

Criminal Code

steps that have been rather vague in the past, even though they were taken by prison officials.

• (9:30 p.m.)

This will be of great benefit. It is being done now in the province of British Columbia. It is paying off, because men are slowly being rehabilitated rather than to being shoved out the prison door with someone saying, "There is your suit and \$35, find a job". This is part of the rehabilitation process and I could not endorse it more.

As much as I might have reservations about some aspects of this bill I think, by and large, the bill will move us ahead. We have been a long time getting ahead with these amendments. I sat on the original committee of the British Columbia Bar which dealt with the matter of abortion in 1962. Here it is 1968.

Mr. Lewis: You are a good Liberal; you are only one year behind.

Mr. Hogarth: In any event here it is 1969, and we are just now introducing these changes. Although I have reservations about certain aspects of the bill, I realize there are so many more reforms which must come about that we should take these interim steps now. They might not all be satisfactory to all of us but let us take this much now. If I wished to include rape, incest and carnal knowledge in the provisions of this bill, I could bring these things up later; but let us take these steps now because it takes so long to get even the most modest measure through. That is one of the reasons I am 100 per cent behind the provisions which are before us.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth) who has just taken his seat. I noted with interest that he prefaced his remarks by stating that he had reservations about this omnibus bill, Bill C-150. Then, having expressed his reservations concerning the bill, he went on to state that he intended to support it. I find this a little difficult to comprehend. I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member and found nothing to reconcile my comprehension of his initial statement that he had reservations about the bill because it seemed to me he intended to support the bill with a great deal of enthusiasm.

I do not think the hon. member who just took his seat could have been present in the

[Mr. Hogarth.]

house when his colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Sullivan) made his speech because, in trying to justify his support of the bill notwithstanding the fact that he had reservations about it, he went on to say as did the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), in his introduction of the bill that the government had a mandate from the people of Canada to introduce this legislation in its present form. That is not the way I understand it. With respect, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way the people I represent understand it. I submit also it is not the way the Minister of Justice initially understood it. If my memory serves me correctly it was the government's intention to introduce this bill broken down into at least four parts. In other words, we would then not find ourselves in the awkward position we are in today. Some of us are in the invidious position today at least of having to vote against the bill, notwithstanding the fact that we support the greater portion of the bill.

I am not one of the Perry Masons referred to by the learned gentleman who just took his seat. I am not a barrister or a practitioner of the law; but I do think I represent a great number of Canadians who are very much disturbed over the fact that we are introducing this legislation in this form. I am concerned about it. I am concerned about it as a parent, as a Canadian and as a benefactor if you like of the Judaeo-Christian traditions. I am concerned about it because I ask, where does it end.

We have before us a major piece of legislation dealing at once with the very sacred laws of life itself and the rather mundane laws of lotteries and gun control. I support with a great deal of enthusiasm those clauses of the bill which would amend our Criminal Code of Canada to make it possible to eliminate the carnage on the highways because of drunk driving. I support the breathalyzer test. All Canadians are in favour of that. I support the amendment to the Criminal Code which would make lotteries possible in Canada. Indeed, I support that particular amendment very strongly. I support the amendments which would at least take a step toward some measure of gun control in Canada, because we are all greatly concerned with the violence in our country. We are aware of what is taking place south of the border to which eloquent reference was made today by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). We are concerned with all these things and we support them. We support the