

*Hate Propaganda*

conclude that in his book, and in many of his speeches to which I have had the opportunity of listening, he does incite an element of hatred. Could he not incite his enemies to a breach of the peace? What about Martin Luther King, Abraham Lincoln or Joseph Howe? Should these men have gone to prison for incitement likely to lead to a breach of the peace?

• (3:40 p.m.)

Men like Harold Cardinal are angry men. They feel an injustice. They feel that their people have been deprived of the riches that many of our other Canadians enjoy. They feel that they are being disadvantaged, and they feel a sense of frustration and injustice. I ask you, Mr. Speaker is it right that we should take away their right to articulate their views simply because they are angry, simply because they may appear to be somewhat militant, simply because they feel the lethargy of our society forces them to be militant in their modes of expression?

I wonder what Bill C-3 proposes for dealing with the 97 per cent drop-out rate of Indians from school, or what in fact it would propose to do about providing the equal opportunity that is necessary to enable these people to participate in the full riches of Canadian life. I wonder what this bill proposes to do about supplying them with an adequate water supply, or adequate housing, or about providing them with adequate jobs. And I wonder what it could do to remove the frustration that presently exists among the Indian population in Alberta with respect to medical treatment.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) visited my constituency some two weeks ago just to talk about medicare. The members of the Indian community there are very frustrated, and are apprehensive about the matter of medical care. The minister blames the situation on the provinces, but well before medicare came along they had full medical coverage and there were no problems. These are the types of situations that promote an element of hatred.

I am not an advocate of violence, Mr. Speaker, and I recognize that indifference and lethargy sometimes lead to violent words and violent action. Last week in this debate a number of speakers referred to the Ontario Human Rights Code. It certainly is an admirable document, but here again we have to consider its constitutional validity. As far as I can see, it is a declaration of good intentions, and I would be one of the first to sign my

name to such a declaration should it come before the House. But the Ontario Human Rights Code states that its aim is "to create a climate of understanding and mutual respect among our people." No act of this or any other Parliament can create a climate of understanding. No law can impose that feeling of mutual respect because, as I said before, mutual respect comes from mutual consideration and understanding, and that only comes through education and the free expression of opinion.

I wonder how much discrimination we do have in this country, and will Bill C-3 help us to find it out? Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not see how it can. As a Member of Parliament from an area containing several identifiable minority groups I want to know what kind of propaganda is being spread about them, or is being spread around. I say that if you force such propaganda underground it is liable to spread like an evil and uncontrollable plague, similar to the situation we have with respect to the control of drugs. Certainly our present laws are not going to remove the drug problem. We have all heard the slogan, "Cancer can be beaten." But it can only be beaten if we have a thorough and understanding knowledge of it. I say let us keep the lamented few in the open, where we can see them. Let us not take their advice. Let us not take the advice of those who advocate repression.

This leads me to my third and final point. I believe this bill represents an invasion of our sacred right to freedom of speech. In fact, I suspect this bill is unconstitutional and will be so declared the first time it is tested in the courts. I base this view not only on the Canadian Bill of Rights but also on our whole constitutional and political tradition.

On August 4, 1960, as I said before, this House passed the Canadian Bill of Rights. The Bill is unequivocal in its declaration and recognition of the existence in this country of the right to freedom of speech, and moreover there are no conditions or limitations attached. Perhaps it might be well for hon. members to take note of the second section of the Bill of Rights which states the supremacy of the Bill of Rights over all other Canadian laws:

Every law of Canada shall, unless it is expressly declared by an Act of the Parliament of Canada that it shall operate notwithstanding the Canadian Bill of Rights, be so construed and applied as not to abrogate, abridge or infringe or to authorize the abrogation, abridgement or infringement of any of the rights or freedoms herein recognized—