

Time Allocation Motion

exchange of hon. members, one will see that all three hon. members indicated they had been impatiently awaiting that announcement. The hon. member for York-Simcoe began by saying:

—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.

The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie and the hon. member for Lotbinière echoed this comment. We can see that the policy to be implemented under Bill C-58 was announced almost ten full months ago and on April 17, almost seven months ago, notice of the ways and means motion on which the bill was based was laid before the House. The next day, April 18, the bill was given first reading. This bill has been debated at second reading stage for six days, May 8, 16, 20 and 26, June 4 and November 12, for a total of 19 hours. Some 47 members have spoken—12 Liberals, 30 Conservatives, 3 members of the NDP and 2 Social Credit members.

While this extensive debate has been going on for hours, spread over seven months—ten, if you deal with policy—we have been exposed, as well, both publicly and privately to the views of persons and corporations directly affected. We have heard from *Time*, *Reader's Digest*, the American broadcasters, *Maclean's* and other interested Canadians both within and outside the media. We have heard claims and counterclaims; we have heard rumours and counter-rumours but all we have come up with thus far in the House of Commons is talk.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Anderson: We do not need much more talk now.

An hon. Member: What are you doing? Where have you been?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Anderson: We have had 19 hours of talk, and the government proposes another five hours. After that, in order to be in a position to make decisions the House of Commons will need facts; and the place to get the facts is in committee, not at second reading. The Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts can call witnesses. Interested parties and representatives of *Time* and *Reader's Digest* can appear at that time to put their case to the committee. Then the committee can make a decision based on the facts. Eventually, so will the House be in a position to make its decision based on facts and not, as has been the case on occasion in the past when there has not been too much fact, perhaps on posturing and other things outside the realm of actual fact.

The time has come for the bill to go to the committee. Those who have been so concerned with this matter have the right to make their case in public. The government has no desire to unduly restrict debate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Where have you been?

Mr. Anderson: The government has no desire to unduly restrict debate, especially on a measure that concerns the media. However, one cannot but conclude that all points of

[Mr. Anderson.]

view will be expressed more than adequately after 24 hours of debate. The time has come for the bill to go to the committee. If I may use the words of the hon. member for York-Simcoe, the time has come for the bill to go to the committee "at long last". Amen!

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, from the speech of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) it is obvious to most of us that he just came in and has missed the speeches of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield).

An hon. Member: He was just lucky, I guess.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The point of those speeches, particularly the speech by the Leader of the Opposition, was to the effect that the guidelines relating to how this bill is to be applied have only been the subject of debate, in terms of time, for 3½ hours. I think the hon. member missed the point completely. No one will deny, in so far as second reading is concerned, that there have been a great number of speakers. I wish there had been more speakers from the government side, rather than those members sitting there like the trained seals they are, backing up everything this government does, good or bad. I am glad there are a few in this House who are prepared to stand and say that this government is wrong. There are very few on that side of the House who are prepared to do that—and the hon. member for Comox-Alberni is not one of them. The whole point of the speech by the Leader of the Opposition was that these guidelines and how they are to be applied—which is really the guts of the bill—has only been the subject matter of debate in this House for 3½ hours.

Someone has asked what parliament is all about. Parliament is a place to discuss these issues. I have listened to the arguments and I have read the statement of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) in respect of the length of time of debate. The only thing that statement has done is indicate just how inadequate the President of the Privy Council has been in respect of the management of the business of this House. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) called him stupid. Well, I have not been here long enough to say that.

● (1610)

Mr. MacFarlane: He did not say that; he is too honourable.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): But I have been here long enough, Mr. Speaker, and I have had enough to do with the management of the business of this House in the short time that I have been here to realize that the management of this place has been stupid. There are members from all sides of the House who are interested in reforming the rules. I have on the order paper a private bill regarding the order of business, and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) issued a very detailed and long statement on how he would like to see the business of the House organized. But one thing none of them has said is that the business of the House should be organized in such a way that the members of the House, whether they sit on the