

● (12:10 p.m.)

I do not intend to speak at length today, but as a brother member of the bar of Ontario and as a member of Grays Inn, of which I am honoured to be an honorary bencher, I can only say that it is with deep concern that I view a young member of this house with a distinguished past and, I hope, a distinguished future advancing the arguments he adduced yesterday. It must have been difficult, but after all in the shadows stands the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) keeping watch upon his flock. He insisted on this. We endeavoured to make it possible for a reasonable vote to be taken in the house, making allowances for the differences we naturally have on a matter that has caused concern to theologians and philosophers throughout the years right from the time of Machiavelli who, incidentally, the Prime Minister said some months ago was his favourite politician.

It is of interest that we now see something of what is happening under the new committee system which was going to be the rebirth of parliament. Those of us who have been here for many long years will always recognize that changes must be made. The new committee system received its baptism in the presentation of this bill to a committee of the house. Some amendments were permitted. But when it came to homosexuality and abortion the government's answer, in effect, was: "So far, no farther; don't touch".

Why this solicitude for these matters to be legalized? The minister says that they are not legalized but that from now on they will not be subject to penalty, even though they may still be immoral—if I understood the argument he advanced yesterday. We now know why it was that the government refused to divide the bill. The steamroller was at work. The government said: "We care not what amendments you may make in regard to the other sections but when it comes to homosexuality and abortion the government stands firm."

I wonder what was the argument behind it. I have not yet been able to find out. Canadians have asked for action on other matters that effect the lives of individuals across the nation, but these matters are still in the hands of task forces or snoop groups. We have never had a government in the history of Canada that has sat on so many things, and I say that in the fullest sense of the word. Ministers divide on everything else but not on homosexuality and abortion. Is this not interesting?

Criminal Code

On NATO they travel about the country adopting various attitudes. The latest example is a press release by the Department of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), and I had hoped that he would be here today. Recently he was out west, and I hope he comes back, but one more trip out west and there will be no Liberals elected next time. The Secretary of State came out with a classic. I should like to refer to a press release issued by the National Museums of Canada on the subject of aboriginal art. They did not know anything about aboriginal art until they got into the question of abortion—a classic analogy. The press release states that there is going to be a magnificent exhibition of Canadian aboriginal art at the Musée de l'Homme in Paris on March 25, and here is the last paragraph:

—Canada will be represented by an official party headed by Secretary of State Gérard Pelletier who will open the exhibition. The party will include both Canadian and French cabinet ministers.

What nonsense is this! Is this the new birth of biculturalism in Canada? There is no mistaking what it means. It says that Canada will be represented by an official party, and the party will consist of those I have stated. These ministers can disagree about anything else. They can bring forth the most unusual ebullitions, but their attitude is, "Don't monkey with the government's intention to legalize homosexuality and abortion."

As soon as this matter came before the house the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) asked for a free vote. There was a free vote in this party. One government member voted against the measure. The government said: "Either you pass this measure, including these two items, or else." This government has lost the confidence of parliament and you know, Mr. Speaker, what will be the consequences of that.

Then the government said: "Wait till you get into committee". When the matter came to the committee I said that you could not incorporate the United States system by superimposing it on the parliamentary system in the British tradition. Under our tradition the government requires the support of a majority in the house or in committee, as the case may be. But I was told that there was going to be a new day, that parliament was going to be made to work. What has the government done for the people of Canada since December 13 last?

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):
Make them all homos.