

look at the February edition you will find articles from the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *New York Times* and the *London Times*, along with a number of Canadian articles. What this government is trying to do is put this periodical out of business. This government is frightened about what we might read and feels that if the background is American it might do something to us as Canadians. When I went to university, part of my political science study included the reading of Karl Marx and other writings on the political philosophy and background of communism. Did that make me a communist? I leave that question to you, Madam Speaker.

This government has taken over everything else, and now it wants to tell us what we should read. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) once said he wanted to keep the government out of the bedrooms of the nation. I suggest to you that the Prime Minister and his government should keep the government out of the libraries. To me this is a complete affront and an attack on the freedom of our minds, or freedom in every respect. Let me put on the record some of what the Russian philosopher to whom I have referred said when he left his country. He said he wanted the privilege of reading anything that is written. Mr. Solzhenitsyn then said:

So let the reader who expects this book to be a political exposé slam its covers shut right now.

This was a man who was educated in a communist state, but he is capable of the most beautiful philosophy and English language. He wrote the following:

If only it were all so simple! If only there were evil people somewhere insidiously committing evil deeds, and it were necessary only to separate them from the rest of us and destroy them. But the line dividing good and evil cuts through the heart of every human being. And who is willing to destroy a piece of his own heart?

During the life of any heart this line keeps changing place: sometimes it is squeezed one way by exuberant evil and sometimes it shifts to allow enough space for good to flourish.

● (1450)

One and the same human being is, at various ages, under various circumstances, a totally different human being. At times he is close to being a devil, at times to sainthood. But his name doesn't change, and to that name we ascribe the whole lot, good and evil.

That is literature from a man who was raised and educated in a communist state during the time of the revolution and the development of Bolshevism, communism and a dictatorship which is really the same thing as socialism in the world. This government would want to choose what we are able to read.

I want to remind Liberals today of another Liberal. I do not know where the Liberal Party has gone and where the Liberal thinkers are. Some years ago in this chamber—and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) will recall it because one of his own members, Mr. Rose, left at that time to go to Poland—we heard from one great Liberal. Although it was not because of what was being done in the civil service or what one member of parliament did, people were being arrested for what they may have done and were kept in jail, not charged, interrogated and everything in respect of the scandal at that time in reference to the spy case. At that time, one great Liberal in the cabinet, Mr. Power, who was a minister during the war, stood up and said this:

Non-Canadian Publications

As for me, brought up in an atmosphere wherein a framed photograph of Magna Carta was on almost every wall, accompanied with a warrant for the execution of Charles I, and steeped through my reading in the traditions of the martyrs of liberty and freedom, I cannot wish to turn back the pages of history seven hundred years and repeal Magna Carta. I cannot by my silence appear to approve even tacitly what I believe to have been a great mistake on the part of the government. If this is to be the funeral of liberalism I do not desire to be even an honorary pall-bearer at the funeral, and I do not wish by not taking part in this debate to give silent approval to the procedure which has taken place.

Where are the Liberals today? They say they are here. They are here in the Liberal Party, but the Liberal philosophy is gone because today they are turning back the pages of history 700 years to tell us what we will read and to go into our libraries and select the reading content in this country. With all the horror with which I have viewed this government, I never thought I would stand in this House of Commons and see censorship by taxation in this country. If that is not turning back the pages of history 700 years, nothing has ever equalled it in my time in this House and I question whether anything will ever equal it again.

I hope this bill dies on the order paper. My friends talk. They do not worry. They are the new Liberals. They are exactly like the Prime Minister said in his writings of 1963. I do not have the quotation before me but I can tell you what he said: he said that a Liberal is an opportunist today, he is a pragmatist and that the name of the game is power; power at any price or for anything. He said all he wanted was power. When he finally became a minister, at that moment the party changed from a Liberal Party to the kind of Trudeauism it has today, with a new foreign policy, selection of what one may read and taxation for pleasure. The attitude is that they are far more able to do it for the people than the people can do it for themselves.

An hon. Member: Read the bill.

Mr. Woolliams: My friend says, "Read the bill". Sometimes I wonder, if these people do read, whether they can think, because they follow blindly what I have just described. The Prime Minister wrote that article and described the philosophy of the party today. The reason they are sitting there is that they love power. When the Prime Minister wrote that article he was asked how the power is held, and he said that you give them a minister-ship, you give them a parliamentary secretaryship, you give them a senatorship and you give them a judgeship: he said that is how you do it—and that it how they are doing it.

My friend is not sitting quite where she should sit. But it is all right because I do not mind. I did not make the remark to which she alludes, but I am sure it applies to her as it does to me. We are all equal people. I said that I received approximately 200 letters.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. The parliamentary secretary rises on a point of privilege.

Mrs. Campagnolo: Madam Speaker, although I do not agree with the hon. member in his premise, I was listening to him courteously and I should like to remind him of the remarks of my colleague from Vancouver-Kingsway who