

is only on one level, but we know from everything else, from brainwashing and from the nature of the study of prejudice itself, we know of the immense number of influence on people behaving in groups; and the whole field of modern and social psychology is filled with literature which tells us something about the danger to the human psyche, the danger when it is prodded, and the latent beast in us all. The idea of the perfectibility of man was good Protestant doctrine in 1860, but is it good Protestant doctrine today? Who really denies today some concept of original sin in view of what happened in our own lifetime? Our whole attitude towards what is now the human condition and what makes man behave as he does has changed completely. We no longer have the illusions of John Stuart Mill, those illusions which made him write as he did. Maybe it is just as well. Look at the debate we are having here today in the context of our new knowledge of the situation, of man's behaviour in the group situation, and which is often so pleasant within the group situation and so antagonistic outside the group. This is our current knowledge. So the second thing I would say is that the general philosophical argument about free speech must now be related to the social argument about the nature of community life and group psychology.

Marshall McLuhan may not be everybody's cup of tea. But he was a classmate of mine and he has brought us richly in touch with the impact of all the media of communication, either consciously or unconsciously. This is quite apart from the thinking of all the sociologists who worked in the field before McLuhan. I say one cannot be indifferent with your insight and my insight, in 1968, to the human condition and the capacity of man for evil behaviour and his ability to acquire prejudices. I would say that not to see this effort in that context is really not to see what our committee tried to spell out.

My third and final point which we, at least in this bill, tried to relate to the grand tradition to which you refer, and taking into account our new psychological knowledge, is that we are doing no damage to that tradition to which you and I belong and which we share as part of the Anglo-Canadian tradition. I propose to go through this to demonstrate that every one of the substantive positions we take in the Report are within the classical Anglo-Canadian tradition. If I can demon-

strate to you that it is not against that tradition you may agree with me that the bill is technically viable and can fit into the stream of the syntax I have been talking about.

The Chairman: It is now a quarter to one. I think we should adjourn until 2.30.

The committee adjourned until 2.30 p.m.

Upon resuming at 2.30 p.m.

The Chairman: Gentlemen, we have a quorum.

At the time we adjourned for lunch Dean Cohen was dealing with the question of whether the legislation was really necessary, or whether by passing legislation like this we perhaps belittle Canada by the implication that we needed this kind of legislation.

Senator Roebuck: I think that he had dealt with that. He was giving us the philosophical basis.

The Chairman: Yes, he was dealing with the philosophical basis.

Dean Cohen: I wonder if I might say a word on the particular point which I think Senator Lang really had in mind, namely: Does this demean the Canadian self-image by having to pass this kind of law? The answer, surely, is: No. Any society that is intelligent about its self-image, fashions whatever realities are brought to its attention by those facts which it can respect. You have facts of 1968 you did not have in 1955, or 1935, or 1905. You therefore tailor your understanding of the situation on the basis of these new facts.

Senator Lang, I am dealing with one crucial part of your question: How far one's own image of Canada is distorted by this kind of legislation. I have said that on the contrary, far from distorting it, it reflects positively on the mental health of Canada that it can honestly look at human problems and fashion regulations to deal with difficult matters in a realistic and honest way. When you know something about your own society and about human behaviour in 1968 which you did not know in 1908 or 1858, you should be able to tailor your legal and social machinery accordingly. Is it a distortion of our self-image to have passed legislation dealing with discrimination in employment? Is it a distortion of our self-image to have passed legislation dealing with discrimination in housing; or to have eliminated our rather vicious anti-Asiatic provisions of the immigration laws? On the