

objection, because I am finished with my comments.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** You cannot say that I did not let you go on.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** The honourable senator has been out of order for 40 minutes.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** All right, I have done the best I could. I have espoused this measure for years, and I leave it in your hands.

Report adopted.

### THIRD READING

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** I move, with leave of the Senate, that this bill be read the third time now.

**Hon. George S. White:** Honourable senators, I fully realize that a speech on third reading is almost hopeless, particularly with Bill S-21, known as the hate bill. In my opinion, this is a most vicious and objectionable bill that is an insult to every Canadian citizen, a bill that is totally unnecessary. This bill, if passed, will damage the prestige of this chamber and will damage the Canadian image around the world. However hopeless it may be, I intend to make one last protest against the provisions of the bill relating to genocide.

There have been several hate bills before this chamber. I have read all the briefs presented to the committee and all the evidence. Despite what the honourable senator has just said, I for one cannot find in that evidence one single instance where any brief or any witness showed the need or any good reason or argument for a bill such as this in Canada as far as genocide is concerned. On the other hand, many briefs and much evidence showed that the bill was not only vicious but dangerous, and practically impossible of interpretation or enforcement.

The press from coast to coast have carried many editorials condemning this bill. Only last Friday the *Toronto Globe and Mail* had a leading article headed "A steady erosion of rights". I should like to read certain passages from that editorial. It starts:

"There is a point," mused Sophocles, 'beyond which even justice becomes unjust.' The week's transactions in Ottawa remind us that excessive justice threatens Canadian freedoms as much as it did those of ancient Greece.

The menace looms in both parliamentary bastions of our democracy, the House of Commons and the Senate. Its shape emerges from two debates on three areas of law where we seek to broaden and entrench our liberties: bills on official languages and hate literature and a Commons committee study of wiretapping.

Further on it states:

Which Canadians of conscience want to watch any individual or group this country held up, by sheer perverted principle, to ridicule, contempt or hate? . . . We will not heed the heralds of bigotry.

The editorial continues further on:

Of the right, in simple truth, not to be considered guilty by the fact of accusation itself?

These rights, especially the presumption of innocence until judicial proof has been established to the contrary, are not some flimsy fads from an overtaken tradition. They are the heart and guts and life of all our freedoms.

Towards the end, the editorial states:

And, in the Senate, an act was passed that would put the onus on an accused to clear himself of charges of an ill-defined offense involving hate.

As I said before, we do not need this type of legislation in Canada. If the Senate of Canada now passes this bill today will be known as a black Tuesday for the Senate of Canada, for in this chamber we have honourable senators of great wisdom, from every profession, from the world of finance, the world of business, the press and many other fields. Surely the majority of honourable senators, with their great experience of this Canada of ours, will not decide that this vicious and infamous bill is necessary in Canada in the year 1969.

I repeat, this bill is an insult to every individual Canadian. Are the citizens of Canada being put on a par with the Germany of Hitler and his gang of storm troopers and SS guards, and on a par with the people of certain other countries from which there are reports from time to time of acts of genocide? What type of breed are we Canadians in 1969 that we need such a bill? I think it was Shakespeare who used the phrase, "the happy breed", which definition may well be applied to we Canadians.

I think every honorable senator will agree when I say that we have found Canadians as