

*Criminal Code*

The proposed amendment improves a little the meaning of the clause; only, in our opinion, it is not sufficient. We are going to accept the amendment which establishes that the health would be seriously impaired and, if it is seriously impaired, that the abortion be accepted.

Mr. Speaker, as was mentioned by my colleague from Champlain (Mr. Matte), it is proved beyond doubt that death or seriously impaired health were deplored in only three cases out of 10,000 pregnancies.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment stipulates that pregnancy would endanger the life of the mother or impair seriously or directly her health, and everybody agrees that the pregnant woman is from the beginning rather ill, although it is natural. This lasts as long as she is pregnant. I have among my relatives the mother of a family who, when pregnant for the first time, was practically condemned to death. She was told that she would not reach her term and so on. Today, this mother has seven children. She did not die. Her health is even better than ever.

And how many Canadian mothers of families with a delicate constitution, have we not seen bearing families of 10, 12 and 15 children. And yet, they were ill everytime they gave birth to a child. From the point of view of health, people said: She is ruining her health. However, nothing prevented those mothers of families from raising large families.

● (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, if 50 years ago a bill providing for the termination of pregnancy, when it endangered the life of the mother or seriously and directly affected her health, had been introduced, it is probable that we would not have those brilliant men in parliament at the present time.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Caouette:** The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) might not be here today, if such a legislation or regulation had been passed 50 years ago. That is what I think.

In the name of civilization, such bills are introduced while those who will vote in favour of them might not be members of parliament. They would have been rejected because their mothers' life was in danger or the birth of these particular birds would have seriously affected her health.

[Mr. Caouette.]

It is all absurd and confusing. The minister, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or any member are unable to cope with the matter. The bill is introduced even if it is a known fact that the majority of the people object to it and nobody says a word of what the people are expecting to hear.

If such a bill had been passed 50 years ago, the Chinese would perhaps have taken over our country. How many members would be here? We are told that we would help the Canadian people by passing such a legislation. This means that we are attacking and betraying future generations through that bill.

Mr. Speaker—I said it earlier and I repeat it now—they rely heavily on the concept of civilization to introduce in Parliament such a bill and such amendments as provide that abortion could be procured when the mother's life is "endangered or her health seriously and directly impaired".

Mr. Speaker, to hear such lines of argument is unbelievable. Particularly among Liberals, the services of psychiatrists are called upon. Before psychiatrists existed, there were women who gave birth to children. Psychiatrists have never helped anyone from losing his reason if he was meant to. Psychiatry has seldom cured the insane. We realize it when we look at the other side of the house.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** You should look at yourself in a mirror.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice tells me to look at myself in a mirror. He probably knows from experience, because he has seen his own reflection.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, the services of psychiatrists are requested. We have nothing against psychiatrists. No. But since Canada and the world exist, there have been all kinds of such people. For awhile there were "wise women", who were first replaced by psychiatrists, then by "wise ministers". Nonetheless, we cannot determine, exactly and completely, as the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme) said earlier, that such a person will die, or that her health will be affected or ruined by pregnancy, or bearing a child.

In my view, the amendment—and I repeat the words of the hon. member for Champlain—partially improves the legislation.