

*Hate Propaganda*

Criminal Code against that person for what he said, or against anybody else who made similar extravagant statements. If we took action, I think we would turn these people into martyrs. They would feel this was just another attempt to muzzle their expression of thought. The problems about which he tried to speak in his frustration would remain unsolved. The consciences of a few who think that one cannot go around in public using indecent language and making statements of that sort might be relieved by the laying of a charge.

To me, it would be much better to have such a person making complaints on behalf of those who have grievances about houses, about jobs and about opportunities, rather than putting him away. This point of view makes sense, because we all know how intolerant Russia was under the Czars. It is still intolerant but I use that as a specific example of how the terrorist philosophy of Necheyev written on little bits and pieces of paper scraped from here and there, led to the philosophy adopted by Lenin, the philosophy of kill anybody who stands in the way. This philosophy found favour with certain middle class people who did carry it into effect and who did substitute Bolshevik terrorism for the other form which existed before, Czarist terrorism. We know what practical effect that had. That was the result of the imprisonment of people like Necheyev for long periods of time. This illustrates the dilemma you get yourself into if you try to deal with different philosophies by simply saying that those who express them are unworthy to be at large in society.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Even if those people, the Necheyevists and the Leninists, were the ones who philosophically backed the policies which brought about the revolution, or even if they took an active part in it, the fact is their actions prove that even the most well-meaning oppressions of thought simply will not work in society. So, as I say, sir, I hope the dialogue in Halifax continues until those grievances are overcome. The mood now seems right for it. I know there are many people who have held discussions as a result of the meetings I described earlier and as a result of the Alinsky encounter. I know they will not be satisfied so long as their consciences are in that state. I think they would take an entirely different attitude if there were not the right of free expression to get issues before the public.

[Mr. McCleave.]

That one instance alone is the reason I would vote and intend to vote against the bill. I do not think it will help the black minority in Nova Scotia to have this bill in force in Canada. I think these provisions could so easily be turned against them if there were anyone cruel enough or with a sharp sense of injustice who would use them. The provincial attorneys general across Canada are all fine, decent men and I suppose no one would quarrel with any decisions they would make under this bill. But that will not always be the situation. We could have attorneys general who would use measures that go against a particular religious sect. We know this has happened in Canada. There have been instances in the past, which I shall not relate, in which there have been repressive measures directed at certain groups within society and the sores from those are still visible. So, as I say, in my opinion this bill would not protect a minority group.

I regret I must disagree with my hon. friend from Hamilton West, who certainly delivered the most eloquent speech I heard in this debate. It came from his heart, from his soul and from his mind. It was a total expression of what the man believes. It was well delivered. He and I share the same objectives. Let there be no doubt about that. We want to see the problems of the black, Indian, Métis or any other disadvantaged people in Canada overcome. Yet, thankfully, in this place we have the right to disagree concerning the best method to bring this about. My friend says this can be done by passing the hate bill and I say the hate bill worries me very much. I say it would prevent the people from expressing themselves about their problems and would not give them a chance to reach out and touch the consciences of other people. Therefore, I say this is a bad measure.

In concluding, the example I gave earlier in respect of the Sermon on the Mount comes to mind. In that example, a man went about teaching that the meek were blessed because they would inherit the earth. One would have thought that message would have touched the consciences of all within the range of that voice, but it really did not. It touched the consciences of some and their numbers have multiplied so that today, most of us in this country are His followers, but not all. Be that as it may, the majority of the people in His own time heard these very mild words and one would not think that would have excited extraordinary passions in the breasts of the people. Yet, had this bill been in effect at the