

The next point is that 70 per cent of its articles are reprints from other articles either at home or abroad. Only between 40 per cent and 45 per cent of those articles are about the U.S.A. or written by Americans, which means that 55 per cent to 60 per cent of all the articles appearing in the Canadian edition are either on Canadian or international subjects.

I think another point should be made. *Reader's Digest* is not a news magazine like *Time*. In my view it is a magazine which does not in a significant way direct itself to political or news issues but to issues which are people-to-people oriented. They are related to the uplifting of the spirit and perhaps the well-being of man by articles of good example and a whole series of things which in my view are quite wholesome. I see no objection to that, and it would not be in the interests of Canadians for any of us, or all of us collectively, to try to insulate ourselves culturally from that which takes place throughout the world, not in a news sense but in a very human sense. I think we ought to have that kind of opportunity, and any step by a government to limit our access to that kind of international flavour is not really in the best interests of ourselves as a nation or as a cultural people.

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

**Mr. Cafik:** There are many arguments about nationalism which make a great deal of sense, but in terms of cultural or intellectual nationalism they are just a lot of nonsense. I do not accept the principle that because Aristotle was not born in Pickering, where I come from, I should not be reading his works or someone should not be publishing them. I think that intelligence, rational thinking, philosophy, music and art and that sort of thing do not have national boundaries: these are the common heritage of all mankind from wherever they might come.

● (1650)

I should like to consider *Reader's Digest* a little further, Mr. Speaker. On a monthly comparative basis, the Canadian edition of *Reader's Digest* would be approximately 40 per cent different from the American edition. That ought to take it around one of the provisions of the act but, as I pointed out earlier, it does not. There is a significant difference between the Canadian edition in a given month and the American edition in a given month, or in any of the 27 editions of *Reader's Digest* published around the world.

In excess of 50 per cent of the articles written by Canadians or about Canada which appear in the *Reader's Digest* appear in international editions of the *Digest*. I think that is very important because it provides an opportunity for Canadians to have a window on the world or for the world to look into Canada.

One sees articles in *Reader's Digest* about Toronto, Expo, Vancouver, or individuals. I think of one written by an hon. member of this House about a man in Vancouver, Ben Wosk, I found it very stimulating. I suppose I can use the name of the author rather than the name of the riding: Simma Holt has written for this magazine and some of her articles have appeared around the world. I see nothing objectionable in that; I think it is commendable.

#### *Non-Canadian Publications*

There is another aspect of the *Reader's Digest* question. It publishes two Canadian magazines, one in English and one in French. In terms of national unity and the development of our nation, I think that type of thing should be commended. Many publishers in this country who are applying pressure to have this legislation passed have not bothered to publish in both languages. I think this is something they ought to practice before they come to the Government of Canada seeking special dispensation from legitimate competition in this country.

When one speaks of competition it raises a question that I think a lot of Canadians do not understand. Some people seem to think that the present law gives preferential treatment to *Reader's Digest*, *Time*, *Modern Medicine* and a couple of other publications that is not available to Canadian publishers. As we all know, that is not true, but it is the impression that people have. They want to get rid of the special status of *Time*, *Reader's Digest* and the others. But that special status has no relationship to anybody who is publishing in Canada. As a matter of fact, they are treated in exactly the same way as anybody else who publishes in Canada, because *Reader's Digest* and the others publish under the conditions laid down for them a few years ago. I think it is important for people to understand that what this bill is trying to do is make sure that they do not have an opportunity to compete in a normal competitive way against Canadian publishers, with the same rules and regulations under which they operate.

The last point I want to make is primarily addressed to the committee that will consider this bill. I suggest they consider some amendments so that the bill does not have the adverse effect that I have mentioned. I think it is not inappropriate that we ask *Reader's Digest*, *Time* and these other publications to have a majority Canadian ownership. I think at the moment the ownership of *Reader's Digest* is 33 per cent Canadian, and I see no reason why we should not ask them to increase that to 50 per cent or 51 per cent. I think they could live up to that kind of commitment.

The committee should consider asking that we allow an exemption under certain conditions, one being that the firm be majority Canadian-controlled. If a publication is published by a Canadian corporation which is incorporated and registered under federal or provincial law, and is majority-controlled by Canadians, I think it is appropriate that such things as typesetting, plate-making, printing, circulation, advertising, and so on, be carried on in Canada. That should be made a condition for continuing to publish in this country, and they then should have the same tax advantages as any Canadian publisher.

The policies of such publishing corporations must be controlled from Canada, I believe, and I am sure that *Reader's Digest* could conform to this. Editorial direction should be Canadian, although there is one problem here in relation to the copyright law. In light of the fact that *Reader's Digest* is largely a reprint operation, we should make sure that they are allowed to conform to the copyright law in order to protect the authors. At the present time there is a licensing arrangement which is a violation of one of the provisions of the bill before us, and I think we should make sure that the publications are allowed to conform to the normal copyright laws.