

create in Canada a similar magazine because that would cost too much. All that explained why we stood for the interests of *Reader's Digest*. It was impossible in any event to have a substitute. The minister and the government have forgotten certain facts that arise from the very nature of these periodicals. I am wondering why *Time* should not be considered as a Canadian magazine if it meets the same conditions that are imposed to *Reader's Digest*.

Even though I do not affirm that the bill has been strongly influenced by *Maclean's* owners, one must contemplate such a possibility. It is all very well to promote Canadian periodicals, we are all for that, but we should not create a monopoly of inferior quality to other magazines that seem to serve Canadian interests very well. Mr. Speaker, we should not make such a mistake.

That is why, in my opinion, this amendment is highly justified and all members in the House, including of course those on the treasury benches, should accept it. Thus would an issue which has been under study for far too long be settled in a reasonable and precise manner. There is a time when the government should curb their arrogance and accept what appears more and more to correspond to the opinion of the majority in this House, regardless of political allegiances.

● (1750)

[English]

Mr. Ken Hurlburt (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter this debate on Bill C-58. I have just been reading the speech made by my hon. friend from Parry Sound-Muskoka who at one point quoted comments made by Mr. Gordon Sinclair. One of Mr. Sinclair's comments as reported at page 10755 of *Hansard* for February 9, reads:

For months I have been saying and believing that the legislation being passed in Ottawa requiring that publications be 80 per cent Canadian content in order to be considered Canadian was discriminatory and immoral and was being rammed through parliament for one reason only, to get rid of the Canadian edition of *Time* magazine. By the way, if the rule was to be strictly enforced they might get rid of most Canadian newspapers as well.

My hon. friend from Parry Sound-Muskoka then went on to quote Ian McKenzie of Station CJAD, who said on February 4:

As you know, the Trudeau government has been trying to boot the Canadian editions of *Time* and *Reader's Digest* out of Canada, and now the government has backed down on *Reader's Digest*. That's good news for the hundreds of *Reader's Digest* employees in Montreal and it is also good news for anybody who values the free press in this country. The government should now back down on the Canadian edition of *Time* and withdraw Bill C-58 and its own interpretation of Canadian content. The real problem here is with the Canadian content rule.

He went on to say:

More than 80 per cent of the contents of a Canadian periodical must be material which has not appeared in prior issues of foreign publications. And I should like to add here that "foreign publication" refers to one with which the Canadian periodical has a continuing arrangement. Now this so-called Cullen rule gets right down to the arrangement and size of photographs on a page. Suppose a photograph appears in the Japan publication and a similar view of the same photograph then appears in the Canadian magazine. It will not be considered Canadian content.

But here is the rub. Who decides what is Canadian content and what is not? I expect it's the boys in the Revenue Department in Ottawa. They are the same gang which decides for all of us what is a dirty book.

Non-Canadian Publications

He went on to say:

Mr. Robert Stanfield said this legislation is not acceptable to anyone who still believes in the fundamental principles of a free democracy. Mr. Stanfield is right. The government should withdraw Bill C-58 and review its 80 per cent content rule.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): An amendment was introduced just prior to six o'clock. It was moved by the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Scott), seconded by the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen):

That amendment No. 4 to Bill C-58, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, be amended in clause 1 by deleting the figure "75" in line 3, and substituting therefor "51 per cent or more".

The House is presently studying an amendment to motion No. 4, and the hon. member's amendment does not seem to be relevant to motion No. 4. The Chair would advise the hon. member that at present it is not receivable as an amendment to the amendment to motion No. 4, but it could be offered later on after we have disposed of the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt). The question is on motion No. 4 and on the amendment thereto. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: On division.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Pursuant to section (11) of Standing Order 75, a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

As the House is undoubtedly aware, there is some affinity between motion No. 5, standing in the name of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway, and the amendment moved by the same hon. member to motion No. 4. This raises a question of procedure which perhaps could be avoided, at least for the time being, if the House would agree to standing motion No. 5 until a decision is taken on motion No. 4. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 5 stood.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock) moved motion No. 6:

That Bill C-58, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, be amended by deleting clause 2.