

Criminal Code

Mr. Mongrain: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. For once I hear my hon. friend say sensible things and I am inclined to vote with him. But if he upsets me, I shall vote against him.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, we shall take him at his word and stop teasing him, so he will vote with us. I would ask my hon. colleagues to welcome him with a good hand because for the first time in this debate he has said something intelligent.

Mr. Speaker, there remains the same unnecessary expression in paragraph (b) of subsection 5, and I quote:

(b) require a medical practitioner who, in that province, has procured the miscarriage of any female person named—

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) has said, it is horrible and it reflects the nonsense of the clause.

It seems to me that the matter is self-explanatory, because one cannot imagine the pregnancy of a male person.

Mr. Speaker, I see several of my colleagues from all parties in the house are laughing. It is precisely because that clause is ridiculous. My colleague from Abitibi has seen fit to clarify the situation and to strike out from clause 18 that term which in our opinion is superfluous.

Mr. Speaker, let us summarize to see why we are using that term.

In subsection (4) of section 18, it is stated:

—any means for the purpose of carrying out his intention to procure the miscarriage of a female person—

In my opinion, there should be a period after the term “to procure the miscarriage.”

● (9:50 p.m.)

Why? As I was saying, it is ridiculous to repeat that expression. If one asks: What is the meaning of to procure the miscarriage of a female person? The meaning is obvious and, from that point of view, both the French and the English language give the expression a precise meaning. In both languages you can find the expression “female person”. Then, why after “the miscarriage of a person” use the expression “female person”? It seems to me that it is useless and ridiculous and that that expression could be avoided. It is merely a repetition. It does not clarify anything.

In paragraph (b) one can read and I quote:

(b) a female person who, being pregnant—

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, let us try and imagine that that expression is removed.

There may be another reason why the expression “female person” is used. It may be that the author of the bill did not know exactly what the female sex was, unlike the hon. members who are married, and that it was important for him that it be added.

Mr. Speaker, again it strikes me that the expression female person who, being pregnant, permits a qualified medical practitioner to use. . .” is pure repetition.

One reads further on, and I quote:

—of the committee at which the case of such female person has been reviewed—

However, Mr. Speaker, it is useless to belabour the point. It could be summed up in this way: if the hon. minister wants at all cost to distinguish between the three sexes, that is the male, the female and the other sex, it should be mentioned once at the beginning of the section and, from then on, this useless expressions should be deleted.

The hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Pilon) says that it is against maturity. It may be true; I have the impression that we are simply showing common sense, that we are reasonable. It is ridiculous, it is stupid, and I am almost ashamed to speak of such a thing. It seems to me that that goes without saying.

Mr. Speaker, on that matter of abortion, the bill says: “to procure the miscarriage of a female person” and further, in paragraph (5) (b):

—require a medical practitioner who, in that province, has procured the miscarriage of any female person named in a certificate—

We recognize in principle that we cannot logically be in favour of that clause 18, because that is ridiculous, and the word “female” proves it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to show, that we are not the only ones to think along these lines; we sincerely regret that the previous amendments, aiming to appoint specialists on abortion committees, have not been adopted. We do not see why the government is once more refusing the amendment which is proposed by the hon. member for Abitibi.

It may be my turn to read an editorial; it was published by the newspaper *L'Union des Cantons de l'Est* dated Tuesday April 29, 1969. This is a most interesting leading article. I require the attention of the house and particularly of the cabinet members. They will see into what problems they are pushing us headlong, as well as the Canadian population.