

*Criminal Code*

according to which a doctor can, today, practice an abortion for true reasons of health.

Therefore, we think that this amendment, notwithstanding what the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) says or what is said by the government members, is most serious because we want to remove from the Criminal Code reasons that cannot be defined, diseases that are not specified, discomforts even that could be put forward in order to get an abortion, though it would be a matter of discomfort and not a disease.

Because abortion is a very important subject and because people tend to use spurious reasons to save the mother's health such futile or commonplace reasons seem unacceptable to us.

Mr. Speaker, I would still like to mention testimonies of physicians who have studied all aspects of medicine, they are to be found on page 6200 of the book "*Biologie et médecine*" which deals with what is normal, and statistically normal. I quote:

In very general terms, it can be said that the majority of human beings for most of their lives, are not prey to conscious sufferings. This state is subjectively that of good health.

And a little further:

One day, in Geneva, some young women asked surgeons whom they trusted to remove unsightly tumours from the anterior part of their necks; these tumours were goiters.

First stage: goiters suddenly become a pathological phenomenon. It did not happen until the middle of the XIXth century, in an enlightened Western society, because these goiters, in fact, were undesirable only from an esthetic point of view.

● (3:40 p.m.)

Formerly, a person with a goiter was said to be ill, but the medical science says it is nothing but an esthetic flaw. I resume the quotation:

Third phase: a surgeon is sure enough of his technique to allow himself to operate goiters.

Today, surgeons have confidence in themselves, and statistics prove that goiters can be operated on with good results. What used to be considered as an incurable disease can now be cured by a minor operation.

Third phase: The patients present a special pathological picture, resembling certain states of cretinism with cutaneous infiltrations, the nature of which was unknown.

I could give other examples of illnesses which used to be incurable but which to-day, thanks to medical science, have become curable.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

Wanting to kill a foetus because a pregnant woman believes she is ill, is contrary to medical knowledge, medical science.

Further on under the title *Standards and Time* in the same book, one reads, and I quote:

A normal man is indeed an infant, then a child, an adolescent, an adult and an old man.

Still, it must be recognized that certain organic crises such as puberty or menopause, certain periods such as pregnancy, although they must be considered as physiological and normal—

No longer, in this day and age, as illnesses but as discomforts.

But, Mr. Speaker, this amendment deals with "health",—it was mentioned earlier that certain illnesses were considered as discomforts—and we cannot accept to kill a foetus on the basis of temporary discomfort.

For instance, if a woman at the beginning of her pregnancy had discomfort, she might have applied for an abortion pretending that she was sick. And, because pregnancy is something natural, normal, after two or three months, everything is back to normal. The discomfort disappears but not the illness, as she was not sick; the discomfort disappears and from then on she begins to love her child and afterwards the idea of an abortion gets off her mind.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we look at this bill we find that it is not based on any scientific or moral principle. It is not based on any biological or scientific fact. On what is it based then? On the protection, not of medical skills, but on the fact that some doctors, with this bill, will have a free hand and will have no concern because they will be protected by the Criminal Code. They will be able to allow abortion on request, not on the basis of sickness, but of discomfort.

Mr. Speaker, that is why these proposed amendments are absolutely in order, logical, and should be accepted by the minister.

If for any discomfort the foetus should be eliminated for such trifling reasons, I would not want to have on my shoulders or on those of future generations, the heavy responsibility of a stupid act, of an abominable killing which, for the sake of "health"—which is not defined—will lead to the elimination of foetuses in this country. To reduce the population and even be finally threatened with extermination, as is now the case in Japan where the number of abortions exceeds that of births, is a terrible thing. Within ten years, the Japanese race will be altogether exterminated. Why? Because any disease, which