

*Non-Canadian Publications*

French outside Canada. If there are translation facilities available in Canada, I think they should be used, but I have listened a thousand times to spokesmen for the government saying that royal commission reports, for instance, could not be tabled because the translation was not ready. Both official languages enjoy equality in this House: this has been the position since 1867, though many people believe it only came about much more recently. Mr. Speaker, if we have all these translators available for use by *Reader's Digest*, I suggest the government should be employing them.

Finally, to the minister I would say this. Give the matter a little more thought; Think carefully about what has been recommended to you, especially by the hon. member for Cochrane, on the matter of guidelines. Have a serious talk with the Minister of National Revenue before we get into this 80 per cent question.

**Mr. Basford:** How about 70 per cent?

**Mr. Macquarrie:** The hon. gentleman thinks the figure is important. I think that what one is measuring is more important than the percentage. The minister is confirming what an old don used to say, that certain students had the capacity for majoring in minors. It is not the figure; it is a matter of goals and directions. I am not usually a man who suggests we slow down legislation, but on this occasion, to use a turn of phrase familiar to Prince Edward Islanders, I think we would be advised to put her back in dry dock for a while and take another look at the ship before launching her again.

[Translation]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, my purpose in rising now is not to reply to the distinguished professor from Prince Edward Island who has just so knowingly spoken. But before making my own remarks on the matter before us, I would like nonetheless to reassure the hon. member who preceded me on some questions he wondered about.

First I must say that I was personally reassured by his speech. I was reluctant to take part in the debate, since departmental business kept me away from the House last week when the matter was debated. But I think the speaker who preceded me was also absent because he raised questions that had been solved even before he mentioned them or spoke.

For instance, I do not understand how he can still talk about this matter of the Canadian content when I read in the speech the minister made when he introduced the bill in the House the following remarks, quote:

Contrary to the view expressed in a recent editorial in one of our leading financial journals . . .

And I should say contrary to the view expressed by our hon. colleague opposite—

. . . a periodical, to be counted for tax purposes as a Canadian publication, does not have to have a certain minimum percentage of Canadian content. It should be understood by everyone that to be "not substantially the same" as a periodical printed, edited or published outside Canada does not mean that a magazine's contents have to be Canadian in whole or in part. They simply have to be such as to make that magazine, for the most part, different from a foreign counterpart.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

I suggest that these very words should have calmed in advance the worries the hon. member has just expressed on he issue of the Canadian content.

Secondly, I should like to reassure him about the possible voting along party line by hon. members. I would like to tell my hon. friend that he will not be able to level this charge at me. As a matter of fact, I was a newsman when this problem occurred for the first time, 12 or 13 years ago. I belonged to the occupation under discussion today and I have unequivocally expressed my objections against the exceptions made in favour of *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, which are incidentally two of the richest publications in the whole world; they are loaded with money and they do not need Canadian charity to pursue their careers.

Finally, I would like to reassure the hon. member about the unsolved questions he has just mentioned and which led him to advise the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) to put his bill in dry dock. I think this question has been in dry dock for too long. It seems to me that with his already long parliamentary experience, and in spite of his youth, the hon. member must know that the committee is the best place to solve the matters which remain unsolved, which can cause some concern to the hon. member. Instead of recommending to the minister who took this matter out of the dry dock to set it afloat again, he should let it afloat, refer it to the committee by a majority vote of the House, or even better, by consent of the House. In committee, as he perfectly knows, unsolved issues can be solved. Concerns that worry us can be cleared up. All lacking precisions can be obtained. And above all, a bill can be pushed through if, in the opinion of the great majority of the House, it should become law as soon as possible.

I come back to my point, Mr. Speaker, which prompts me to rise in this debate. It will consist, first of all, in stressing the importance of measuring the point of view of Canadian broadcasting. I do not think that aspect of the question has been very strongly questioned by any member of the House. But I would like the rationalization of the provisions of the bill on broadcasting to be included in the file of the bill. What is it all about on the broadcasting standpoint? It is a question of stations located in big American urban centres near big Canadian centres. But, often, too it is a question of broadcasting stations purposefully located on the Canadian border. In both cases, the evident objective is to exploit the Canadian market through the border.

● (1550)

One needs only see the size of the villages and small towns where some of the stations concerned are built. The size of these villages and small towns does not justify, in many cases, the size of the stations themselves. That is the best indication that the goal is not to enrich the American broadcasting system with American funds, which is an honourable objective for our southern neighbours to pursue, but most of the time to exploit systematically the Canadian broadcasting market, which is not large enough in itself for us Canadians to decide to give up whole parts of it to foreign broadcasters.

If anybody doubted that these stations seek in many cases above all to exploit the Canadian market, he would only have to consider the kind of advertisement aired by