

whole of my lifetime in western Canada. And I have in my blood and in my instincts a reverence for British institutions, for constitutional freedom and for that orderly liberty which has been the greatest contribution made by the British people to the progress of this world; and nowhere do I find in British history, of late years at least, any legislation of this character. They have found by long experience that when error is mooted abroad, that when ideas that are foolish and destructive are discussed in the open light of day they are then branded and understood as the foolish and unnecessary proceedings which they are. Because of this, I oppose section 98.

Looking back over the past years I remember the discussions in the house and the votes cast time after time. The motion to repeal section 98 was carried by this house more than once either with a large majority on division or without opposition, but I am told that since that time great changes have occurred, that communism has become a menace and that poisonous doctrines have been spread throughout the land. What does this prove? It proves the absolute inadequacy of section 98 to repress the spread of opinions of any kind. Be it remembered that this development which has been referred to, this spreading of poisonous doctrines has taken place while the provisions of section 98 have been in full effect. It is quite obvious that this section has proved ineffective in preventing the spread of these doctrines. It might be said and it has been said: What would have happened had we not had section 98? That is an assumption and in answering it I will follow the position taken by the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett). He has denied the application of a hypothetical argument, he has stated that the mere assumption of what would be if something else had happened is no argument at all. I decline to accept this as an argument and in that respect I place myself beside the Prime Minister.

This section is unnecessary. In every part of the British commonwealth except in our own there are criminal laws which do not include a section such as we find here. In Great Britain and other parts of the empire the ordinary criminal code has proved itself wholly adequate to deal with any real menace to the public peace. I am not prepared to enter into any legal arguments as I know that you can obtain varying and conflicting legal opinions upon every piece of legislation, I intend to apply my own common sense, my own feeling of what is right and what is logical in considering the arguments which have been advanced. I find that the ordinary

sections of the criminal code dealing with sedition and the breaking of the peace are such as would effectively meet and effectively punish any attack upon public order or any utterances of a seditious character. Because I believe that the greatest contributions made by the British race to the progress of humanity has been that concept of freedom, of constitutional progress and of orderly reform, I disbelieve in a section which, to my mind, contradicts those great principles.

What is the greatest strength and the greatest beauty of the British constitution? It lies in its elasticity, in the fact that under that constitution the greatest improvements and fundamental changes in our customs, in our political systems and in our economic systems can be carried out legally, peacefully and beneficially. They can be carried out only when everyone is able to advance those doctrines, those suggestions and those ideas which he or she thinks may be beneficial, leaving it to the common sense of the average man and woman to judge of their worth. I have sufficient confidence in the people of Canada to believe that given a clear picture and given a clear statement of the views and ideals of communism as opposed to orderly and constitutional progress, the ideals of communism will be buried so deep that they will never be resurrected. I believe that the people of Canada will follow that orderly and constitutional path to a better, a sounder and happier system than we have at this time.

Mr. F. R. MacMILLAN (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I intend to take up the time of the house only for a moment or two. I have listened very patiently to the arguments brought forward in favour of the bill introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth). I was mayor of the city of Saskatoon in 1919 during the great Winnipeg strike. I was surprised at some of the statements made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in an effort to disabuse the minds of the people of the belief that he is in favour of the use of force. I should like to read an extract from *The Canadian Annual Review of 1919*, at page 476, as follows:

—on July 11 J. S. Woodsworth was reported as saying (*Globe dispatch*) that F. J. Dixon should be at Ottawa "because the federal authorities control the military and the courts, and labour is not going to get what it wants until it in some way gets control of the military and the courts";

That is how the hon. member is quoted by *The Canadian Annual Review*. I well recall what took place in my own city during that trying time. If hon. members will cast their