

say: If a child is going to be handicapped, that is grounds for having an abortion and preventing that child from being born. I keep wondering what happened to us in the last thirty years that made us give up all those values we had acquired since the age of Hippocrates and even before then—Hippocrates said that a doctor had no right to suggest or give medication that would result in the death of a patient, and he even said that one should never offer a woman a pessary to induce abortion. Since that time and even before then, since the time of Hippocrates, that great Greek physician, we as a society have taken the position that we should protect human life, the life of the child yet to be born and the life of any person. And now we are qualifying that position, when we say that if the child yet to be born will be handicapped, we should not allow it to live.

I think we have reached a sorry stage in the history of human civilization. Incidentally, this is not a typically Canadian problem. It is a problem the world over. I keep thinking that we are very regressive in the way we look at things, and I find this very sad.

[*English*]

The bill that we have before us today is deficient in a number of ways and I will spend the next few minutes expressing the amendments that I would like to see to this bill in order to make it acceptable.

First this bill states, in its first sentence, that abortion is wrong. In other words, "Every person who induces an abortion—is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment". This, of course, makes the clear statement that abortion is a criminal offence and should be treated as a crime.

However, the bill is deficient as it goes along. First of all, we are discussing here a term of imprisonment not to exceed two years. I would submit to my colleagues in the House of Commons that if we are to consider abortion to be a crime, a term of two years does not reflect the fact that it is a crime. I believe that that penalty should be stricter and should reflect the seriousness of that statement.

Criminal law does two things; one, it punishes a guilty individual or an individual who behaves in a way unacceptable to society as a whole and, second, it makes a statement of where we stand in that society. It makes a

### *Government Orders*

statement of what we think is right and what we think is wrong. If we are to consider abortion to be a crime, which this bill does, then surely the punishment should reflect that. That sentence of the bill continues:

—unless the abortion is induced by or under the direction of a medical practitioner—

I will speak in a few moments on when I think abortion should be permitted which, as some of my colleagues may have detected by now, is not very often. In any case, before we get to that point, I do not believe that an abortion should ever be induced, on the few occasions where they should be, by anyone other than a doctor. Where the sentence says "induced—under the direction of" I believe that an amendment would be necessary to the bill.

The other deficiency that I see in this bill is that the next sentence continues and says:

—a medical practitioner who is of the opinion that,—

It describes when the abortion should be performed. I think that bill should be amended to say, starting with the same sentence, "—unless the abortion is induced by a medical practitioner having received the opinion of two other medical practitioners stating that the abortion is necessary".

In other words, I do not believe that Henry Morgentaler should say: "Abortion is necessary for this woman and, by the way, I will do it right now." I do think that the medical practitioner should be giving an independent opinion. As a matter of fact, I think there should be two of them.

I want to read further because my time is close to ending. The sentence of the bill continues:

—if the abortion were not induced, the health or life of the female person would be likely to be threatened.

I think that that should be changed to say only: "the life of the female person would likely be threatened". The word "health" in the previous section of the Criminal Code was completely bent out of shape from its original meaning and we are inviting that by putting it in the bill this time again.

I would like to have commented quite a bit more about this bill. I hope to have the opportunity to offer some of the amendments which I think would go a long way toward making this bill a bill which will protect human life from the time of conception.