

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gauthier: It is still another contrivance of the big chief, I suppose. Some made a point of adding to their comments on the bill stories which could bring tears to the eyes of the most hardened persons, stories moreover, which were unrelated to the specific point to which we object.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if that amendment was solely meant to save the life of the mother, we would not have to alter the present legislation. I would even add that all our conscientious physicians have always respected that compulsory reservation. But the bill goes still farther, since it adds:

—to protect the mental health of the mother—

This is a door opened to abuses. There remains only to establish a small board made up of three physicians specializing in abortions and that is it. It is easy for a physician who wishes to do so to diagnose symptom of mental illness in a pregnant girl or woman. Since according to the testimonies of the highest medical and religious authorities, any abortion is a real murder, who would be ready to authorize such a butchery of innocent and harmless unborn children?

Some suggest that it is not a religious matter. They are free to do so, but any practising Catholic must condemn such a criminal act on account of the great commandment: Thou shalt not kill. Indeed, if all sins are not necessarily criminal, on the other hand, all crimes are necessarily sins.

All true Christians to whom the law of Christ forbids to take part in such a crime, and all decent men to whom the mere law of nature inspired the bill of rights should be strong enough to stop the movement toward legalized infanticide.

Indeed the bill of rights says that the greatest of fundamental rights is the right to live.

● (9:30 p.m.)

Therefore, I appeal to all Catholics and all Christians who represent about 80 or 90 per cent of the house. I also call upon atheists who have still a little sense of humanity, to remove from the bill on abortion the words I mentioned earlier and, for goodness sake, let there not be any more ridiculous comments such as those we have heard a few days ago from someone who likes to criticize everyone else without ever looking at himself in the mirror at night. In fact, that member

Criminal Code

concluded his comments by saying: Mr. Speaker, personally I am against abortion and homosexuality and I shall vote for both. After that, the only thing to do is to dry up.

The Conservative members who spoke insisted that the bill be divided, in order to vote separately on each aspect.

We have supported them because we refuse to swallow the pill. We also realize that among them, opinions are divided according to religious denominations and it is only natural to find differences among lay people on such delicate matters. Besides, the same disagreements can be found among theologians.

The member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) has presented himself as a theologian—something I never doubted—although we have not read the same authors nor had the same professors, and it is only normal that we should differ regarding the bill, because I emphasize particularly that I am discussing only what is written in the bill, not what should or could have been in it.

As for the members of the New Democratic Party, most are well known for their avant-garde ideas, that they call sophisticated. But I always considered these ideas as being not too catholic. The leader of that party in the house made it very clear when he stated that part of our criminal legislation was formulated at a time when the clergy was greatly influencing popular beliefs and morals and dictating to our society most of its attitudes.

Since then however, he said, our society has evolved. We now have a pluralist society, where it is no longer possible to impose on a religious group the generally accepted views of society.

If the remarks of that hon. member could be applied to our financial system, it would be marvelous. But in the realm of religion, I will tell him that whatever he may think it is certainly not progress to follow the downward path of a materialistic and atheistic minority.

Unfortunately that is the modern trend. Indeed we had a sample of it when listening to certain New Democratic party speakers. One always wonders what they are driving at. If there is a traitor to hide, they join in. If there is a notorious criminal to defend, they join in. If there is a revolutionary principle to expound, they again join in.