

Non-Canadian Publications

lists provided by a Canadian mailing house. All advertising is solicited in Canada by the sales staffs located in Montreal and Oakville, Ontario.

The free flow of medical information, regardless of its source, is vital to public health in this country. It is a matter separate and distinct from the problems of publications for the laity. *MD of Canada* has received favourable comments from thousands of physicians across the country illustrating the very real and important contribution that *MD* is making to the practice of medicine by presenting information of medical value to physicians throughout the world.

In summing up the position of *MD of Canada* I would point out that *MD of Canada* is a controlled circulation magazine with no subscription revenue. Paid circulation magazines might have the alternative of sending non-Canadian editions into Canada for sale to readers, but *MD of Canada* does not have that choice. Its only source of revenue is advertising. If *MD of Canada*, an important medical publication which has been sent to physicians in this country for more than 15 years, ceased to publish in Canada as a result of Bill C-58, the *MD* concept would be lost and could not be replaced.

MD of Canada is not a Canadian edition of a parent magazine. It is neither a split run edition nor the result of overflow circulation of a parent magazine. It is a fully integrated Canadian medical publication whose editorial content is based upon the *MD* concept.

MD of Canada purchases, and always has, all of its mechanical production from Canadian suppliers. These include typesetting, printing, labelling and mailing.

By definition, *MD of Canada* is a "magazine of medical culture and cultural medicine". *MD of Canada* carries a completely Canadian medical news section. *MD of Canada* prepares original features which, when re-researched, appear, along with Canadian medical news, in *MD*, the medical newsmagazine USA, in *MD en Espanol* and in *MD Pacific*. *MD of Canada* reworks editorial feature material prepared internationally before it appears in *MD of Canada*. *MD of Canada* publishes an English edition and a combined English and French edition.

The physician readers of *MD of Canada* identify strongly with this magazine for many reasons. The first of these reasons is the fact that the magazine is researched, written, and edited for physicians. Another reason is that *MD of Canada* is always responsive to the requests of its readers. Thousands of reprints of essays appearing in *MD of Canada* have been distributed to physicians who have requested them. These reprints are free and there is no charge for them to the physicians in any way whatsoever.

The contents of *MD of Canada* are not the same as in any of the other editions of *MD*, namely, the US edition, the Latin American editions, or the edition for the Far East. There is no simultaneous publication of contents in any of the four magazines. All articles that are published in *MD of Canada* are especially scheduled and edited for that publication.

MD of Canada plays an important role by serving a numerically small but professionally highly important segment of the population with a magazine which responds to the full range of the physician's interests.

[Mr. Holmes.]

I would hope that the contents of this brief, which has been prepared by *MD of Canada*, and indeed of other similar briefs, will be very carefully assessed by the standing committee at the completion of this debate on second reading, and I hope that their importance is discernible to hon. members.

In conclusion I wish to reiterate that the principal issue in this debate is editorial freedom. I would simply say that if that objective is not realized before the passage of this bill, then I have no doubt that the minister will be remembered in the annals of history for his infringement on one of the basic freedoms that we have observed in the past, namely, editorial freedom.

● (2120)

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, in some ways I should like to begin where the previous speaker left off. I do not really see that the great issue in this bill and in the debate we are going through has anything to do with editorial freedom. I think it has to do with the question of money and how much money people will make by either having advertising as a deductible item or not having it as a deductible item. It is on that basis that I think it has to be viewed.

I am supporting this bill, but I am doing it with enormous reservations because, frankly, I do not like the kind of reasons which have brought us to this point. In some ways I think we are dealing with two different problems when we talk about *Reader's Digest* and *Time* magazine. It seems to me that this bill is really directed against *Time* rather than *Reader's Digest* because *Reader's Digest*, in a way, is unique, and if the government could have found a way to let it off the hook it probably would have done so. However, in the interests of consistency they have probably both been put into the same bag, because it is really a question of a news magazine rather than something like *Reader's Digest*.

I do not pretend to be an expert on *Reader's Digest*, and I will just leave it at this point because I have not been a great reader. Its endless optimism really gets to me after a while, and there are so many medical articles about rare diseases that when I read them I become sick and think that I have those rare diseases.

Let us go on to talk about *Time* magazine. As most people do, I realize that that magazine has an enormous advantage because of the fact that it is an international publication and can afford all kinds of things which no national magazine in any country can afford. The problem with *Time* magazine is that it is too good, and if we are trying to build up some kind of national magazine and to foster our own journalism and culture, we have to hobble those that are too good. That is the real problem.

I had a little experience with *Time* magazine. By a strange coincidence I ran a campaign pamphlet which bore a startling resemblance to *Time* magazine's own journal. I received a letter from *Time*'s lawyers on election day suggesting that I cease and desist from the distribution. Of course I complied with this. However, it is a magazine which in many ways cannot be matched by any other magazine which has to rely on the resources of one nation. I am sorry that is so because in many ways both *Time* and *Reader's Digest* have tried to be good citizens in this coun-