

Customs Tariff

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to respond to the Hon. Member's comments. She has a great interest in the subject-matter which we are debating. All I can suggest to that particular Member of Parliament is that we were the Party in government which passed the Charter of Rights that she so loudly applauds at this point in time.

Just for her own edification and so she will be able to sleep better in the evening, in 1959 amendments to the Criminal Code were brought in by the Conservative Party. There were further amendments in 1962, and in January, 1978 the amendments of 1962 were reflected upon. There were further amendments on March 22, 1978; on May 1, 1978; on January 12, 1981; on February 16, 1981; on April 17, 1982; in January of 1983; on March 31, 1983; on June 23, 1983; and in November of 1983. The list goes on and on. I do not wish to have the debate go on longer than necessary, but the record is there for everyone to examine and is very clear. I suggest to the Hon. Member that she is a little off centre.

Mr. Roland de Corneille (Eglinton-Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, it seems that all Hon. Members of the House who are present have thus far indicated their willingness to support the measure before us for consideration. Also I think we have agreed that this is a stop-gap Bill. It is something which was hastily put together in order to try to overcome what seemed to be shortcomings in terms of preventing the admission of various kinds of materials which incite hatred and violence. Since we all understand the ultimate fate of this Bill, that we will all work together to pass it today, I should like to use this occasion to reflect upon some of the important issues that in our haste about other matters we keep passing over.

Once again this Bill brings to our attention the urgency of dealing with matters relating to the whole question of violence, whatever form violence takes. We have seen over the years that the inciting of violence has been successful. We have seen wars and genocides internationally. We have seen the danger of terrorism which until recently we thought happened on the other side of the world. Now it has come home to roost, to Toronto and to Ottawa.

I have worked on conferences dealing with terrorism in an attempt to bring about some way of condemning it as a nation. Nationally and internationally we have noted a certain degree of apathy about the matter. Violence has also been recommended in this country against those who allegedly committed murder by bringing in capital punishment. Violence is part of our lives as we watch television and see people being massacred at an incredible rate of speed. We become almost immune and in fact somehow inured to the danger of violence in society.

Violence is something with which we have to deal not as an isolated matter or on a patchwork quilt basis. We have to take a comprehensive view of it and of course we have to deal with it as it emerges. I served on the committee on battered women which was a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs in the last Parliament. It brought forth a report which needed to be acted on fully and was acted upon in part. The Liberal Government at that time

took certain steps to provide through CMHC homes for battered wives. We saw certain steps taken to deal with the concerns of those groups in terms of amending the laws and the ways in which we dealt with their concerns.

I suggest that these steps deal with the result, the violence itself. In my view it is important that we deal comprehensively with the cause as well, not in a patchwork quilt, unrelated way. Some comprehensive steps which were taken to deal with violence occurred as long ago as when Mr. Trudeau, Dean Maxwell Cohen and Mark MacGuigan began to deal with the hate literature Bill. They brought about a Bill which was successful and began to call to our attention as Canadians the grave problems which result from the promotion of hatred. That hate literature Bill was passed.

All people concerned about freedom of speech—and I am sure that would include everyone in the House—have to realize that there is a growing understanding that groups cannot be labelled any more than individuals. Hate literature is a way of libelling individuals because they are members of a libelled group. While there are still perhaps some who belong to civil liberties groups which oppose the idea of bans against hate literature, the vast majority of civil libertarians today approve of the steps that were taken to deal with hate literature.

● (1240)

Because we have begun to set those kinds of legal definitions which have taken years to evolve, they have become accepted gradually by the community. There are certain things that you cannot say against a group any more than against an individual. We are now beginning to grow in our culture and in our approach to civilization. At last we have passed rules and laws against hate literature. They must still be further refined. They must be strengthened. We still see that hate literature is being brought across the borders into this country which in fact incites hatred against people in our community.

The second thing the Liberal Government of the past did was not only develop the hate literature law gradually against opposition, against editorials in *The Globe and Mail* and *The Toronto Star*, but it nonetheless persisted in bringing in that legislation against hate literature. We also moved in the direction of bringing about a policy of multiculturalism. That policy tried to bring about better respect among Canadians each of the other, no matter what their linguistic background, the language they spoke, the religion they espoused, the culture group they belonged to, their sex or gender or what their background may have been.

We have a rich country because we have a multitude of cultures, not just one. They are the riches of the nation, the riches of the world. We have people who belong to many cultures, backgrounds, races and creeds. We respect one another. That policy of multiculturalism has been the basis for this country in fighting hatred and violence. It is a total policy which we must use to fight violence.

The third area to fight violence was to bring in a Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I remember the time it took us to