

*Criminal Code*

Obviously that is not flattering for the promoters of the bill, the Prime Minister of Canada and the present Minister of Justice.

In an editorial entitled "Abortion, from Solomon to P. E. Trudeau", which was published in the February 1, 1968, issue of the magazine *Maintenant*, two laymen, Mr. Vincent Harvey and Mrs. Hélène Pelletier-Baillargeon, answer those who, along with the promoters of that ignominious bill, allege that pluralism in our society, that is to say, a multiplicity of creeds, as well as social expediency, justify legalization of abortion. I quote:

That is an over-simple opinion. However, a country which fully adheres to the Charter of Human Rights, rehabilitates the handicapped, educates orphans, treats the retarded and abolishes the death penalty is also a country which, whenever the least doubt remains in favour of the life or the innocence of one of its members, abstains from intervening against him. In fact, such a country always requires irrefutable evidence to condemn a criminal, requires duly certified medical certificates to legally confirm a citizen's death. Now, in such a doubtful case as intra-uterine life, far from waiting until convincing evidence is available, the State legislates as if the embryo were not actually a human being, since it sometimes allows it to be destroyed.

The argument of pluralism, in our opinion, gives us food for thought. Since no civilized State can today authorize the destruction of a life considered innocent or still fully human by many... then such a State implicitly at least, even though it denies making any option whatever, has already made one, that is by refusing to acknowledge the human personality of a foetus and considering it a "thing" which may be disposed of in the name of alleged higher interests.

Such legislation is not requested by the people but only by a few whose true motives we cannot understand but who make such an infernal turmoil that the government has listened attentively to them.

We should perhaps find another reason which could explain such amendments respecting abortion. At least this is what Reverend Father Marcel Marcotte, Jesuit, claims in an article entitled "Abortion, morality and law", published in the February 1968 issue of *Relations*.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is what Father Marcotte said:

As things are going, we will finally think that Canada is definitely an Anglo-Saxon country whose umbilical cord has really not been cut somewhere. No sooner had Great Britain voted new laws on divorce, on homosexuality or even, these recent months, on abortion than already the Canadian government falls into step and follows close behind.

In Canada, from the ashes of political colonialism is a new colonialism, of a judicial nature... com-

[Mr. Rondeau.]

ing forth with new life? That is how they sometimes solve controversial questions in Ottawa.

This is how requests and protests from Quebec... in connection with an important and precise matter... and in the present case—

—from Christian Canada—

—often are received: they are hushed up, swept under the rug and altogether treated unfairly. Small wonder then, that so many Canadians are complaining about their lot and that they dream, occasionally, of autonomous political structures, thanks to which their voice will cease, at last, to be a cry in the wilderness?

We are blamed, we, the Creditistes, and Christians in general, for using moral arguments in our opposition to various sections of the omnibus bill, especially where abortion is concerned.

You must have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the supporters of the omnibus bill have also brought out moral arguments.

For instance, the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) in the speech he delivered on April 17, stated as recorded on page 7646 of the House of Commons Debates, and I quote:

—a group of theologians from Laval University—

But who are those theologians whose names have not been mentioned? Why did the hon. member for Trois-Rivières not identify the theologians who are members of the committee he mentioned?

Another hon. member whom I respect, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), as well as certain members of his party do not like to hear the Cr ditistes, when they discuss abortion, take into account the moral requirements and teachings of the Church to which they are proud to belong.

Nevertheless, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre did not hesitate to refer to the authority of a few Protestant denominations to assert his opposition to the clause on lotteries in Bill C-150. This is what he said in this connection, as reported in the official report of the House of Commons of April 21, on page 7776:

We have had a good deal of correspondence about Bill C-150. I should like to say that I am particularly proud of the kind of letters and submissions that have reached my desk from the churches and church organizations. The thing that interests me is the stand that most of the churches have taken on the question of lotteries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre could use the arguments of certain Protestant churches to object to lotteries and even bingos, there is all the more reason for the Cr ditistes and Christians