

try. I do not feel that the way these magazines are being hobbled is any fault of their own, unless it is the fault of being too good in the work they do.

In many ways I have a good feeling for *Time* magazine because as far as I am concerned personally, and I think as far as my party is concerned, we receive as fair a treatment in *Time* magazine—perhaps a fairer treatment with regard to events in the House of Commons than we receive in Canadian journals and Canadian magazines, and therefore I have a great deal of regret at what is being done. I think I am not alone in this and that many people feel exactly the same way. I do not think anyone wants to do this. We have reached a point in our history where we feel that it has to be done in order to encourage the sense of nationalism which has developed in this country, and a longing for a national culture and identity.

There is an irony to this present government bringing in this legislation. I was in the House when the then minister responsible, Hon. Walter Gordon, brought in the exemption for *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. My friend and colleague, the then hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, Colin Cameron, was privately assured that under no circumstances would that great Canadian nationalist, Walter Gordon, ever grant the exemption to *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. I am sure that, if it had been the decision of Walter Gordon alone, that would not have been done. To our surprise Walter Gordon stood up and announced the exemption, and it took quite a bit of effort on my part to restrain Colin Cameron from charging across the aisle and doing physical violence to the then minister.

At that time we felt that we had been betrayed, that in fact the government of the day had sold out and knuckled under to the pressure which it had been subjected to, not only from *Time* magazine but also from the U.S. government. We tend to forget this. There is a kind of lesson there when we consider all the favours *Time* magazine has done for the Liberal Party and how in two elections it virtually acted as the advocate of the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party shows no gratitude at this time, which demonstrates that parties are not reliable. After all the things *Time* did for the Liberal Party, look at the gratitude and reward it is reaping from the association. Perhaps it is an irony, but it is heartening that loyalties like that do not last forever; but when everyone says, "what have you done for me lately?"

It looks as though the time has come when the Liberal Party is more concerned about what the Maclean's publishing company is going to say about it than what *Time* magazine is going to say. Liberals know who is on the way up and who is on the way down, and there is no sense hitching your future to a falling Star. They might as well see where the rising rockets are going and tie on to them, especially if some propulsion can be added to that rocket.

As I said, I am not really proud of taking the position I am taking. I feel I must take it, and I take it with some regret because it is a sad thing for a country to do this. It is sad for a country to admit that it has failed to create its own culture, and then to blame this on someone else.

Mr. Blais: Oh, come on.

Mr. Saltzman: I feel that this is what in fact has happened. It has been much too easy for this country's

Non-Canadian Publications

so-called intellectual establishment to admit that the reason we cannot get ahead, and the reason we cannot produce this excellence is that we have *Time* magazine, *Reader's Digest*, or something else hobbling us.

I made a speech recently at a Commonwealth conference in which I said to some third world countries which were complaining about their present state that for a long time they could blame it on colonialism; that they could not get anywhere because they were being colonized. They got rid of the colonialists. Then they started to blame multi-national corporations and got rid of them. I asked them who they would blame it on now.

One of the reasons I am supporting this measure is that I want to see whether our intellectual establishment is really going to come through, because it is going to have to come through now. It has been given every single advantage possible. In my view *Time* magazine will not go away. I know that the president of *Time* says he cannot operate, and that the president of *Reader's Digest* says he cannot operate under this legislation, and just recently we heard that *MD of Canada* magazine cannot operate under it. I have the feeling that despite the 80 per cent content and the Canadian ownership rule they will find a way of operating in Canada, because they cannot afford not to. What does it mean to them? It means that their profits will not be as fat. Their profits have been very fat in this country, but I do not think a magazine of the international stature of *Time* can afford to have itself pushed out of a country.

What are the other Canadian magazines going to do? They will still have to compete. I hope they do, and I wish them well. There are encouraging signs that Canadian magazines are in fact competing, but there is a problem, and once we pass this legislation let us not blame anyone else for what are essentially our own failures. From here on we must be very critical of our own intellectual establishment.

● (2130)

We realize that in many ways we are going against public opinion in this debate, and we must be frank about that. It is not the first time we have gone against public opinion, of course. We have done it with the CBC, with films, with cable, and with our bilingualism program.

We in this chamber have a responsibility to think about not only what is immediately popular but we have a responsibility for the development of a sense of Canadian nationalism. Even if public opinion is not entirely with us on this issue, we have to take our chance.

In many ways I regret that the government brought in closure to halt this debate. I think it was on its last legs anyway. I am not opposed to closure in principle; I voted against closure and I voted for closure, so I am inclined to view it in light of the specific circumstances.

In some ways the Liberal party has never learned to understand the role of the opposition and why the opposition opposes. Unfortunately Liberals have not spent enough time in opposition over the years to give them a sense of what an opposition tries to do. The whole point of an opposition digging in its heels on an issue—even when debates have nothing further to consider in some new and sparkling way that would get the attention of the press—is