

to desist from soliciting advertising in the United States. It is the same argument, but it is TV rather than radio.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, my intervention in this debate at this stage is prompted by a couple of important considerations, and these considerations were rather underlined by a comment I am almost sure I heard from the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) to the effect, "if you are lucky". That comment was in relation to something which did go on the record, as said by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman), that he would be intervening to complete his argument on another occasion. This suggested to me that there was a slightly threatening tone to this comment "if you are lucky", and that is one of the considerations which prompted me to enter this debate.

One of these considerations directly concerns the wishes of my constituents as expressed to me in letters, and through the press, and the second, closely related to the present issue, even if of a general and more indirect nature, is related to the attitude of the government toward parliament, the parliamentary process, and members of parliament, whom we have heard described by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as "nobodies". Parenthetically, I suggest if we allow things to go on unchallenged and unchanged this is exactly what we are going to be, and we will merit that designation of "nobodies".

Even the first of my reasons has an element of the second in it. I have been deluged over the past month, as I am sure all my fellow members from the island and the lower mainland have been, with letters from constituents expressing their opposition to developments that seem designed to deprive them of their TV viewing enjoyment, or at least to inhibit it—specifically, moves that will inhibit to a considerable extent their ability to see TV stations with transmitters in the United States over the receivers they now have in their homes.

What baffles me about the government, with all due respect, is its attitude toward citizen participation in the governing process. We have had dished out to us grandiloquent phrases referring to the just society. We hear little about what that just society is or was intended to be, who defined it, and how it is to be brought into being. Perhaps we have passed beyond the just society, and maybe there is no possibility of bringing it into being. We are now hearing about the new society. If that is so, we need all the help we can get to preserve the society we want, by whatever name it is called. We are not getting much justice from the government.

The whole purpose of the government, my experience both as an administrator and as a parliamentarian demonstrates clearly to me, is that with the advent of that just or new society, by whatever name it is to be called, Canadians are being told, "You just wait, you will get the society we design for you since you really do not know what kind of a society you want". This government is Edmund Burke stood on his head and transposed from the individual to the party context. This government, in its own view, was returned in the last election on the basis of specious promises and campaign slogans, not to represent those who sent it here but rather to devise what the master minds within the party feel is good for the Canadian people.

Non-Canadian Publications

This attitude can be seen in the government's every move. Take the death penalty debate, the debate within the Canadian community and not the one we can expect here in this House. There is no doubt in my mind on the strength of polls taken by fellow members of this House and by the press, and just by reading the press and my correspondence, that the general public wants the death penalty retained as part of Canada's law. My correspondence is full of such demands—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. I am afraid that the motions we are debating do not touch on the death penalty. Perhaps the hon. member would limit his remarks to the motions.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, I rather anticipated being called to order. I am using this simply as an illustration of the manner of the government in devising policies which the rest of this parliament is expected to concur in, and with which Canadians must live.

My next comment is, what has all this to do with the amendments to which I address myself today? Madam Speaker, you anticipated my notes. It is simply this; if the government is not aware that the people on the west coast, the lower mainland and the island anyway, do not want to lose the ability to watch the programs available on KVOS with the convenience now available to them, but will have to buy some sort of an attachment, then the government is not listening to what the people are saying.

The same applies, of course, in point of volume demand—popular demand—for the continuation of the *Reader's Digest*, with which we have been dealing. I have been deluged with letters on that matter.

● (1650)

The government forces through measures on simply this inverted concept of Edmond Burke's definition of a parliamentary representative. It is also of course a manifestation of the Liberal party's self-satisfied assurance—the over-weening arrogance of power—that it knows better than the general populace. A just society indeed! If this is the new society, God help us! Now who has been had? A just society by any definition I can think of should rest on government action that takes into account the needs and concerns of the public, and as the public itself defines those needs and concerns. This brings me to the point at issue today.

What I am urging in citing these various examples is that in this debate, and in many other debates, we should have a free vote. This is not a matter on which the government should stand or fall. The government must have its supporters to support it when it brings forth its legislative proposals, but I urge through this medium, with examples I shall cite further, that the government must take action to allow a free vote, and if it did the other parties would certainly follow suit.

This brings me to another attitude of the government which I find so unacceptable. It claims to be innovative in stimulating consideration of new ideas and in encouraging debate on these public issues. It also claims that it responds quickly and readily to the consensus arising out of this debate. I defy anyone to cite one issue that found