

that the book is probably in the realm of a classic. The same results apply to prosecutions of stage plays, movies, paintings and sculptures. In fact, some of the prosecutions have been ridiculous to the nth degree. In one case a witness described the painting as totally indecent, whereas another described the same painting as a great work of art.

In the interpretation of many words of this bill, and especially in the interpretation as to what is hate propaganda, we will have the same confusion and uncertainty as to opinions for and against what one witness may consider hate propaganda and another may consider to be just, fair and proper.

The briefs presented and the entire evidence before the committee did not give one single case or incident of a happening in Canada that would make it necessary for the introduction of this far-reaching and most objectionable bill. It is true that there were references to the lunatic fringe, hatemongers, crackpots and similar words. There was direct reference to one named individual, but, I repeat, no brief or evidence gave any instance in the slightest degree to show why it is necessary to have a bill of this type.

I said at the beginning that I realized it was folly to protest. This bill is to be rammed, crammed down the throats of the Canadian people. We, the Canadian people, a happy breed of people, are known, respected and loved throughout the entire world for our freedoms, for our respect for law and order, for our friendliness and our willingness to help and assist others. We are renowned for the great effort of all the Canadian people, who, in two world wars, and in Korea, sent hundreds of thousands of young Canadians overseas to help and protect other peoples. Canada gave freely of men and poured out its wealth, not for any material gain, but to protect the freedom of other peoples.

Today, honourable senators, this proud nation—though small in population—a nation which has done so much in many ways to help and assist other peoples in all parts of the world, is to have its proud name and record blackened and sullied, by proclaiming to all nations of the world that in 1969 the Parliament of Canada deems it necessary to pass this act against the advocacy or promotion of genocide in Canada.

Hon. Daniel A. Lang: Honourable senators, when this bill was first introduced into this chamber in November 1966, I spoke to it at that time on second reading and made my

objections to it known. I still hold those objections today and even this evening after the amendments have been presented.

Because this bill has been with us twice before, there was no debate on it here when it was introduced on second reading in this session. At that time, it was felt better to refer it immediately to committee and to reserve debate until after the committee had made its report. For that reason, and because I have not made my views known in this chamber since November 1966, I feel I should speak tonight.

Honourable senators, I want to be satisfied completely in my own mind that the Senate realizes the nature and the extent of my objections, and that the Senate fully realizes the significance of the provisions which may be put into law by passage of this bill.

In opposing this bill, I find myself in very distinguished company. Apart from my colleagues on the opposite side of the chamber, I count among that company editorial columnists in most of the major dailies across this country, distinguished columnists and commentators in those papers. These are indeed represented by the editorial from the *Globe and Mail* which was quoted extensively tonight by Senator White. I have that editorial in front of me, and if I may I would read one paragraph which Senator White omitted to read. It says:

It is a comfort, though perhaps an illusion, to believe that a massive majority of Canadians cherish procedural rights as much as the rights of substance the proposed bills aim specifically to secure.

And here particularly he is referring to the shift of onus of proof to the accused, under this proposed legislation:

Yet the defenders of equilibrium are few and dwindling: after Mr. Justice C. D. Stewart and former Chief Justice J. C. McRuer, the names of men who keep justice in perspective come slowly to mind.

Unless a coherent and authoritative body of opinion adds itself very soon to these lonely Horatios, the bridge of Good Causes will fall to a horde of too-eager, too-hasty, above all too self-righteous, partisans of expediency. Already these are bold enough, or insensitive enough, to argue that the precedent of aborted procedure in one law fully justifies its emulation in another. The erosion of liberty's safeguards has gathered a frightening momentum.