

Criminal Code

● (3:30 p.m.)

[Translation]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the amendment concerning lotteries, I said earlier that we supported it in part.

Mr. Speaker, if our economy was adequately controlled and properly balanced, there would be no need for these national "barbottes" to support municipalities, school boards or various religious or other organizations.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we will vote for this bill. We will vote for the legislation dealing with lotteries. Ours will be a reluctant vote because we know that it involves a national "barbotte".

We know that we could act otherwise. If we had a just society, there would be no need to adopt unjust regulations and legislation. Establishing lotteries is an injustice in a country such as Canada which has an abundance of resources and could be self-supporting. Our country is capable of guaranteeing three meals a day and a suitable income to everybody, since we do not know what to do with our products because we do not have enough consumers. We want to increase the number of consumers. Because of applied science and the work of past generations, we could do without such things. As we are living under the present system, we will probably vote in favour of lotteries.

As for the other clauses of the bill, such as the one on abortion, I have had my say on the subject.

On the subject of homosexuality, this bill deals with a most evil and indecent matter and it should be of no concern to the government.

Mr. Speaker, the state should endeavour to introduce sound regulations which are morally acceptable so that there will be an end to these indecent matters and that our nation might develop itself and rise above animality.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other things I would like to say. I will conclude by asking once again that each member vote according to his conscience as this vote is exceptionally important because it involves the essence of life itself. Abortion is one subject that strikes at the very essence of the individual, of humanity and of society as a whole. If this does not exist, there will not be any society because, I repeat it, I know of no one in this world who does not owe his life to his mother.

29180-3463

[English]

Mr. McIlraith: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if argument is to be heard on whether or not the amendment is in order I should like an opportunity to make a submission along the lines that it is a type of amendment which is not properly admissible at this stage, though it could be moved at another stage of our proceedings.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak only briefly on this bill, realizing that what we are doing at this stage is to give general consent to the proposition that this legislation be referred to a committee for investigation, study and possible amendment before further debate and third reading.

I enter this discussion with a certain amount of trepidation because it is not usual in these days for a theologian to become directly involved in questions which concern amendments to the Criminal Code. But perhaps I should not classify myself as a theologian at this late juncture. Since, however, there seems to be some basic confusion with regard to the bill before us—whether we are dealing here with what is fundamentally a theological question or with what is really a legal or political question—it is perhaps appropriate that a person who passes from time to time as a theologian should become involved.

An attempt to clarify this point was made by the N.D.P. house leader when he suggested in the course of his remarks that much of our criminal law was developed in a day and age when the influence of the church on attitudes in our society and its popularly held folkways and mores was very greatly felt. However, we have since moved into a pluralistic society in which no one denomination or religion can be said to answer for all the popularly accepted opinions of society. What we shall be called upon to do increasingly as we deal with reform of the Criminal Code is to make a clear distinction between what we mean by criminal acts and what we mean by immoral behaviour or sin, as it was more often referred to in a previous age. If you like, it is the distinction between sin and crime. This will impel many of us to consider what we mean by sin. It will also involve, particularly for those who are called upon to pass laws, whether in this parliament or another, the question of what we really mean by crime. I say in all humility that various religious