

*Criminal Code*

As regards the information the public would be entitled to get from those various agencies, we can read the following:

Another organization has taken a non-equivocal stand on this problem: the "Conseil des Oeuvres de Montréal", in the so-called "Opération Rénovation sociale". As for birth control, we think it is high time that information clinics would be made available to the public.

And further on:

We think that only a team made of specialists of various professions would really answer the needs of the couples who come in quest of such advice.

The team should comprise, on a regular basis, a doctor, a nurse, a social worker or a psychologist. It could require, for consultation, the assistance of a psychiatrist, a gynaecologist and a moralist.

I go on quoting:

Such clinics—

—of information or education should be—

—geographically well distributed in the country and free—

—and available to pregnant women in Canada. And, page 118, while still tackling the subject of information for pregnant women, we read:

A study conducted in the Netherlands has demonstrated how important were these clinics in reducing abortion.

It is a crying shame, that the government has no family policy. The only bill it has submitted to the house aims at killing the foetus without giving those defenceless beings the opportunity of being born and of living on their own.

Many other arguments have helped us in our fearless fight. They were of a scientific nature.

A doctor in England, speaking of how ridiculous abortion is, says this, and I quote:

If we were to kill the foetus for all kinds of reasons and social considerations, why should we not kill old people as well for equally silly social reasons?

He also said this:

• (9:30 p.m.)

[English]

A doctor in England suggested that an age be set beyond which doctors no longer would strive to keep patients alive—why?—

[Translation]

Doctors could stop taking care of them so that those persons could die as soon as possible. Why could not the same arguments be used as for abortion? Why?—

[English]

—because they are overloading the health and welfare system;—

[Translation]

Why? Because, today, old people are the ones who overload the social welfare budgets. They are the ones who get the most money, in old age pensions.

[English]

—they are taking up beds so that young people cannot be admitted for needed medical treatment;—

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, if we had to accept abortion for any reason pertaining to social order, for any imaginary discomfort or illness that women can have, why should we not forbid the doctors to cure the sick who are over 55 because those people are the ones who occupy the greatest number of hospital beds?

[English]

—they are traffic hazards; they degenerate into persons of neglect and squalor and they are a fire risk to neighbours.

[Translation]

They have become dangerous people in regard to traffic.

These are also social considerations which are as intelligent as the imbecile and stupid considerations that the Liberal government is now presenting to the house.

A little further, we read that we could kill the old because they have also become a fire hazard for their neighbours. We know that old people, through carelessness or because they are all shaky are dangerous and represent a fire hazard for their neighbours. These are, Mr. Speaker, stupid, childish and non humanitarian considerations. They are in the same line as those which are called upon to try and make us accept abortion.

I continue the quotation:

[English]

—'we can set an example of our respect for the sanctity of human life to a world that is sorely in need of a higher regard for human life and a higher standard of human conduct'. Now, when it concerns the preservation of the life of unborn children, parliament seems to take an about face. There does not seem to be the same high regard for human life on the part of some.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to accept the arguments of the government. We care a lot about the old as human beings. However, the government feels more deeply about animals than about orphans, or unborn children.

Sometime ago in this house the Minister of Fisheries displayed great humanitarian feelings for baby seals which cannot see. But how come the Minister of Justice does not have