

a long time the very tax the government is trying to impose on them through this bill. For instance, in an association I know very well in Quebec, the amount provided for welfare and social and democratic education purposes is in the neighbourhood of \$250,000 every year. As for the tax that the Government is trying to impose on this association and others, is it not true, as I said, that it is already paying it voluntarily? I doubt if the Government could do as much with the same amount of money.

Honourable senators, in all sincerity, I am convinced that these fraternal societies should not be taxed. They have always been exempt in our society; this is a wise policy and we should continue to follow it.

[ English ]

On motion of Hon. Mr. Flynn, for Hon. Mr. Grosart, debate adjourned until later this day.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** Honourable senators, this may be a good point at which to adjourn during pleasure, until approximately 8 o'clock this evening.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

At 8 p.m. the sitting was resumed.

Leave having been given to revert to Order No. 3:

### CRIMINAL CODE (HATE PROPAGANDA)

BILL TO AMEND—REPORT OF COMMITTEE  
ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs on Bill S-21, to amend the Criminal Code, which was presented on Thursday, June 12.

**Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck:** Honourable senators, Bill S-21 is no stranger in these parts. Its subject matter has been before the Senate for a long time. It has been discussed in the Senate chamber and in the committees of the Senate.

The predecessor of this bill was practically identical in content with the one now before us; it was known as Bill S-40 and was presented in this house as a Government bill on November 9, 1966. Honourable senators, I had the honour of sponsoring that bill. Its presentation was followed, my colleagues will well remember, by a long series of speeches. As many as 29 senators joined in the debate and

discussed the question with great vigour. For nearly five months it was on the Order Paper. Unfortunately, Parliament prorogued on May 8, 1967, and Bill S-40 died on the Order Paper.

However, a measure was promptly introduced in the new session on May 9, 1967, as Bill S-5. That bill was referred to a joint committee of both houses of Parliament for study and report, in the expressed hope of both sides of the house that it could be improved upon and made more acceptable to all of us.

However, the joint committee was able to meet only once, at which time Senator Bourque was elected Senate Chairman, and then on July 7, 1967, Parliament adjourned. Parliament reassembled on October 31, 1967, and on November 2 the order constituting the joint committee was rescinded.

That joint committee's duty to study and report upon the bill was referred to a Senate committee of which Senator Prowse became Chairman. Senator Prowse's committee held three meetings only. Then Parliament was dissolved, and once again the bill died on the Order Paper and the committee was *functus officio*.

When the present Parliament assembled on September 12, 1968, the measure was again introduced as Bill S-21, which is the bill before us at the present moment. That was introduced on December 19, 1968. On January 22, 1969 Bill S-21 received second reading and was referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** Would the honourable senator permit a question? Where could I find a copy of the bill as amended by your committee?

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** It has not been printed yet, but the bill as unamended is before us and the report of the committee is in *Hansard* at page 1566. In the report of the committee there is set forth the explanation and the placing of the amendments.

The honourable senator will recollect that I supplied him and the other members of the committee with a memorandum showing just where the amendments came in. If he will permit me to proceed now, I think I can make clear just what we have done, if honourable senators will keep the original bill before them.

In connection with this matter now before us I wish to point out that the committee held