

call that real progress. After all, this bill attempts to Canadianize an essentially American publication; it attempts to make it conform to our laws. It wants to make *Time* a Canadian magazine. I submit the present bill is overkill.

After *Time* had prepared mock-ups of the new magazine and said it could live with the definition of "Canadian content," suddenly, in October, the roof fell in. The Minister of National Revenue announced that "essentially the same" meant about 80 per cent the same. I say this is overkill. Frankly, I should like to examine the publishers of *Reader's Digest* and learn how they can live with the new definition. I am glad they can live with it, glad we will continue to receive *Reader's Digest* in this country, glad that that good corporate citizen of Canada will continue to contribute to this country's publishing industry. But what will happen if a new minister of national revenue appointed tomorrow, decides he does not care for the present definition and wants to change the rules? I would say that is a very uncertain future to put any company in, especially a company that has tried so hard to live within the rules, to be a good corporate citizen and make its stock available to the people of this country. I do not understand the attitude of the government.

● (1650)

A lot has been said about specialized magazines such as *MD*, *Canadian Doctor*, and so on. I will not go into that subject. There is no way in which the medical profession in this country can sustain the publication of these specialized magazines which bring to our medical profession ideas from around the world.

Let us talk about what this bill does and what the Cullen rule does to the bill. It changes the bill. This is not the bill that we had on second reading. This is not the agreement we arrived at during committee stage. This is a whole new situation. We recognize and respect the right of the government to make this definition. That is the rule of the Minister of National Revenue and his officials. However, we have a definition of such proportions as to arrive at an accord totally opposite to what we were told in committee. Surely, in light of that situation, we are entitled to go back to committee and examine the Minister of National Revenue and the Secretary of State. Perhaps an accord can be worked out with *Time* magazine; who knows? We had only a very brief opportunity to examine the publishers of *Time* magazine, and an equally brief time to examine the publishers of *Reader's Digest*, the two principals in this bill.

I believe this is bad legislation. What concerns me even more is that it is setting a very bad and very dangerous precedent. Why did the minister not come before us in committee and say he was prepared to work out an understanding with *Reader's Digest* and *Time* to see if they could live within his definition of what constitutes "essentially the same"? Such an understanding is not beyond the realm of possibility. We know that now, as a result of the fact that the government finally recognized *Reader's Digest* as being a unique magazine. As a digest, it is unique; it is without competition. As a digest, it would obviously have to bring in articles from publications all around the world. In recognition of the uniqueness of *Reader's Digest*, the accord was arrived at.

Non-Canadian Publications

I submit that *Time* magazine is also unique, with its substantial, international news gathering capacity which no publication, given the limitations placed upon it by the Canadian market, could afford. No Canadian publication could afford the international news gathering capacity of *Time* magazine. Yet this magazine, which has tried to meet the provisions of the legislation, has tried to operate within the framework of the new law and was prepared to become 75 per cent owned in Canada and had in fact worked out an understanding with potential purchasers, has suddenly had the rug pulled out from under it.

What we are left with is some kind of backdoor accord as a result of pressure on the minister by his own colleagues which will allow *Reader's Digest* to continue at least until we get another minister of national revenue. The Canadian edition of *Time* magazine which we now know will be lost to this country. Perhaps it will not be long before *Time* magazine ceases to publish in Canada and has its printing work done in the United States, as is the case with *Newsweek*, *U. S. News* and *World Report* and some of the other American news magazines which get into the Canadian market. If that is progress, if that is helping the Canadian publishing industry, I have to be convinced, and I submit that many members of the House still have to be convinced.

We are worried about this bill. We are worried about what it does to parliament. I look at the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) who has a contribution to make with her substantial background in journalism. She has made a contribution to this debate but was denied the right to make that contribution in committee.

Mr. Breau: That is untrue.

Mr. McGrath: That is true. I have it on the hon. member's own word. The only time the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway was heard in committee was when I moved a motion and it was passed by a majority of the members. That is true, and the hon. member must accept the word of his colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway. What about the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart)? The hon. member seems to want to know the facts. He was the chairman of the committee for four or five years, and he was denied the right—

Mr. Breau: Madam Speaker, can I ask the hon. member a question? Is the hon. member not aware that any member of the House of Commons, regardless of his party or standing on the committee, is allowed to be heard in committee regardless of whether he has the right to vote?

Mr. McGrath: Madam Speaker, the hon. member who just took the floor, the former parliamentary secretary, has been around here long enough to know better. He knows that members of the House who are not members of the standing committee may only be heard after all other members of the committee have been heard, and because we were operating under closure the hon. members could not be heard; there was no time.

Mr. Breau: You are wrong.