

*Criminal Code*

led into the venture of libertinage where the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice are leading us, then we are not going forward, because we are just replacing something wrong by something worse. There lies the huge responsibility which rests heavily upon legislators.

On the one hand, we must bring forward a legislation which is humane, and promotes freedom and security for individuals, while on the other hand, that very same legislation must be sufficiently firm to maintain that happy medium which will ensure that our society is based on order and not on disorder, on justice and not on injustice and crime, on honesty and not on perversity.

To illustrate my viewpoint, I shall say a few words of sections 14, 15 and 18 regarding abortion.

Mr. Speaker, it is generally recognized that abortion in all its forms, is being practised on a large scale, not only in Canada, but in many other countries.

It seems to me that abortion is a social ill which cannot be easily erased but as it has most serious implications, we must try to correct it.

The practice of abortion is the indication of a very deep problem which has existed for a very long time and which is more and more prevalent, even though it stems from an ill-balanced notion of sex. That is my opinion.

As the Foyers Notre-Dame have indicated, abortion is rather a last resort in cases where contraceptives have failed. The danger we are facing in this ill-balanced concept of sex, which is often due to an inadequate and unhealthy education or to a rotten social environment, is that when you allow abortion, women who resort to it begin to believe—it is already so—that this practice which I consider as a crime, is the best method of birth control.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that therapeutic abortion is irrational because it is based on false premises and can only warp the scales of values.

Whoever says abortion says interruption of the natural course of things, and the reasons that may warrant such an interruption cannot be, in most cases, anything but pretexts prompted by a false notion of sexuality, or the misfortune of a young girl who has been caught, wilfully or not, or else by the miscalculation of a couple who, for some reason, do not want a child, or still, through the influence of an unhealthy social environment where economic conditions, very often, only make matters worse.

To procure or secure abortion is not a natural thing. On the contrary, it puts an end, in a most tragic way, to the natural development of life.

On the one hand, Mr. Speaker, people talk of therapeutic abortion, which constitutes a formal contradiction. As a matter of fact, whoever says therapy says taking a step in order to re-establish the normal course of a thing. Whoever says therapy says natural treatment in order to insure health.

Mr. Speaker, doctors admit, even the specialists, that pregnancy is not necessarily an illness. Indeed, in these circumstances, some women suffer only a few minor discomforts, of a very temporary nature.

In general, thanks mainly to medical progress and new techniques that are almost one hundred per cent effective, few pregnant women get sick to the point that their health is endangered and, even less, their life.

Clause 18 of the bill before us is intended to add to section 237 subsection (4) (c) which reads in part as follows, and I quote:

—would or would be likely to endanger her life or health,—

—that is the pregnant woman's. That provision is much too broad and could involve numerous definitions, Mr. Speaker. For instance, these words "would endanger her life or health" need to be clearly defined. And in the same section, we find this:

—would be likely to endanger her life or health—

—that is the mother's.

Who shall determine whether the mother's life is or is likely to be endangered? That is the point that should be settled. Where the mother's life is really endangered, medical practitioners must intervene to save the mother's or the child's life. The decision, I feel, should be made by the couple and not by the Prime Minister.

If the mother's life is likely to be endangered, decision must still be made, but now it is much more difficult than in the first instance. There is a difference, Mr. Speaker. The legislation should provide for various situations rather than lumping them all together, as if all human reactions could be foreseen.

● (3:10 p.m.)

We start on a false premise, I think, when we insert in the same clause, in the same paragraph, the words "would be likely" and "would".