

Revenue (Mr. Basford) has said that he will insist that the magazines coming into Canada be 80 per cent different from those published by the parent company in another country.

The minister who brought this bill before us says there will be no censure. Surely he cannot be so naive as to try to make us believe that the difference in the magazines can be that in one an article appears in the front, and in another it appears in the back. Surely he would not defend this bill on those grounds. No indeed, he insists that the contents of the magazine which this act regulates be 80 per cent different from the magazine published in the United States. He cannot tell me that is an attempt to help mature this cultural evolution—that it is not an attempt to erect a cultural barrier along the longest peaceful border in the world, that between the United States and Canada. He cannot tell me there will not be a curtain along that border with the maple leaf on it. Some of the other measures with which we are confronted point that out in no uncertain terms.

We have a problem when attempting to defend some of the action we have taken in the electronic media against our American colleagues. We are pirating signals from the border cities of the United States, stripping them of advertising and selling them to a Canadian audience. What price cultural integrity there, I ask—what about any kind of integrity in the face of a scheme like that? The United States has no laws similar to those we are constructing here. They are not afraid of something that might come down from Canada although perhaps they had better be soon.

It is ridiculous to try to defend ourselves and make any kind of sense in talking to our American counterparts—as we recently had the opportunity of doing in Quebec City—when we come up with such laws and regulations.

Section 19(2) of the act provides the same privileges for *Time* and *Reader's Digest* as for many other publications. Today I learned that a number of newspapers in western Canada are totally owned outside this country. They have always presented the Canadian viewpoint, always displayed the contemporary scene in the little towns they serve where no Canadian had the guts to start such newspapers. They had to come from the United States and Great Britain. All of a sudden we say that these newspapers are in our country and doing something bad to us. That is nonsense, Madam Speaker. Surely we cannot let it go unchallenged.

When the minister says that *Time* and *Reader's Digest* enjoy special privileges in this country he is misinterpreting the facts—the minister is a stranger to the facts. These magazines do not enjoy special privileges in our country; they enjoy the same privileges as any other publication in the country—that of allowing advertisers to deduct that cost as an expense for taxation purposes. I say it is wrong that this privilege should now be taken from them.

If we have to discuss the matter at all we should at least have tried to make a distinction between *Reader's Digest*, that great window of the world, and *Time* magazine. I agree with the minister that it is impossible to do this; they are already in an impossible situation, and to perpetuate it would be wrong.

#### Non-Canadian Publications

I think this bill should be withdrawn, Madam Speaker. The minister is embarking on a course that will haunt us. We are talking about advertising dollars which are presently being spent in these great international magazines and which will apparently now flow to the Canadian media.

I have used advertising in the various business I have conducted in my time. I consider an advertiser to be much like a reader. If I spend a dollar on advertising I insist that I get my money's worth. Any smart businessman would. The giant-international corporations and the large corporations within our country that can afford to advertise in these international magazines will continue to do so even if the tax privilege is removed. They will continue to advertise in those two magazines in preference to any other media. *Time* and *Reader's Digest* will likely continue to send their publications to Canada—under considerable hardship no doubt, but I do not think they will be discouraged by a measure such as this from catering to the needs of the Canadian people.

I must confess that *Reader's Digest* is a little more to me than just a Canadian news magazine. I have a very direct, personal, and emotional relationship with the *Reader's Digest* and I hope you will bear with me if I elaborate just a little. I started reading *Reader's Digest* when it was called *Das Beste*, which in English means *The Best*. That magazine was published in the country in which I grew up.

• (2120)

I was 12 when the second war ended, and even at that tender age I felt that my mother country had nothing to offer me in the future. I looked around the world because I was young and ambitious. My older brother had read *Reader's Digest* when he was a prisoner of war in Great Britain. He advised me to read *Reader's Digest* and bought me my first subscription. I was 19 when I read two particularly good stories about Canada. I then decided what part of the world best suited me and my particular needs. Even at the tender age of 19 people have their own ideas.

It was the two stories about Canada I read in *Das Beste* which influenced my decision to come to Canada. That is why I am emotionally involved with the magazine. I do not want to see people all over the world deprived of the wonderful stories *Reader's Digest* prints about Canada. I want to see people of 26 countries who read that magazine read the wonderful stories about my own country, about Canada. I, for one, commend that magazine's objective and disciplined reporting of the contemporary scene. We should all be proud of the series of magnificent stories about this country which are read throughout the world.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Oberle:** Madam Speaker, I object strongly to having our window on the world shaded by this stupid proposed regulation. All of us here have received hundreds of letters on this issue, and I have received not one which supports the minister's attempt at regulation.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Neither have I.