

it all dumping. We have heard how terrible is this published dumping of *Time* and *Reader's Digest*—except that now we have agreed that the *Reader's Digest* dumping is not that bad after all: we find that *Reader's Digest* dumping is acceptable.

If we are looking at dumping in respect of publications, where does it stop? Does the *Toronto Star*, published in Toronto, dump its papers in Timmins? Is that dumping? Does the *New York Times* dump its papers in Philadelphia? Is that dumping? It is an argument that can become, and is, really ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. Suppose for a moment that we agree it is dumping—I do not, but let us suppose that for a moment—what, then, is the consequence of this bill? I say that I accept the economic restrictions, the ownership percentage, the director provisions, and so on, but let us zero in on the 80 per cent “dissimilar content” provision. In that respect, what is the consequence of the 80 per cent content provision? The very simple consequence, and the choice we make by having this provision, is whether Canadian owners or American owners will make the profit on this alleged dumping.

Take *Time* magazine, for instance. If the 80 per cent restriction is applied, *Time* cannot comply, so they move their existing Canadian facilities back to the United States; they keep dumping, so-called, their magazines in Canada—and who makes the profit? The American owners. So with the 80 per cent restriction, Americans make the profit. On the other hand if *Time* complies with the 75 per cent Canadian ownership restriction—and they have indicated they will—and if the government were not to impose the 80 per cent restriction, what would happen? *Time* keeps its Canadian facilities, it can comply with the act and its new, 75 per cent Canadian owners make the profits on the so-called dumping. And make no mistake, we are talking of practically the same material and the same dumping in both cases. Mr. Speaker, without the 80 per cent content restriction we even conserve the editorial staff in Canada and the Canadian section of the magazine.

The issue is very simple. With the 80 per cent content ruling, Americans make the profit; and without it, Canadians make the profit. Surely it does not take a genius to realize what our decision should be on the 80 per cent ruling under those circumstances. The 80 per cent ruling loses us a great deal and gains us nothing in terms of profits and published material. Taking away the rhetoric, the artificial and forced arguments of the debate, we are left with these facts. The people who will be restricted by the legislation are mostly Canadians. The bill introduces discrimination between different competing segments of the media industry. No other country has adopted this kind of negative legislation. Finally, the profits are Canadian without the content restriction in the bill, and they are American with it in the bill.

I have no time for the people who complain about lobbying, Mr. Speaker. I think all they are saying, in a very narrow-minded way is, “Don't bother me with the facts and figures; I want to make a decision in my own way without knowledge of the case”. Nor do I have any time for the people who have based their decision on whether or not the profits of the publishers were high, excessive, or whatever. It has always been my experience that those who criticize and profit the most are not necessarily socialists

Non-Canadian Publications

but people who have never invested a cent in the potential of Canada in any way.

We have been told on several occasions that if we would only read the committee proceedings we would be totally illuminated and would understand everything. I have read the entire committee proceedings and I have attended some of the sessions—as an observer, of course. Those proceedings did not change my mind. I made the necessary allowances for the testimony of vested interests for both sides, I tried to separate the substance from the fiction, and I noticed the large percentage of media background people who formed the government's side of the committee; and I do not say this disparagingly, because I have the greatest respect and admiration for my colleagues. However, surely they would accept that their interest in a sense could not be impartial. They are not, after all, Solomon. Under those circumstances, is it not just possible that the committee study on our side was, to a degree, distorted? After reading all the proceedings, Mr. Speaker, I find we are still left with a bill that is contrary to our Liberal principles and which cannot be justified in light of those principles.

The bill, very obviously, was aimed at two publications—and later only one. If it had been aimed at 50 publications, however, it would still have been contrary to my Liberal principles. When you want to help and assist someone or some industry, you do it in a positive way, not by restrictions. If we want to aid Canadian publishers, then we should find a positive way in which to do it. We should not do it at the expense of someone else.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roy (Timmins): In committee, Mr. Zimmerman made what I consider to be a very telling statement. He said something to the effect that if the government wants to help the Canadian publishing industry, why not give 10 per cent of the CBC budget to those publishers and they would then have more money than they could ever hope to gain from the total of *Time* and *Reader's Digest* advertising.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roy (Timmins): Just 10 per cent of that monstrous, costly \$350 million—I retract that, because in the estimates tabled in the House today the CBC budget is up to \$415 million—would mean \$41 million to the publishers of Canada and it would not even touch the level of expenses of CBC. It just makes me shiver to think of that particular budget, Mr. Speaker. I think Mr. Zimmerman is right. I think we could take half of the CBC budget and put in into other endeavours. Most Canadians would highly applaud such a move.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was quoted in committee, and I think his words bear repetition here. The irony is that the quotation comes from *Maclean's* magazine of October 20. This is what the Prime Minister said:

—for me, I am afraid of the word “nationalism”—particularly economic nationalism, though it applies to cultural nationalism too—is very often a vehicle of the ruling classes to transfer wealth to themselves. In the case of culture, you put tariffs on culture because you want the people to have the culture as defined by you. Now you can and would come back and say that you have taken some “nationalistic measures”. I'd say that the test of them is always: are they by and large good for the mass of the people, or are they something which is brought in to protect a