

parliamentary committee and make their views known. This does not seem to be such an unreasonable request. This seems to be totally consistent with the very best practices and traditions of this House, and I suggest that to follow the route proposed by the official opposition would be tantamount to a callous indifference of the rights of people outside this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat discouraged and saddened to be rising at this time.

An hon. Member: So are we.

An hon. Member: Then sit down.

Mr. Dick: I was going to support, and perhaps will support, the government in this proposed legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dick: I noticed last night, when reading all the speeches to date and before deciding to partake on this, the fifth complete day, that of the 11 speakers on the government side fully one-third of them disagreed with the policy of the government. I wonder whether the government is imposing closure today in fear of losing more of its backbenchers than it can afford, and therefore losing the measure.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dick: I have listened to the sanctimonious Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) who, with great oratorical prowess—or he thought it was—tried to say that the Conservative party had always stated it was supporting his proposal. He tried to say many things, but in fact he forgot to tell the people that he was supporting a royal commission which advocated the following:

—in an area as vital and sensitive as that of the press, whatever is done should be positive rather than negative, with the goal the promotion of the Canadian periodical, not the suppression of the foreign.

● (1630)

He did not quote that, but he should have. It is my judgment that the bill is headed in the right direction, one in which I happen to believe.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dick: I hope my hon. friends on the government side will be as quick to applaud when I point out that there are many errors and omissions in this bill. If they had the courage of their convictions and the courage of good government and would listen to other people, they might introduce measures to strengthen the bill, such as the Canadian-owned distribution system recommended by the Davey committee and the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather). They might also consider a review of the postal rate structure as it affects small Canadian magazines. This cannot be done in committee. The only thing this bill deals with is the Income Tax Act; if the hon. member who is interjecting would read the bill, he would

Time Allocation Motion

know that. It has nothing to do with distribution and postal rates. Read the damn bill!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacFarlane: That's rude.

Mr. Dick: It is not rude when the stupid member happens to say he can amend it in committee. If he can tell me how that can be amended in committee, he can stand up and I will sit down.

The Secretary of State should not have tried to speak to the present motion on this bill he was putting through the House. It would probably have been better had he let the thing run its course. I am afraid the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) has inflamed emotions in this country. We will now have more editorials than ever, and I dare say this subject has caused more editorials in the last 12 months than anything other than prices and income controls.

I believe members of this House have received more correspondence on this subject in the last 24 months than on any other topic. My own mail on it runs twice as much as on capital punishment. Yet we will deal with capital punishment in 15 or 20 days. If abortion were brought in, we might deal with that in 15 or 20 days. We always have ten days for a budget, and we will go on for a long time on prices and income controls. A lot of people feel that this bill is a type of censorship and that there is control of or interference with a free press. They are writing letters to that effect. Why not let this House have full discussion of the subject, rather than closing it down?

I abhor this procedure. I think it is unfounded and unnecessary. If the President of the Privy Council had his wits about him and knew what was going on in this House, he would know there are maybe six people still to speak from this side. I want to say that I abhor the use of closure on a bill dealing with civil liberties and an area of the Bill of Rights. A lot of people perceive it as such, and that is good enough for me. This bill cannot be amended effectively in committee, and I think it is a mistake to bring in closure.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, when a motion such as this one is under consideration, we must not forget a quite important concept of our parliamentary system.

When some provisions are practically never enforced and are at a given moment, one wonders why a debate is unilaterally restricted. And when we look for the reasons prompting the government to restrict the debates at a given moment, we find that it is always due to the evident unpopularity of a bill or still an excessive haste to enforce a bill to which Parliament sees no urgency.

Mr. Speaker, this is a consequence of an inconsistent system and the basic reason of that inconsistency is the following: we are not free to vote and this fact must be mentioned. The vote is not free. This is so true that from time to time a motion is moved to indicate that the vote will be free, which means that at other times, it is not.

When time came to vote on maintaining capital punishment or against the abolition of capital punishment, we