

decadence of imperial Persia and the fall of the Roman empire. I find it rather difficult to draw those analogies to this particular argument when what we are really speaking about are these magazines. It is hardly the Persian empire. In any event, really the most important part of these magazines' objections to their sudden disenfranchisement as ersatz Canadians is only one point.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Would the hon. member permit a question from the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen)?

**Mrs. Campagnolo:** Yes, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Friesen:** It pains me here, Madam Speaker, to hear this. I would just like to correct the record. I made no reference at all to either the Persian empire or the decline and fall of the Roman Empire.

**An hon. Member:** Why not?

**Mrs. Campagnolo:** I should like to return to the question because I think it is very important, that we define what is really at the root of this disenfranchisement of these magazines since Bill C-58 does not prevent them from publishing in Canada. It does not prohibit them from writing about Canadian events or about events of interest to Canadian readers. Neither does it censor their contents, no matter from what source they are derived.

In reality all this bill and this section of the bill do are one thing. The bill prevents them from making as much money as they could if they were still to be called "Canadian" magazines. That is what is at the bottom of all this. It sounds rather mercenary, does it not, when it is put so bluntly? But stripped of its legalese jargon that is the consequence of this part of Bill C-58 and, I submit, stripped of all the pious frothings over a selective interpretation of "freedom of speech" and "government censorship", that is the real concern of the magazines affected by Bill C-58. They are not concerned with cultural, religious or any other freedom, but the freedom to make a buck. That is what they are worried about.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Campagnolo:** The passage of this part of Bill C-58 will cost the specific magazines affected by it a considerable amount of money. I must state to the House that I would have a great deal more respect and even sympathy for the arguments that have been made by the publications affected by this legislation if these arguments at least had the intellectual integrity, not to say honesty, to admit that it is money that is at the root of the opposition to Bill C-58.

These magazines are in business to make a profit, and if they were not then they would not be in business. It is as simple as that. There is nothing wrong with making a profit. The passage of Bill C-58 will reduce or eliminate that profitability unless they conform with the requirements of the new law. Is that not, with all the fine words removed, the real and basic issue that we are facing?

I will cite as an example one of the magazines which I would like the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock to think about. He has pleaded for the continuation of its Canadian status under subsection 19(4). This is the maga-

#### *Non-Canadian Publications*

zine called *MD of Canada*, and I use it as an example and show it to members not because it is best in the field or for any other reason except that it happened to be at the top of my correspondence today when I was thinking about the hon. member's amendment. It is not because the arguments in it are any better or any worse than those in any other magazine attempting to avoid this provision of Bill C-58. What are the arguments of this magazine?

*MD of Canada* is a magazine owned by MD Publications Limited, a foreign and, to the best of my knowledge, U.S. corporation. It is "sent to Canadian physicians on a regular controlled circulation basis", that is what it says on the magazine, and it is free of charge. In other words, its revenues come solely from its advertising receipts.

*MD of Canada's* first objection to Bill C-58 is that it is "a publication of unique richness and quality both in cultural content and style". This is certainly true and I am the first to congratulate them on creating a book that is both visually beautiful and highly erudite. The content of their publication is without fault, I am sure, but this, I must point out, in no way makes it a Canadian magazine.

There are many beautiful and interesting magazines in this country, but unfortunately very few of them are Canadian. Why this justifies a continued artificial status for *MD of Canada* I simply cannot comprehend.

Then there is the argument that section 19(4) is designed for the benefit of Canadians wishing access to cultural and scientific journals and that they should be retained for the sake of these people. This is the hon. member's freedom of information argument. *MD of Canada*, we must note, is one of the magazines which would qualify as Canadian under this ruling.

● (2110)

However, this magazine goes on to point out that fears for Canada's cultural independence are not justified because the government can prevent other similar magazines from being established in Canada through the Foreign Investment Review Act, if it so desires. Of course what it does not state is that this would lock it in its own position as Canadian and free it from the threat of competition, much like the fox already inside the chicken coop urging the farmer to lock the door so that all those other foxes cannot get in. It is an argument which would do wonders for the magazine's bank account, but not, I am afraid, a great deal to justify its concern over the free movement of information within this country.

Moving along to the third line of defence we find *MD of Canada* arguing that the passage of Bill C-58 would probably result in its ceasing to publish in Canada, thus depriving 30,000 Canadian physicians access to the only journal of medico-historical writing available to them, and of course, the implied ceasing, according to their presentation to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, of world-wide coverage of Canadian medical events and the bringing to the attention of physicians around the world outstanding Canadians such as Banting, Best, Grenville and, Lord forbid for I cannot understand it, Stephen Leacock.

While this last argument does not merit serious criticism in the context of any reputable international medical journal, we should look for a moment at the first problem, that