

*Criminal Code*

that subject would be discussed, he asked to be named on that committee and his report is simply marvellous, as well as the work he did to get information and pass an equitable judgment.

He says that in both reports he tabled in the house, it was clearly stated: "provided that the pregnancy worsens the mother's condition and seriously endangers her life or health".

That is what struck me. While he says that in both reports tabled in the house, he suggested to the minister of Justice not to forget to insert that word, no account has been taken of that suggestion in the text of the bill. The sentence: "probablement en danger la vie et la santé de la mère", has certainly not been written by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, not by the hon. member for Montmorency, nor by the hon. member for Gatineau.

I note that the amendments moved by those hon. members always aim at defining the word "health", and the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce has just provided us with striking evidence that the committee reports, since the beginning of this session, do not weigh much in the leaders' decisions.

We must remember that that bill was prepared long before—I am not talking about the present Minister of Justice—but the picture has not changed, because the chief said so. It cannot be changed. When I look at this task as a whole, I commend those members who were responsible, who worked seriously.

They are a little roused themselves since they are bringing us these amendments in order to try to correct the situation, to come back to the terms of the committees' reports.

Those who helped draft this bill, according to me, and to the evidence just given us, did not take into account the two committees' report regarding subsection (c). And this is why we see some members, despite the orders given to them, rise, protest and say: We have reached the limit; it does not make sense anymore.

And I understand that their social conception is rebelling. It looks as if their present leader compels them to destroy the Canadian nation. An infernal spirit which I am unable to describe is behind that.

That is why today, after the member for Gatineau who wants to delete the word "likely"—and it was quite clear in his amendment—the word "likely" must be taken off.

Had such a word been left out, we could not have talked about it.

We missed that, we missed another amendment. I am wondering if we shall not miss the third, that of the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. And yet, these are three fine testimonies from the government side and not from just anybody.

The points made by the hon. member for Montmorency were not frivolous. I know personally the hon. member for Montmorency and usually, he knows what he is talking about. I am convinced that his reasoning today was based on the fundamental principles concerning the child's right to live, because if we deny here all rights to a child, we might as well shut up shop and go home, for this affects the future generation, our heirs of tomorrow. I will admit that the amendment is not quite perfect yet. But at least it might bring some comfort to people when they read the following words:

—endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health.

Those words, will in my opinion be of great help, though it is still far from perfection. It is not a hundred per cent in accordance with our idea yet, but we approve of a middle course. That is why we have been fighting for many days, in order to find a middle course.

Such a course is being indicated to us this afternoon, but some proclaim it to be futile. They forbid their colleagues to change the idea for the sake of which we are fighting. Yet they are not shallow-minded; let us tell them so, let us praise them. We are braver than people on the government side; say "thank you for a job well done" and this has nothing to do with politics. The future of the Canadian people is at stake.

As the hon. member for Montmorency pointed out a while ago, if we do not accept this amendment, with what is allowed by the law, we shall see in a few years from now abortions upon request, which is a very dangerous thing. And that is precisely what we do not want; we do not want to be like some other countries, like England and all the other countries mentioned since this fight began. We want to avoid the extremes to which other countries have gone.

Mr. Speaker, may I declare six o'clock?

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock this sitting stands suspended until 8 p.m.

At 6 p.m. the house took recess.