

Non-Canadian Publications

it seems that nothing has changed, in spite of the fact that the tax bill in 1965 was supposed to make everything rosy for those magazines. It was pointed out at that time, and it has been pointed out in recent debates, that freezing out all the quality publications in Canada will not ensure the financial health of any of the publications that will be left. I think Canadians know what they want to read, and I think Canadian advertisers know where they want to advertise.

It is also interesting to note that back in 1965 the government was deluged with letters and telegrams from publishers of Canadian newspapers and other publications, objecting to the government's bill to remove the tax exempt status on advertising on all except Canadian-owned publications. They considered it unwarranted interference by the government into the realm of free enterprise and of freedom of speech and the press. Again I have to say that nothing has changed. The hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates) was active in the debate on the tax bill in 1965 and I think that one of his comments at that time is worth repeating. In *Hansard* of June 17, 1965, the hon. member said, and I quote from page 2550 of *Hansard* of that date:

No one in his right mind would bring this kind of legislation before the House unless he had an ulterior motive.

I have to agree with that assessment, Mr. Speaker. We have been waiting throughout the debate on this bill for the Secretary of State to tell us just why he brought in a bill to reverse a decision of a previous Liberal government respecting *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. Many of us on this side of the House, and some members of the minister's own party, cannot help wondering if it is simply a move to get revenge for some real or imagined slight. I know that the minister has been accused by some segments of the press of being a do-nothing minister, but this is certainly not the way to prove them wrong. The real victims will be those who want to continue to read the English and French editions of *Reader's Digest* and those people who now work for *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. With the permission of the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North I would like to read another of his comments into the record from *Hansard* of June 17, 1965. The hon. member closed his remarks by saying:

Smarten up; take this legislation off the order paper, and let us get on with the business of the country.

Madam Speaker, many of the other speakers here this afternoon voiced their opinions as well as the opinions of the ordinary constituents who have written them. I have received many interesting letters from people residing in the great riding of Parry Sound-Muskoka. I should like to read one letter from an elderly widow who writes regarding *Reader's Digest*. It reads:

I believe the time of parliamentarians and our money could be better spent by encouraging Canadian publishers to look for Canadian writers to create text books for all the grades in our school system.

It is beyond belief that any government would be sniping at a magazine of the high quality and excellent content as is the Canadian edition of the *Reader's Digest*. Published in Canada with many Canadian employees, do leave the content to the editors who are doing a superb job. Ignorance of other parts of our world is not bliss but a

danger. One has only to look at the results of the long years of suppression of good and wide scope of educational material in the province of Quebec to be appalled at the possibility of so good a magazine as the *Reader's Digest* being put out of business in Canada.

That was from a lady in my own village of Burks Falls. A teacher from Gravenhurst writes:

To the degree that you can fight this measure to throttle the *Reader's Digest's* availability in Canada you will be expressing my opinion.

I wrote the Secretary of State and included many excerpts from these letters because I could not begin to combine them all, but certainly some of them bear repeating and I think will be well worth reading in *Hansard*. Here are few of them. One person wrote:

Maybe one day when there is a Canadian publication that can favourably compete with this magazine, there will no longer be a need for *Reader's Digest*.

Another wrote:

We think it is the best and most reading in it of any magazine that comes to our house.

Another wrote:

I first became an ardent reader of this fine magazine when I was a soldier overseas in World War II and have received it monthly ever since and never would like to see the day when *Reader's Digest* is no longer available in our home.

Another constituent wrote:

It is a way of life—one of the few decent, sound publications left in existence.

Then:

It has been in our home for over 30 years; without it I would feel I had lost a friend.

Another reader wrote:

None of the "slush and dirt" you read in so many of the magazines today.

Another wrote:

I don't see much chance of another being produced to its equal, so I'll just quit buying magazines.

Then I received this letter:

Invaluable to the busy Canadian. Also clean.

Another wrote:

Why the government would be taking any kind of action to take this material out of our homes is beyond my understanding.

Madam Speaker, I do not know how many of the letters that I have received keep repeating that it is good, clean reading. One reader wrote:

Hopefully, you could rid us of other trash instead.

Another reader wrote:

We Canadians in Canada would be poorer in consequence.

And another:

An influence for good in Canada.

An old age pensioner wrote:

I am a pensioner and *Reader's Digest* and their books are the only ones I can afford.

Madam Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.