

*Criminal Code*

The people of Canada feel this way. Members here represent the decent people of Canada. I can think of no better way of closing my remarks than to use the concluding remarks of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) when he said:

Of course we must differentiate between the spiritual and the temporal. Therefore, this bill should be separated and divided so that all changes can be fairly decided upon according to the consciences of members of parliament and the people of this nation.

**Mr. Walter C. Carier (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable reluctance that I rise to speak on this question. I am compelled to do so only because of the government's refusal to separate the controversial and conscience binding parts of the bill. There is no doubt that the refusal was deliberate and part of the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) plan to force members to vote for those aspects of this Bill which are a direct attack on the conscience of members.

In all fairness, sir, I must agree with my colleague and friend, the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Peddle) and other hon. members, that this is a disgrace to the Canadian public. It is an insult to the Canadian nation that a bill of this consequence, a bill that affects so much the consciences, the religious and maybe the non-religious beliefs of the Canadian people, should be presented as a package deal.

There are some of us in this house, and I would suggest many thousands of Canadians across this great country of ours, who are against homosexuality on principle, and who regard human life as sacred, even that of a child before it is born. I noted with regret that those who defended that point of view were described by some of the pundits and interpreters of events in this chamber as belonging to another age, as belonging to the era before the floods. There was a time when to argue in favour of these things was to be called a non-conformist. In this age of liberal enlightenment to argue against them is at the risk of being called a non-conformist.

While all of us have our religious or non-religious beliefs, I wish to deal with these particular parts of the bill not exclusively from the point of view of morals but from the aspect of their social consequences. I do this not through moral cowardice or lack of conviction, because I do not think that those who favour these devices will be impressed with the moral argument, but I hope they will at least consider the social consequences.

[Mr. Peddle.]

I start from the position that those things which are harmful to society must be regarded with suspicion and must be placed under certain restrictions. A government which relaxes the regulations and curbs on drugs, that makes divorce easier, that permits abortion and homosexuality, is in the process of remaking our society. The question which we must ask is, in whose image and likeness?

The government by this legislation permits homosexual acts in private between two consenting adults—no more than two. Apparently, for some reason, if there are more than two it becomes illegal. One wonders at the government's strange delicacy. In effect it is confirming by legislation the old saying, with which most of us agreed at some time or another, that three's a crowd. It is nice to know that the members of the government subscribe to that age old theory and that they know where to draw the line.

I think it must be agreed, Mr. Speaker, that homosexuality is basically a psychological aberration. Some persons feel that because a lot of people do something that makes it natural and acceptable. I might remind the house that a lot of people take drugs nowadays—I think the modern term is that they are taking pot—and so it is automatically all right according to that theory. Homosexuality is gaining adherents, and so it cannot be unnatural. That philosophy is of course the traditional symptom of decay. When numbers make something right then we are on the way to something, but it is not Christian democracy.

Let us examine the consequences of this thinking. If homosexuality were practised on a widespread scale society would break down. If it were universally practised, the human race in a matter of time would become extinct. Obviously, therefore, it cannot be said to be conducive to social progress. If one does not believe in social order and progress, then of course one would welcome the destruction or even the suicide of society. But, Mr. Speaker, my constituents in St. John's West did not send me to Ottawa to participate in the undermining of our social order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what of the homosexual? He commands our sympathy in the same way that any human with some aberration commands our sympathy. But one of the salient features about homosexuality and the real reason for its being anti-social is the compulsion to convert, to induce others into its practice. In those nations where homosexuality has raged unchecked conversion has been a