

Non-Canadian Publications

Mr. McGrath: The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway, who has an amendment before the House which I support and commend to members, was denied the right time after time after time by the government members on that committee to be heard in that committee—and not only the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway.

I should like to point out for the benefit of the House some other very interesting aspects of the examination of this bill by members of the committee. The hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) had been the very distinguished chairman of the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts all during the last parliament and the one before, and has been a member of this committee ever since. Yet the hon. member for Cochrane was denied the right to sit on this committee because of his known opposition to the bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. Motion No. 4 deals with the definition of a Canadian magazine. Perhaps the hon. member would limit his remarks to the motion.

Mr. McGrath: Madam Speaker, we are dealing with report stage of the bill and I am bringing my remarks to the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway now before the House and the reasons why it was necessary for her to move the amendment. I was talking about the hon. member for Cochrane who had been the distinguished chairman of the committee and who was denied the right not only to sit on the committee but to participate in it because of his opposition to this bill.

● (2100)

The hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert), another outstanding and dedicated member of that same committee, was also denied the right to participate in its debates because of his opposition to the bill.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McGrath: And what about the opposition to this bill of the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy)? Was he given an opportunity to participate in committee?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Never.

Mr. Roy (Timmins): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

Mr. McGrath: And what about the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin) who made such an outstanding contribution—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. The hon. member for Timmins is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Roy (Timmins): Madam Speaker, I do not like to disappoint the hon. member, but I never requested the opportunity to participate in that committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: Madam Speaker, I understand why the hon. member did not request the opportunity to sit on the

[Mr. McGrath.]

committee. He knew what happened to his colleague from Cochrane, to his colleague from Vancouver-Kingsway, and to his colleague from Vaudreuil. They were all denied the right to participate.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. I remind the hon. member that motion No. 4 has to do with the definition of a Canadian magazine. The motion is restricted in scope and the hon. member ought to address his remarks only to the motion. The remarks the hon. member is presently making could be made on third reading.

Mr. McGrath: Madam Speaker, I intend to participate in the debate on third reading. I submit to you, with great deference, that we sat here last Friday and last Thursday and listened to hon. members make the same kind of intervention that I am making this evening.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. The hon. member has been brought to order several times. He must speak to motion No. 4 or the subamendment.

Mr. McGrath: Madam Speaker, I was merely trying to speak in the vein in which other hon. members have spoken, including the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway and including the chief government whip, the government's disciplinarian. I am trying to set the record straight, because the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway, and really this is what my remarks are all about, stood in her place and said she was denied the right to participate in the committee; she was denied the right to contribute to the deliberations of that committee. I submit that what the hon. member said was accurate and is a matter of record.

It is obvious that the government's bill is a shambles. I can only echo the words of the hon. member for Scarborough West, a government supporter, who said in the House last week that it would be in the public interest to withdraw this bill. He said that this bill was not, in fact, in the public interest.

Mr. Martin: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I appreciate very much being referred to in the remarks of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) but I wish that he would keep to the context of what I actually said. I do not think I indicated at any time that Bill C-58 as such should be withdrawn. I supported the amendment—and this is the reason for my concern—because the 80 per cent content rule was not contained in the legislation.

Mr. McGrath: Madam Speaker, that was not a point of order. It was a point of debate, and the hon. member ought to know better.

The government is in trouble with this legislation, and knows it. The government ought to harken to the advice of some of its own supporters and withdraw this bill. I say that, even in view of the back room accord which has been reached in the case of *Reader's Digest*. That decision could be withdrawn at any time at the whim or the pleasure of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) or his successor. That minister, or a successor in that portfolio, could withdraw tomorrow the interpretation leading to the accord and redefine what is meant by "substantially the same," or "80 per cent different". That will show you the