

*Non-Canadian Publications*

It was a play. I enjoyed it. It was Canadian until it came to, shall I say, the epilogue, although it was not referred to as an epilogue. It was a story about the committing of a crime. The criminal had been apprehended and proven guilty.

The closing of that story came out in such a way that, after the trial was completed, society was to be ashamed of itself because a criminal had been improperly treated by society, and it was because of society that he had committed this crime. He was virtually excused of being guilty of anything, but society was guilty.

Second, these closing remarks indicated that the police work had been cumbersome, slow, and incompetent, and that young people, old people, or people of any age in Canada should really not have respect for that police force, or at least that section of it which presumably participated in the solution of the crime.

The third conclusion one would have to draw was that the crime had been committed against a party who had been a successful individual in life, and that he was the guiltiest of all because he had been successful and had accumulated some of this world's goods, perhaps a little more than the average. The victim of the crime was guilty of success. The police were downgraded in the eyes of the public who might have been viewing, and the criminal should be excused because of that attitude of society. This is not the kind of story which is going to create a strong and law abiding Canada.

● (2010)

If the philosophy of some part of that producing structure, CBC, is going to be imposed in virtually every story, every play, produced by that organization, and if the total structure of our society is to be continuously under attack by people who do not approve of our present society, then I submit that control has been an extremely bad thing in the television field.

I should like to see respect for success, respect for the police, and no excuse for the criminal. That is the type of philosophy that I think we have to disseminate if we are to develop a strong, law-abiding, co-operating society in this nation. Is this what we will get if we continue to control the pen as it moves across Canada? I submit it may well be.

When you exercise control you create a structure which must use what is available to fill its books or its time slot. When you create a captive structure you become subject to those who philosophize mostly against the things for which this House stands. That has been demonstrated for many years in the structures already controlling and influencing our society.

I think it should be known, and I do not think anyone has said it in a definitive way, that in the income tax sense or corporate tax sense no special concession has been extended to *Time* and *Reader's Digest* in Canada. They pay exactly the same tax on their earnings as any other corporation in any field which functions in any form of business anywhere in this country. These two companies have been extended a privilege in the field of publication, and have acceded to the request for a percentage of Canadian content. By the guidelines set down earlier they have earned the right to publish in Canada under identically the same

tax structure as any corporation operating anywhere in this nation.

I submit that the government and the minister responsible have tried to sell this proposition to Canadians on the basis that there is a special tax concession granted to *Reader's Digest* and *Time*. That is a myth, Madam Speaker. It is untrue. They pay the same rate of tax as any other corporation in Canada. Does the government deny that? They have been granted an opportunity to publish in Canada under terms not granted to publications from other foreign countries, but have not been granted a special tax concession, as the public seems to think. No matter what the company may be, they pay the same tax, so let us be honest about it from here on. Let us say that these two firms have met certain Canadian standards, which gives them permission to publish in Canada. Forget about the special tax structure.

We have heard the requirements, so-called, of the media and the magazine industry discussed in this House and outside. It seems that there are problems in respect of Canadian copyright in regard to the international scene. Canadian authors apparently do not get the protection which Canada extends to foreign authors. This not only affects their livelihood but is a disincentive for those who write.

Authorship in Canada is certainly not as attractive as in other nations. Surely the government could negotiate this firmly with other nations so that we get for our authors the same privilege we grant those from other countries. If we cannot arrange this perhaps we should cancel the copyright privileges we have extended to international authors. Our authors should not be expected to publish without pay. This is important to writers who publish at home or abroad, and surely it is important to the publishing companies. The government should be encouraging our writers to have their first publication in Canada rather than have their first publication abroad where the syndicated copyright laws would work for them.

I am concerned about the type of public affairs broadcasts on radio and television where politicians, dignitaries, church people, all sorts of people are interrogated by representatives of the media. In the United States such programs give the public an opportunity to hear the opinions of people who are outstanding on a particular subject. Usually, not always, but usually it is a straight interrogation, a fact finding or opinion finding program. The comparable programs in Canada could practically all be titled "Under Attack" because they are usually an interrogatory inquisition of an individual whose opinions do not coincide with those of the interviewer.

Is every publisher in Canada going to continue on the road he has taken in the past two years and publish his own philosophies? Is he going to screen his writers so that they will reflect his philosophies? I submit, Madam Speaker, that if a newspaper or periodical is to be acceptable to the reading public it should take note of what is happening along our border with the United States. As it is they do not care what the public thinks because the public purse will pay, regardless.

Those who have relied upon the public purse in the radio and television structure along the border are now complaining that the system south of the border is going to