

*Criminal Code*

far as he knew, persons of another sex could undergo abortion?

I see that the bill was reported without any amendment and I find it strange to want to amend at this stage by making it clear that abortion should be practised only on a female person.

I would like to know whether according to the scientists of the Liberal party, there exists a third, a fourth or even fifth sex that we do not know. To the best of my knowledge, the house has not had the privilege of meeting any worthy specimen of those various sexes. To my knowledge, we have only known in this house two sexes: the male sex and the female sex. In fact there is only one person of the female sex here. We do not know people of the third, fourth, or fifth sex.

Therefore, why make a bill even more ridiculous by inserting the words: "the abortion of a person of the female sex"? What other sex can undergo abortion apart from the female sex? I find that absolutely stupid and ridiculous, and I demand why the legal advisors, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the experts who drafted this bill tried, through the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), to get the Canadian people to swallow it? How is it that in a text of law, reputedly serious, we read that we are to procure the miscarriage of a female person only?

Mr. Speaker, I find in at least twenty different places in the bill these terms: "miscarriage of a female person".

However, the minister has not yet answered this question: How many sexes are there in Canada?

Mr. Speaker, at least the spirit of this amendment is in keeping with our beliefs when it provides that an hospital should not be obliged to establish a therapeutic abortion committee. In the name of the freedom which some members want to preach in the house so that a woman may feel free to have an abortion if she so wishes. We should ensure to hospitals and doctors unwilling to perform abortion the same liberty not to have to submit, for some reason or other, to the legislation which they do not want to be part of our statutes.

Mr. Speaker, in expressing my opposition to the provisions of Bill C-150 regarding abortion, I shall not deal tonight with the moral problems involved in abortion.

We have merely brought in arguments based on common sense or provided by medical authorities condemning abortion, even therapeutic abortion, a practice that this bill

[Mr. Rondeau.]

is trying to impose on our hospitals and medical practitioners.

The main argument against abortion is that this small being, as such, has the right to live. Consequently, society must do every possible thing to ensure him this right.

Mr. Eugene Quay, an American professor, wrote a study which was published in the Georgetown Law Journal. Here is what he said:

The protection of the life of an unborn child has always been a major concern in the oldest laws known. This matter has continued to form the subject of laws in all civilizations right through to the present time, because this thought springs from a universal sentiment that foresees the decline of civilization when this right is no longer protected.

Unfortunately, we have to realize that at the present time Canada's civilization is decadent, for rather than protecting the right to life, we do everything possible to eliminate such a right.

Section 3 of the United Nations Universal declaration of human rights, passed in 1948, stipulates that, and I quote:

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Paragraph (a) of section 1 of the Canadian Bill of Rights, passed in 1960, recognizes that:

—the right of the individual to life—

—exists in Canada and will continue to exist. However, in 1969, we are already willing to question that principle and to pass legislation to abolish it.

The convention to protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, signed in Rome in 1950 by the members of the European Council, states the following in paragraph (1) of section 2, and I quote:

The right of the individual to life is protected by law. Death cannot be inflicted intentionally, except in the carrying out of a death sentence passed by a court of justice in the case of an offence punishable by death under the law.

In his book entitled "The Right to Live" Mr. Norman St. John-Stevás wrote in New York in 1964:

Respect for human life is part of the moral consensus of western civilization—such consensus emanating from intuitive wisdom of a really human society.

It then appears that the right to life is universally recognized and the voluntary and intentional destruction of a living foetus in the body of its mother, or of a child at its birth, constitutes a practice which is universally prohibited.