

*Guaranteed Annual Income*

**Mr. Woolliams:** I agree that he is highly intelligent. Little reflection is needed to understand how widely varied may be the kinds of communicated statements which do in fact incite hatred or contempt. The paradox is that not only is it bad speeches, speeches intentionally so designed to incite hatred or contempt. The most necessary word that has to be said in society at the most critical time may incite the most fanatical hatred. The speeches of John F. Kennedy and Robert F. Kennedy incited hatred. And these men were both shot. The speeches of Martin Luther King indisputably incited hatred and contempt of himself and others, among those who feared, in their own contemptible phrases which I do not want to repeat.

The late President of the United States, John F. Kennedy and the late Attorney General of the United States, Robert Kennedy, made certain statements. A few moments before he was assassinated Robert Kennedy said in a speech that if he were the President of the United States, help would go to Israel. That incited contempt and ridicule in an Arab who had some problems, a hang-up as the young people say, from the environment from which he came. Because of that, Robert Kennedy lost his life.

I want to emphasize that great leaders of the world who brought about reforms and progress had to incite somebody. They had to knock over the establishment. I will come to what Professor Mewett had to say. In my opinion, this bill will not help minorities. If implemented and ever used, which I question, it would work against minorities, not for them.

Section 267B adds the qualification "where such incitement is likely to lead to a breach of the peace". Consider what this might mean in practice. If someone is advancing an unpopular cause, which some other person thinks will expose him to hatred or contempt, then if the over-agitated person gathers together a gang of his buddies and threatens to beat the speaker to a pulp, the law will move in to arrest, not the mob which is threatening the peace, but the prospective victim.

This tactic, cleverly exploited, could obliquely recruit the courts of the land as reserve allies of a fanatical group. Freedom of speech is, of course, not without limit. But it is meaningless if it is freedom for unpopular or even contemptible opinion. To admit that certain groups in society are "bad guys" and that they may therefore be silenced by

assault or by threat, is to open the way for other groups to nominate other "bad guys" who may be silenced by assault or by threats, which as I said in committee, is exactly what the Nazis did.

Thirty years ago in Quebec, a certain premier passed the notorious padlock law. In Quebec at the time no questioner could get any rational consideration of the true nature of the bill for fear of seeming to be soft on communism. The sections of this bill on hate propaganda, though not a padlock law, seems to me to be dangerously vague and susceptible to abuse. We are not faced with a clear and present danger that warrants such sections on hatred and contempt.

I say we are protected under the Code and by the Bill of Rights. What crisis exists in Canada today that makes it necessary to control freedom of speech within the limits of reasonable men? Reasonable men are tempered by the society and the culture of Canada. I trust Canadians; they are reasonable.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE  
DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—Post Office—Montreal postal dispute; the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—consumer affairs—action respecting non-returnable bottles; the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Criminal Code—proclamation of remainder of amendments respecting breathalyzer.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, notices of motions.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES OF MOTIONS

### SOCIAL SECURITY

SUGGESTION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF  
GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the advisability