

*Criminal Code*

to study carefully the frequency of illicit abortions and the means to eliminate it; to stimulate medical research; to make a real effort to help mothers in difficulty, by providing them with the resources of medicine and psychiatry; to develop an understanding attitude towards unmarried mothers and their children, as well as provide a positive answer to their needs; to increase help to mental cases; to develop a more generous and more adequate social and family policy.

As far as this bill is concerned we are now asking ourselves: Whom shall we obey? Shall we obey now Caesar or in this instance the government, or God?

There is therefore a basic contradiction between the proposed amendments to bill No. C-150 regarding abortion and the philosophy from which we seek inspiration. Those who have no problem, are those who have lost their philosophy.

As to the antinomy between what the State proposes and the teachings of our Church, let me remind you what Yves de Chartres was writing to Pope Pascal II:

When empire and churchmen live peacefully, the world is well governed. When discord sets in between them, not only do small things do not grow any more but great things themselves are doomed to destruction.

What should we do when the demands of the State go against the demands made by the Church upon Christians and when the two powers to which we are subjected are giving us opposite orders?

No man can serve two masters. So we have no choice. We will not break the laws of Jesus Christ and His Church, on the pretence of respecting secular rights. It is better to obey God than men. This answer of Peter and the other apostles to those magistrates who ordered them to do illicit deeds, we must make it ours insofar as the debate on the amendments pertaining to abortion is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, before winding up my remarks, I should like to say a word on the free vote. I earnestly ask government members, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice to withdraw the amendment concerning abortion.

It is the duty of the government and the legislators to protect the life of the innocent by enacting laws and providing adequate penalties; all the more must they take a stand, when life is directly involved or imperilled, as is certainly the case for the unborn in his mother's womb.

● (9:50 p.m.)

We ask hon. members of all parties not to fear to assume their responsibilities, to hold fast to their convictions, if they still have any, particularly when it comes to legislation affecting morals and contrary to their previous beliefs.

I think the Prime Minister is liberal enough, in the broad sense of the word, to allow at least a free vote on this matter.

As for us, of the Ralliement Cr ditiste, I say again that we will fight to the end to prevent the passage of the amendments proposed by the Minister of Justice. And at this stage, I would like to point out, as many hon. members already have, that we would have been in favour of dividing this bill. In this respect, I should like to quote an article published in the 28th of January 1969 issue of *Le Devoir* to the effect that the Minister of Justice has already stated there is no need to divide the bill, since at the committee stage, amendments could be moved to every clause.

This is certainly not a satisfactory answer, for if the government is actually determined to put its life at stake on this bill in its present form, it will not agree to any substantial amendment to the main sections of the bill. But the sections pertaining to abortion and homosexuality are among those main amendments.

The opposition has urged that the different areas covered in this omnibus bill be divided into at least four separate bills. It is a most legitimate request. Otherwise hon. members might as well be asked at the beginning of a session to vote in bulk the legislative program contained in the Speech from the Throne. Each party should leave its members free to vote according to their conscience. We should be informed of the opinion of each legislator, and not of the leaders of the diverse political parties.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, we regret not to be able to accept this bill tonight, at the government house leader's request, as several of our members still have many things to say. In fact, we do not think it will be passed speedily, for it is important that the population be informed of the different views expressed by members in this house, by those who declared themselves for or against and that it be aware of those who are not courageous enough to give their opinion right now, for silence gives consent and considering the importance of a bill that will have effects in the future, people could think that we accept today homosexuality as such.