

*Criminal Code*

Mr. Speaker, I could name Liberal members who were against abortion, but I shall be discreet and kind, and refrain from doing so.

They even mentioned in public the hon. member for Matane, Mr. Pierre De Bané.

He rose in the house to say he was against the bill, but that he had to vote for it, because he had to toe the party line.

We have no reason to question their good faith. As far as we are concerned, two Liberal members told us privately they were opposed to the bill. There is not a single member of parliament who is not in this case.

Abuse begets abuse. The Créditistes' battle has been a long one. It is nearing its end now. Members of the Ralliement have proved loyal to the mandate conferred on them by their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the following words of Mr. Brown are very significant:

One cannot say as much for the Liberals, considering the ambiguous promise made by the Prime Minister and in particular by Mr. John Turner, to amend the Criminal Code, since those amendments did not materialize.

The filibuster on Bill C-150 is teaching us a lesson. We hope it will teach the Prime Minister that his own views on legislation cannot always prevail, when they go against the beliefs of a large part of the Canadian population.

Mr. Speaker, that is the testimony of a journalist who is not a Créditiste, but who states his opinion. Members of the Conservative party have supported the bill as such, while others who did not, especially the section on abortion.

The clauses which improve legislation concerning parole, the penitentiaries, customs tariff, we would have accepted straight away without the slightest debate, save maybe for a few suggestions here and there.

Regarding lotteries, we were in favour of an almost complete liberty. After all, people, men, are born gamblers. We love races, games of chance, risks of all kinds, we love to play the horses or the dogs. Those are just so many different forms of lotteries.

We probably would have allowed the passage of these clauses.

As for homosexuality, we objected for the same reasons that we opposed abortion. When the clause on homosexuality was voted by the house, one could read the following report in *Montreal-Matin* of Tuesday, April 22, 1969:

Three Cheers for the Omnibus Bill!  
First social club—

—in Montreal.

The first private social club for homosexuals in Montreal opened quietly Saturday night, for the [Mr. Caouette.]

"purpose of giving a better understanding of the homosexual's condition within today's society."

● (8:30 p.m.)

The club is called Gemini I and is located at 1285—

This is for those who would like to know the address.

—Maisonneuve Boulevard West. Deep pile has been used in large quantities for the interior decoration—

They say it is beautiful plush. Apparently, those who would like to go in have been advised to bring their snowshoes because it is a really a good deep plush pile.

I continue the quotation:

Besides, one can see a large oil portrait—

An Oil painting, not a water colour.

—of Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the Twins (Castor and Pollux).

An oil-painting of the Prime Minister, for inspiration purposes no doubt.

This is a newspaper add which gives the name of the owner. It is explained that he wants to educate homosexuals. All told, it is now public knowledge.

Eventually we shall see no doubt in our newspaper stands magazines showing men with lipstick on and wearing earrings.

Mr. Speaker, we opposed this clause of the bill and then we fought tremendously against abortion. This afternoon, I read an article under the byline of Muriel Bowen, in the *Toronto Telegram* of May 10, about the abortion legislation passed in England a little over a year ago:

[English]

The Abortion Act makes abortion legal on the three counts:

If pregnancy involves risk to the mother's life, if it involves risk to her physical or mental health (or to the well being of her existing children) if there is a substantial risk that the expected child would be physically or mentally abnormal.

[Translation]

It deals with the three essentials of the legislation on abortion in England.

After the legislation had been in effect for one year—

[English]

After a year there is still bitter disagreement in the medical profession over what is a proper interpretation of the third point, the so-called social clause. Some doctors, and politicians and many people who have studied the statistics say that it is resulting in abortion on demand, for those who can afford to go to private clinics.