

*Hate Propaganda*

great deal of his time pointing out flaws and weaknesses of the bill and then concluded that, in spite of all this, he was compelled to support the bill to demonstrate his concern for minorities.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while that argument is attractive, probably because all of us are members of some sort of minority group or other, it does nothing to advance the cause of minorities in this country. To my mind, that argument is a classic example of fuzzy-minded, small "I" liberal, bleeding heart, do-gooder thinking. This is the type of thinking that has, in my opinion, resulted in the very policies which have produced today's permissive society that appears to be getting ready for an authoritarian takeover.

I understand the views of those who have suffered as a result of prejudicial talk and statements designed to bring a certain group into contempt. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) made reference to certain actions taken in this country during the second world war. When that war broke out I was six years old. My family lived in a small community and we were the only family with a distinctively German name. Unlike other members of this House I was not taught, nor did I believe, that the second world war was imperialistic or otherwise bad.

While I was too young to understand the reasons that lay behind that outbreak of hostilities, I did believe then and believe now it was necessary in all the circumstances that prevailed. However, irrespective of my beliefs at the time I was still subject to ridicule and abuse as a result of my name. So, I believe I have some understanding of the objects of this bill. Notwithstanding its objects, Mr. Speaker, I can only describe this as a bad bill. While the basic argument used to advance it is the one I have already referred to, I am not prepared to impute the same lofty, if misguided, motives to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who must take the ultimate responsibility for it being before us today.

In my view this bill is just one of several devices being used by the Prime Minister to bring the people of this country to heel. What other reason is there for it? We all know the apparent reason for the bill arose out of a vile and filthy outbreak of antisemitism in the city of Toronto six or seven years ago. But, Mr. Speaker, this isolated outbreak has receded into insignificance and is virtually non-existent today. In other words, there is no clear and present danger in the country to

justify this legislation. If there is, where is the evidence? Does the government have evidence that it has not laid before this House? Does the government have some evidence that disaster is about to befall some racial or religious group in Canada? If the government has such evidence it should have been presented to this House and to the country, Mr. Speaker. If there is a real and present danger to a particular group of people in this country we have a right to know all of the facts so that we can deal with them now.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is not, in fact, a real and present danger to any individual or group in this country because of racial or religious or ethnic affiliation or origin. I will grant that there is a danger to not only some Canadians but to all Canadians. That danger stems from the group across the floor of this House wielding the power of an absolute majority. I suggest that the present government, unable to find answers to real problems, is erecting safeguards against imagined and improbable events of the future. I urge the government to deal with present problems first, and leave imaginary problems for the future, preferably the distant future.

The present government is saying to the Canadian people that they cannot be trusted to develop and mature within the framework of the society that they have preserved and nurtured over the past century. This is an arrogant and authoritarian attitude. The present government did not invent or devise our present form of parliamentary government. The present government does not have a mandate to invent or devise a new form of government and impose it on the people. They have a mandate to preserve the form of government that was handed to them by the people in a free vote. We are considering Bill C-3, Mr. Speaker, because the present government is determined to control and regulate the quantity and quality of dissent in this country. There can be no other reason for such a measure. The present government has demonstrated over and over again that if the people of this country do not like the quality of government they are getting, they will just have to learn to like it.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I would venture to say that every ethnic group in the country has been and is represented in the House, and that has been the case throughout most of the years this Parliament has existed. I do not need Bill C-3 to protect me from any member of this House,