

*Hate Propaganda*

Bryce has stated, that no democracy can function without parties and that parties are older than democracy and essential to it. But there are many matters such as this upon which, I submit, it would be difficult for one to derive a party position.

This issue is not only one of conscience it is, in many important respects, a question of philosophy. Perhaps at times it comes close almost to a theological point of view that hon. members must debate. I think that we do not in this House add lustre to the institution of Parliament or its reputation when we take a party line on every item that comes before us. As one philosopher once said, if there is any large group of people all thinking the same thing, you can be sure that in that large group of people there is more than one who is not thinking at all.

There was obviously much uncertainty in the minds of hon. members. This was clear from the debate, and I envy those who can be so sure of the rightness of their stand or the precision of their voting pattern. I am not in that position. I think I have never been all that sure as to which is the better course of action. I can only, sir, after a long process of reading, study and introspection, come to some point of view, choose my course and vote in the way which I think will contribute to the betterment of our society rather than the reverse. In other words, my resolution does not come with any startling clarity from an ideological point of view, but rather from a process of weighing advantages and disadvantages.

I suppose, in a sense, I have been comparing some aspects of the measure which appeal to me, against some which I find repugnant. I am not ashamed of that, because I regard as one of the great pronouncements on the political process this famous statement Burke made:

All government—indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act—is founded on compromise and barter.

That was said in days, some generations ago, before the word "compromise" had become downgraded in meaning.

● (4:10 p.m.)

Many people are deeply concerned, and there has been much careful study of the bill by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), whose brilliant legal mind and careful research has done much to bring about a greater understanding of the measure and, indeed, a greater knowledge of its various

aspects. There are of course, disconcerting features in the bill. It is filled with aspects which cause concern to thoughtful people. These have been detailed vigorously and brilliantly by many men in this House learned in the law and in parliamentary procedure. Of all the things about it, what distresses me most is the matter referred to by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) the other day in connection with section 267(c). I find this totally repugnant and though I cannot forecast what other people may do, I hope that somehow this particular feature can be cast into the limbo to which it belongs.

There have been interesting evocations of history in the course of this debate. One or two members said the bill would have caught Christ. Others said it would not be strong enough to catch Hitler. So there is a wide difference of interpretation here in the House, even before the legislation gets to the courts. I do not know whether it was hatred of Christ or the love of Christ which brought him to his destiny but I am sure there have been times in the 2,000 years since when Christian communities in various parts of the world might have found themselves aided rather than harassed by a measure of this kind. The bill makes it hard, often, to distinguish things, because it is not, in my opinion, a well-written bill, but, surely, we must all distinguish between dissent and the wilful promotion of hatred against an identifiable group. There is an immense difference here. We can go back through history for fascinating examples, but even if this bill is bad it is not likely to cause our governors—and I use the word in its broad sense to mean those who are governing us—to take leave of their senses. Surely, a measure of common sense will survive the passage of this bill; a society without some measure of this quality would not be able to survive in any case.

Another objection stems from the fear in some minds that an orator who stirs a multitude to riot would find this legislation aimed at him while, presumably, the rioters would go free. However, it seems to me that the state is not bereft of power and authority to deal with those who destroy life and property. Nor can we postulate that the passage of this measure would inhibit the state if it came to dealing with riotous and destructive behaviour; it could deal with such offences just as it does, now.

No one has a monopoly of concern for free speech and civil liberties. We all care. But we