

al board in the United States. Only 32 per cent of the shares of *Reader's Digest* are open to Canadians for purchase. As for the ownership issue, suppose *Reader's Digest* and *Time* were to go public and issue shares in Canada. Even if something like 75 per cent of the ownership resided in Canada, to use the expression of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie when speaking for our party on this question, this would be just like "fudging the issue".

The key issue here is not who owns the actual publication, but who controls editorial policy and hence the content of these magazines. Let me repeat my own view on this occasion. While I have been engulfed by letters from my constituents asking me, on behalf of *Reader's Digest*, to take a different stand, I feel I am acting more in the interest of Canada by agreeing substantially with the content of Bill C-58. I hope most of us recognize that the special pleas made on Friday and today on behalf of two foreign publications are pleas that do not deserve special consideration from Canadians.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I have just listened to a very interesting speech by the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan), but I think he has fallen into the trap that the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) fell into in terms of drafting this legislation. I do not know whether it was ever presented to caucus; I do not know how things are done over on that side of the House. But as I say, I think the hon. member has fallen into exactly the same trap, which is to deal with *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, in terms of this piece of legislation, on an equal basis.

I am a subscriber to both these magazines. I am not so sure whether the hon. member who has just sat down is a subscriber to either, but I subscribe to both and in my judgment both magazines fill a different kind of requirement. On the one hand, *Time* is a contemporary news magazine. It is as old next week, in terms of its content, as the daily newspaper is as old and out of date the following day. This is not the case, Madam Speaker, with *Reader's Digest*, and perhaps one ought to consider the point made by the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Johnston) when he discussed the longevity of the articles in the magazine in terms of their interest and the fact that they can be picked up year after year and read. The thrust of the two magazines is different. The difficulty I see in the position taken by the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond is that he is putting them in the same bag; and this may well be the difficulty in which the Secretary of State finds himself.

The hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Roberts) spoke a few moments ago and said he was worried about the position taken by the official opposition. I am worrying about the position taken by the government on this matter. I have heard two very respected private members on the government side say that this is not a partisan issue, that what we are discussing here is the whole future of the Canadian periodical publishing industry. They said that given the importance of this question, why is the Secretary of State refusing to move? The hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) said he was intransigent. The hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) asked why he denies the statistics that are apparent, and why he fails to compromise?

Non-Canadian Publications

If this matter is to be treated as a non-partisan issue, why does the minister take this position? If the whips were not on pretty hard and fast, why did the hon. member for St. Paul's come into the House as the messenger boy of the government to give a lecture to the hon. member for Cochrane and to tell him that his remarks, which were given as a member of the House, were not worthy of him?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. Is the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Roberts) rising to ask a question?

Mr. Roberts: Yes, Madam Speaker. Would the hon. member accept a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Would the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) accept a question at this point?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I will at the end of my speech, Madam Speaker; I would be very happy to do so then. If I may continue, I think it is extremely important to note that what those members were expressing were the reservations of many members of this House, because this difference of opinion is not surrounded by the parameters of party discipline; it is a deep and important question about which we are speaking.

I read the speech given by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather), and I can be just as selective as the hon. member for St. Paul's. The hon. member for Fundy-Royal spoke on May 8 and put the position pretty carefully in terms of the taxation aspects of this matter. As reported at page 5597 of *Hansard*, the hon. member said:

Although the minister made a most interesting speech, the amendments he proposes to the Income Tax Act as put forward in Bill C-58 in no way constitute a periodicals policy for Canada.

Pausing there for a moment, that is surely the first issue. What is this bill going to do to advance the periodical press in this country? In my respectful submission, it will do nothing. The hon. member continued:

I think, personally, and I hope most will agree, that it is wrong of a tax policy to differentiate with respect to, say, *Time* and *Reader's Digest* as this leads to all sorts of anomalies and possibly unfairness. A tax policy should apply equally. *Time* and *Reader's Digest* could easily fulfil their obligations as Canadian citizens by broadening substantially—

These are the important words.

—over an agreed span of time, their Canadian ownership.

In the next paragraph of his speech he outlined what he felt was one consideration among a number of considerations regarding a part of the debate dealing with the principles of this bill. So I do not see why the hon. member for St. Paul's is having the trouble he is having, unless his problem is not with the official opposition but with the hon. member for Vaudreuil and the hon. member for Cochrane, who are from his own caucus, and with the many other hon. members of his caucus who may want to speak in this debate. Indeed, I hope they do because it is an important debate. However they decide to vote, I hope they voice their feelings and reservations. I dare say there are many more members in the government caucus who, like the hon. member for Cochrane and the hon. member for Vaudreuil, are thinking about this issue in depth, even