

ernment side of the House so that they might think about what they really are trying to do. I ask the members on the government side of the House to request the minister respond to some of these suggestions.

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Flynn). I agree with most of his remarks. There is perhaps one exception. When I look at page 9035 of *Hansard* for November 13, 1975, I find that when the government ram-rodged its closure motion through the House to deal with this matter with very little debate, indeed his name is found among those voting yea.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

● (1720)

Mr. McKinnon: It is always interesting to watch a new member come to this House filled with a sense of independence as a government backbencher. However, gradually he gets filed down until he votes nay or yea on orders from the front bench.

I received a great deal of correspondence, as has everyone else, on this contentious bill and I, like the hon. member for Kitchener, discounted a certain amount of it as having originated from the tear-sheet which was put out by *Reader's Digest*. But I was amazed at the number of people from my constituency who wrote separate letters to me. They did not send in the tear-sheet with "I am against it" written on the dotted lines. I have here several hundred letters and they are not second hand from *Reader's Digest*; they represent and effort by my constituents to tell me why they want *Reader's Digest* and, to a lesser extent, *Time*, maintained in Canada. I will give you an example of this type of letter, and in particular I will call your attention to one aspect in them. I have here one letter which reads as follows:

Reader's Digest is only one of its kind, always informative, always human, always in good taste—a most delightful magazine. I have not seen any magazine which can compare. If this is discontinued in Canada, we have only vulgarity left. I subscribed to several magazines this year which I felt would be interesting for my family. I have been shocked. Now when they arrive, I toss them in the garbage. I am no prude but there is a limit.

This theme runs through my correspondence. I began to notice it after the first few letters and have since looked at several magazines, Canadian and others. While the minister responsible for this travesty of a bill, this travesty of a democratic process, might not feel offended by the language which one sees used in too many magazines these days, many of my constituents are offended. They are offended by the kind of language in *Maclean's* and in a flood of other magazines from the pulp industry which can get into one's home, if one is not carefully, via the newsstands. I do not think I am particularly prudish but sometimes it is beyond my comprehension why certain writers who have gained popularity find it impossible to express their opinions without the benefit of four letter words.

I have received several hundred letters, but from among them I should like to quote one delightful one which found its way to my desk on May 13, 1975. I presume it arrived on the desks of other members of parliament because it was addressed to all members of parliament and senators. It

Non-Canadian Publications

came from the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt), and it read:

Dear Colleague,

Attached is my response to literally hundreds of letters from across Canada, primarily the west, opposing Hugh Faulkner's plan to rescind section 19(2) threatening the future of *Reader's Digest* and *Time*. This action, I feel, will also abrogate the right of advertisers, in our free enterprise system, to select the media through which to advertise. Only three of the letters favoured the Faulkner action.

I wish to quote from this letter at some length because, although I do not generally quote lengthy passages from letters, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway set out the advantages and disadvantages of the scheme quite fairly, and I would like to put it on the record. It is somewhat of a surprise to me, as it was to the hon. member for Kitchener. In this letter the hon. member said:

—I will continue my fight against the proposed action when it comes before the House of Commons—

Let me say again at this point that I was reading *Hansard* for last Thursday and I found that the hon. member was not present in the House when the vote was being taken, and she is not present here today. I know she was here earlier, but she was not in the House when the vote was taken. She went on to say:

—and if it comes before the Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee.

In the second paragraph of her letter the hon. member wrote:

At the very time when free societies are being swallowed up in the communist thrust to achieve its proclaimed aim—world domination—this action is symbolic of a concerted effort to alienate an old and strong ally and Canada's closest friend, the United States. One wonders if we are not being used by the small but vocal Toronto-based anti-American clique.

That paragraph goes a little beyond what I would be prepared to say. It may be that a backbencher on the other side might think the government is inspired by communists, but I have never agreed with this thesis which was expressed by the hon. member when she said that free societies are being swallowed up in the communist thrust, and that this bill is symbolic of the concerted effort in that direction.

She went on to say:

Those who compare *Reader's Digest* with *Playboy*, *Newsweek*, the *US News and World Report* or other all-American publications are forgetting these publications did not offer or even try to provide ANY Canadian news or to set up offices in Canada or give jobs to Canadians.

I might say that from here on I agree with what the hon. member has said. She attached a letter which she used as a form letter to reply to her numerous constituents who wrote to her. It is undated. There is a blank space for the date and address to go in. This is what she wrote:

Thank you for writing to advise of your reaction to the announcement by the Honourable J. Hugh Faulkner, Secretary of State, that he intends to rescind section 19(2) of the Income Tax Act and its affect on *Reader's Digest*.

I expect they had proof readers at the newspaper where the hon. member used to work.

She went on:

I had been openly opposed to this step. It is discriminatory and unjust—a threat to the life of a first class landed (corporate) immigrant for more than 30 years. Not only has *Reader's Digest* provided jobs and writing opportunities to many Canadians within a small industry—