happy about any kind of censorship, and that is what will occur in one way or another: by way of legislation we are determining what people may or may not have a right to read.

I believe there has to be a spirit of compromise on the part of this parliament and the committee that considers this legislation. Amendments will have to be accepted before this legislation is credible. I sincerely hope that all members will look at the legislation, especially with regard to *Reader's Digest*, with this thought in mind: we must be careful not to endanger a Canadian magazine that, as far as I am concerned, is as Canadian as any magazine in this nation. It provides tremendous enjoyment to at least six million people in this country. If that were to happen, it would be a very serious loss. It is something for which parliament will not be forgiven if we act in the wrong way as far as *Reader's Digest* is concerned.

* * *

[Translation]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C-32, an act to impose a charge on the export of crude oil and certain petroleum products, to provide compensation for certain petroleum costs and to