

Non-Canadian Publications

measure of whose design is individual profit or punishment.

To design law in order to get rid of one you dislike, whether it is *Time*, *Reader's Digest*, or human beings, is an act of despotism, and I would hate to see such a law passed through the parliament of my Canada. A law of this sort is in great danger of being held up to ridicule and contempt if it is not consistent and, God knows, what has happened in the past week has shown that it is not consistent, that it is without plan and without structure except to destroy several corporate citizens. It has become a ludicrous mass of contradiction.

In the periodical publishing business we cannot have continuing arrangements. The electronic media and the newspapers are totally dependent upon continuing arrangements. Instead, we are putting a knife in the back of small businesses. Our combines bill, C-2, was designed to ensure that competition is not impaired by powerful cartels and monopolies as exemplified by the big three who control newspapers in Canada, specifically, Southam's and the Maclean-Hunter Publishing Company, a multinational corporation which just so happens to have its base in Canada. Hardly nationalistic. All this in the name of nationalism—not patriotism, but nationalism. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in his great and remarkable wisdom which we all admire so much, in an interview with Peter Newman—would you believe, Peter Newman, the great nationalist—on September 29, 1975, had something to say about nationalism. These are the Prime Minister's words, not mine:

● (1610)

My feelings about nationalism and... prejudices against it lie in the very history and meaning of the word. I never thought the nation should have preponderance over the individual...

I am against nationalism in the broader sense, it is a rationale for the establishment of the governing classes or those who have power with it to bring in solutions which are deleterious to individual freedoms—

I would repeat that for emphasis—"to bring in solutions which are deleterious to individual freedoms". Let me continue with the Prime Minister's words:

The word nationalism—particularly economic nationalism, though it applies to cultural nationalism too—is very often a vehicle of the ruling classes to transfer wealth to themselves.

Bill C-58 does just that. It is a bill to transfer wealth from the conglomerates to themselves, to keep out all competition and to deny the whole thing the government is intending to do; that is, protect the right of citizens to a free choice.

In this whole plan called Bill C-58 as it involves KVOS, *Time* and *Reader's Digest*—and I think *Reader's Digest* is still threatened regardless of a contemporary concession—*MD*, *Canadian Medicine*, etc., there is absolutely no understanding of the isolation and difference that exists in the west. *Time* provides us with the only in-depth Canadian news as well as a marvellous insight into the whole world. Yes, we can continue to buy *Time*, just as we can buy *U.S. News and World Affairs*, *Newsweek*, *Playboy* and *Oui* but none of the latter has Canadian content. They are not published in Canada. The centrefold of *Playboy* only once had Canadian content, as far as I can remember.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[Mrs. Holt.]

An hon. Member: Was it 80 per cent different?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: It was "substantially the same." If you have seen one centrefold, you have seen them all. We hear this over and over by the proponents of this bill, that we can still get *Time*, *Reader's Digest* and all these other magazines. They still maintain we have all the freedom in the world to buy these United States magazines and watch these American shows. But there is a big difference. These American magazines do not provide jobs in Canada. They do not provide opportunities to writers and the allied trades. We have settled in respect of *Reader's Digest* so that takes care of Montreal. But the *Time* people are going to lose jobs out in the west. Perhaps these people who say we can still get these magazines are too naive to understand what the difference is between importing them and having them home-developed, and I maintain that *Time* and *Reader's Digest* are home-developed.

Canadian writers, editors and printers work for *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, and in the case of KVOS there are animators, cartoonists, artists, writers and actors who are getting, very often, their first and only opportunity to use and develop their talents. Let this station fold, and where will these people go? I suggest that they will go to Hollywood and other places. They already have contracted out of Vancouver for Hollywood.

These people already have done such things as 52 segments of the "Abbott and Costello" cartoon series, plus work on the "Beatles", "Moby Dick" and "Samson and Goliath". In 1972, they had additional subcontract animation work for "Gidget" and "The Last of the Curling". In 1973 and 1974, they produced 13 half-hour segments of "Wait Till Your Father Gets Home", an adult cartoon series, and two segments of "Count of Monte Cristo". Those are just a few of the things which are being done in the west. These opportunities for the people in this trade are going to be lost.

I cannot tell whether the proponents of this bill who say we should receive *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, U.S.A., in the same way we do other American imported magazines are deliberately telling us falsehoods or just do not understand what is being discussed here. I am also tired of the misconceptions being peddled by those who say that these media groups have been receiving special privileges. That is not true. It is the advertisers who receive the privileges and the right to advertise wherever they want. If only Canadians could understand the principle so deeply involved here! I wish I could convey this to my colleagues, because I feel so very much alone.

Mr. McGrath: You are not alone, Simma; we are all with you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member, but her allotted time has expired.

An hon. Member: Carry on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member may continue with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?