

terms of the bill, the government believed it had taken the heat out of this issue and solved a substantial part of its problem. Madam Speaker, questions of principle are not so easily set aside by arrangements of convenience, and the principle involved in this legislation is far more important than whether the government has been able to reach an accommodation with *Reader's Digest*.

Suppose that next year *Reader's Digest* were to contemplate making some change in its policy. Would it be making any new arrangements with the government in consequence and, if so, would the government be so receptive once the legislation had been passed into law and the issue was no longer before the public eye? Would the attitude of the government change when the subject was no longer a matter for discussion in the House of Commons? Possibly we should keep this debate going so that the people of Canada might have an opportunity to communicate with the government—

**An hon. Member:** Filibuster!

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** I am trying to make a concise and reasonable contribution to the debate. When one tries to be logical, members on the other side begin to get nervous.

**An hon. Member:** You were nice and short on television and more effective.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** There is no provision for television editing in the House of Commons, so I shall have to ask hon. members to bear with me a little longer.

The hon. member for St. John's East made a valid point when he indicated that the reason we are dealing with these amendments on the report stage is because the participation of members on the government side who had taken part in the proceedings in committee had been thwarted. This is one of the criticisms levelled at the committee system as it operates in practice. Had the government taken a more flexible approach, had it allowed its members on the committee to take part in the proceedings without restriction and to put forward amendments at that stage, the progress of the bill might have fared far better.

There is no surer way of giving rise to a long debate on legislation than by first of all imposing closure, and then, second, by trying to manipulate the membership of a committee. I hope the government learns something from this debate and that in future it will allow its members to continue to sit on a committee even though they may hold certain views which are contrary to those held by the government with respect to legislation under consideration.

I want to assure members on the government side that, as far as I know, we are as interested as they are in the Canadian publishing industry. I believe though that we place more emphasis on a positive approach to encouraging the industry in Canada as opposed to the questionable, negative approach the government is taking and the generally vague legislation it appears determined to enforce.

● (2130)

I ask hon. members to encourage the government to withdraw this legislation, because basically it is bad. If that is not possible, I ask the government to allow the

#### *Non-Canadian Publications*

legislation to remain unpromulgated for at least one year so as to allow the publications affected by this legislation to make appropriate adjustments. It seems to me if the government demonstrates it is genuinely interested in dealing in a fair and even-handed way with this problem, instead of adopting a heavy-handed attitude, it will have far better success in getting this legislation through the House.

**Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster):** Mr. Speaker, I rise somewhat reluctantly because I do not like to stand in my place at any time to support something that the government does, since it does so many bad and ridiculous things. However, I doubt very much whether this legislation is one of them.

A great deal as been said in this debate by members on both sides about censorship. I have had the opportunity of listening to and reading some of this debate, so tonight I decided to take a look at the bill.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Leggatt:** I know I am a little late but it would seem to me useful if all hon. members read the legislation, which occupies only one and a half pages and is simple to read.

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** You have to look at the main act as well.

**Mr. Leggatt:** I can assure the hon. member that I have read that too. This bill says, in effect, two things. First, it says that those Canadians advertising in a non-Canadian newspaper which is directed primarily to a market in Canada will no longer receive a tax deduction. Secondly, it says that those advertising in the broadcasting media will no longer receive a tax deduction for an advertisement directed primarily to a market in Canada and broadcast by a foreign broadcasting undertaking. In other words, the tax advantage given to two particular publications has been removed. We have spent a good deal of time in this House talking about a red herring, in my opinion. I am just wondering how long it will be before Canadians start to grow up and try to be Canadian for a change.

I am sorry the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) is not here, but he was so worried about CP Air advertising in *Newsweek* to encourage United States traffic to use CP Air services. This situation is clearly covered by the bill. The bill refers to advertising that is directed primarily to the Canadian market. The market referred to by the hon. member is the U.S. market, so CP Air would clearly be allowed the deduction my hon. friend was so worried about.

**Mr. Towers:** Read the bill again; you obviously do not understand it.

**Mr. Leggatt:** Now, Mr. Speaker, what are we about here? What is the bill trying to accomplish? It is not a question of who will be allowed to publish. We have been determining what is substantially Canadian and what is substantially foreign for some time now. Where were all these defenders of freedom over the last 20 years when we were making determinations in connection with *Newsweek* and similar magazines? In terms of intent, this legislation does nothing more nor less than determine who in the publish-