

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

violence, disruption and intolerance in the country.

It is one thing to say that Canada Council awards should be given without regard to the political views of the recipient. That is a principle which I, along with most hon. members, support to the hilt. We do not punish a man for what he thinks. Freedom of speech prevails in this country. I have sat as a student in many classes in institutions of higher learning and observed the utmost freedom exercised in this regard. This is one of the functions of institutions of higher learning. It is my suggestion that it is not what Mr. Gray thinks that is offensive, but rather that what he does is offensive. This is offensive not only to the maintenance of order, which he seeks consistently to disrupt, but it is offensive also to the principle of fair, free and rational discussion.

By his own actions, Stanley Gray is branded as a man intolerant of the opinions of others and the processes of rational discussion and inquiry. By his own actions, he is identified as a man prepared to use his own so-called rights to limit and abuse the legitimate and accepted rights of others. That is why he is in trouble at McGill. If I had time I could quote the head of McGill University, Dr. Locke Robertson. These matters have been completely aired in the press and I am sure hon. members are familiar with them. So far as I know, no one disputes Mr. Gray's I.Q. or intellectual capacity. But there are serious questions about his willingness to respect the views of others and his determination to disrupt the tolerant and orderly atmosphere necessary to a good university. These questions are serious enough to the authorities of McGill that they would deny tenure to this intelligent man. They are apparently not serious enough to persuade the Canada Council to invest its limited funds elsewhere, where there is greater priority from the standpoint of the development of Canadian nationhood.

● (10:00 p.m.)

Let me repeat, so there is no misunderstanding; the qualifications of Stanley Gray are not at issue. There have been Marxists even in this chamber. We recall that in one instance a member of parliament was dismissed from this chamber, not because of his Marxist views but because of his treason toward Canada. Stanley Gray's actions are at issue, and surely this parliament has the right to protest the granting of scarce public funds to subsidize the disruption of public order. As

we discovered from our deliberations in the Standing Committee on Films, Broadcasting and the Arts, this action has brought about a crisis in the promotion of artistic development in this country.

The second important aspect of the matter concerns the respect Canadians will have for parliament and for the Canada Council if this award should pass unchallenged. It is a sad state of affairs when we have agencies set up by parliament and by the government which protest because we have the audacity to challenge their actions. This is a trend toward bureaucratic madness that must be stopped if we are to maintain the democratic process in this country.

Canadians are seriously disturbed by the disruptive actions and revolutionary ambitions of persons like Stanley Gray. I have a personal interest in this matter because, over the week end, I was called to an emergency meeting of what used to be a quiet campus, the University of Brandon. The president of that university a very distinguished Canadian citizen well known in this city, Dr. John Robins, tendered his resignation because of the sort of thing being promoted by Stanley Gray. The story is on the front page of the *Journal*. I was delighted to see that Dr. Robins, who is an academician beyond challenge, a supporter of the arts, humanities and social sciences in this country from a long time back, was saying that he could no longer endure this sort of authoritarianism on the campus because it repels him. This is not an ordinary citizen; he is a man distinguished in the arts, humanities and social sciences.

A man like Gray can win attention for his views by disrupting the orderly and regular processes of the country. Does the view of the ordinary Canadian not also deserve attention? To suggest that parliament should remain silent on this question is to suggest that the long-suffering, ordinary Canadian should not even be allowed to use the high court of parliament to register his protest. Members of parliament have a right and a duty to protest when such a man receives a subsidy from our government.

The reputation of the Canadian Council is also at stake. I think this is also one of the reasons why the matter should be dealt with. I see, Mr. Speaker, that you are rising to tell me my time has expired. I want to make just one final statement. It also seems that in protecting this man we are suggesting the award was made to him because of his revolutionary