

Time Allocation Motion

Mr. Faulkner: I also find it hollow in the extreme to hear hon. members such as the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton talk about the rights of parliament as though somehow that sanctimonious individual was any more concerned about these rights than are members on this side of the House.

● (1620)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Faulkner: In fact, if the government had not tried to use the Standing Orders of this House—and they are not rules for the government; they are Standing Orders approved by the House and they are available to the House—and had not moved after all this time, given the range of other pieces of legislation before the House and pending legislation dealing with housing, government annuities and a range of other questions, I would say we would have stood, if not condemned then at least criticized for an irresponsible waste of parliamentary time.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You are condemned now.

Mr. Faulkner: This bill is simple. It has been around since at least 1961—since at least the royal commission. I find this extraordinary. Here I am, a rather new member of parliament, implementing the recommendations of the O'Leary commission. He is a well known Tory and a distinguished defender of civil rights and the right to free speech—and I am accused of censorship by the Tories.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Faulkner: The debate has been long and repetitive. We heard hon. members like the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) quoting editorials from Belleville or Sudbury papers. I am not sure of the names and I apologize, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has never read those papers before, but yesterday they were the cornerstone of his debate and suddenly oracles of truth. These papers are relatively unknown; he certainly never reads them.

The principle behind Standing Order 75C, the issue before this House today and the vote which will take place in a few minutes, is whether an important public bill can be killed by debate rather than by a vote. That is the issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Faulkner: Hon. members opposite know perfectly well that no responsible government could go on forever debating Bill C-58.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Who says it is a responsible government?

Mr. Faulkner: They understood that, and their tactic was not to let it come to a vote, which is essentially what this chamber is all about; their tactic was to kill the bill by talking it out. That is what the issue is all about.

Mr. McRae: Filibuster.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Faulkner.]

Mr. Faulkner: What makes it all the more puzzling and what makes the position of the official opposition all the more difficult to take seriously is when one recalls that the spokesman for the official opposition, the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey), stood in the House and asked me this question on October 8, 1974:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Secretary of State. In view of the financial difficulties of *Saturday Night* and several other Canadian publications, when does the government intend to keep its promises and remove tax exemption from *Time* and *Reader's Digest*?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We thought you would bring in a sensible bill.

Mr. Baldwin: What were you saying about controls at the same time?

Mr. Faulkner: That was not just a fly-by-night, sort of sporadic happening by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi, because he was representing the official opposition, speaking on behalf of them and declared by his leader to be the official spokesman for the party on matters pertaining to the Secretary of State. So like any good spokesman, he came back to the issue on October 22. He was not satisfied with the answer he received from the Secretary of State, so he asked the then minister of finance the following:

Has it been brought to the attention of the minister that if these privileges for *Time* were ended sufficient advertising dollars would be available to enable a Canadian magazine to go on the market immediately on a weekly basis? Has the hon. gentleman been in touch with the Secretary of State with regard to studying the question of tax privileges for *Time* magazine?

Then we came into 1975 when there was the announcement in January. What was the official position of the official spokesman of the official opposition in response to my proposal that we remove the exemptions? Let me quote from page 2527 of *Hansard* for January 23. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), who is noticeably absent today, said:

—in responding to the statement just made I would first like to say, on behalf of the official opposition, that we are pleased the government has clarified this matter at long last. We believe that the move to eliminate the income tax advantage shared mainly by two magazines, *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, is a good one.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Faulkner: A year later we are accused of invoking closure, arrogance and denying the right to free speech on a bill which they themselves over the period of a year have supported. Mr. Speaker, you will understand it if from time to time we on this side of the House have difficulty taking the official opposition seriously.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Faulkner: The final point I wish to make is this. This issue does not just affect hon. members of this House; it affects a whole range of people outside who are advertisers, publishers and owners of television stations. I submit that they have a right to know where parliament stands on Bill C-58, they have a right to a decision from this House, and all we are asking today is that this bill be moved into committee where those who have interests involved and those who have ideas on this subject can meet before the