

Criminal Code

But in this parliament we go beyond all that. While Canadian workers are paying taxes, while the unemployed are wondering about what tomorrow will bring, we are discussing the fate of the third sex.

Can an honest government allow itself to neglect the majority on behalf of a small group of perverts? Why is clause 7 of Bill C-150 now before us? Wherefrom came the representations to that effect?

Mr. Speaker, I have been here for three years and a half. During that period, I met various groups, among which were teamsters, farmers, workmen, even union representatives, which came and exerted pressure on the government and I would like to know which of them requested clause 7 now under study.

Was that clause requested by the electors of the Mount-Royal or the Ottawa-Carleton constituency? To how many persons did the government commit itself? Since minorities normally dispossessed, that is the poor, are being forgotten most of the time, would the request have originated from the minority of millionnaires contributing to the electoral fund?

We recall that bill C-222, that is the bank act, was passed on March 21, 1967. We also remember that the electoral funds of both parties were very well provided for, following the passage of the bill.

Shortly afterwards, in February 1968, that is before the last election, came the passage of bill C-191, amending the Excise Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party is not yet through with counting the moneys that were contributed to its election fund by the mining and lumber companies being assisted by the bill, which exempted them from paying the 10 per cent sales tax on the purchase of machinery and trucks.

Still more recently, was not the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme) offered a certain amount of money for sponsoring bill S-27 respecting the Quebec Savings Bank? That bill only purported to change the name *Quebec Savings Bank* into that of *People's Bank*.

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have been listening to the hon. member with some care, and I remind him that the amendment before the house at the moment deals with the deletion of clause 7 of Bill C-150. The debate must be restricted to the amendment itself, and I invite the hon. member to deal specifically with this amendment.

[Translation]

Mr. Godin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am sorry I lost my temper.

In any case—

Mr. Cantin: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member has made charges against the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme), who is reported as having been offered a certain amount of money. I think not only that he was out of order, but also that he made a false charge, and I want him to take full responsibility for it.

I am sure the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme) has not been blackmailed, has received nothing and has performed his duty by sponsoring a bill in the house.

Mr. Godin: Mr. Speaker, I am taking due note of the remark made by the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Cantin). The hon. member who is a lawyer, has understood very well what I said. I did not say that the hon. member had accepted anything, I said that an offer had been made to him. There is quite a difference.

Mr. Speaker, in any case, they persist in rejecting all amendments to this bill and we are asking ourselves questions as well as everybody across the country, especially with regard to clause 7 which deals with homosexuality.

That this clause should appear in the former bill introduced by the former Minister of Justice, a bachelor, and member for Mont-Royal, that was understandable. The people, who knew the hon. member as a comical character, a great joker, considered this part of the bill with a smile, believing it was a joke.

However, the peoples of Canada who thought it was all a joke, realize now that the clause had actually been presented with the firm intention of having it adopted. Under these circumstances, the peoples of Canada sympathise, as I do, with the present Minister of Justice. In fact, one wonders what advantages the hon. minister of Justice, representing Ottawa-Carleton, who is married and has, if I am correct, four children, could derive from inserting clause 7 in the present Bill C-150.

At all events, I ask those who support this clause, and who mostly are married men, whether their wives are in favour of their consenting adults stepping out. The peoples of Canada are dissatisfied, Mr. Speaker. It is not