

*Criminal Code*

people. Tomorrow, the lawyers will have to interpret the laws which we will have passed. And as mentioned by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), there will always be some falsifiers to misinterpret the law, enabling unscrupulous people to be heard and backed up.

Is it not the responsibility of the state to sanction the respect of life?

Because life is the first human right and that our fundamental social values are based on respect for it, I would think it is the duty of Parliament to protect any life and to make this known in its laws, and to give the term "health" a definite, precise and clear meaning.

If, by allowing abortion, we ruin the health of people as a matter of fact, with a confusing law, how could the entire population fail to find as anything but irresponsible.

Some physicians may question the value of life, but value judgments are not medical decisions, and physicians are no more competent than others to pass them.

In medical terms, they know the problem and the situation. That is why, at present, too much responsibility is given to physicians who want the automatic rejection of the bill or, at least, mitigating action through which amendments would clearly define the law.

There could be special cases when the mother could die unless an abortion were performed. It would then be impossible to save the child, since the mother's death would kill them both.

But every time the child can be saved, he is entitled to our protection because, tomorrow, under the protection of our laws, which will be sensible laws we hope, this healthy child will keep the democratic institution of parliament going—if there still is a parliament; indeed the present dictatorship makes one wonder if tomorrow our country will not have turned socialist.

This eliminates abortion for any other reason than for the purpose of saving the mother's life. For instance, abortion is ruled out as a means to increase the mother's life expectancy. To justify an abortion by putting forward such a reason is to deny that all human lives are of equal value, because it is to take for granted that the few years added to the mother's life are more important than the whole life of the child.

[Mr. Dumont.]

● (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words to add, but I should like, as a last recommendation, to ask once again the 264 members of the house to listen to the voice of truth calling for a referendum in Canada and for the immediate rejection of all these abortion and homosexuality measures. I urge that all our amendments concerning the word "health" or any other terms be taken into serious consideration.

Members of the *Comité d'action Hull-Gatineau*—some are very familiar with this organization which is against abortion—are asking and I support them:

1. That a serious study be undertaken on the abortion problem before the legislation is amended;

—by considering, for instance, amendments such as the one tending to delete from the text of the legislation the word "health".

2. That positive and immediate steps be taken to reduce the social pressures which drive women to seek an abortion and that enough time be devoted to the review of the findings arrived at before condemning a life;

We are convinced that this amendment aimed at deleting the word "health", would give an automatic opportunity of studying more seriously the recommendations we have brought forward:

3. That all necessary services be set up for the purpose of educating the people in the fields of family life, sexuality and birth control before replacing by the so-called "remedial" measures the preventive methods not yet existing;

4. That, in the meantime, the respect Canadians have towards life be reaffirmed by Parliament by clarifying the wording of the law and by refraining from extending the grounds for legal abortions;

—which could ipso facto jeopardize completely the health of a person, but if the word "health" were allowed to be deleted, we could then, ponder seriously over the amendments we are proposing and which have been quite serious from the beginning.

We are not the ones who have wasted the members' time. If the two amendments I referred to earlier had been scratched, those dealing with abortion and homosexuality, the bill known as the "autobus" bill would have been carried, because, three days ago, we were willing to accept the other amendments. But, in our minds, we can never accept abortion, let alone homosexuality.

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, we have had the opportunity, in the course of the afternoon, of hearing numerous arguments having regard to health. That proves, I