

able. However, we do not receive that much hate propaganda through the mails. Some senators might say, "Oh, but they will not send their publications to legislators. They are afraid we will raise a fuss about it. Therefore other people must receive it, not those in a position to do something to curtail it." In this respect, I will say that to my knowledge, members of Parliament do not receive all that much mail from constituents on this subject; nor do I. In other words, the people themselves do not appear overly concerned.

Therefore, in terms of the quantity of hate propaganda circulating in Canada this legislation, in my opinion, is not justified. With regard to point two, I only wish to re-affirm my own confidence in the ability of the Canadian people to recognize and reject publications and propaganda of this nature. Here is something that the Government has not done. This Government is essentially paternalistic, which has been shown in a number of areas. In the field of welfare, they have not reflected that confidence that Canadians are able to care for their own health and welfare. In the economic sphere they have not reflected confidence in our businessman, since they do not believe that he can do the job himself. However, the thing that disturbs Canadians is that they refuse to use this paternalistic attitude towards the C.B.C. where it is greatly needed.

The Government has made the incorrect assumption that Canadians need help in certain fields. In the field of hate literature, they are, in effect, telling us that the Canadian people have not the common sense or the ability to discriminate between hate literature and the daily newspaper.

The Government has become known as an administration that continually retreats from the legislative and policy positions it takes in Parliament. Why does it retreat, alter, back-track and change horses in mid-race? Because it is confused, and this confusion is reflected in bills such as this.

There is an important connection here. I believe that confusion breeds disrespect. An example of the actions of this confused Government are reflected in part in this bill. How can we have any respect for the bill—this bill of all bills—which has as its essence the protection of the individual? Was it not for this and other purposes that the Bill of Rights was passed?

I sincerely feel that, instead of enacting new legislation which will but erode our existing legislation and create disrespect for our laws, we should do some soul searching and

find ways and means that will command respect for our laws and authorities.

No wonder our youth and citizens at large are losing respect for our laws and traditions when we, as legislators, are unsteady and indecisive in our aim to protect and conserve this priceless title of being a Canadian. In this new age it should not be surprising to find crackpots who would try to abuse our already limited freedom. It should not be surprising to find emerging a new liberalism, a new conservatism, and a new socialism.

The new world is being increasingly fettered by automation, electronics, the amazing speed in communications and the media of press, television and radio. It seems that the theory of obsolescence is making a sharp impact on political persons, theories and programs.

Honourable senators, may I ask a lingering question, whether or not this onrush is totally wise. To what extent can a nation afford to toss into the ashcan much of its proven past in preference for the untried, as the new generation ventures into the unknown future? I am not too easily impressed by those johnny-come-latelys with theories brainwashed by modern-day propagandists and history re-writers.

My point is this. The fact that we have the opportunity to debate this bill is a tremendous thing for Canadians. It gives us the opportunity of showing them that we have confidence in their ability to make up their own minds. Therefore, we should block this bill. Here we have an opportunity to say to all Canadians who will listen, that we have confidence in their judgment regarding hate literature. It is one of the duties of our Canadian Senate to protect the sovereign right of the people themselves to decide what is good literature and what is bad literature, which is harmful and which is not.

I want to thank the Government for providing us with the opportunity of stating something which they are reluctant to say, but even more reluctant to demonstrate—that at least some legislators believe that the Canadian people should be left alone to handle those affairs which only they can handle best.

I know Canadians will treat hate propaganda as they treat the common housefly—they will simply whisk it off their sleeve because they know that while it is dirty and might pester them, it will not hurt them. Or, as Canadians can kill the nuisance fly, they can destroy hate literature by throwing it into the fire.