

position against *Time* magazine only. Whether we are talking about *Time* at about *Reader's Digest*, if we are to believe the government, Mr. Speaker, we are still talking about revenue of which Canadian publications will be deprived. Although I have difficulty believing the government, I have no difficulty in seeing that not only is this unprincipled in terms of administrative law and parliamentary practice, but it is equally a kind of vendetta against *Time* magazine. I would commend to members of the House an editorial that appeared in today's *Montreal Gazette* written by Christopher Young, former editor of the *Ottawa Citizen*. He had this to say:

The great Canadian magazine policy is now hardly more than a vendetta against *Time*. Or perhaps, to give it a positive framework, the magazine bill is reduced to that ancient national policy, protection of infant industry.

The "infant" in this case is *Maclean's* now ironically calling itself by the *Time*-coined name "newsmagazine".

If that is the object of this legislation—and it will be the result of this unprincipled move by the government, and I hope by fewer than a majority of the members of the House—then all of us will be party to an act which will be discriminatory against one magazine that we have accepted in favour of another, on the narrow ground that it happens to be Canadian. As I say, Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to all members of the House as one that examines the real purpose of this legislation. It is written by a well known journalist, a man of the highest repute who is as much concerned about the fate of the publishing industry in this country as any member of the House.

This is a bad discriminatory practice that the government asks the House to approve. I, for one, am not prepared to stand by and allow this to happen and I know there are others in the House who are not. I am satisfied that before this debate is over the government will rue the day it ever decided to tinker in the backroom with principles that affect and which ought to govern a parliamentary democracy.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker)—Agriculture—Reduction in federal share of cost of crop insurance—Government action to offset; the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald)—Manpower—Possible elimination of some youth assistance programs—Alternative measures to increase employment opportunities; the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen)—Air Transport—Introduction of bilingual air traffic control in provinces other than Quebec.

## Non-Canadian Publications GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### INCOME TAX ACT

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

The House resumed 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. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, we have had the great privilege of listening to a first-rate speech by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker)—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Baldwin:**—which was emotional but reasonable, which was on a high level yet based on the law. It was the kind of speech that I hope will have great appeal to hon. members opposite, fresh from their weekend caucus at which they dealt with the very serious problems they are now facing. I was not privileged to be at that caucus, Mr. Speaker, but I can imagine Your Honour was there. There is no doubt at all in my mind that among the issues they discussed was this very bill.

**Mr. Lalonde:** Wrong again.

**Mr. Baldwin:** If I am wrong, let one of the members opposite stand up when I am finished and make a speech about what exactly is the approach of his party's caucus.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** You fellows should come clean.

**Mr. Baldwin:** As they feel their world trembling about them, getting close to the last days of Pompeii, I would have thought they would have seized the first opportunity to make a speech either in defence of the bill and the strange and tortured actions of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) and the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner), or they would stand up, if they had the courage to do so—as my hon. friend from Grenville-Carleton said—and challenge the bill and the principles behind it.

I have not spoken on this bill before, though I did ask the Minister of National Revenue some questions about it. I did not get the answers I sought; they did not deal strictly with the issue I raised. Today the minister spoke, but failed to deal with what I consider to be a very important although possibly a collateral issue of the bill and the principle involved.

● (1700)

I asked the Minister of National Revenue why, if the government did not want to legislate the terms under which certain periodicals would either be or would not be allowed to be published in Canada and receive the tax benefits which heretofore have been received by *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, it did not at least use the opportunity provided under section 221 of the Income Tax Act and put this in the form of regulation. If the government did not want to put this in the form of legislation, as it did in the