

*Non-Canadian Publications*

the country—holding his hand aloft and saying, «It is not true; believe me, please.» Why does he not listen to the people, study the bill in committee and then agree that changes should be made, that *Time* and *Reader's Digest* should be separated and that television stations should be viewed in a different light. The minister would do himself a tremendous favour. He is a young man and new to politics. Many of us had high hopes for him until he became the minister of censorship. In a free country, one cannot go far with that kind of label. He is perceived as one who is directing Canada down some strange path in wanting to censor what we and our children can read and see.

I suggest that if this bill passes and this minister remains in office, we will see the national television news regulated to a greater extent than it is today. The Global television station already complains about the stringent rules they have to meet because of financial difficulties. I suggest the daily newspapers will be next, then the national television stations, and soon reading material will be smuggled in—other than obscene reading material which I have never agreed should be distributed in any case. That is what I see ahead under this young minister. I believe this is dangerous legislation and should be widely debated in this House and in committee, where witnesses should be called. I hope the minister and his colleagues will listen to the people and adjust their stand in accordance with the criticism that has been levelled at this piece of legislation.

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, my intervention in this debate shall be very brief. I hope that the debate in future will be as brief as my statement. I point out that Bill C-58 originated in a notice of ways and means tabled on April 17, 1975. That notice of ways and means was concurred in on April 18, 1975, and the bill was given first reading on that day. The bill was debated at second reading on May 8, 16, 20 and 26 as well as on June 4 and, of course, today.

It is the government's opinion that the issues raised by this bill would be best resolved after full committee hearings. I was very happy to hear this view expressed by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). Consequently, I have discussed with my counterparts the question of completing the debate on the motion for second reading and reference to committee of Bill C-58 and I am obliged to report that agreement could not be reached, under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or Standing Order 75B, in respect of proceedings at the second reading stage of Bill C-58, an act to amend the Income Tax Act. Therefore, in accordance with Standing Order 75C I hereby give notice that at the next sitting of the House I shall move that not more than five additional hours shall be allotted to the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the said stage of the said bill.

**Mr. Horner:** Closure on censorship.

**Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher):** Madam Speaker, the honourable member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) labelled the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) as the minister of censorship. Now the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) has risen and placed closure on the House of Commons on a censorship bill.

[Mr. Horner.]

**Mr. Faulkner:** It is not a censorship bill.

**Mr. Epp:** That is exactly what he has done; he has said that this House will no longer have an opportunity to debate and to present the views of Canadians in this House. The young member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale) asks if two weeks' debate is not enough. I say that if the people's representatives here want to speak on the bill and they have representations from their constituents, they have the right to express them in this House of Commons, no matter what the hon. member for Assiniboia says. I say to him, "No, two weeks is not too long."

● (1650)

By saying it will bring in closure, the government is telling this country, «We will introduce censorship. We want to control the press, say who shall and shall not publish news, and what you may or may not read.» You must admit that the government is honest: it is doing what it said it would ever since it introduced Bill C-58 earlier this spring. It intends to control news coverage in this country. Already, by allowing the CRTC to control the content of our television programs under the mistaken guise of nationalism, it is controlling what every Canadian is entitled to see. Now the government wants to close debate, to ram this bill through the House. Would it have done this between 1972 and 1974 when it was a minority government? Would Bill C-58 then have been forced through the House?

**Mr. Nystrom:** The NDP held the balance of power.

**Mr. Epp:** But you blew that, son! Now the government is to use its majority to force the bill through on second reading. This is a sad day for the people of Canada. Hon. members may say that our fears are groundless, that we are hoisting false danger signals. We are not. We say it is dangerous for the government to be involved in censorship and to say what we can and cannot read or see. Now, when the country is enduring for the fourth week a national postal strike and hearing the government explaining its restraint program, we are debating this particular issue the outcome of which will determine if certain magazines are to have the right to exist. On top of this, the government seeks to invoke closure. Where are the government's priorities? This is a sad day for Canadians.

**Mr. Paproski:** A shameful day.

**Mr. Epp:** The government unabashedly admits it is willing to close the debate. It will not listen to our representations; it will do as it jolly well pleases. Has not almost every member of this House received letters from average Canadians who support the continued existence of *Reader's Digest* and *Time*? Do these letters not ask us not to impose closure? I submit that almost every hon. member has received such letters which are overwhelmingly in favour of the retention of *Reader's Digest* and *Time*, and oppose Bill C-58. But the government will not listen. I challenge government backbenchers not to remain silent but to speak and tell us they are concerned about the implications of Bill C-58. Let them speak their true feelings.

**Mr. Paproski:** They are afraid.