

### *Non-Canadian Publications*

of section 19, they will have to meet the criteria outlined in the law, which has been in existence since 1965. These criteria relate to ownership, control and content.

I should like to emphasize the word "content". The press release went on to say this:

National revenue officials, who administer the Income Tax Act, can provide an advance ruling on the eligibility of a periodical for the benefits of Section 19 in the case of uncertainty on the part of a publisher contemplating the publication in Canada of a periodical with a certain format and editorial content.

My fears were rekindled when the recently appointed Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) announced the new content regulations, indicating that Canadian editions of foreign parent publications must have more than 80 per cent difference in content or lose tax exemptions for advertisers. As I understand the government's position, to qualify as a Canadian publication a magazine would need to be 80 per cent different from a parent foreign publication and, indeed, even a Canadian-owned publication cannot be recognized as Canadian if its contents are substantially the same as printed elsewhere.

● (2100)

The issue in my view is not the loss of *Reader's Digest*, *Time* magazine, *MD of Canada*, *Modern Medicine* or the *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality*, and there are other publications which will be affected, all publications which I have personally enjoyed for several years. The issue in my view in this debate is the principle of editorial freedom, which I truly believe is being attacked and eroded by this particular legislation.

I have no difficulty in accepting that the minister and the government, whether their decision is right or wrong, and whether I agree or disagree with it, have the right to define for income tax purposes Canadian ownership of a publication. I recognize that the government has a responsibility in enforcing laws that deal with libel, obscenity, contempt, sedition, etc. However, when Canadian ownership is determined by the government then it should make it absolutely clear it will absolve itself from further interference.

Perhaps the most overworked and misunderstood word in this entire debate has been censorship. I have listened to the charges and countercharges over this particular word and this particular issue. The minister and the government in defending the bill have repeatedly stated that censorship is not being employed as part of government policy.

The government is correct in saying that the regulations in the strictest terms are not censorship, and yet it is their attitude and their response to the charge of censorship that alarms me and, frankly, should alarm all Canadian people.

The minister knows perfectly well that he is legislating a mechanism for government interference in the decisions of a publisher. Indeed the Minister of National Revenue has indicated unequivocally that the effects of the new legislation will undoubtedly destroy *Time's* Canadian edition, which will probably go out of business under these regulations. If the government deems it necessary to deceive the public with a play on words in this particular instance, and in particular when we are discussing the very fundamental principle of editorial freedom, I have severe reservations as to what the government's response will be in future if it is

[Mr. Holmes.]

confronted with criticism or adverse editorial comment by future Canadian publications. This situation to me smacks of authoritarianism and, of course, authoritarian government has no place in our democratic society.

As one who has trained in a science discipline I have recognized for a long time, and would defend, the importance and the necessity of the free exchange of knowledge and views. This exchange of information is not solely for the benefit of those who are involved in scientific endeavours. I should like to suggest that this scientific exchange is really to the benefit of and has a salutary effect on the larger community and citizens of Canada.

When I was thinking about this I wondered how many individuals in this Chamber had taken, or even had the opportunity to review world literature. I can assure you that I have done this on at least one occasion; it is a great experience, and underlines the importance of this type of exchange of knowledge and information. I have a permanent appreciation of this fact and it will have a lasting effect on me. I may say that it influenced my comments in this particular debate.

The major part of this debate has been concerned with *Reader's Digest* and *Time*, and I can state, as I am sure other hon. members can, that my correspondence on the subject in respect of *Reader's Digest* and *Time* has been heavy and overwhelmingly in support of their retention. I do not want to reiterate these arguments at this time as they have been well outlined by other members in the House. However, I should like to raise the issue in respect of the impact this legislation and the regulations will have on medical publications in Canada and, indeed, on other technical journals which will be confronted with a similar fate.

As I indicated sometime earlier, *MD of Canada*, *Modern Medicine* and the *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality* will be affected by this legislation and I have no doubt they will disappear from the Canadian scene.

I want to take a few moments to discuss the specific publication *MD of Canada*. I have picked this particular journal for three reasons, recognizing that it does have a unique editorial concept. First, in many ways the problem which have been created for *Md of Canada* by his legislation are similar to those experienced by other medical journals and, indeed, other technical publications presently in Canada. The second reason is my personal knowledge and interest in reading this journal since its inception in Canada. Of course this does permit me to indicate that the information I have can be received as reliable and authoritative. Thirdly, I think it is important to review one of these so we can assess the impact this legislation will have on other scientific publications. I believe this will demonstrate unequivocally the seriousness of the legislation not only as it relates to *MD of Canada* but to other publications.

*MD of Canada* is dedicated to serving physicians by giving them a publication that reflects the highest ideals of the medical profession and by presenting features related to the universality of medicine and man. It was founded in January, 1960. *MD of Canada* is a monthly controlled circulation magazine that is sent free of charge to more than 25,000 physicians in Canada. It is published by MD Publications (Canada) Ltd., with offices in Quebec and at Oak-