

been individuals without the manly courage to come out openly and promulgate their ideas. They have been getting together and popping off and blowing off in defiance, maybe, of the provisions of section 98, but doing no harm. They would not be the heroes that many of them have become were it not that section 98 is on the Statute Book of Canada; and it has been admitted by the honourable gentleman who has just taken his seat that no prosecutions have taken place under that section.

I happened to spend a considerable time in Winnipeg in the strenuous days of 1919, and I think that possibly I know as much about what occurred there as any other man in Canada. I remember going to Winnipeg with the Minister of Labour, in his car, and upon arrival there at 10 o'clock in the evening, going in to a meeting of several hundred men, many of whom I had known for years as outstanding Canadians, loyal and British to the core. During that meeting, at which I stayed until about 4 o'clock in the morning, when I was asked to retire, I saw many of those men going about with tears streaming down their faces, and acting like insane persons, simply because they were all heated up and excited about a lot of rubbish that amounted to nothing. Those men came to their senses, as 99 per cent of such men do if you let them pop off and keep up their foolish talk until they find out just how foolish it is. A farmer walking through a barnyard does not dodge with fear when the gander with his wings outspread and his bill open runs at him.

For more than thirty years I have been coming into contact with the irrational and foolish arguments of people who want to do this, that, and the other thing, which have never been done before and will never be done in the future—things that are going to revolutionize the world. It is my experience that the only proper and safe way to treat them and their fellows is to let them go as far as they like. If I am any judge of such matters—and I imagine that I am—it would be entirely impossible to show that an association was formed for the purposes mentioned in section 98. I know that there are some people without the courage to back up in any way their aims and desires. Such people may have in the back of their heads some of the things that are contemplated in the section. The only way to deal with them is to smoke them out and let them explode their ideas in the open, if they do so with reasonable decency. That will show them and their fellows how foolish they are in their views.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: How about Winnipeg?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: It would not be proper for me to say exactly what I think about Winnipeg. It would have been better to go right up to the hornet's nest, so to speak. If that had been done more—if those men had been looked in the eye, there might have been less trouble. The incident in Winnipeg took place, as we all know, when throughout the length and breadth of Canada, in every walk of life, the people were seething with uncertainty and excitement. Under the circumstances was it not only natural that thousands of poor unfortunates who were facing the uncertainty of the future should act in the way they did, and can we not excuse them? I think we were fortunate indeed that in 1919 we had not more dissension and popping off; and I believe that, either with or without this particular section, we shall never have a repetition of the conditions that then prevailed. Since that time some effective educational campaigns have been carried on by those who, I think, understand the class of individual aimed at in this section. So again I say that I am not at all concerned whether this body does as it has done on former occasions or not; but my earnest advice to this House would be to adopt the proposal before it, and by cancelling section 98 of the Criminal Code to cease giving dignity to irrational hot-air artists who have been making capital for themselves and some of their foolish theories during the past few years.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: If we were considering a proposal to place this legislation upon the Statute Book at the present time, I should be less inclined than I am to take the position I intend to take this afternoon. But this legislation has been on the Statute Book from 1919 to the present time. It has occupied a place and exercised an influence—as all laws are supposed to do—and has been a warning that certain things must not be undertaken, and that if they are attempted, certain penalties will follow. Such is the essence of all our laws and regulations. The conventions of society impose restrictions by their moral or social effect, and gradually become laws having behind them executive force and a body of public opinion, which has been formed in what were previously conventions.

If attention had not been called to this danger signal that has been hung up, I should not have so much objection to its being attacked and overthrown; but it strikes me that