

*Non-Canadian Publications*

simply or primarily to preserve the periodical but rather to preserve ourselves and our humanity.

I know there are members in this House who are in the medical profession. I would like to pay a tribute to the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Holmes) who spoke on behalf of the periodical *MD* before the Christmas recess. He spoke in glowing terms of what a periodical like *MD* meant to him in his profession.

I recognize also that there are other members in this House from the medical profession who do not care for the magazine. I listened to the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Philbrook) who said it was worthless so far as he is concerned. That is a choice he can make. I would simply refer hon. members to the editorial pages and to the letters to the editor, and let them read for themselves the testimonials other people have given to the periodical. They have stated what this magazine has meant to them. If there are hon. members in this House who feel it is of little value to them, let them ignore it. That is a choice they can make. But why should that be a reason to deny other members of the medical profession the right to the pleasure of reading this kind of a periodical?

I would hasten to point out that the purpose of this periodical is to provide that kind of information, that kind of cultural content that will give the doctors a new dimension in their practice, that will help them relate to their patients in a new and vital way, and which will in fact humanize their practice.

There are members of the profession in this House who have testified to that fact. When I read the letters to the editor and when I consider all the people who have asked for reprinted articles from *MD* I recognize that that publication serves a very valuable function in our society.

I know there are members in this House who feel that a periodical that goes to members of the profession free of charge threatens the publication industry. The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) has indicated that it would in fact threaten industry in Canada. Really there is no such threat. *MD of Canada* does not compete with any other journal in Canada. Thus its elimination will in no way strengthen any other periodical in Canada because there is no periodical like it, nor does there seem to be one intended for the profession. If members think that a periodical that has its origin in the United States is a threat to us, we still have the Foreign Investment Review Act that has jurisdiction, and in that way we can consider any industry in Canada that has relationships with a foreign country. So I would simply ask members of the House to look at this periodical to see in what way it is a threat to the periodical industry in Canada, and to see whether the asset of having this kind of publication in our country outweighs the detriment.

We are in no way threatened by the periodicals. We are in fact the benefactors. Their research, skills and culture will make us richer for having these periodicals with us. I would ask hon. members to consider this motion and adopt it in order to preserve this dimension in our society.

● (2100)

**Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr.

[Mr. Friesen.]

Friesen) is always so eloquent with such beautiful phrases that I cannot bring myself to say anything against him, so I have researched the subject and I have come up with something that hon. members opposite will cherish just as I have cherished the words of the previous speaker.

The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is quoted in *Hansard* of June 14, 1965, as saying:

I do not believe the two publications that are singled out merit this rather favourable treatment they are receiving.

As a matter of fact hon. members opposite at that time were busy arguing that the government had simply not gone far enough. However, at the outset I would like to re-emphasize my support for Bill C-58 and for our government's efforts to encourage healthy and independent Canadian magazine publishing and broadcasting industries. After all, that is the main objective of this legislation and it is an objective which I would hope no member of this House could disagree with or lose sight of through the course of this rather turgid debate in which we have engaged for some time.

However, much as I endeavour to extend Christian charity to the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock—and of course we all know that we must extend charity to members opposite in this trying time for them—I can well see the new leader of the Tory party coming into his first caucus and addressing his colleagues, after being greeted with loud applause as he enters. He will select the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock and say:

Speak the speech, I pray you

As I pronounced it to you, trippingly on the tongue;

But if you mouth it, as many of your players do,

I had as lief the town-crier spoke my lines.

I need not go on, but that is the way it may be.

I find it difficult to reconcile the hon. member's amendment to Bill C-58 with the important objective of this piece of legislation. The hon. member is asking us to delete clause 2 from Bill C-58 or, in other words, to leave in the Income Tax Act subsection 19(4) which classifies as Canadian certain foreign owned publications which have as their principal function "the encouragement, promotion or development of the fine arts, letters, scholarship or religion." In return, of course, the Canadian edition of these publications must have made at least a token move toward the inclusion of Canadian content and Canadian editorial direction.

As far as this goes I considered it to be quite acceptable, but let us look for a moment at the government's reason for wanting to delete this clause and the arguments being put forward for its retention. The government has decided that, whatever contributions these magazines may make to Canadian culture, Canadian arts, letters, scholarship or religion, or to the Canadian publishing industry, such contributions do not justify the profits that they have made solely because of their artificial status as "Canadian" magazines.

The arguments against this move have ranged from the intrinsic quality of the magazines to nothing less than the "freedom of the press" and the "cultural deprivation" of this country to the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock's own alleged concern about "the free concourse of information in a society" and his rather histrionic allusions to the