

*Criminal Code*

When it was deferred to the committee, some of my colleagues attended the sittings and brought forward two pediatrists. But the committee members were mostly government members and the instruction was that the government assumed the responsibility for that bill. The minister was therefore frank on that point this afternoon, when he stated that the government supports this bill, and if the people do not like it they will have the opportunity to let it be known in due time.

Mr. Speaker, at the committee report stage we brought in amendments to the various clauses of the bill. Not a single amendment—not even the two moved by government members—was accepted, because once again, all Liberals without exception had been instructed to take position in favour of the bill, or in other words, to see to it, as government members, that it would pass all the stages and be adopted.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, we have now reached third reading and the same thing is happening. This afternoon, the minister told us that the government assumed full responsibility for the bill, which deals with all kind of things, namely arms, lotteries, homosexuality, abortion, penitentiaries, tariffs, parole, etc. Everything was put in the same package, to get members of parliament to swallow whole what they would not have accepted separately, had the bill been split. Bill C-150 was imposed upon parliament, and I am convinced it will remain memorable in Canadian parliamentary history and Canadian history.

Our stand has been a firm one; we have been criticized, but much less than the government has been for introducing a bill that mixes all kinds of things together.

We asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he was Minister of Justice, to divide the bill, to group those clauses that deal with a specific or a common subject matter. Both he and the Minister of Justice refused stubbornly to hear of it. The constructive work of my colleagues of the Ralliement créditiste stems from that. And that work, as I said last week, was not performed lightly. My colleagues sought out information, called on doctors and others to testify; when they spoke in the house, their speeches were serious and logical. This, the Minister of Justice recognized himself.

Mr. Speaker, we have been accused of wanting to impose the wishes of the minority upon the majority. We should not be pilloried for wanting to force upon the minority the

views of the majority. It is the minority which is now forcing its will upon the majority of Canadians. I was reading last week in *Le Droit*, from Ottawa, an editorial by Marcel Gingras, who is, I believe, the editor in chief of this newspaper. He wrote this:

The Créditistes are very much aware of what is going on and their opposition seems to us more political than really virtuous—

I do not think we are making a show of our virtue. We are trying to prove that morality should be respected. The morality of a human person is not just that of any animal, it is that of a reasonable being, a being with a right to life at its Creator's will. It befits no man, whether he is a minister or not, whether he is a member of the Liberal, Progressive Conservative, Créditiste, or NDP party to take away the life of any human being. This is obvious.

People who want to dabble politics about this are more often found among petty, insignificant people, like Mr. Marcel Gingras of *Le Droit*, than among members of the Ralliement créditiste, for Mr. Gingras is a guy who is always on the side of the government whether it is right or wrong. Such an attitude serves his purpose.

There is another newspaperman, who is worth at least as much as the whipper-snapper from *Le Droit*, Mr. Marcel Gingras. At any rate, the other one is not a member of the Ralliement créditiste; he is an acknowledged supporter of the Progressive Conservative party, and well known all over the place.

He is Mr. Clément Brown, of the newspaper *Montréal-Matin*—which does not give its allegiance to the Ralliement créditiste. He said, and I quote:

There is a good amount of pharisaism in the vituperations of some newspapers against the filibuster conducted by the Ralliement créditiste against bill C-150, better known as the omnibus bill. The government's sycophants loudly clamor for the old Standing Order 16A, which limits the time of debates.

"Sycophant" means slanderer or informer. These slanders originate in government quarters.

Let us say right away that even without Standing Order 16A, the business of the house has progressed quite smoothly and that the new Rules and Regulation are quite satisfactory.

Parties agreed normally, without too much difficulty, on the length of time allotted for the discussion of various government measures. The Prime Minister abused his power. He even did violence to the conscience of his own members.

The Liberals, we know that.

Créditistes make no bones about naming in private conversation those government members who gave them their support against abortion.