

I must tell you I am against abortion. I am against these criminal acts, and I entirely disagree with the Member for the New Democratic Party who claimed this should not be considered a crime. I disagree. Anyone who kills a child is a criminal.

I am for the right to life. I think every member of this House should realize that destroying a child in its mother's womb is a criminal act.

Mr. Prud'homme: Are you against capital punishment too?

Mr. Desrosiers: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Prud'homme: Are you against capital punishment?

Mr. Desrosiers: We will get back to that later. We are now talking about Bill C-226.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that I support this Bill and that if I were in a position to have it adopted today, I would be even happier. Unfortunately, we all know the intricacies of parliamentary procedure and the rules we must follow. I wanted to say openly that I am against abortion.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that the Hon. Member for York South-Weston (Mr. Nunziata) left the Chamber. He also left some unfortunate views on the table which need some kind of explanation. I do not know whether he did that deliberately or whether he really lacks an understanding of how this House of Commons works although that does seem a little incredible given his 16 months in this Chamber.

However, what we have before us today in the form of Bill C-226 is, of course, a Bill. If we were to cease talking about that Bill at this very moment, Mr. Speaker would put the question, the bells would ring, Members would come in and vote on the principle of the Bill. If the majority were in agreement with that principle, then the Bill would go to committee. Therefore, it is not a question of passing the subject matter of this Bill to committee. If the Hon. Member was familiar with this Chamber and the notion of parliamentary reform, he would know that standing committees of the House of Commons can inquire into a subject matter of their own choosing provided it falls under the mandate of the particular committee. If the Hon. Member serves on a committee which does not have the mandate to discuss this subject matter, he can go to his Whip and ask to be put on the committee which does have that mandate. It is that simple. The subject matter could be discussed in committee provided the majority of Members want to discuss it. However, what the Hon. Member was asking this House to do was to move to the voting stage where you either accept or reject a principle affecting human life. It affects the woman more than the man, the unborn child more than the living child. He asked us to pronounce on that principle after less than two hours of public debate.

Adjournment Debate

That request comes from a Member who supported days of filibustering over a penny a day in connection with family allowances, as well as a whole host of other issues. These were not life-and-death issues, but he is now asking Members of this Chamber to pronounce on a life-and-death issue after less than two hours of debate. That should run against the grain of responsibility which all Members of this Chamber should have. I find the notion simply unacceptable.

The Hon. Member was also asking the Government to respect the notion of parliamentary review and reform and the independence of Members by telling us what to do. If there is an illogical fallacy anywhere in this Chamber it is to say to Members of this Chamber that we should all be in favour of reform and independence, and then ask the Government to tell us what to do. Let me assert in the clearest possible terms that no member of the Government has ever told me what I had to say or the way I had to behave concerning Private Members' Hour. If any Member of the Government tries to tell me at any point in the future about the way I have to behave or what I have to say, then they are asking for trouble. This is Private Members' Hour where we reach private decisions about what we would like to do.

I believe I have some 20 minutes to speak to this Bill and I have considerably more than 10 minutes left to address myself to its substance. It being six o'clock I wonder if I might be guaranteed the floor as the first speaker when this debate resumes because it deserves careful thought, consideration and debate and I would like to continue that debate when this Bill next comes before the House.

● (1800)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 46 deemed to have been moved.

MEDICAL CARE—FUNDING OF CANCER TREATMENT CENTRES.
(B) MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, on January 13, I put questions to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) which were prompted by reports from Toronto, Winnipeg, and now from Ottawa, about the inadequacies of facilities for the treatment of people suffering from cancer in those and other cities in Canada. We have an aging population and, because cancer so often affects people as they get older, we have an ever-increasing number of people who suffer from cancer. They are, as reported in the stories of