

*Criminal Code***GOVERNMENT ORDERS****CRIMINAL CODE**

The house resumed, from Monday, May 12, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner that Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be read the third time and do pass.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, after all the tenseness we have been experiencing during the past week and even for several weeks, I am ever so pleased to come back, on third reading, to the main points on which we have been and are still insisting so strongly.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had the opportunity to hear—

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Could we have order, please. There are so many conversations in the house that it is difficult for the Chair to hear the speech being made by the hon. member for Champlain.

[*Translation*]

I ask the hon. members to co-operate with the Chair so that we may hear what the hon. member for Champlain has to say.

**Mr. Matte:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and his Parliamentary Secretary, the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Cantin), summed up their views on the omnibus bill yesterday.

They mentioned in particular the fight we put up against the committee report. Mr. Speaker, in reading over what they said, I noticed the tremendous shortcomings in the arguments brought forward by the spokesmen for the Department of Justice.

In my remarks, I would like to point out those shortcomings and prove that even if all the amendments we introduced were defeated, it remains nevertheless that, in my opinion, we are still right. We are still fighting for a good cause and we would like our arguments to be listened to again seriously.

We would like precisely to refer to the very comments of the Minister of Justice who said

[Mr. Speaker.]

yesterday that he had been through a full and searching debate.

Mr. Speaker, we wish to thank the minister from the bottom of our hearts for his complimentary remarks to us.

• (3:00 p.m.)

He acknowledges that this long debate on the amendments proposed when the report of the committee on justice and legal affairs was considered, was not as frolicsome as was suggested by several government members and their spokesmen outside the house, such as, for instance, an insignificant fellow like Mr. Marcel Gingras, editor of the newspaper *Le Droit*.

Mr. Speaker, that newspaperman was merely echoing in *Le Droit* the viewpoints of a few members of this house who thought we were simply twaddling on, that we were only stretching time. I therefore wonder who is right. The Minister of Justice or those gossip-mongers who even took the liberty of cutting in, like the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) and the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain)?

Mr. Speaker, the minister himself said there had been a full debate; we put some life into it because life was what we wanted to save. We set our minds, our hearts and our souls to this task, and it has been a full debate. You cannot blame anybody for looking after his own interest.

The minister said also that it was a searching debate. Is it the minister who was right, or those members who saw red and forgot to reason and make really acceptable judgments, not only for us because we are members of the Ralliement Créditiste, but for the whole population? I quote the exact words of the minister:

In answering that remark may I say what ministers often say, namely, that we have had a full and searching debate—and I think I can say that with some justification.

We therefore thank the minister for his comments about us. He also recognized that we had made a fine contribution to this debate for which he is grateful. We thank him sincerely for thinking so and I am again quoting the minister who stated yesterday:

There have been serious and deep differences of opinion on certain aspects of this proposed legislation. I listened to those opinions with great feeling because I know how sincere and profound are the convictions of members in some quarters of the house, particularly those opinions that are related to measures that affect private morals and the concept of life and death.