

*Criminal Code*

equitable, unjust and retrogressive. It exploits the desire to make easy money on the part of those people who can least afford to pay. Every state which has attempted state lotteries has been forced to abandon them because of their poor results. Yet because of some popular pressure, perhaps popular ignorance, we are urged to expand the scope of lotteries.

I have no doubt that in my own constituency the majority of my constituents would say they are in favour of expanding lotteries. I do not like to take a stand perhaps different from that of many of my constituents, but in this field my conscience requires me to say that most of them have not studied the facts. Had they done so I am sure they would agree with most of us who urge that we take this provision out of the bill. We need a more equitable and just tax system. When we need a juster tax system, why should we be denied a method of approach which is intelligent and just rather than an approach which is inequitable, inexpensive and pushes costs upwards? Lotteries are, in effect, taxes which are unjust, unreasonable and unfair, and I certainly hope to get the opportunity to vote against this part of the legislation. I will vote against what I think might turn out to be a social nuisance.

Let me say a word about the moot question of abortion. We all recognize that this is a delicate subject which involves peoples' deepest religious feelings. We are discussing the sanctity of human life. All I can say is that while I respect the views of others it is my view that it would be more convenient and more humane to take abortion out of the field of criminal law. I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway that we should remove it from the sphere of criminal law altogether. If we are to have a law in respect of abortion I think the proposal in the bill is reasonable because it specifically refers to life and health, and these are intimately interconnected. I do not understand how abortion can be said to be disregard of life when we permit an operation which may save the life and basic health of one fully developed personality at the expense of a personality that has not developed.

I cannot go into all the fine refinements of theology in respect of this matter, but I know different churches take different views. The church to which I happen to belong has recognized, I think rightly, that the views it used to hold are no longer applicable in this modern age of scientific development. I go along with that view, not entirely because that is my church but because I think it is

sound sense and a matter of respect of humanity.

Let me say a word about the law in respect of homosexuality. I hope the committee will study this whole question to ascertain whether the legislation we are proposing in this field is adequate. I want to say that the basic principle in respect of this matter should be that private aberrations or illnesses should not become public crimes. If they are made into public crimes they open the door to blackmail without providing a cure of the disease. They add to the human misery which can flow from this affliction.

It is my suggestion that we look into this matter to see what other jurisdictions have done about it. Perhaps something more could be done than will be done by the provisions in this bill, although in my opinion they are steps in the right direction.

I was particularly pleased to read the proposals in the bill for the expansion of the National Parole Board. I do not want to deal with this at length because it can be dealt with in detail at a later stage. I do want to emphasize that this system has worked and worked well. It has rehabilitated many people. But those responsible in this bill have worked with inadequate facilities and without a sufficient number of trained people to carry out the functions of supervisory parole. No arguments of economy should stop us from expanding this service which has been shown to be beneficial and, incidentally, a matter of sound economy as well. We create a sort of false economy when we cut down services of that sort. We condemn people to jail for long terms at great loss to their lives and great expense to the public. If we are to extend this system of parole we must also increase the funds available to those who are doing the actual job of supervising in the field.

In the course of this debate hon. members have made reference to the inadequacies of this so-called omnibus bill and its omissions. I suppose each one of us has a list of different omissions, but in my mind the notable omission is in respect of bail. A number of studies have been made in this regard. Learned experts have referred to the wastefulness, injustices and inequities of our bail system. Why cannot our Department of Justice prepare a revision of the bail provisions of the code?

I should like to see a new definition of insanity as a defence to a criminal charge spelled out. We now have a definition that every learned psychiatrist and medical man in the world has condemned as being inadequate. Distinguished lawyers, including my