

*Non-Canadian Publications*

A moment ago I was interrupted by someone who asked who was listening to the people. I wish the readers of *Reader's Digest* would be listened to by the government. Perhaps one in 300,000 or one in 400,000 agree with Bill C-58, but the rest do not; the rest wish the government would allow *Reader's Digest* to continue its work of serving the Canadian people.

*Time* is a peculiar magazine. It has been in plenty of hot water in the past. Sometimes it is not too flattering to us, the politicians in Canada, and sometimes we do not particularly like it for that reason. But I think it should be judged on its ability to provide a necessary service to Canadian readers. *Time* magazine has been in my home for so long that I cannot remember when we first began to subscribe to it. It was in my parents' home for so long that I cannot remember the time when it was not around.

Why did I feel I should subscribe to it? It gives a summary of current events in Canada, the U.S. and the rest of the world. I am not ashamed of wanting to read what is happening in the United States. Whether Canadians like it or not, we are tied to that country by something like 4,500 miles of border that separates us. Our trade is closely linked with the U.S. Some 65 per cent of the goods we import are from the U.S. and some 65 per cent of the goods we export go to the U.S. It behooves every Canadian to know what is going on in the United States. We can better prepare ourselves for conditions which may occur here in Canada.

It is sometimes said that our economy lags behind that of the U.S. by around six months; that what is happening in the U.S. will happen here in six months' time. I do not know if it is a rule of thumb at all times, but certainly it behooves any Canadian who wants to keep abreast of world affairs to read not only the Canadian section of *Time* magazine but some of the American content and some of the world content. One might wonder why one should read the Canadian content in *Time* magazine. As a member of parliament, I am supposed to be well informed on Canadian politics. I can honestly say that, apart from reading Canadian daily newspapers, I like to read *Time* magazine where the news is summed up—whether correctly or incorrectly does not matter. On some occasions I agree with them, and on others I do not; nevertheless, they put out the best weekly capsule on current Canadian news that I have been able to read.

I might say that I have subscribed to *Maclean's* magazine for a number of years. It has been the wish of *Maclean's* management to send me, personally, a copy, so that we get two copies of *Maclean's* in my household. *Maclean's* does not contain, yet, a weekly or bi-weekly summary of the news. I could complain at length about the format of the new *Maclean's* magazine, but I do not want to complain about it. The argument here is whether or not it needs protection from *Time* magazine, which receives similar advantages under the Income Tax Act.

It is not amusing for me, as a longtime student of politics, to see the recent trend in the Liberal party. We see the present young minister attempting to bring in protection for Canadian publications, we see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) attempting to bring in protection in the field of agriculture, and we see the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and the Minister of National

Defence (Mr. Richardson) trying to bring in protection for Canadians under their jurisdictions.

**Mr. Symes:** It is almost as if they were Conservatives.

**Mr. Horner:** Yes, Conservatives of the 1911 era. Some protection was warranted in 1911, 1912 and 1920, but surely it is not warranted today, either in agriculture or in the news magazine field. In my opinion, this whole question has not been adequately aired. I know that one should not use colour, but it is interesting to see that this bill has been piloted by three rather green and naive ministers. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) at one time was involved with this bill. There was the former minister of communications and the new Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen). They are all ministers doing what they are told. Where does this lead us? The *Montreal Star*—

● (1630)

**An hon. Member:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Horner:** Someone said, «Oh», as if he were in pain. The *Montreal Star* is a well established paper in Canada, noted for its Liberal leanings in the past. However, in an editorial it stated the following:

Whatever the good intentions may be of the framers of this legislation and no matter how far-fetched the idea of such control may appear to be, it is the beginning of a road which has an inevitable end.

The inevitable end is censorship. As I say, the *Montreal Star* is a Liberal paper and it has been for years, but it foresees the dangers of this type of legislation. One can read editorials in all kinds of newspapers, including the *Sudbury Star*. The *Sudbury* area has not been favoured hunting ground for Conservatives, in any case.

**Mr. Nystrom:** It is a good NDP area.

**Mr. Horner:** With regard to this legislation, the *Sudbury Star* carried the headline, «Censorship creeps in 'patriot' guise». I only point that out, Madam Speaker, because *Sudbury* is the constituency of Mr. Speaker. One could read editorials at length. The *Toronto Sun* stated clearly that it views this bill as a step toward censorship. It went on to say that on this occasion it even agrees with the *Globe and Mail*, and suggests why on some days the *Globe and Mail* could barely qualify as Canadian. That is what I was stating, in no derogatory terms, about a Calgary paper in the earlier part of my speech. However, certainly all the daily newspapers could be taken to task with regard to the question of 80 per cent Canadian content if one really analysed all the daily papers in major cities across Canada. The *Ottawa Citizen* and the *Ottawa Journal* probably have greater Canadian content than any of the other daily papers, but only because of their proximity to the House of Commons.

Let us look at Canadian content in its proper context. What about the national television news? We complain about content in news. By what means is the mind of a young child more motivated or more shaped than television itself? If one watches the 6.30 news, in my opinion it will be found that with regard to Canadian content it is substantially better than the eleven o'clock news. However, from the eleven o'clock news it is interesting to note