

*Non-Canadian Publications*

given. I want to say that we are extremely grateful for that kindness on the part of hon. members on that occasion.

**An hon. Member:** You have had it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order, please. The hon. member has already gone on now for 15 minutes. Perhaps he could bring his remarks to a conclusion.

**Mr. Friesen:** Much to the disbelief perhaps of government members, Madam Speaker, I have only about five minutes left and then I will be finished.

**Some hon. Members:** No, no.

**An hon. Member:** The hon. member had unanimous consent before six o'clock.

**Some hon. Members:** Order!

**An hon. Member:** He had unanimous consent, but not for the rest of the day.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member could bring his remarks to a conclusion.

**An hon. Member:** No, no.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** The hon. member has agreed to complete his remarks in a minute or so.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** There is not unanimous consent. Is the House ready for the question?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Madam Speaker, I am as anxious as anyone for this debate to get on, and I think the hon. member has abused the consent given to him by going on this long, but I do not see how the House can withdraw that consent once it has given it.

**An hon. Member:** For the rest of the day, or for the rest of the session?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has confirmed what I had said earlier in respect of what the House did just prior to six o'clock. I do not believe the hon. member who now has the floor intends to abuse that consent in any way, particularly in terms of the importance of the matter before the House.

**An hon. Member:** He already has.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**An hon. Member:** You just don't want to listen.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order, please. The record shows that the hon. member has already spoken an additional 18 minutes.

**An hon. Member:** So what?

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** The hon. member has spoken for 18 minutes over his limit which is almost two allotted periods, so I think the hon. member has had enough time.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe):** Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to contribute to the debate on Bill C-58. My remarks will be brief and, I hope, to the point, realizing that as a result of the many points already raised and debated the government should by now have received the message, and possibly should have withdrawn this bill.

The behind the scenes agreement between *Reader's Digest* and the government to make it possible for *Reader's Digest* to remain in Canada can, in my opinion, be classified as one of the most unworthy acts ever perpetrated in the annals of the history of Canadian governments, and is one more example of the government hacking away at the democratic process on which our country built its foundation, a foundation in which there already appear the cracks of disintegration as the result of almost eight years of misrule by this government.

My Greek ancestors, the founders of democracy, would turn over in their graves if they could perceive the dilution of these principles of democracy, principles which on numerous occasions, they defended, and indeed died for over the last 2,400 years.

Setting policies by regulations drawn up and enforced by civil servants, without prior knowledge or input by elected representatives of the people, is bad enough, but to legislate solely by the whim of a minister, as this regulation regarding *Reader's Digest* will do, leaves periodicals at the mercy of that minister.

Our present minister may have a benign, non-jaundiced and non-interference outlook, which would perhaps be the same outlook as his successor, but there is no guarantee of that. Even if there were a guarantee, all I can say is, what a hell of a way to run the government of a country. Back door policies and back door agreements have no place here.

I am in full agreement, as expressed by some previous speakers, that Bill C-58 is the brain child of an individual or individuals, possibly in the vast hierarchy of the civil service, who from time to time have to justify their jobs or positions. I think the country would have been better off if they had been transferred to somewhere in some never-never land where their words of wisdom might have found their appropriate place.

As my leader earlier admonished, Bill C-58 is a violation of everything that responsible parliamentary government is all about, and changing the law by decree and not by an act of parliament grossly violates the Canadian constitution.

To me Bill C-58 is nothing but veiled censorship to serve the interests not of the majority but only of one publication, *Maclean's*, whose behind the scene power is so necessary and important to the government. In addition, it is a blatant example of the government not only making the decisions regarding the contents of a publication, but also taking on the role of judge and jury. As the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Malone) has said: