

*Hate Propaganda*

time, He clearly would have come under the section about inciting hatred against any identifiable group likely to lead to a breach of the peace. I give that example as proof that changing circumstances and times can bring about very drastic changes in the attitude one has toward legislation. I should like to think we would make a decision that would stand as a landmark for a long time and which would emphasize the right of a person, as a free citizen, to have his say.

**Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South):** Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to prolong the debate, nor in the strict sense of the word do I intend even to debate. The debate has been exhaustive and I think largely honest. I have followed it closely because I needed guidance in determining what I should do. I am not myself aware of having been a member of an identifiable group subjected to the despicable activities which this bill is intended to proscribe and punish. Perhaps if I were, my attitude would be different and my decision easier. That is the reason I have needed the guidance. The fact that two members of this House who are members of such identifiable groups have stood in their places during the debate and have expressed opposite conclusions concerning the bill's wisdom and efficacy, conclusions which coincidentally have been opposite to the views taken by the majorities of their respective parties, will I think make very understandable the difficulty which I, and I am sure other hon. members, are experiencing.

As I said I do not intend to debate; but I do feel it is my duty to tell my colleagues and my constituents why I will vote against this bill on third reading. I did not vote against the amendments put forth last Thursday because they would not cure the provision which compels me to vote against the entire bill. I decided that if the bill were to pass at all, it might as well pass unamended in so far as the amendments put on Thursday are concerned. I must vote against the bill because of the rejection of the amendment to clause 267A proposed by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth). Whatever doubts I have about the other clauses are not to me conclusive, nor would a recitation of those doubts add to the body of human knowledge. I do feel, however, as repulsive, obscene and offensive as the concept of genocide is and as repulsive, obscene and offensive as any person is who would advocate or promote that concept, that person ought not to be

deemed a criminal unless that advocacy or promotion has some public aspect, however slight.

Just a few days ago we were made aware of an instance here in Ottawa when an RCMP officer obtained entry to a private home when no adults were present and questioned a 13-year-old child. This child, in the absence of its parents, was questioned about things that had been done and said in that home. I can conceive of only one greater internal threat to freedom in a country like Canada, which already enjoys freedom, than a police force imbued with missionary zeal. That greater danger is a Parliament which demonstrates a like missionary zeal to proscribe and punish an evil, whatever the means.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Certainly, it would be difficult to conceive an end more appalling than genocide. It would be difficult to devise an objective more worthy of obliteration. One might be tempted to agree that any means is justified. I cannot accept that. I still hold the conviction that an idea advocated or promoted in the home, regardless of how totally evil it may be, however revolting must be the person who would entertain much less advocate or promote it, no criminal investigation, no criminal prosecution and no criminal conviction should follow where no public consequence has followed.

There are those who say that the concept of genocide is so repugnant that its promotion or advocacy, even in the most complete privacy, must be a crime. It is a tempting proposition but one that I cannot buy. Surely in Canada if we are not to impair freedom of thought there must be some place where every idea, however obscene, however repugnant to universally held standards, can be advocated and promoted. If that place is not in the privacy of one's home, where is it? This bill does not preserve it.

**Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of participating in this debate on second reading and since then I have had the opportunity of doing some soul searching and some research, particularly over the weekend. Certainly, I make no apologies for rising to participate at this time on third reading because I am deeply concerned about the subject and I think it is fair to say that many other Canadians are deeply concerned as well.

I am opposed to this piece of legislation because I believe it is an invasion of the right