

bill at this late stage of the debate, but having spent a good deal of my life in addressing public meetings, I thought I should give the house the benefit of my general experience. I for one believe in freedom of speech and would certainly support the principle of any bill that would maintain or more clearly define and recognize such freedom. But the bill of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) goes rather far and I think we must come to a definition of what is freedom or liberty. Freedom, so far as I understand it, is not the right to choose between evil and good, between obeying the law and disobeying it, between supporting society and disorganizing it; it is the right to choose in favour of good and the power to renounce evil.

The bill of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre proposes not to amend what may be defective in section 98, but to do away with that section altogether. I would ask the house to look at the question in this way: Is there any hon. member or any citizen in Canada who is prevented by section 98 of the criminal code from expressing his ideas? I have spoken in this country for the last thirty years, sometimes on rather ticklish subjects, and I have not yet found myself in any jeopardy on account of this section. No man, whatever ideas he may have to express, whether they are the most conservative or the most advanced, is deprived of freedom of speech by section 98. This section has only one object and one we cannot avoid; it is to prevent the destruction of our institutions by force. You can go on the hustings, on the public platforms, just as you can do in Hyde park, London, under the protection of the police and express any opinion, and the law cannot touch you, but the moment you try to incite the people of this country by force, murder, arson, to overthrow our institutions, section 98 steps in. With the worldwide revolution organized to-day by Moscow, this section is one of the most important we have in our criminal code. There is absolutely nothing new in it; all the paragraphs of section 98 appear in spirit or in letter in the criminal code under different sections such as 47, 48, 130, 133 and so forth. I shall not take up the time of the house by quoting them.

The other day I heard the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) say that he was not a communist. I believe him. He stated that he had nothing to do with communism. I believe him. I believe him even more to-day when he is in Quebec fighting against

the rights of the people and for the most trustridden government in Canada, the Taschereau administration. I would ask the hon. member for Quebec East, if he does me the honour of reading my remarks, to refer to the February issue of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, which, in a report of an investigation carried on by Monseigneur Michel d'Herbigny into the most communistic organization in the world, states that the communist theory is this: Our best agents, those who do our work the best, are not those who are out and out communists, avowed reds, but those who say: Well, in Russia there is a sort of interesting experiment going on; let us watch it quietly and see what will come out of it. According to him, those are the best communist agents, and I am sure the hon. member for Quebec East, when he reads my remarks, will not be so keen to object to section 98, which does nothing to prevent freedom of speech in this country. Who can object to section 98? Not any members of this house who, like myself, have sometimes expressed theories which were not readily accepted by the people at large in the country. The other day I heard the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) saying that the communists and bolsheviks hated the hon. members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. How could they, Mr. Speaker? How could they resist the hon. member, first of all? I have read—I do not know if I am correct, but I am sure that I shall be contradicted if I am wrong—that the hon. member for Southeast Grey not so very long ago spoke in Galveston, Texas, and being an advanced member with advanced ideas she spoke on the theory which goes back almost a century to Proudhon—property is theft; and using all that eloquence which we know her to possess she brought such conviction to her audience that that very night she was robbed of \$70. I am told that the hon. lady member had a man arrested in consequence which was rather ungrateful on her part, because to my mind it seemed a splendid test whether the ideas she was propounding had carried conviction.

The hon. lady member from Southeast Grey says that the communists and bolsheviks hate the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. How could they? How can they resist the hon. lady? Everywhere the world over we are faced with an agitation to prepare for the overthrowing of our civilization, and more than that, of Christianity, and these agitators have found their best friends in those who have said: Why not give them a chance to express their opinions? By word