

may ship are ever farther apart. Moreover, the railway is refusing to accept responsibility for goods shipped to certain areas. It has withdrawn its agents and in some cases, has not provided an adequate replacement service to serve those areas affected. The result is that many shipments are delayed. Sometimes goods must be shipped two or three times before they are received by the intended recipient. This has created hardship, especially as in many cases one can ship only by rail, there being no alternate method.

The situation in the Port of Churchill, in my constituency, is critical. The railway is the only facility for transporting heavy goods. In our case, rail rates are specifically designed to discourage small shipments. In the southern areas where small shipments can be sent by truck or alternate means, Canadian National rates are different. In my area they are such as to discourage small shipments by rail. Because the railway provides the only practical means of transport for the residents of northern Manitoba, they must pay prohibitive rates, the result being almost intolerable freight rate increases which have been imposed in the last few years. However, we have no choice. When you live in the north, you pay and grumble, and that is as far as it goes. You cannot do more.

It is true that the railway serves isolated areas; that is evident if one examines the rate structure that the railway insists on using. Of course, the railway justifies the rate it charges by saying, even though there is no alternative means of transport, that the rate is competitive. I ask—competitive with what? At one time only the railway served Thompson, Manitoba. Subsequently a highway was built and goods were shipped in by road. Let us compare that community with Lynn Lake, Manitoba, which is about as far from major shipping centres as Thompson is. The result of competition in the case of Thompson was this: freight rates applicable to Thompson, Manitoba, were approximately one half of those applicable to Lynn Lake, where there was no competition. That shows what is happening to our remote areas. They have had to put up with the present state of affairs. Despite the efforts of various groups in the affected communities to rectify the situation, we have not been able to do very much. I think I speak for every member of the House when I say it is high time something was done to rectify the situation. May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

## 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 Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—Agriculture—Milk subsidy—Reason for delay in application to Prince Edward Island; the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Knight)—Grain—Wheat—Suggested

### *News Sources Protection Act*

change in crop year to equalize payments to farmers who made early deliveries; the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Blenkarn)—Labour Conditions—Suggested increase in minimum wage.

If being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills. I understand that there is agreement about the order to be considered. Perhaps it could be stated and approved, and we could proceed to it.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, as nobody else has risen to speak, may I say that I believe the agreement is that we proceed to Order No. 7, the bill in the name of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters).

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

### NEWS SOURCES PROTECTION ACT

MEASURES TO PROTECT JOURNALISTS FROM  
COMPULSION TO DISCLOSE NEWS SOURCES

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming)** moved that Bill C-41, to provide for the protection of news sources (press privilege), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, never in history have the democracies depended so much on the dissemination of news in order to protect democracy. The United States for many years followed the English tradition of permitting freedom of the press and freedom of speech. The United States has protected that freedom by embodying it in the first amendment of its constitution. The subject was considered of such importance that it was embodied in the first amendment. Until recently, the United States courts always honoured the concept of confidentiality of news sources.

In Canada, this subject has not been as important as it has become south of the border, perhaps partly because of our colder climate and partly because of our less vigorous nature. I hope it also has something to do with the honesty of the Canadian people, something which may not be shown by our southern neighbours. However, Canadians should be no less vigilant in protecting their sources of news than the American congress was with its first amendment. This protection has been challenged in recent years. There are now 55 bills in congress, the purpose of which is to protect news sources in the United States. This situation results from a recent split decision in the Supreme Court which upheld the contention that newsmen must disclose the source of their information.