

p. 170, Case: *R. v. Harding*

1. On what grounds was this defence rejected by the Court?

The Court found that although Mr. Harding maintained that he did not intend to promote hatred against Muslims, he was at best wilfully blind by not foreseeing the probable effect of his actions and therefore did not act "in good faith" as required by s. 319 (3)(b).

2. Why do you think Mr. Harding relied on s. 319 (3)(b) rather than on the other three parts of s. 319 (3) in his defence?

Mr. Harding would have been unable to substantiate a defence under any of the other three parts of s. 319 (3), i.e., he could not establish that the statements were true.

Visit the [Law in Action](#) Web site to see all additional cases.