

Non-Canadian Publications

ing industry in Canada will be assisted. The bill has nothing to do with who will be permitted to publish. There is no tariff being imposed at the border. I suggest the arguments so far has been a red herring. I welcome publications from all over the world, and so does every other Canadian. It is wrong to scare the Canadian people with the idea that somehow we are spending our time trying to determine what they can and cannot read.

An hon. Member: I am glad somebody over there has read the bill.

Mr. Leggatt: What the minister has done in regard to *Reader's Digest* gives some of us considerable cause for thought. I welcome the attempt of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) to amend this legislation; the amendment should be right in the bill where it belongs. I very much regret the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) making this kind of, I would have to say sweetheart deal with *Reader's Digest*, because no such deal has been made with *Time*. It was completely unnecessary to make that special arrangement. It was not out in the open.

I can understand why this debate is being dragged out. I presume that tomorrow there is going to be another announcement that somehow the rules have been changed as well for *Time*, though I hope not.

An hon. Member: What was changed?

Mr. Leggatt: The content rule and the licensing provisions. The hon. member knows very well what was changed. I see the minister is shaking his head. Surely the pool of articles available to *Reader's Digest* in Canada is under licence in terms of the U.S. parent company. In other words, the editorial content of that Canadian magazine is being determined by the pool of articles that is available to the Canadian publication. This being the case, one of the provisions of the legislation has been defeated by the minister's sweetheart deal with *Reader's Digest*, and that is why I regret it.

I think *Reader's Digest* should carry articles gathered from all kinds of places. We do not need a special arrangement between *Reader's Digest* of Canada and *Reader's Digest* of the United States since the pool of articles has already been determined and copyright exists. If the minister says I am wrong, then fine, but it seems to me that we are defeating one of the purposes of the legislation by allowing re-editing in Canada of this narrow pool of articles which are not generally available to *Reader's Digest* in Canada. In other words, it is not a Canadian digest at all. Once more we have an American magazine masquerading as a Canadian magazine, and therefore giving it a tax advantage that the government so rightly took away under this bill.

My intervention, Mr. Speaker, is brief. I cannot support the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway though I am pleased to see her put it on the order paper. I am glad she has tried to make it part of the legislation, where it belongs, so we can engage in some meaningful debate about it. That is all I wish to say at this time, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Leggatt.]

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to launch myself into any kind of attack on another member and I do not propose to do so this evening, but I am very concerned about some of the comments made on this bill by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). I am concerned about his over-simplification of the intent of this bill, about his interpretation of it. There is nothing at all simple about this bill. I challenge the hon. member to give the House an indication of what is simple about the bill other than perhaps the people who drafted it.

● (2140)

Let me liken the amendment that has been proposed and the bill before us to the policies of the previous provincial government in Victoria. That government also wanted to get into the ball game of deciding what the people should read, or at least what they would see and hear through the television media. I refer to the infamous Channel 10 situation. That channel was supposed to be an educational channel, but was really a propaganda machine of the administration of the time. I know the hon. member for New Westminster will reject that proposal out of hand, but nevertheless this was of very real concern. Taking into account the kind of minister who was proposing this and what subsequently happened to him, I am not ready to be convinced that this was not really a propaganda ploy of that government at that time.

I really must say that you cannot have it both ways. Either it is censorship or a form thereof; either it is propaganda or a form thereof, or it is not. It is just that simple, and that is the only simple thing about it. The only simple thing is the basic thrust and the intent of the bill.

Having regard to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt), I must say I am astounded at the lack of favourable response on the part of those on the other side. I think it is a sensible and a reasonable proposal. I am also astounded at the lack of acceptance by the government in respect of all the amendments that have been put forward to this bill. Surely the government has received some kind of message by this time. Surely it realizes what our position is in respect of this bill. Surely the government must realize the kind of concerns we have. Are we concerned because of some kind of political motivation or some deep ingrained Tory philosophy? Of course that is not the case. We are concerned because of a sense of knowing what is right and what is wrong.

Let us get back to this old red herring we have heard so much about. In fact it is no longer a red herring, it has become a mighty great whale that we are supposed to be dragging across in respect of this item of censorship.

An hon. Member: A red whale.

Mr. Brisco: There is no question in my mind as to the intent and the thrust of this bill. I am sure there is no question in that regard in the minds of any of those who have taken part in this debate or brought forward amendments. I have no brief for *Maclean's* magazine or for Canadian publishers. Surely if they were going to, they have had the opportunity to make it on their own. That opportunity has long since presented itself. I am not opposed to the basic idea of taxing *Reader's Digest*, *Time*, or