

vertising will go to television and radio. On some television and radio stations which have top-flight commentators you cannot even buy time.

● (1600)

The story about dumping is rather an interesting one. Why do we not look at the material which is dumped by way of so-called syndicated material in newspapers—comics, Marmaduke, Ann Landers, and all the rest. It is very cheap to buy these syndicated columns. It is dumping. Despite this, there are thoughtful journalists and some publishers I know who have stated strongly that these two healthy magazines should stay in the country in order that the rest of the magazine industry shall stay strong. It is like bringing in a great department store in the middle of a dying business neighbourhood; it strengthens the whole neighbourhood. The day we build only on the weak and destroy the strong, whether it is people or whether it is the magazine industry, is the day we are doomed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: I do not hear many Liberals applaud.

Mrs. Holt: What difference does it make whether it is Liberal or Conservative? Aren't we all here as members of parliament?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Holt: As a matter of fact, I am very tired of this whole concept that speech here is simply a matter of toeing a line. If the only reason you are talking against this bill is because of your politics, then shame on you.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Holt: You should be talking because you care; because you care about the right of the people of Canada to have freedom to read what they want, to advertise where they want.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Holt: I, personally, do not want all-Canadian content. I don't want to see this country one in which we are narrow and uneducated to what is happening in the rest of the world. I am very grateful for the five pages of Canadian news in *Time* and the many human, well researched features in *Reader's Digest* drawn from all parts of Canada. We live on the other side of the mountains, and I believe that if the people from central Canada lived there they would understand what I mean. We don't hear in depth about Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island or Manitoba. We hear a great deal about Ontario and Quebec. All the news across this great country, we do not hear it except in the very condensed, tight, objective reporting that comes to us in *Time*. One column in *Time* is worth a whole page of what is called depth reporting in most newspapers. I am not going to name names. In either case I know, as a journalist, that quantity isn't always quality, nor is it depth reporting.

An hon. Member: Then just sit down.

Non-Canadian Publications

Mrs. Holt: Oh, you're going to get it! You people have been talking for a long time. I know you did a great deal of talking when I was away—out of necessity.

I love Canada very deeply and I consider myself a patriot. I am not a narrow nationalist, though. I will quote someone who wrote better than I do, because his work survived for the century.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: Speaking culturally. Aldington said, "Nationalism is a silly cock crowing on its own dunghill." Or to quote Einstein, he described it as an infantile disease. Let us hope, like the measles of the world, this will just go away.

But let me talk about money going to *Reader's Digest* and *Time*, and the threat to the life of the magazine industry. Since this tax equality—I call it tax equality because it isn't a tax benefit; there is no special tax benefit given to these magazines—came in, 88 new Canadian magazines have been born and are flourishing with a circulation of over 10,000 each. They have been established in the last ten years. Seventy of them are in English and 18 in French. They have 209 million circulation annually.

The magazine industry throughout the world is a struggling industry. Even *John Bull*, the great British magazine, died. *Look* died in the United States. *Life* died. Why should we, in Canada, contribute to the death of our strong magazines?

Reader's Digest offers opportunities to young writers who will never get a chance to write for a great magazine or get international exposure. Those who write for it do get international exposure. *Digest* receives 6,000 manuscripts a year. They do not return a manuscript without reading it and giving advice to the writer. There are two readers for every manuscript. Thus, they have nurtured young Canadian writers. This is a great public service to one profession in this country.

I can read off this list of magazines which have come into being since tax equality with other Canadian magazines was given to *Reader's Digest* and *Time* ten years ago. It is propaganda to say that the industry has been killed. It is misinformation which is bandied about that the two magazines, *Time* and *Digest*, cream off advertising money which is taking the place of advertising which would be placed in Canadian magazines. People who have the statistics have already admitted this, so I don't need to repeat it other than to say that the information is simply not true and that I can—if necessary—put the statistics on record.

As for the corporate behaviour of the two magazines, I think it has been excellent. I think they have set a high standard. Maybe it is too pure for the swingers in this country, but I feel very strongly that these two magazines have been good corporate citizens; they have followed every guideline of corporate conduct set out by the federal government. In the simplest terms, I would say that *Digest* has done this by having more than 30 per cent of its shares owned by Canadians. Four out of five of its directors are Canadians. What is most important to me is its full-time Canadian staff numbering 455 people.

I worked with the associate editor, Charles Smith, one of the best editors of any magazine anywhere, in my