

Hate Propaganda

Examples from Shakespeare are well known. The period during which he wrote these words was the period of the development of English Nationhood, so that is the sort of thing which is likely to lead to at least contempt or ridicule of a minority, if not actual hatred. Even the dictionary would not be free from condemnation under this bill, at least certainly not Dr. Samuel Johnson's dictionary because he defines oats as something eaten by English horses and Scottish people. If that does not hold out to ridicule an identifiable group distinguished by race or by ethnic origin, I do not know what would. Dickens' *Oliver Twist* is an obvious example and even the famous six books in the *Barset* series, by the gentle Anthony Trollope, perhaps the most enjoyable single group of books I have in my library dealing with a life that was somewhat leisurely paced in Victorian England, come under the gun as a result of his reference to certain money lenders.

Mr. MacLean: Would the hon. member permit a question? Is he aware that England is world famous for its horses and Scotland for its people?

Mr. McCleave: Yes, I would say England was well known for its horses, just as a former deputy minister was famous for his horses on the payroll.

An hon. Member: The hon. member is just feeling his oats.

Mr. McCleave: Someone else prompted this remark but it is too good to allow to go unrecorded, in case it was missed by *Hansard*. The hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean) is feeling his oats. To top it off, my forebears escaped from Scotland at one time and that is why I am in Canada.

Rudyard Kipling took on large masses of people in some of his works during what one would call, the golden age of British imperialism. I hope I am not held up as an example of one breaking the provisions of this bill because I seem to be getting after the British. I was afraid, after my experience with Robin Hood, to pick up other books of fairy tales or Mother Goose stories because heaven only knows what sort of incitement to hatred I would find in them. Seriously, at the time these creations came forth they were written in such a way as to escape trial and attack for some of the feelings they expressed. None the less, they were there for a purpose in their time, and that was to strike out at cer-

tain people or certain groups. I suppose when this bill passes any martial song that makes up part of our singing traditions will have to disappear. I do not know what would have happened to all the Lutheran polemics that sprang up in the years immediately following the first steps taken by Martin Luther. I think they all would have been outlawed, or at least subject to seizure and the authors subject to court action. We would have had no reformation and no counter-reformation if this particular bill had been in existence at that time.

A question has been asked in respect of Adolph Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. I would think this particular work could have been dealt with under clause 1 of the bill. I have no particular quarrel with that because that is the direct advocacy or promotion of genocide. If the provisions of the bill were separated, I could quite easily vote for clause 1. It is the other two offences created by the bill which bother me enormously.

A few days ago when I took part in the debate I mentioned some of the soul searching going on in my own particular area with regard to the problems of certain of its residents. I neglected to mention one outstanding incident, namely the visit to Halifax of Sol Alinsky, who is perhaps the chief apostle of social activism we see operating out in the open on the North American continent. This visit gave citizens with grievances a great opportunity to present their views at a very well attended public meeting.

One of the people who expressed his views was a young black gentleman who felt that any attempts at reform that had been made within the Halifax area were not satisfactory. His cure was to pick up a gun and kill all the whites. His answer was just as simple as that, though I have expressed his viewpoint in reasonably modest language whereas he used some obscenities when he expressed it. Be that as it may, it was a cry from the heart of a person who felt very frustrated and ill used, and had all sorts of problems which came to the fore at this Alinsky meeting. In effect this meant, what is the use? Nothing can ever be done, so let us shoot the whites. I suppose he would be guilty under clauses 2 and 3. It seems to me his remarks could be taken as inciting hatred against an identifiable group in a manner likely to lead to a breach of the peace, so it would seem to me, at least on the surface, he would come within the four corners of that particular paragraph.

Yet, I think the most undesirable thing in the world would be to take action under the