

After all it is well known that the major Canadian wire service, the Canadian Press, maintains few correspondents abroad, and relies largely on United States and British news services, such as the Associated Press and Reuters, for its foreign news coverage. Frequently, perhaps most often, this material is rewritten by CP's own staffers, but the perceptions on which their stories are based still are not those of Canadians. Is it realistic, then, to apply the "not substantially the same" test in these circumstances? Is it not likely that Canadian news magazines, forced by economic realities to rely on Canadian news services for foreign coverage, will simply be providing foreign images of the world, couched in the Canadian idiom to meet some unrealistic content ruling?

One might ask what is wrong with Canadian news magazines running foreign perceptions of world affairs rewritten by Canadians? After all, Canadian news services cannot afford to maintain more than a few Canadian correspondents abroad.

If I were asked that question, Mr. Speaker, I would have to admit, sadly, that it is true that we are not likely to find large numbers of Canadian correspondents abroad. It is true that we will likely have to rely heavily in future, as we have in the past, on the perceptions of non-Canadians for our views of world affairs. That being the case, why invoke a Canadian content ruling that can most aptly be described as a sham?

I am just about finished, Mr. Speaker, but I would reiterate that I have some grave reservations about the efficacy of the measures in Bill C-58 in fostering a viable and truly Canadian periodical industry. As I have said, the intent of the bill is one that I feel deserves the support of anyone interested in the concept of an independent Canada. I suppose in supporting it one would be saying that it is better than nothing. But is supporting something that is better than nothing good enough in times that call for strong affirmations of Canada's faith in itself?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—SUGGESTED CANADIAN EFFORT TO HAVE NORTH AND SOUTH KOREA RESOLVE DIFFERENCES

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, probably in my lifetime here I shall never have an opportunity to make a more important speech than the one I propose to make now. It is also probable that I shall never be as pessimistic as I am about making this speech.

As a news man I followed events in Indochina from the days leading up to the fall of Dien Bien Phu years and years ago. I take no satisfaction in the rout of refugees along the trail out of Saigon any more than I took satisfaction a number of years ago in the bombing of Hanoi. I am

Adjournment Debate

really pessimistic about the situation, and regrettably I think that I share that pessimism with fellow members of parliament.

A year ago it was my privilege, occupying the position that Your Honour now occupies as a Deputy Speaker, to have been head of a parliamentary delegation to Seoul, South Korea. As a matter of fact we did not confine ourselves merely to that capital city. The delegation consisted of Mr. Harold Danforth of the Conservative party, the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Cyr) of the Liberal party, Mr. Gleave of the New Democratic Party, and Mr. Tetrault of the Creditistes. We were aided and abetted by Mr. Jacques Vermette, then of the Deputy Speaker's office. He is now with Mr. Ian Imrie's branch in the Confederation Building. So well did he look after our affairs that the only piece of luggage that was lost, strayed, or mislaid for a moment was his own. Our own got through nicely everywhere we went.

● (2200)

What we saw in South Korea was rather fantastic. For example, we saw a shipyard capable of producing ships much larger than anything that can be produced in any Canadian shipyard. It was situated alongside rice paddies that had been in existence for thousands and thousands of years. We saw a very old part of Asia, a very new part of Asia, and a very interesting part of Asia.

We were treated royally by our parliamentary hosts from South Korea. For example, we had 30 minutes with the president. We met with opposition parties. At that time, which was a year ago, we had opportunities to sit down and discuss democracy in South Korea, whether there should be opposition parties and the like. I think that situation has probably altered itself within the last few weeks, particularly since the fall of the government in South Viet Nam.

It is probably only known to very few people in Canada that the president of North Korea antedates all other rulers, with the exception of Generalissimo Franco of Spain, in his tenure of office. He goes right back to the forties. With his relatives on the payroll and with his egotistical style of living, the president of North Korea makes the old family compact of ancient days in Ontario look rather humble and small indeed. This has to be a megalomaniac. Everybody in this chamber is familiar with megalomaniacs in the Canadian political scene, I am sure. This fellow is ten times anything that has occurred or is occurring in Canada.

The government of North Korea is not recognized by any government in the free world, if I may use that expression, with the exception of Australia. In turn, none of the communist countries recognizes the government of South Korea. We are caught in this dilemma. The North Korean government and the South Korean government regard each other rather viciously. Indeed they do. The incidents between them are a recurring part of the political scene in that part of the world.

I see my time is running out. However, I have to make these points if my speech is going to make any sense at all.

The Canadian delegation went to the demilitarized zone. If I had time I could tell you of a third world war that almost broke out of there about a year ago. It was kept out