

*The Budget—Mr. Ritchie*

of narcotic predisposes psychologically and physiologically the use of other narcotics. Narcotics users, particularly among the young, are not likely to be too particular about the type of narcotic when they are in search of the euphoria which narcotics provide. Yet this government has declined to announce policy to deal with what is rapidly becoming the most serious menace with which our society has to contend. We are an open society and we are therefore susceptible to the winds of change, the currents of social evolution and revolution sweeping the world. We are particularly susceptible to the reverberations of change taking place in our neighbour to the south.

The United States today is a society under attack. It is under attack from within. Its institutions, its authority, its freedom and its laws are being systematically undermined and destroyed by those whose mission is not the reform of society, not the overturning of society alone but the destruction of America itself. I do not think that is an exaggeration, because those who believe these things have put themselves on record as wanting America destroyed. We in Canada cannot escape these problems, but so far as this government is concerned they might as well be taking place on the moon. The government is oblivious to social change and disruption. We are particularly vulnerable because we are an open society. In the Soviet Union there is no drug problem because drug peddlers are shot. Secondly, no one can afford to buy drugs. In the Soviet Union there is no problem of revolutionary radicals because revolution is frowned upon. Those who last fall paraded in Red Square on behalf of imprisoned intellectuals were allowed to parade exactly 14 minutes. They are now in Siberia.

Some of the people who in the name of Marxism and Maoism have unloosed bloody riots in America should attempt to organize a protest in some of the countries where Marxism and Maoism are in effect. Let them try to organize public protests in Moscow, Peking or Cuba. Does anyone think there is no oppression in those countries? Does anyone think there is no oppression in Czechoslovakia, Hungary or Poland? The Chicago trial which has become the target of all the professional do-gooders in Canada and the United States was a model of propriety, an extravagant exercise in liberty and license compared with any trial ever held at any time in any Communist-dominated country, and yet the

[Mr. Ritchie.]

professional apologists criticize it in the name of Marxism.

• (9:40 p.m.)

On Sunday, March 15, at ten o'clock in the morning CBC radio staged a long, critical attack on the conduct of the trial in Chicago by Judge Hoffman. He was not of course referred to as Judge Hoffman but as Julius Hoffman, in order to undermine the respect listeners might have for the judiciary. They interviewed by telephone persons connected with the defendants who were allowed to use Canadian network facilities to attack the procedures of an American court. They quoted selected excerpts from the Bantam Book publication of the trial transcript which includes also a scurrilous attack on a judge who was attempting to do his duty under great difficulties.

One wonders why the Canadian taxpayer should be footing the bill for the dissemination of this kind of propaganda on the CBC. It was pure propaganda because only one side of the question was given. Not one word was said in defence of Judge Hoffman or his court. It may be that there is no defence of Judge Hoffman's conduct of the trial. The CBC is not in a position to know that. It is significant that if there was a defence, no one who could have given it was asked to be on that program. Secondly, and most significantly, the only question is whether the defendants had a fair trial, and that is not a question for the CBC to determine, particularly when it concerns a court proceeding in another country: it is a question for an appeal court.

The program made much of the alleged harshness with which defence counsel were treated by Judge Hoffman. Yet anyone who followed those proceedings knows that from the beginning of that trial the defendants, who are in each case professional agitators in their late twenties and thirties—one is in his fifties—went out of their way to disrupt the court, to hurl abuse at the judge and to mock at the very institution of justice. In that they were aided and abetted by their lawyers.

This is a tactic, with which we are all too familiar, which shows contempt for the institutions of democracy, yet these people are now being made heroes in the press and on the CBC. The tactics of disruption have been applied and are being applied in our courts deliberately to undermine. Canadian courts have followed the very commendable procedure of simply ejecting the disrupters.