

**Mr. Horner:** Madam Speaker, I was prepared to make my comments in respect of the bill, but a member has interrupted me. I only point out that there is a question concerning who is listening to the people. That really is the question before the House of Commons today. I suggest the convention of the government party, namely, the Liberal party, at its recent semi-annual meeting demonstrated that it is not prepared to listen to the people. In the time allotted to me I want to demonstrate that the government does not listen to the people in respect of this particular bill.

This bill deals, effectively, with four means of communication. It deals with television stations operating from outside our border into Canada. It deals with daily newspapers operating in Canada. It also deals with *Time* magazine and *Reader's Digest*. First of all, it is regrettable that there is an attempt by means of this bill to deal with four different types of communication all with the same holus-bolus attitude. Television stations should be dealt with in the sense of a broadcast means of communication, and should not be compared, with regard to content and ownership, to a newsmagazine. The bill refers to daily newspapers and their ownership. It does not refer to the content but, rather, strictly to the ownership.

I see the minister shaking his head in a negative manner. He suggests that I show him where. I suggest he read the *Red Deer Advocate*, which is one that comes to mind. Yesterday, when flying to Ottawa, I picked up the *Calgary Herald* and found that page after page dealt strictly with foreign news. I could read all about Squeaky Fromme in California, I could read all about Patty Hearst in California, and all about a family in Pennsylvania and their problems concerning one of their children who is ill. I do not complain about having that privilege. However, we are prepared to put through some kind of rule whereby a magazine must be 80 per cent different from another publication, yet we allow the daily newspapers to use UPI and other international news services and publish their news items in identical form in Canada: they are published here in the same form in which they are published in other countries.

To me, the bill is poor at best. It fails to differentiate between the media, and secretly is being used as a guise to censor what Canadians read. Why should it be used as a guise to impose censorship? I do not know. I have always been proud that in this country, because we have a highly educated population, we feel that our people should be in a position to read almost anything that is published. I say «almost anything» because I know there are some literary works which perhaps immature people would be better off not reading. However, I refer to news magazines and family magazines in particular.

One must remember that 20 years ago there was a great fear about communism, and we in this country said the people should read all about Karl Marx and other communist literature because we believed, with our educational process, that the people would sort it out and reach the right conclusions. What is the government afraid of? Why does it feel that censorship is necessary? What is wrong with *Reader's Digest* as a family magazine? I was particularly pleased that *Reader's Digest* was given to my family as a gift when we were first married, over 20 years ago. It

#### *Non-Canadian Publications*

has been in the household ever since. I think it gives my children, my wife and myself a look at the world. Some of us are not as fortunate as ministers in the government who travel around and see the world: we have to read about it. We have to read about the various countries and what is going on in them. *Reader's Digest* does an admirable job of printing stories about other countries and it does an admirable job of printing articles which cannot be considered nationalistic in any way, such as articles about the human body and about health. These articles cannot be classified as being Russian, American or Canadian. These are informative articles to which all Canadians should have access.

● (1620)

To lump *Reader's Digest* and *Time* magazine together in one bill is a mistake. *Time* magazine purports to be a news magazine, while *Reader's Digest* is a family magazine. Are we afraid of the competition these two magazines will present to Canadian periodicals? I do not think we should be. *Maclean's* magazine has had tremendous success in the last five years. Its circulation has grown and it now comes out bimonthly. Its circulation in Canada is greater than that of *Time* magazine. In my opinion, however, even in its new edition *Maclean's* does not take the place of *Time* magazine. In this legislation we should not lump the two magazines together.

*Reader's Digest* has done an admirable job of complying with the ownership requirements of the Canadian government in the past number of years. I am told that in the neighbourhood of 30 per cent of *Reader's Digest* is owned by Canadians, that they print in Canada all the copies of their magazine sold in Canada, and that they print some 200,000 in French for those people who desire to read the magazine in French, whether they be in Quebec or in other parts of Canada.

It seems to me that they make a concerted effort to comply with the real wish of the government that the magazine be owned by Canadians and that the requirement of service to Canadians be complied with in their effort to sell their stock to Canadians and to print their magazine in both French and English. I believe they should be commended, not condemned. To suggest to them that 80 per cent of their content must be substantially different from the content of their magazine published elsewhere would almost prohibit *Reader's Digest* from publishing in Canada and receiving the same kind of break that all other magazines distributed in Canada have, whether it be *Chatelaine*, which might be considered a family magazine in close competition with *Reader's Digest*, or any other magazine.

I do not consider *Chatelaine* to be in competition with *Reader's Digest*. It has a greater distribution in Canada than *Reader's Digest* and does not, or should not, fear the competition. We must believe that competition is good for the industry, not bad, and that competition is good for the reader. In my opinion, in this legislation the government is moving deliberately to curtail distribution of *Reader's Digest* and its participation in the Canadian economy, which the latter has demonstrated a desire to do. I reprimand the government severely for not listening to the thousands and thousands of readers of *Reader's Digest* in Canada.