

Non-Canadian Publications

noted that Neanderthal thinking has no place in this chamber.

Mr. Woolliams: I am very glad the parliamentary secretary reminded me of that, because I never argue with the hon. lady to whom she referred who takes the same position on this bill I take. I am glad she brought her into this as evidence, because I have her letter here in which she says that every member of parliament should fight this for all their worth.

Mrs. Campagnolo: Madam Speaker, would the hon. gentleman permit a question? Does the hon. member consider and imply that all ethnic minorities, like all women, think alike and look alike as other minorities and ethnics and women?

Mr. Woolliams: I do not want to get into that, but I believe that the rules in respect of every person, be they female or male, in this chamber apply the same. I have always believed that. I might tell the distinguished lady member of parliament that I have probably defended more ladies at the bar than I have gentlemen, and I have done it with all the vigour at my command.

We are having a great afternoon. There is nothing like the truth to stir up my friends. They listen to certain speeches, with no comment; but when I speak there are questions and answers and the excitement becomes fairly emotional. I should like to read part of a letter I received on May 5. Incidentally, it is from a lady in Vancouver and at the end she has something to say which I believe contains a good point. She says:

As Canadians we are becoming more aware of ourselves and, in our awareness, less self-conscious and more confident—in our institutions, our way of life—in our country!

To erect a cultural wall around our various media will serve no useful purpose. Prohibition provides no solutions! Censorship will not work!

Canadians are strong and mature enough to make their own decisions in the areas of culture and entertainment.

This is a time for bold and positive legislation in a great many fields. The legislation you have proposed is parochial, unnecessarily restrictive, and not in the best interest of the country or the industry! Your purposes would be much better served by imaginative incentives to create more outlets for Canadian writers in existing publications, and more motivation for Canadian investors to seek opportunities in the publishing field.

In all the more than 200 letters I have received there is not one word of support for government censorship or for this bill. If ever I have had a duty, it is to stand here and fight with all the knowledge and ability at my command to see that we do not have a law in Canada in respect of censorship over what we may read.

● (1500)

Mr. Breau: Where do you see censorship? You can still buy *Time*.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, but the bill is not through. My hon. friend says that I can still buy *Time*. All we are doing today is buying time to get rid of this government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Breau: *Time* magazine.

[Mrs. Campagnolo.]

Mr. Woolliams: But we have to find out why this happened. Why would a government like this take this position? I know they have great elements of anti-Americanism in their party. One day the Prime Minister said that we must have American capital. Now he says that he never said that. He said he would like much foreign capital but that he just wants to control it. He sure likes control.

I asked myself why this bill came into this House, and when I read an article about *Time* it finally came to me. The article says:

'If *Time* becomes 75 per cent Canadian-owned but provides four to six pages of Canadian news and then a window on the world through American-tinted glass, that won't be good enough'—Keith Davey

Keith Davey is a magic word in the Liberal party because he brought Mr. Pearson to power and gave the Liberals back their majority. He is the great brain behind the Liberal campaign, and this is the pay off to Mr. Davey, the Senator.

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): At least we are not attending the old campground.

Mr. Woolliams: The hon. member, whose constituency I forget, is one who makes more speeches from his seat than he makes on his feet. I will let the record decide for itself.

There is one other reason. I read a book once called "Renegade in Power" written by Peter Newman, the editor of *Maclean's* magazine, so with Keith Davey and the editor of *Maclean's* magazine I think that is the reason we opt for censorship and drive out *Time* and *Reader's Digest* from this country.

I am on the committee and on many other committees. I work when I am on a committee, and I will fight this with all the ability at my command. The government is guilty of implementing a bill of censorship. It is the worst form of taxation in the history of this country. It is a disgrace to the Liberal Party.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. If my hearing is correct, I believe the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) made a statement which is incorrect. I am sure it was inadvertent on his part and that he would be happy to correct it. He referred to Mr. Fred Rose, who was here many years ago, and identified him as a member of my party. That is not correct. Fred Rose was a member of the Communist Party. He got into this House by defeating David Lewis in Cartier in a by election in 1943. I would be grateful if the hon. member would make this correction.

Mr. Woolliams: I appreciate that that is probably correct. They were close together—and I am not saying close together in philosophy. Mr. Coldwell or Mr. Woodsworth was the leader at that time. I believe it was Mr. Coldwell, and you could not find a better Canadian. He happened to be my member of parliament for many years where I was raised. If I left the impression to which the hon. member referred, I certainly would want to correct that on the record.

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I rise in this debate to express some very serious reservations about the bill which is before us. I think it is a little unfortunate that the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr.