

*Post Office Act*

Now, Mr. Chairman, the second group that is very unfairly hit is the biweekly and tri-weekly newspapers of this country, because they have been classed as dailies, and they have to pay the same distribution rate as do the daily newspapers. The big metropolitan dailies, with a large urban circulation, and usually a comparatively small rural circulation, are able to cover a great deal of their costs by the revenue from their urban circulation, which does not have to be delivered through the mail. But for biweekly or tri-weekly newspapers, which have a relatively small circulation, a very large proportion of which has to be delivered through the mails on rural routes, this would be a great hardship. These newspapers are denied the free zone that is accorded to the weekly newspapers, so they are very unfairly dealt with, and very hard hit. As I have said, the people who will have to foot the bill in the long run are the recipients of these biweekly and tri-weekly newspapers, very important organs which give our people the news they want to receive.

Finally, there are the weekly newspapers which have to pay a very much higher rate for distribution. So we can see that this department is not sparing any readers of news in Canada, because everyone who receives newspapers from now on will have to pay a higher price for them, raising the cost of living very materially. As I have pointed out, these newspapers are a necessity, not a luxury. I say the government has arrogantly refused to allow the newspapers of Canada, the dailies, the biweeklies, the triweeklies and the weeklies, to be represented at a hearing of the committee on transport and communications, to put forward their point of view and to explain why they believe they and those who read those newspapers will be unfairly treated.

During the election campaign the Prime Minister said over and over again that he wanted the people of Canada to become more involved in the process of government. He wanted them to know more about government. He said on the hustings and in the shopping plazas, that he wanted the people of Canada to become more involved in government.

**An hon. Member:** So they are.

**Mr. Hees:** This is not the case. We see how ridiculous this situation has become, because to become involved in government you must be able to talk to the government. You must be able to converse with the government and

to learn what it has in mind when it expresses opinions about something. You should not simply be talked to by government, which is obviously the intention of the minister who is in charge of this bill. That is what the government has told the minister to do. The Prime Minister and the members of the cabinet have told the minister to refuse to allow the newspapers of Canada, through their associations, to appear before the appropriate committee of this house, the standing committee on transport and communications, to answer questions and to put forward their point of view.

• (8:20 p.m.)

**An hon. Member:** How can the minister do that?

**Mr. Hees:** That remark shows how ignorant my hon. friend is, because this kind of procedure has been used in parliament for many, many years. It was used extremely well by Mr. Pickersgill when he presented to this parliament a very complex bill about a year ago, the transportation bill. That bill, like this one, had many complicated clauses and was very controversial. But Mr. Pickersgill had the good sense and judgment to send it to the appropriate committee, where witnesses, and all those who wanted to appear, were heard. As a result, Mr. Chairman, of the hearings before that committee, a very excellent bill emerged. The members of the committee gained a great deal of information from those experienced in transportation matters in this country, thereby enabling this parliament to pass a bill much more valuable to the people of Canada than would otherwise have been the case.

Over and over again, Mr. Chairman, controversial bills have been sent to the appropriate committee and people who wanted to appear have been heard. As a result, the legislation was improved, and a far better bill passed by parliament. However, Mr. Chairman, we are now back to majority Liberal government. It is the kind of government that is determined to jam legislation down the throats of the opposition. Hon. members opposite have the votes; the members of the house can be called in at any time, or closure can be brought down, because they have a majority. But let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the last time the Liberals did that they were defeated one year later, and this is what is going to happen four years from now. Let me tell this minister that the last minister who did this, C. D. Howe, was defeated by an