

that Canadians learn so much about Patty Hearst that she must be some kind of Canadian heroine.

Some time ago one of the proponents of the Company of Independent Canada did a study of Canadian school children. He posed a series of questions to school children and was appalled by the answers he received and by how often Canadian children were incorrect. Some of those children were as high as grade 12 but they knew little about Canada and Canadiana. Is it the fault of *Time* magazine, or *Reader's Digest*, that young people are so ill-informed about Canada? No. I suggest that young Canadians are not avid readers of *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, although they should be. Young people are ill-informed about Canada because it is not dealt with on the national news on television or by the daily headlines in newspapers. If one were to consider the percentage of Canadian news broadcast every evening on CBC and CTV, one would become alarmed. Little wonder Canadian students are so well informed about whether Patty Hearst is mentally sound or able to stand trial. Why should Canadians know about that? I do not think she is a heroine of any particular cause in which Canadians should become involved. Canadians were well indoctrinated with respect to the Viet Nam war by the national news media.

Mr. Symes: And *Time*.

Mr. Horner: That may be so, but *Time* never covered that story so comprehensively as the national news media. If we are so concerned about Canadian content, let us go where the most persuasive forces are really at work, the national news media, and not to independent television stations sitting along the border trying to be good corporate citizens. I am thinking particularly about a situation in the Vancouver area.

Miss Campbell: Pirate.

Mr. Horner: A pirate is anyone who steals the property of someone else.

Mrs. Campagnolo: And money.

Mr. Horner: Many ideas have been stolen from one political party or another and I am not going to get into the question of pirates, but I believe that many of these television stations are attempting to become good Canadian corporate citizens. It is wise for the Canadian government to lay down guidelines for them to become good Canadian corporate citizens, but those guidelines should not make it impossible for them to be good Canadian corporate citizens—that and is what this bill is doing to *Reader's Digest* particularly, and to some of the television stations operating close to the Canadian border. Certainly, exceptions will have to be made for daily newspapers such as the *Red Deer Advocate* and a couple of others operating in Canada.

The minister should fully explain why the government wants this legislation. If the government does not explain it any better than it has to date, it will have failed. According to the people I have been listening to, the government has failed to convince them. It has failed to convince the news magazine business.

I am not arguing the fact that the government has failed to convince *Maclean's* magazine. That magazine would like

Non-Canadian Publications

to get *Time* out of the road; then it would have a monopoly. Who would be better served by a monopoly? Just recently the Minister of Transport said he believed in competition in the transportation field, and when he is not throwing Air Canada to the wolves he leads us to believe that he is going to give CP Air some advantages it has not had until now because of the theory of competition. Yet here we have another minister acting in a directly opposite manner by attempting to force *Time* magazine out of business and making it more costly for *Time* to produce its Canadian version, because he wants to be rid of competition. He wants to help *Maclean's* magazine, and I do not doubt that Peter Newman and company will favour him in the next election—and his leader, whoever that might be. I suppose that *Maclean's* will go down in history as a Liberal rag. I hope its future is brighter than that. I hope it will continue to publish in spite of good competition from *Time* magazine.

● (1640)

I think *Time* magazine does publish a Canadian version. They pay specific attention to Canada on six or eight of the front pages, and that is worth something. Canadians should be entitled to read those six or eight pages as well as some news from the United States and other parts of the world, just as we are entitled to view happenings from all over the world on our late night television news. We know more about the dispute in Northern Ireland than our proximity to Ireland warrants. The nightly news programs became tired of that issue and aired another. They follow trends. I suppose we will now get a large dose of Australian parliamentary problems, and maybe we should; I am not complaining about it.

My complaint is that in this legislation the government is attempting to prohibit me, my constituents and people across Canada who think as I do reading about these events in *Reader's Digest*, *Time* magazine or the *Red Deer Advocate*, or seeing it on the TV stations. They are all attempting to become good corporate citizens and for one reason or other have found it an advantage to become established at or near the border.

When the legislation goes before the standing committee and witnesses are called, I hope the minister in charge of it will listen to them. As a result, perhaps he will bring in different legislation which will not lay him open to the charge of censorship. I like the minister, Madam Speaker, and I do not think he wants censorship. I think he owes it to himself and his constituents, however, to attempt to remove that stigma. In a free country, censorship is perhaps the most damning accusation that could be levelled against anyone.

Mr. Faulkner: If it were true.

Mr. Horner: The minister says, «If it is true.» He agrees with me that it is the most damning accusation that can be levelled against anybody, if it is true. That is the strange thing about politics, though; it is not what is true but what is believed to be true. I read that the *Sudbury Star* believes it is censorship, the *Toronto Sun* believes it is censorship. The *Montreal Star*, the *Toronto Sun*, the *Vancouver Sun*, the *Moncton Transcript*—all those newspapers perceive this minister as the minister of censorship. Why go across