

*Criminal Code*

We might call this splitting hairs, Mr. Speaker but such an interpretation is possible.

Therefore, our "smart aleck" could say: "She, of the female sex, cannot, but I, I am not of the female sex, therefore, I can get the necessary authorization.

Often, we refuse to believe that people may be so stupid. It is the kind of objection that the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) could put forward, for instance. I would answer that if we see eggs, there must be a hen around. And we, in this house, since we are discussing idiocies, there must have been some idiots to lay such rotten eggs. If we bear in mind the consummate skill of the law artists—of those people who know how to evade legislation or to use it to their benefit—such a hypothesis might appear quite likely.

Mr. Speaker, it has been common knowledge since time immemorial that the greatest thieves are as free as a bird and that the law is unable to catch them. I would be tempted to add that, sometimes, having caught them, it lets them get away again. I am thinking at this very moment of Lucien Rivard's famous evasion.

● (3:30 p.m.)

All such interpretations, though they may seem crazy, are nevertheless plausible. We are puzzled by this heavy insistence on "female person". How many sexes are there? Was it the intention in this way to spare the pretty boys who, instead of being normally constituted, are cracked in the head?

Mr. Speaker, may I refer to a definition of the sexes to be found in the works of Plato. I quote:

Formerly, our nature was not what it is today; it was quite different. First of all, there were three species of humans—

May be it is to that text that the author of the omnibus bill was referring.

—and not two, as is the case today: the male, the female and, in addition, a third species made up of the first two. Only the name survives today, the species has disappeared. That was the androgynous species which combined the forms and the names of the two other species, male and female; it no longer exists today; only the name survives as an expression of scorn.

Moreover every man as a whole was round-shaped, with a rounded back and rounded sides, four hands, as many legs, two faces quite similar on a round neck, and on top of those opposite faces, a single head, four ears, two generative organs and all the rest accordingly. He walked erectly, as we do now, in whatever direction he wanted, and when he started running fast, he did like showmen who turn in circles while throwing

[Mr. Matte.]

their legs up in the air; leaning on their eight members, they turned somersaults in rapid succession. And those three species were thus shaped because the male originated from the sun, the female from the earth, and the mixed species from the moon which has the characteristics of both.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that I am young, but I have yet to meet such beings as those I have just described.

So, we only know two kinds, and we know only one sex that can transmit life, that can bear the foetus which will result in a normally shaped human being. There is only one sex.

That is why when the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) stresses the fact that this provision should be deleted, I think that he is quite right. It is altogether useless. However, the amendment might not cover all the clauses adequately, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) pointed out, because the same expression recurs in other clauses.

If the minister agreed, he would simply eliminate the expression every time it met and in all sections on abortion.

But the interpretations I just pointed out may exist. The main interpretation, at least according to the French version we have here, would be that the abortion of a person of the "female sex" might not be really that of the person because we understand the embryo, the foetus is a human being, a living being and consequently abortion could be interpreted as being that of the foetus itself of the female sex, which would create tremendous confusion.

Were we expected to understand that since the result of these masculine affairs, of the feminine gender, could not affect life or health, the fact of clearly specifying the "female sex" was meant to eliminate this kind of sex? This specification was useless as science is not advanced enough to know the nature of the young of this new race. Will they be aqueous or terrestrial creatures?

Finally, what will happen to these persons of both sexes physically? We have here all kinds of problems which, as ridiculous and stupid as they may seem at first sight, are nevertheless a very eloquent demonstration, in my opinion, of the uselessness of the present debate.

Before I conclude my remarks, I would like our motives to be understood and I want the government to consider the fact that we do not want to delay this debate in any way and that we would be very happy if the minister