

and make a percentage without applying any specific act of censorship whatsoever. These provisions do not exclude any specific material from appearing in any magazine whether Canadian or foreign. It is true they would encourage, within certain broad categories, the inclusion of material in magazines, but they would not censor out.

Perhaps to make the distinction clear, we could think of it in these terms. If I were to invite you out to dinner, Madam Speaker—which I would like to do some time—I do not think other members of the House would say that I am prejudiced against them by not allowing them to come out with us. On the other hand, if I said that under no circumstances would I ever invite you out to dinner, you might legitimately conclude that I had something against you, that I was censoring you out. The kind of provisions being brought forward in this legislation are inclusive. They are inviting Canadian magazines and other magazines that wish to be entitled to the tax provisions that apply to the Canadian magazines to include content in them which is substantially different from that which appears outside the country. However, there is no censorship.

One could attack this government, one could attack the Secretary of State, one could even attack these provisions *ad infinitum* and *ad nauseam* without being restricted by this legislation. This legislation will not lead to control of magazines in any way. For example, magazines now entering the country are not controlled. There will be no censorship of *Time* and *Reader's Digest* if they choose to come into this country as foreign magazines, no more than there is now censorship of *Playboy*, the *Economist* or *Newsweek*. They will not be censored if they choose to become Canadian magazines. They will not be censored in any way, just as *Maclean's*, *Chatelaine*, *Homemaker's Digest*, and so on, are not now censored. They will be in exactly the same position.

What this legislation does is make *Time* and *Reader's Digest* choose whether to be Canadian players in the periodical press game, or non-Canadian players. At the moment, there is a double inequity. These magazines have a favoured position in comparison with other foreign magazines coming into the country because they receive the same tax benefits as Canadian magazines. They have a special competitive advantage in relation to Canadian magazines because they are able to produce their product for a much larger market outside the country and write down their editorial costs. They can undersell. They can dump editorial material on the Canadian market. That is their advantage in comparison with Canadian magazines.

What this legislation does is make them choose. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot have a special position above and beyond that of foreign magazines, nor one above and beyond that of Canadian magazines. You have to decide which is your role, and play it effectively. If you want to compete against foreign magazines, do so without special tax privileges which they do not have. If you want to compete against Canadian magazines, do it without having the basic editorial material which enables you to write down your overhead, something which is not available to Canadian magazines. I cannot imagine why anyone would say that placing *Time* and *Reader's Digest* on an equal footing with other foreign magazines, or Canadi-

#### *Non-Canadian Publications*

an magazines, constitutes a form of censorship. It is an argument which staggers the imagination.

I wish to say a few words about the remarks made by my colleague, the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart), in his participation in the debate last Friday. I do not have a great deal to criticize in his speech. His speech was not partisan; it was moderate: it raised interesting questions which should be gone into in detail in the committee.

I do disagree with his analysis. I think the hon. member is overly fearful that these very profitable enterprises cannot move to meet the requirements of the legislation and still maintain their position in the Canadian market. He overemphasized their difficulties. He has not satisfactorily analysed their true economic situation and its effect on other periodicals in the Canadian publishing industry. On that we can go into detail in committee.

I was more concerned about newspaper reports of the hon. member's comments on Friday. It is often possible that one's remarks are misinterpreted in the press. I cannot go on anything other than what has been reported in the press. I think there are two great difficulties or inaccuracies in his remarks last Friday. In the press report it indicates he believes there is a great lack of resolution on the government side, splits within the government party, about whether or not we should proceed with this legislation.

My response to that, as one who knows the sentiments of the people on this side of the House as well as the hon. member for Cochrane is that that statement, if it is one he made, is simply not true. This is not a party which requires 100 per cent automatic coherent support for every measure which is brought forward. It is a large party with a variety of opinions in it. There are certainly divergences of opinion. It would not be surprising if, after the massive campaign of lobbying which has been mounted over the past few weeks, there were some members on this side of the House with doubts about this legislation. However, I know there is by far a majority of substantial agreement on this side of the House that we proceed with the measure. There are very few people who doubt its desirability and whether we should move forward to discuss this question and bring it to resolution.

I was particularly disturbed by the assertion that somehow the Secretary of State had "snuck in" this legislation to the House of Commons. It makes me wonder where the hon. member for Cochrane has been for the past ten years. This matter was raised by the O'Leary commission over 14 years ago, and the Davey commission. It has been discussed *ad infinitum* and *ad nauseam* in the press. It received overwhelming support at two conventions of the Liberal Party. It was discussed when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) was bringing in his budget last autumn. It was discussed again last January when the Secretary of State brought the legislation before the House of Commons. It has been discussed for the past two weeks. It has been a current, topical, running issue in this country for almost 15 years. To suggest that somehow the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) has introduced this measure through the back door is not worthy of the hon. member.