

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Rynard: I was saying when the house rose at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, that the pressure which will be brought to bear on hospitals and on the abortion committees of those hospitals—if they have one and they likely will have—will be great, indeed. If any arguments are needed to substantiate this assertion they will be found clearly set out in the report of Dr. Lewis on B.M.J. which I placed on record.

This is what will happen: a certain clause of this bill, once adopted and passed into law, will gradually be the subject of wider interpretation. This is what has happened elsewhere. Today, in Europe, I believe probably less than 4 per cent of abortions performed there are carried out for valid medical reasons. In the long run, the pressure of the affluent society, or of the just society—which, in effect, means “do what you want to do whether it is morally right or not”—may be great enough to break down the moral conscience of abortion committees and hospitals. This is what I fear. Where they have not had abortion committees on religious grounds, they will be made to create them.

If proof of this is required, hon. members need only look at today's *Ottawa Citizen* where an article appears by Karl E. Meyer concerning social conditions in the Baltic countries. He says:

Moralists would become discouraged in visiting Denmark, Sweden and the Netherlands. Not only are these countries allowing permissiveness to become a way of life, but nearly everybody seems incorrigibly relaxed about it, even those who may have their doubts... The sky is the limit as long as nobody gets hurt. Or, as Irene van der Weetering, who holds the Provo seat on the city council, complains: “They smother us with tolerance.”

This seems definitely the trend in Europe today. I wonder whether the Minister of Justice would continue to follow his present course if he felt he was setting a similar trend in motion here in Canada. They certainly did not set out with that intention in Europe, and I warn hon. members that with the permissiveness contemplated here we might well be starting on the same road.

I am one who feels that television can be singled out as a primary agent of change. The author of the article I mentioned quotes a Swedish journalist as saying “Television has

Criminal Code

the power of legitimizing things.” The article goes on to say:

As a result of all these factors... the Dutch, Danes and Swedes are on the way to creating societies where anything goes.

These things go on in communist countries, but these are atheistic in their thinking.

● (8:10 p.m.)

In Denmark and Sweden, there are new forms of marriage, social acceptance of homosexuality, abolition of censorship, permission to use soft drugs, compulsory sex education and easy access to contraceptives. All of these things exist in one or other of these countries. It may be that when the limits of permissiveness are reached the Dutch, the Danes and the Swedes will find that they have not solved any of the age old moral problems but have simply transferred them to a different plane. Their experience has a certain fascination for the rest of the world, and they should not complain, as some of them do, when we curiously peer and prod.

I intend to speak on some other clauses, Mr. Speaker, but I will conclude now by saying that anything that denigrates the spiritual and moral forces of a nation destroys the power of that nation to choose between right and wrong. This could very well happen to the abortion committees and our hospitals when the pressure is on.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, we are studying amendment No. 21 which reads as follows:

Nothing in this section shall be construed as obliging any hospital to establish a therapeutic abortion committee or any qualified medical practitioner to procure the miscarriage of a female person.

However, Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks I would like to point out to the house, if other hon. members have not done so already—for I have not had the opportunity to listen to all the speeches delivered on that important matter—that the end of the text of the amendment refers to “the miscarriage of a female person”.

During the debate of the committee on justice and legal affairs, when Bill C-150 was under study, I had the opportunity to remind the minister who, with much patience, sponsors the bill, that several pages of the bill, in particular pages 42 and 43, and a score of other pages, are devoted to “the miscarriage of a female person”. I asked him whether, as