

Time Allocation Motion

strong stand in this regard, I think it is worth pointing out that the company owning *Maclean's* was in receipt of revenues last year totalling \$132 million, that it is the largest publisher of national periodicals in Canada and that it publishes periodicals in the United States, Great Britain, France, South Africa, Germany and Austria.

What is going to happen? The party opposite has a majority in numbers—though they are not representative of the people of Canada—and they intend to force this bill through by closure. They are going to deny discussion. If the bill is passed, what will happen? A monopoly of the thinking of Canada will be assumed by Mr. Peter Newman, the editor of *Maclean's*. That is what will happen. Hon. gentlemen opposite smile. The castigation he gave the former leader of the Liberal party, Mr. Pearson, was a disgrace. He is a man with no idea of the democratic system at all; a man who believes in power. All his writings have to do with power. Yet he will be in a position, as editor of a magazine with a million circulation, to dominate the thinking of Canadians to an extent no one has yet been able to achieve. I am opposed to monopolies, either in general or in particular, when they have to do with the thinking of Canadians. Yet this area is to be controlled and dominated by a person who has no regard for the parliamentary system.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The President of the Privy Council will recall the pipeline debates. He smiles; he bows his head in acknowledgment. I smile, too, when I think of the reaction of the Liberals at the time of that debate. They trampled on the rights of parliament as the government is endeavouring to do now, and they reaped their reward when Canadians had their first opportunity to speak. All I can say is this: You can apply the muzzle. You can let fall the guillotine. But this legislation in its present form constitutes such an interference with the freedom of thought and freedom of the press in Canada as to constitute a dereliction in the constitutional rights of parliament to interfere with freedom of speech.

First, there is the control over thinking with Peter Newman. Second, there is the denial of the alternative regarding Canada being shown or revealed by any magazine which could compete with *Maclean's*. Third, there is the attitude on the part of the government that because they have an arithmetical majority they can trample on the rights of the Canadian people. It is not stupid; it is even worse than that; it is further evidence of the fact that the Liberal party today is in keeping with what happened in 1956 when the rights of parliament were trampled upon. That is happening now, because you have a group of individuals who, regardless of what is brought before parliament by the government, have to toe the line and support the administration, irrespective of the dangers and difficulties which will ensue for parliament itself.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to make one point in addition to those which have been made, and I think it is exceedingly pertinent. My understanding is that since the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) announced the guidelines which would constitute the background of this bill—perhaps they are not so much guidelines as the very found-

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

ation upon which the administration will be based—we had a debate yesterday and we are having five hours more debate. I would simply make the point that it is not correct to seek to give the impression in the House or in the country that there have been 5½ hours or 6 hours of debate on the issue which is now before us. The issue was only put before the House precisely when the Minister of National Revenue stated his position. Prior to that time there had been grave doubt as to the basis upon which this bill would be administered.

I suggest that for a government to impose what is, in effect, closure upon a discussion after 3 hours or 3½ hours of debate—that is what it is, 3½ hours of debate—on an issue clearly before the House, because prior to that time we were debating in the midst of fog without any clear idea how some of these things would be interpreted without any idea as to the basis of administration, is to impose closure after only 3½ hours of debate on the actual issue.

• (1550)

[Translation]

Mr. Allard: Mr. Speaker, I thought we were discussing Bill C-58. Can one rise now to talk about Bill 58?

An hon. Member: We are discussing Standing Order 75C!

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Order, please. The House is debating a motion on time allocation for Bill C-58.

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the official opposition, I know of no more difficult task than to follow the speech just made by our leader and the very enthusiastic speech made by the former prime minister of Canada, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker).

[Translation]

I will now address the government. I am surprised that the government faces us today with a guillotine motion. I am surprised, because for quite some time already they have had a majority which enables them to manage the country in the democratic way we all know. But in spite of that majority, they have chosen today to muzzle and tie up the official opposition, to accelerate the passing of this bill. I am surprised, but maybe not because we read during the weekend that those people, at a Liberal convention, had voted almost unanimously against capital punishment, and we realize now how easily they dare impose closure, how easily they resort to guillotine, and let the blade fall on the heads of democratic forces in the House.

But on the other hand, one or two contradictions more do not really matter. What surprises me also, Mr. Speaker, is that on many occasions this government was depicted as cynical, machiavelical, disrespectful of popular will, and recently—

An hon. Member: By whom?

Mr. Wagner: A government member, who was at the same time the joint chairman of the convention, asks by whom. The hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux Montagnes