

*Non-Canadian Publications*

It is because I am so worried about government control of what any publisher can write that I am apprehensive, and I say this on the basis of my own experience in the business, of any formula written into law under which a publication would be required to be "not substantially the same", with that requirement being put into the hands of some official or bureaucrat who would be empowered to make the decision of what an editor could or could not say.

I am not so concerned about what a publication says or contains. I am less concerned about that than I am about the question of ownership and the question of licensing in Canada. If you put all these things together you will see that what I am suggesting is that this would be a way out of the dilemma we are facing now in dealing with a bill that has some good sections, such as the broadcasting part, as well as other sections that worry me a good deal. I do not think the bill as it now stands will accomplish the aim I share with the minister of helping to strengthen Canadian publishing. I ask the minister to consider seriously my remarks, and when I read his speech in concluding this debate I will determine how I am going to vote.

**Mr. Marke Raines (Burnaby-Seymour):** Madam Speaker, I have heard a great many words bandied about which I do not understand in connection with this issue. For example, we have heard reference to the word censorship, the matter of government control, and punitive action on the part of the government. I would urge hon. members to come back to the basic matter at issue here, and that is *Time and Reader's Digest*.

As I see it, and apparently as the Cabinet sees it, what is involved here is a matter of special tax privilege and the withdrawal of this special tax privilege. This is the heart of the matter. I assume this matter will come before the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, of which I am a member. I wish to make it clear that I will listen to all the arguments of the spokesmen, and I am sure there will be many from *Time and Reader's Digest*. I will listen to their arguments very carefully.

So far as I have been able to determine, the matter still comes back to the special tax privileges which were granted 10 years ago, for what reason I am not sure. At any rate, the government in its wisdom has now decided to withdraw those special privileges.

Where does the matter of censorship arrive? I have no great interest in the content of *Reader's Digest*, *Time*, *Playboy* or *Newsweek*. Canadians will continue to buy them, and I am sure the companies will continue to publish and put them on the newsstands in this country. *Time* and *Reader's Digest* are two of the wealthiest magazines in the world, and their publishers will continue to publish whatever they wish in whatever country they wish, and that material will continue to come into Canada.

As to punitive action resulting from the withdrawal of these special privileges, how this can be construed as punitive action is beyond me. I think perhaps I missed part of the argument that linked this action in that way. There is no censorship in any way, shape or form, and I can see no punitive action. What the government is doing is withdrawing special tax privileges.

[Mr. Roche.]

The publishers have said they would like to continue with these special tax privileges, and they have asked us what they must do. We have told them they must become Canadian magazines because only Canadians can enjoy these tax concessions which are designed to help the industry grow. If *Time* and *Reader's Digest* wish to change their content that is up to them. This too will be a matter for discussion at the committee.

It must be pointed out that the editorial comment in *Time* and *Reader's Digest* comes from their headquarters in the United States. That is well and good. I like to read U.S. material, and I am sure many hon. members here read *Newsweek* and various other periodicals. Why should Canadian taxpayers have to subsidize these companies? I submit that this is simply a matter of belling the cat.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** You mean catting the bell.

**Mr. Raines:** If the hon. member has not read that little story perhaps he will in his basic French course.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order, please. It being four o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions, public bills, and private bills.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Speaker, I think you will find there is an agreement to take Item No. 36 standing in the name of the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) under private members' notices of motions.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** That is agreeable.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The ones ahead of it will retain their positions?

**Mr. Reid:** Yes, at the request of the government.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Not to mention the Official Opposition.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Is it agreed that the House will proceed to the consideration of private member's notice of motion No. 36 appearing in the name of the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), and that all other notices of motions appearing ahead of No. 36 will be stood at the request of the government?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.