

es? Or even about myself? What about the Roman Catholic publications, which may still be speaking in the all too common language of the past that Protestant literature is a dangerous and hateful attack upon the Christian faith. All these can be judged to incite hatred or contempt. How could any judge determine whether or not there are reasonable grounds for believing such things to be true?

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Is religion included in the bill?

Hon. Mr. Choquette: No. I am coming to that, because I have asked that it be included. I am going to be a member of the committee and, if you ever saw anybody fighting to have one word included in a bill, you will see this little fellow insisting that religion should be and must be included in the identifiable group. However, I will deal with it.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Choquette: This is a further paragraph from the same article:

Hate literature will be stifled more quickly by the silence of contempt than by mob violence and jail sentences. It would be more rational to ignore its producers and purveyors as the perverts they are, than to dignify them with the suggestion that they are likely to take over Canada.

Then, one last paragraph of this excellent article reads as follows:

The attempt to crack down by force on utterances tending to incite hatred or contempt is an adventure in futility. The clever will only do it but more effectively within the law. The only real antidote to ill-will is to cultivate within the community, and spread beyond the community, a common spirit of understanding and good will, and a discerning appreciation for every form of excellence. Here is an area where we must overcome evil with good.

Hon. Mr. Bourget: Which newspaper was it published in?

Hon. Mr. Choquette: I gave the name at the beginning, but perhaps you are interested in buying a copy of it. It is the *Jewish Voice*, a Toronto paper, in the issue of November 12, 1966, or thereabouts.

Hon. Mr. Bourget: I did not say I was going to buy it. I was just interested.

Hon. Mr. Choquette: Well, you can get it.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Brantford): I thought it was the United Church *Observer*.

Hon. Mr. Choquette: No, it is the *Jewish Voice*.

Hon. Mr. Leonard: Was that article not reprinted in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*?

Hon. Mr. Choquette: I am coming to that, because I have the particular issue of the *Globe*. It does not reprint all of the article, but this man is so determined to influence the parliamentarians who are dealing with this question that, in the *Toronto Telegram* of November 26, 1966, which is quite recent, there is an article entitled "Former Moderator's View".

Cleric raps proposed bill. Hate law smacks of Nazi storm troopers.

This is how he terminates his article, which should be read and which I commend to all honourable senators:

Not the way

Duplessis was not facing any "clear and present danger" of Communism which warranted the despotic measures of the padlock law. Even if he had been, the padlock law was not the right way to deal with it.

And we are not facing any clear and present danger of Nazism which warrants the sweeping and dangerous clauses proposed in the hate law.

To make laws for Canadian society as though we were on the brink of toppling either into Communism or Nazism is as unnecessary as to make martial law the normal order of our community life.

It may possibly be that some addition to our present law is necessary to deal with literature and speech that does, in fact, incite to violence—including that which incites violence against the crackpots. But, certainly, the hate law, as at present proposed, should be summarily rejected. It is too much a resort to Nazi methods as a means of stopping Nazi ideas.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Who is the author of that?

Hon. Mr. Choquette: Again, the same Reverend Howse, former United Church Moderator.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Brantford): Just recently retired.