

Here is one magazine that is above reproach. So what if there are articles from the American viewpoint? There are also Canadian selections, and English ones, and a good smattering from many other countries. This is what the world needs to bring its peoples into closer harmony. We need to understand various cultures and outlooks, and here they are presented intelligently, along with a wide range of human interest, scientific and historical articles.

It is signed by Rosemary Brown.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kempling: As I say, I wish the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby were here.

Mr. Paproski: The one and only Rosemary Brown.

Mr. Kempling: I would not say that. All I say is that it is signed by Rosemary Brown. I think we should be realistic and look at the contribution made by these magazines. Let us take *Reader's Digest*. It does \$30 million worth of business in Canada. That is considerable. At least 90 per cent of its revenue produced in Canada remains in Canada. It has an investment of something like \$8 million in capital assets. Its land is worth a little over half a million dollars. Its buildings are worth \$2,700,000. Its machinery is worth \$4½ million. It employs about 500 people and provides additional employment for about 1,000 others. We should think what would happen to these people. Can this magazine continue? We have heard that *Time* magazine intends to reduce its advertising rate for Canadians in order to offset the effect of the legislation. So what, really, would the government gain by this legislation?

An hon. Member: They have to look after their «gritty» friends.

An hon. Member: Canadian friends.

Mr. Kempling: When I speak it always seems that several people interject. This is great because it makes speaking at this hour of the evening, when the galleries are packed, very interesting. Thirty-two per cent of the stock of *Reader's Digest* is available to the Canadian people. Five out of six directors, as has been mentioned, are Canadian. I was very interested in the question the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean) put to the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby. He mentioned automobiles and said that if we are doing this in respect of magazines and are insisting on 80 per cent Canadian content, why should we not also do it in respect of products such as automobiles, and so on? The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby said he thought this would be great. I say we would not have an automobile in this country if we had to rely 100 per cent on Canadian design and Canadian content.

● (1740)

I read *Time*, *Newsweek*, *Reader's Digest* and *Maclean's*. I have these magazines at home, where my family looks at them, and after a period of a few days I find that *Time*, *Reader's Digest* and *Newsweek* are dog-eared but *Maclean's* could go back to the newsstand as it is rarely read. That is their choice; it is for them to read it or not. But if they find other magazines more interesting, so be it.

I am concerned, as other hon. members are, about the content requirements and about some civil servants sitting

Non-Canadian Publications

in an office here in Ottawa with a ruler and pencil deciding just whether there is 80 per cent Canadian content in a magazine or if it is 80 per cent different from the content in the foreign issue of the same magazine. I think that is a backward step and many of the letters that I have received from my constituents have expressed this view. I will go through this pile of letters and select some which I would like to read to the House. I have about half of them here and the stack is about five inches high. I will read my constituents' comments into the record because they have expressed their views and have asked me to express them to the House, which I intend to do.

There is a letter from a gentleman who writes:

This is my letter of protest against the government's bill to remove the special income tax status of advertising in *Time*, *Reader's Digest* and a number of religious and scientific magazines.

He also sent a copy to the minister. I suppose I find the following paragraph in practically every letter that I receive. He writes:

Specifically with respect to the two first mentioned publications, they have an eminently deserved reputation that results from the quality of their offering and not, in my view, from the special tax standing they enjoy.

In other words, so far as he is concerned he has not been de-Canadianized or de-Americanized by reading these magazines. He finds that they are a source of information to him and he is intelligent enough to judge that information and to treat it accordingly. Another letter from a constituent reads:

We urge you to vote against the proposed government bill to withdraw the tax privilege from *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. We feel this bill is a serious threat to democracy and our tradition of free press.

Another letter is from a little old lady in a senior citizens' home who writes:

Both my husband and myself are quite upset over the action the government is contemplating on taking regarding the *Reader's Digest* Association (Canada) Ltd.

We strongly oppose any action parliament may take against the *Reader's Digest*.

We enjoy reading the *Digest* and feel the articles printed are most interesting and worth while.

We also feel that the possibility of more Canadians becoming unemployed would be disastrous.

Many of these letters are in the same vein. This letter from a lady reads:

In this day of trashy publications and second-rate writing, the *Reader's Digest* is a bright and shining star.

Another letter reads:

I am a resident of Wentworth Lodge. For several years I have enjoyed and read *Reader's Digest*. I would most definitely like to continue doing so.

Could you please direct this letter to the proper department so that possible further legislation would be aware of my views and those of many other Canadians on this matter.

Some of these letters are very hard to read because they are written by elderly people. The following is a letter from a businessman:

I strongly object to the proposal of rescinding section 19(2) of the Income Tax Act. I have been reading the *Reader's Digest* for over 20 years and don't feel that I have been corrupted or Americanized.

I have some letters from students as well. One of them reads: