

Hate Propaganda

of Rights which touches on the inalienable civil rights of individuals. What are some of those rights? One is the right of an individual to life. Does that not deal with genocide? Others are the right to liberty, security of person, the enjoyment of property, the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law, the right of an individual to equality before the law and to the protection of the law; the right to freedom of religion, and so on. Those rights were enumerated in that great speech made on July 1, 1960. The right hon. member for Prince Albert said that Canada was the first Commonwealth country to grant freedom of worship in law.

We have not experienced the troubles they have experienced in Britain and other places in the Commonwealth. We were the first to legislate freedom of religion. We have also freedom of assembly and association, and freedom of the press, which can be interpreted to mean freedom of communication of all kinds, be it through radio, television or any means that may arise in future. So, before saying what the Supreme Court of Canada said, I just wish to show hon. members that the Criminal Code and the Bill of Rights today protect Canadians against any difficulties which might arise as described in this piece of window dressing.

The hon. member for New Westminster and his father are both great lawyers of tremendously high calibre. Both have served as Crown prosecutors in our country and served our nation well in this regard. This afternoon the hon. member touched the pulse of this debate when he said that this measure is a political move. The bill is introduced to win votes. The Bill of Rights and the Criminal Code protect us adequately. May I deal with this at some length, Mr. Speaker, as this will save my having to speak on third reading.

The Criminal Code and the Bill of Rights, as interpreted by our courts, give us all the protection we need. Do you think for one moment that if this bill were not introduced, if this piece of window dressing were not brought in, any Canadian tonight would be in fear of genocide? I shall deal with the question of ridicule in a few moments. If we were not permitted some ridicule and were not permitted to create some disturbances, this would be a sorry country indeed. Democracy would be pretty dead. Little reflection is needed to understand how widely varied may be the kinds of communicated statements which do in fact incite hatred or contempt.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

• (4:50 p.m.)

We have only to look at the famous Russell case and the book which the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) wrote about her father, Mr. Woodsworth. Every Member of Parliament and every Canadian should read that book. When the soldiers returned from the war to end all wars, World War I, unemployment was rampant in this country. There were poverty, ghettos and unemployment, maybe even worse than we have today. Men like Mr. Woodsworth and other great labour leaders brought men together. What happened to them? They were charged under the Criminal Code. If we compare the Code of those days with the Code of today, we see that they could not have been convicted since they wanted to ridicule and treat with contempt the society in which they were living because they could not get jobs and dared to unite in unions. Whether we agree with the philosophy of Mr. Woodsworth or not, he was a great Canadian who should be remembered.

The daughter of Mr. Woodsworth has written a book on the great drama of the life of her father. This book shows there is a time when we must incite and when there must be protests beyond the stagnation of the legislature and even Parliament. Possibly the fellow who heckled me this afternoon was right. I must apologize. I thought it came from the rump of the chamber. When I said there was nothing wrong with Parliament, he had a right to say what he did. He may have been ridiculing the institution, but when this or any other parliamentary institution does not function and serve society, one of two things will happen. Either we slide into a dictatorship or else the protests take place outside the chamber.

Thank God there have been men who have incited, showed contempt and ridiculed. Whether it is through a union or otherwise, the average Canadian can negotiate proper hours and wages and in this way we got the children out of the mines and factories. That is why I oppose certain sections of the bill, and moved my amendment. I do not want to put a lid on free speech.

I am going to refer to what Professor Mewett and Professor Scott had to say. I do not know what Professor Mewett's politics are, but I have a pretty good idea of Professor Scott's.

An hon. Member: He is intelligent.