

Criminal Code

them at least allow members to vote according to their conscience. It is illogical to oblige in order to permit... to command so as to let people do what they want.

Why link this measure to a vote of confidence and bind the fate of the government to such a controversial legislation?

A free vote had been accepted on the bill relating to the abolition of capital punishment. Why not a free vote on the imposition of another capital punishment: the "Slaughter of Innocents"?

If the bill is preserved as presented, the member of Parliament who is a believer will have to make the best of it and to remind himself that he is a Christian before being a member of a party. Religious beliefs are not to be traded in a multi-racial society for political ideology. In any event, compulsion is a thing of the past in our time of progress, and it must be "aborted" as soon as possible.

There is so much ado about personal freedom these days that, to say the least, this is an odd and indecent practice to order a "wholesale vote", especially after having touted "pluralism". The *Humanae Vitae* encyclical again points out to the legislators that they must not allow "a degradation of the moral tenets of nations through legal processes... through practices which are contrary to natural and divine law". Paul VI is only continuing the teachings of his predecessor, John XXIII, who had warned public authorities that the problems resulting from the trends of populations "must not be solved through methods that would be unworthy of mankind and which may be explained as a purely materialistic concept of man himself and of life" (*Mater et Magistra*)

Mr. Speaker, when in a country such as ours which does not know how to dispose of its overproduction, we are called upon to approve legislation which would encourage mass murder, I think it is appropriate that we should ask ourselves questions and give serious consideration to the massacres that have taken place before. Let us remember the slaying of all the first-born in the Egyptian families. In Palestine, when Christ was born, there was the total slaughter of the Holy Innocents in the hope of killing the God Child. Under Nero, there was yet another slaughter of hundreds of thousands of citizens. In Cyprus, in Greece, in Egypt, people have been slain by millions. In 1918, in Hungary, there were 30,000 people butchered in three months' time. In Russia, at about the same time, 2 million bishops, priests, army officers, police officers, middle-class people, teachers, engineers, workers, farmers, were killed in the space of 18 months while at the same time, 30 million people were starved to death because of the unrest. And for the past 18 years, a very similar kind of slaughter has cost 12 million Chinese their life.

Remembering all these facts and considering the background of the member for Mont Royal (Mr. Trudeau) who is now Prime

[Mr. Godin.]

Minister, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the present government, with its loathsome laws on divorce, on abortion, on homosexuality, is not simply the tool of a dreadful plot against our civilization.

On the other hand; if this is not the case let us draw the conclusion that the omnibus bill should be split so as to provide every member with the opportunity to vote according to his religious beliefs and to the voice of his conscience.

The member, on his part, has to assume his responsibilities as a Christian and remember he owes his life to a Supreme Being whom he should please rather than try to please man, even if his own future or the future of his party were to be at stake.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest the consequences of this bill should be considered right now. Either you decide you are going to let yourself be submerged by a wave of depravation, or you resolve to assume your responsibilities.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I will devote the few minutes at my disposal to express certain views about this bill which has been so much debated and which is so debatable.

For a few months, I have sometimes read or listened to certain speeches in this house and I have realized the attitude of the present government. I think it is normal that we support certain laws when we think they will be advantageous for the population. If we study the present bill so actively today, it is because it is very important. Many things have been said, but for my part my comments will be brief. I do not want to repeat all the figures that have been mentioned since the beginning of this debate. But when one talks of a bill that elicits so many important amendments to the Criminal Code, like the lotteries, the carrying of firearms, abortion, homosexuality and when one is asked for a blanket I wonder how we can do it conscientiously and in all fairness. How can we vote freely on subjects that are so different and so controversial.

We have asked like others for a freedom at the level of the members of Parliament. We have asked for the division of the bill and we still think that every member in the house should be free to vote according to his conscience. It is of course impossible to ask members with different mentalities to think the same way. Since this bill covers many subjects, I think one must treat each member