

*Criminal Code*

government's move to provide amendments to our laws to make these things practical and possible.

So far as the amendments to the Criminal Code concerning permissive homosexuality between consulting adults are concerned, I could not care less. It is a matter of complete indifference to me. I submit it is a matter of great indifference to the vast majority of Canadians; they just could not care less. But, Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain I am greatly concerned with the clause in the bill dealing with abortion. I am concerned because it pricks at my conscience. I shall not detain the house tonight with a long speech.

• (9:40 p.m.)

We have listened during this debate to members of this house who are distinguished members of the bar. As I understand it, the hon. member who just took his seat is a distinguished member of the bar of British Columbia. It is also my understanding that the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain is a distinguished member of the bar of Ontario. I am not going to repeat the arguments of the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain, relevant and important though they may be. Nor am I going to repeat that very cogent argument presented to the house by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). I am going to present my own views.

I am not going to quote any authority but I should like put on the record the fact that I subscribe to the view of the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain and not to the view of the hon. member who has just taken his seat or the view of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). The latter members tried to justify to this house the failure of the government to split this bill by saying they had a mandate from the people of Canada to present it in its omnibus form. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth) said the government had no alternative because they had a mandate from the people of Canada. The hon. member could not have been present in the house when his colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain, made his speech. His remarks appear at page 4785 of *Hansard* and I quote:

I believe that, regardless of party affiliation, each hon. member of this house must vote on this issue according to his own conscience, as it goes far beyond party lines or other man made disciplines.

29180—309A

For this reason I am opposing the proposed amendment concerning the law of abortion in its present form and intend to vote against this bill.

The hon. member then continues, again recorded at page 4785:

Contrary to some unfounded and untrue reports, Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform you and the members of this house that my position on this matter is the same now as it was before nomination day and as it was before the election, and I made this fact known publicly during the campaign.

He was indicating to the house, and I am not putting words into his mouth, that he had the full support of his party when, before the election, he stated his opposition to the amendments concerning abortion. He concludes by saying:

In conclusion I should also like to inform you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this house that at no time did I get any request from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to change or alter my position on this matter, and I would like to thank him publicly for this consideration.

Whose view should we accept on this? Do we accept the view of the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain who spoke so eloquently and conscientiously in the house, or do we accept the view of the hon. member for New Westminster who also spoke eloquently but, I suspect, not so conscientiously? I am a little perplexed, but I am not bothered because I know what I am going to do.

I am not going to take up the time of the house tonight because all the things I would like to say were said in a most eloquent way by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain. I am in a position where I am going to oppose the bill. I am going to oppose it because, notwithstanding the fact that the bill contains many measures I would enthusiastically support, this bill contains a provision which tears at my very conscience. In my humble estimation, it contains a provision which tears at the very root of life itself. I submit to you that it ill behooves any member of this house to make lightly of this matter, although the sections of the bill dealing with the breathalyzer test and lotteries, to bring humour to the debate, are tempting, indeed. When the bill contains provisions relating to what I consider to be the very essence and sacredness of life itself, I say it ill behooves any member to make lightly of it.

I speak as a member of this house and I believe firmly in what I say. My words are dictated by no dogma or pressure group, but are merely dictated by my own conscience. They are dictated by my own feelings for the