

**Mere repugnancy of the ideas expressed is insufficient to constitute the crime attracting penalty.**

Court referred to the Canadian Supreme Court decision in **Saskatchewan (Human Rights Commission) v. Whatcott., [2013] 1 SCR 467** In that judgment, the Canadian Supreme Court set out what it considered to be a workable approach in interpreting “hatred” as is used in legislative provisions prohibiting hate speech. The first test was for the Courts to apply the hate speech prohibition objectively and in so doing, ask whether a reasonable person, aware of the context and circumstances, would view the expression as exposing the protected group to hatred. The second test was to restrict interpretation of the legislative term “hatred” to those extreme manifestations of the emotion described by the words “detestation” and “vilification”. This would filter out and protect speech which might be repugnant and offensive, but does not incite the level of abhorrence, delegitimization and rejection that risks causing discrimination or injury. The third test was for Courts to focus their analysis on the effect of the expression at issue, namely, whether it is likely to expose the targeted person or group to hatred by others. Mere repugnancy of the ideas expressed is insufficient to constitute the crime attracting penalty.

[2014 S.C.J. 004: \(2](#)