

Criminal Code

The hon. member says that I am as stupid as that editorial. But I do not want to have anything in common with the hon. member.

I go on—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I might point out to the house that we could go on at some length dealing with points of order and points of privilege, but I would caution hon. members against using this type of device to prolong discussion. If I may make an observation, this sort of thing does tend to diminish the importance of a point of order or a point of privilege, both of which are important parts of our procedure. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, after listening for two weeks to a lot of things being said by our colleagues in the Cr ditistes party who have referred to all kinds of reports, books, booklets and editorials, I should like to put forward something in rebuttal. This amendment proposes that there be various types of doctors on these committees which decide who should be aborted and who should not. To prove their point, these hon. members have referred to a lot of things over the last two weeks. I am now trying to prove my point.

I contend this amendment is not justified because its objective is already met in the bill presented to the house. I want to read two paragraphs to help prove my point. Since they are in French, I will read them in French.

[*Translation*]

Several people will hold the Cr ditistes' filibuster of Bill C-150, known as the omnibus bill, to be highly virtuous. But we should not make such a mistake when they only pursue political interests—

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I can entertain only one point of order at a time. I recognize the hon. member for Shefford.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that I and my colleagues have stuck to the amendment under consideration which deals especially with the members of the

[Mr. Mongrain.]

committee, the psychiatrist in particular. I should then ask the hon. member for Trois-Rivi res (Mr. Mongrain) to stick to the subject and, more especially, to the psychiatrist whom he should consult more often.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I certainly appreciate having the support of the hon. member for Shefford, in this matter but I point out to the house that under our standing orders we are restricted at this point to a specific amendment. I know the hon. member for Trois-Rivi res is as much aware of this as I am. If the editorial in question relates to this amendment, I would certainly be pleased to hear him; otherwise I caution him against referring to it because not only would the reading of it be a violation of our standing orders, but it likely would precipitate the sort of situation we would want to avoid.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, I intend to be as calm and objective as I can be. I intend to follow the fatherly advice that you have just given us, that is not to stray from the subject of the amendment.

I have respectfully listened during twenty minutes to the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe). He said we were against morality.

The other day, one of his colleagues said we were murderers and we did not protest too much.

I would simply like to take a few minutes to read two paragraphs tending to show that if we refuse this amendment, which calls for a psychiatrist, a pediatrician, etc., it is not because we are for vice and against virtue. On the contrary, our attitude is justified, and I want to prove that I am not the only one to say so. If I were, my friends the Cr ditistes would not believe me. I shall, therefore, be brief. I need only a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker. I quote:

Those who approve this bill know as well as do the Cr ditistes that morality condemns and will continue to condemn certain practices opposed by R al Caouette's followers. One needs not be a theologian to understand that. The legislation under study does not condone vice; it states simply that the State will not longer act as the conscience of the citizens.

The Cr ditistes know very well what is involved and their filibuster seems much more political than virtuous.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.