

Post Office Act

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I would remind the hon. member that we are on clause 1 of Bill C-116, an act to amend the Post Office Act.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Chairman, I was just trying to better educate some of the members on the government side, and show them the great similarity between what happened in 1956 and what is happening today. This government does have an over-all majority, and the majority does rule; there is no question about that. All the government has to do is to call in the members. It can vote us down, it can ram anything it wants down our throats, it can impose closure. This government is the master of parliament.

● (8:10 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Béchard): Order, please.

Mr. Pringle: As a new member, Mr. Chairman, I am humbly respectful of the experience of hon. members such as the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings and of other hon. members, but if the majority rules, I wonder how we got into all these problems during a majority opposition.

Mr. Hees: You did not have a majority opposition; you had a minority government, in case you do not know about it. That is how ignorant some of the members on the government side are.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I would ask the hon. member to revert to the matter of the bill before us and I would ask all hon. members not to interrupt the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. Hees: I will be glad to do that, Mr. Chairman and I will finish by saying that one year after the pipe line debate, that great majority government was defeated, and the man who rammed that bill down our throats was defeated by over 3,000 votes. I want to tell the minister this, so he can look forward to it in the future.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Béchard): I hope the hon. member has said all he wanted to say.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Chairman, I think you will agree that I was continuing with my speech in which I dealt with this measure, but I was [Mr. Hees.]

interrupted and asked some questions for clarification by some hon. members on the government side, so I felt obliged to give them an answer. Mr. Chairman, we on this side are not arrogant.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hees: We give information when it is asked for, as a complete opposite to what goes on on the other side of the house.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to continue my speech I will be very pleased to do so. I should like to deal with the hardships that are encountered by some of our newspapers. First of all I will start with the daily papers. In the second class mail classification, daily newspapers will be charged 5 cents a pound on news content, and 15 cents a pound on advertising content. No other publication in the second class mail group pays a higher rate on advertising content than it does on news or editorial content. In this regard I want to ask the minister a question which I hope he will answer. Why are newspapers being charged 15 cents a pound on advertising when magazines—notably *Time* and *Reader's Digest*—will pay only 5 cents a pound? I claim this discriminates against daily newspapers, and is, in fact, a tax on daily newspaper advertising.

I would like to hear an explanation from the minister as to why this unsatisfactory and unfair situation has been brought about by this government, and by the minister in charge of these operations. I hope that very soon he will take the opportunity to rise and explain the reason for this. Perhaps he would like to do so now.

Mr. Kierans: Mr. Chairman, I will answer the hon. member's question when we get to the clause in which this matter is dealt with. Now we are on clause 1.

Mr. Hees: The house can appreciate the minister's reluctance. He has a right to delay answering that question, but when the time comes, I think he will slough over it and hide it under something else. We had a minister at one time who was very good at that, and then he was defeated. Mr. Gardiner was very good at that.

An hon. Member: Would the hon. member resign at once.

Mr. Hees: Yes, and I certainly did. This is something I do not suppose the hon. member would ever have the courage to do if he felt he disagreed with his party. He would continue to be a rubber stamp.