

those who may have gone in for earning, as R. B. Bennett used to say, a competence. There are, alas, a great many people in this country who are not rich, and I could be one of their best spokesmen, knowing a good deal about it.

Therefore, I commend this new recognition of equality, constitutionally and juridically, among the provinces. I hope this measure will not be mired down by sniping about who is more restrained than someone else. I think these ten people, no matter who they are, should have conferred upon them by this parliament a respect for their performance of a highly important duty.

The office of lieutenant governor has been often overlooked by our students and scholars in political science. I do not suppose I am the favoured colleague of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), but I was profoundly impressed by the quality of the people whom he appointed to the office of lieutenant governor. Over the years I happened to become acquainted with nearly all of them. They were adornments to the office. They were more than adornments; they were functioning in an office which they filled nobly.

One of these appointees—I do not know how widely this is known—had a little difficulty on a royal visit with one of the members of the royal family. In a fit of pique, I suppose, she declined to meet any more people and said she was not going to have any more people presented to her. This very distinguished and able lieutenant governor to this member of the royal family, using the proper tone of address but also showing the power of his own office, said, "I hope you will not force me to act in my role as Her Majesty's representative and command you to go to this presentation". He knew his office, and it is an important office. And this is an important bill. But, Madam Speaker, it is surely not, and should not be, a controversial one.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

\* \* \*

### INCOME TAX ACT

#### REMOVAL OF PROVISION ALLOWING DEDUCTION OF EXPENSES FOR ADVERTISING IN NON-CANADIAN PERIODICALS

The House resumed, from Thursday, May 8, consideration of the motion of Mr. Sharp (for the Minister of Finance) that Bill C-58, to amend the Income Tax Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Madam Speaker, I hope I am not establishing a precedent by having made a speech yesterday and making another

### Non-Canadian Publications

today, but I had planned on speaking on this measure for some time. I think the minister will know the position that I am going to take. According to the title of this bill, which is described as Bill C-58, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, it is a very innocuous little bill, but I get pretty worked up about this sort of thing. Of all the matters I inherited from my constituency, I have never had so much correspondence as on this matter. I have received over 263 letters about *Readers' Digest* and *Time* magazine.

Let me say at the outset that I am not speaking as one who is prejudiced against *Time* or *Readers' Digest*, particularly *Time*. I recall a cartoon by that great cartoonist, MacPherson, that appeared in the *Toronto Star* in which three people were putting various ingredients into Mr. Stanfield's salad. The cartoon was with reference to a meeting held in Saskatoon. I was not at the meeting and had no part in it, so I called up the editor of the *Toronto Star* and of *Time*. I do not know whether it is because of my physical make-up, but my wife always maintains that I do not cartoon very easily, and they had my name on my tie so there was no mistaking who I was. I cannot remember whether I was putting glass into the salad or something worse, but I hired some lawyers and received an apology both from the *Toronto Star* and *Time*. I think *Time* carried an article saying "Woolliams is innocent." I felt as though I had just been tried for murder and acquitted by a jury.

So after that introduction, Madam Speaker, I am certainly not speaking from any prejudice. However, I have always felt that *Time* gave a kind of capsule or pill version of the news and never really carried the news itself. They tend to editorialize the news. But this is not what I want to speak about this afternoon. I came here this afternoon because I am pretty concerned that by means of a tax measure we have brought censorship into this country.

**An hon. Member:** Oh, no!

**Mr. Woolliams:** My hon. friend says, "Oh, no". If this bill passes, the *Readers' Digest* and *Time* magazine will likely come off the news shelves in Canada. One of the most fundamental freedoms of all is surely freedom of speech. From freedom of speech flows democracy; and freedom of the press, of course, follows from that. It might be a good idea for my hon. friend who says, "Oh, no" to look at chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes of Canada and read section 2 of the Canadian Bill of Rights, which crystallizes the common law not only of the Commonwealth but particularly the law that we have inherited in statute form through our constitution from the British system. I maintain that if this act passes, it will permit not only this act but the act covering taxation in this field to allow a group of bureaucrats to determine what Canadians will be able to read.

● (1440)

I only know of few countries, even today, that have taken such drastic steps. One is the U.S.S.R. We have only to think of one of the great writers of today who was forced out of his homeland, Mr. Solzhenitsyn. Let me remind hon. members of what he said when he first escaped. He said that when you curtailed the press or tried to curtail freedom of speech, whether by taxation or other-