

Mr. Jones: Even the recently departed former minister of finance—a fine fellow, mind you, but as a minister of finance I question his success because of his last four or five budget failures—received a personal invitation to lead the Tories out of the wilderness. It makes one think. At this point I wish to make it abundantly clear that I am going to make my presence in this House felt even more from now on, and if unanimous consent is required at any time I believe my vote for consent or dissent is as valid as that of any other member of parliament.

In closing, I want to issue a caveat—which I expect every hon. member of the House to read in *Hansard*—regarding standing committees, donations to my organization and the obvious injustices perpetrated upon me, a member of this House, and consequently upon my constituents and other good-thinking Canadians. Therefore, I ask hon. members to co-operate by assisting in having two private bills which I presented on these matters enacted immediately.

I have no obligation whatsoever to the House leaders or to any leaders of any party, and in particular to the Tory party now. Any relation or connection now is purely coincidental. If the new Tory leader is not a member of the caucus, his caucus will be in no different spot than I am. They, too, will not have their leader in the House. I could expand on this, but I leave hon. members to think of other combinations and permutations of the results.

I express the grassroots-level views of a large percentage of Canadians. These views, ideas and thoughts, are important to me and I trust they are important to every hon. member of this House. I find myself in the position where I have the large support of the people of this country, and not just in my own constituency—but, for better or for worse, not from the top brass of any political party.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank you very kindly for permitting me to speak on this motion. I believe it has given me the opportunity, briefly, to put a few important views on the record without unduly wasting the time of this House, as has been done on other occasions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones) has raised a number of matters which deserve consideration and which could be discussed with considerable interest.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Are you inviting him into your party?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He has already invited himself to go into the Liberal party, and from there to the Tory party. I think the point which most of all deserves consideration is that when we are seeking to do things by unanimous consent, if the hon. member is here on those occasions he should be asked if he gives consent as well.

However, it seems to me that what is now before us is a very simple motion. All it calls for is for this Thursday evening and all day Friday to be taken off for a purpose which I think is fairly well known. I do not think this motion lends itself to discussion of the whole parliamentary system or the trials and tribulations of the Progress-

ive Conservative Party. I think it is a matter of common courtesy. This House has taken time off for Progressive Conservative leadership conventions in the past, for Liberal leadership conventions on previous occasions, and recently for the leadership convention of this party. I think it should be done now. Maybe no more speeches will be necessary. I am sure the Progressive Conservatives will vote for the motion, and on this occasion I think I can speak for the Liberal majority in this House as well. In other words, it is unanimous. We are all prepared to vote for the motion.

● (1530)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Order of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

REMOVAL OF PROVISIONS ALLOWING DEDUCTION OF EXPENSES FOR ADVERTISING IN NON-CANADIAN PERIODICALS

The House resumed, from Friday, February 13, consideration of Bill C-58, to amend the Income Tax Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, in connection with motions Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and the amendment to motion No. 7, I must say that I generally and largely support the intent and the principle underlying Bill C-58 in connection with the deduction for advertising expenses in that they should not be available to advertisers who advertise on a foreign broadcasting station whose primary market is directed into Canada. Until recent days we have not questioned the validity of this policy because, on the face of it, its merits have been self-evident in the terms of national interest.

Bill C-58 has been largely viewed by the public and parliamentarians as a bill whose primary thrust, if not its whole thrust, was in the area of periodicals, and the controversy surrounding the *Time* and *Reader's Digest* question became the preoccupation of everybody connected with the bill. My view changed somewhat while I was flying westward on January 13, 1976, to Victoria to attend the funeral of my former colleague, David Groos. While I was going out west, I took advantage of the opportunity to