

*Hate Propaganda*

the people in the 1970s. I do not want to be too critical of the hon. member for Calgary North, but I heard him speak on the side of what may be called the establishment, and knowing the views he seemed to be espousing tonight I find it difficult to understand his position.

I can understand those who are concerned about this bill and feel it may infringe upon the rights of people to express their views. People such as Professor Arthur and Professor Scott have a deep commitment to civil liberties: they have worked to defend the right of all those who want to express themselves, not just those who want to say things with which most of the people of Canada agree. I have respect for Professor Scott and the kind of things he has done over the years. I think that people who express views with which most of us do not agree have a right to their opinions.

I think those who have been labelled hippies have a right to their opinions and their way of life. In my own and in other cities I have found the police have taken the position that these people are not very welcome and are not very useful. They have adopted methods with which I do not agree. I do not agree with the methods used by all those who are critical of the involvement of the United States in the war in Viet Nam, but I join with those who insist that those people have a right to express their view here in Canada. If I lived in the United States I would say they have a right to express their point of view there.

I disagree with many of those who are associated with what is commonly called the New Left, the Maoists, the Trotskyists, and so on. All my life I have opposed that point of view. But I defend their right to say what they think and put forward their point of view even though others may strongly disagree with them. So I understand the position of most of the people who are opposed to this bill, because I am a civil libertarian. I think I have demonstrated both in the House and outside my concern about what I consider to be these zealous activities on the part of the police, the Crown prosecutors or indeed the courts. I shall continue to do so, and I want others to have the right to continue to do these things even if the majority of the people do not agree with them.

I do not believe, however, that freedom of speech means licence. I do not believe this bill will prevent the expression of controversial or what some people, and even I, might con-

sider to be offensive modes of speaking or writing. We already have slander and libel laws under which a person who is falsely accused, defamed or injured, either in speech or in writing, can go to the courts and can claim damages and ask for an injunction prohibiting the type of malicious, false accusation which has been made against him.

Although I do not place myself in the same position as many hon. members who are trained in the legal profession, I do understand that this bill proposes to do for groups what has already been done and what has worked so well over many years for individuals. It proposes, as I understand it, to protect groups from the type of dishonest, malicious and harmful criticism which is now prohibited by law against an individual. I think that is not only fair but is necessary.

Of course, we are proposing a limitation on complete freedom of expression. But can we really argue that there ought not to be any limitations, in light of the history of the past half-century? We are not living in the golden age of liberalism when in some countries like Great Britain people could say almost anything they wanted without hurting anybody.

• (8:50 p.m.)

After all, need I remind members of this House of Commons what has happened in the world? Need I remind Members of Parliament that in the United States of America there are people who so hate and despise American citizens whose colour is not white that they write and speak about Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans in the kind of language which has led to murder, to rape, to lynchings and to burning of whole communities?

This is a fact of history which I think most Canadians know. Need I remind Members of Parliament of what happened in Europe during World War II when Hitler decided that certain people who were not members of the master race should be, and they were, exterminated? At that time millions of people, Jews, Poles, Ukrainians, were murdered in gas ovens, were shot and were burnt simply because of their racial origin. These are facts of life. That hatred lingers on.

Who would have believed that in a communist country—I have spoken about my dislike of and opposition to communism many times both inside and outside this chamber—racism would exist? Not many of us, as anti-communist as we were, really believed that the communists with all their faults could be guilty of

[Mr. Orlikow.]