

Criminal Code

legislation. We have been able to explain the reasons why we were opposed with all our might to the implementation of this legislation, namely because we believe that the population does not want it and that everyone of us here has a heavy responsibility as far as legislation is concerned. And if there is a piece of legislation whose consequences will be serious, it is indeed this one.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have known since last night that the committee on regional development, composed of 20 members, will leave the capital Monday night on a study tour. We anticipated that the vote would be taken on the amendment and on the main motion on Tuesday, since Monday is a holiday.

In view of the fact that Thursday is an opposition day and that Friday is a rather short day, it would have been easy for us of the Ralliement créditiste to line up several speakers in order that they express their views on the matter.

As far as I know, the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin), the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe), the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin), the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Tétrault), the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue), the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne) and the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), could speak again on that matter. The debate could last until Tuesday; however, that would be anti-democratic, for the simple reason that two main things matter in this house, that is first, to discuss legislation and second, to vote.

Now, as we would like the question to be put this afternoon, we are ready to give up our time for that purpose and to allow all hon. members to vote according to their conscience this afternoon not only on the very good amendment moved by the hon. member for Champlain but also on the main motion, for we are anxious to know the opinion of each member, in particular the opinion of those on the government side, on the matter.

It would be regrettable to allow these hon. members to abstain from participating in a vote which could be taken Tuesday, and thus deprive the population from knowing how each hon. member would have voted.

I therefore conclude my remarks even if I have still a few minutes to speak and even if there are still about ten of our members who were most willing to take the floor in order to allow everyone to vote according to

his conscience, not only on the amendment brought in by the hon. member for Champlain but on the main motion.

It is important that hon. members should vote and we do not want them to dodge their responsibilities. That is why we are taking that position.

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I thank the previous speaker for having accepted to cut short a little his remarks on the amendment of his colleague and on the main motion, that is on third reading of that bill.

I have decided to shorten my last comments quite a bit in order to enable hon. members to be called and vote, so that the Canadian public and parliament will know the views of all hon. members on that basic question, resting on the most important principles which we have had to discuss in the history of this parliament and previous ones.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief. I would like, however, since it is my last opportunity to do so, to thank those of my colleagues who were kind enough to bring in my amendments, during my absence. I thank them all the more because I could not be in the house to give the reasons and arguments I had to support those amendments. I take this opportunity to extend to them my warmest thanks.

Mr. Speaker, we have really reached the end of a lengthy debate. The members of the Progressive Conservative party took part in it in a very modest way. We agreed in a general way to leave the debate to our colleagues of the Ralliement créditiste, not that sometimes we did not have extremely important arguments to set forth, but we believed that the time to really work efficiently, as the government had promised, was in the committee of justice and legal affairs, where we could put forward our amendments and viewpoints.

The committee report has been tabled in the house. We shall be called upon this afternoon to vote on the motion for third reading. However—and I must say that, Mr. Speaker, since my remarks deal with the amendment that has been moved—we tried several times in the committee to convince the government that some of the amendments were necessary to protect both public morality and the medical profession, and especially the medical practitioners who stood against the bill before the committee because they were themselves, in conscience, against the practice of abortion.

Criminal Code

We tried to convince the minister and his colleagues, both within the committee and in the house. We tried to make them realize that the doctors were worried about this bill.

A committee of doctors had suggested that the legislation be amended in order to enable doctors who would object as a matter of conscience or for personal reasons to procure an abortion, not to have to procure one. It would have been easy to accept a minor amendment drafted in general terms to the effect that nothing in this legislation would oblige a doctor to procure an abortion if, for personal reasons or reasons of conscience or other professional imperatives, he would feel necessary not to procure it. The government refused that amendment which in fact was sound.

The government refuses also a motion by the Creditiste member concerning a six month's hoist so that the Canadian people could really get aware of the problem now under consideration in the Canadian parliament.

This amendment is so necessary that some members of the Ralliement créditiste, myself and some others of my colleagues, have received representations from Liberal associations from all over Canada. In fact, some presidents of associations have expressed their concern and made statements contrary to the assertions of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and some other Liberal members, that during the last election, the Canadian people had been invited to vote at the same time for this government and for the omnibus bill.

This is totally incorrect since we have in hand documents and letters coming to us from all parts of Canada telling us clearly that during the last election, the Canadian people had not authorized the Trudeau government to pass this famous and infamous bill on abortion.

I have here an article from the May 5 edition of the *Ottawa Journal*, where it is said that Dr. Dalton McGuinty, who was president of the Ottawa-Carleton Liberal Association, dissociates himself from the Liberal party because he does not accept this legislation. That is why I am in favour of the amendment moved by the Ralliement créditiste so that those people may stand in opposition.

Another letter was sent to me which explains why the amendment was moved. I received a letter from Mrs. Claire Campbell, dated May 1, 1969, where it is said, and I quote:

[Mr. Valade.]

• (3:10 p.m.)

[English]

The Campbell family voted for your party—

[Translation]

Mrs. Campbell was writing then to the Minister of Justice.

[English]

The Campbell family voted for your party but did not vote for the liberalization of abortion. I know many families, traditionally Liberal, who voted against your party because of that very question.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, we get such evidence from all parts of the country. I have some from Vancouver, from Ottawa, in short from everywhere. Canadians oppose this erroneous, unfounded and fallacious assertion which has been made for too long by the party in office, to the effect that the people, when they voted for the present Liberal government, approved at the same time the omnibus bill. This is an inaccurate and dishonest statement and, for the Liberal members, too convenient a pretext to shrug off their obligations and their responsibilities before the house and before the Canadian electorate.

Mr. Speaker, since I do not want to delay the vote, I do not intend to extend my remarks. I must go fast, unfortunately, but I still feel duty bound to remind the house of this magnificent document called "the Canadian charter of human rights" which bears the signature of the right hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau when he was Minister of Justice. It is not necessary to examine this wonderful document for very long to demonstrate the present contrast between what exists in the Liberal representation and in the grey matter of the present Prime Minister. I just have to open the document at page 9, chapter 1, under the title "The rights of the individual". This chapter was written by Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau. I will just quote the first paragraph:

Interest in human rights is as old as civilization. Once his primary requirements of security, shelter and nourishment have been satisfied, man has distinguished himself from other animals by directing his attention to those matters which affect his individual dignity.

I wonder what the Prime Minister had in mind when he referred to the dignity of the human being.

The dignity of the human being, as I understand it, is to respect oneself as such. It is to be aware, not only of one's responsibility