

Criminal Code

This is a very technical matter that would require thorough consideration, but if the hon. members did not bother about scrutinizing it, considering it throughly—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I think the hon. member cannot impute any motives to any member I ask him once again to limit his remarks to the amendment before us.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that whenever we speak in the house, it should not be merely to enlighten chairs and desks, but to try to convince our hon. colleagues of the need of an amendment. If such is not our function, I wonder what it could be.

Our business is to try and state our case as well as we possibly can, in order to reach a clear understanding of the matter in hand. And as a good number of people turn a deaf ear, we try to wake them up and make them understand what those amendments are all about.

Mr. Speaker, if we thoroughly examine the matter, we have to acknowledge that it is logical and based on scientific grounds and I wonder whether every member should not make some efforts to vote in favour of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I know that sometimes we indulge in digressions but I can assure you that it is not out of ill-will. The point is merely to deal with amendments in depth and to convince the house to vote seriously on a matter which will have repercussions on the future.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

[*Mr. Matte.*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Pursuant to Standing Order 75 (11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau) moved amendment No. 26:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or would be likely to" on line 4 on page 43.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are at least three schools of thought on abortion.

According to one of them, abortion could be secured at will, and the right to abortion should be a matter between the pregnant woman and her doctor.

A second school of thought would not allow abortion on any ground whatever, and a third contends that it should very seldom be permitted, as is proposed in clause 18 of Bill C-150.

I think that clause 18 (4) (c) of this bill is too important for us to pass it right away because if it contains obscure wording it could be given a meaning much beyond the one intended by its proponents.

Mr. Speaker, clause 18 (4) (c) reads as follows:

—has by certificate in writing stated that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health, and—

Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to follow the argumentation of clause 18 (4) (c) when I read it and I confine myself strictly to the French text of Bill C-150—

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

I think there is a contradiction here. I was asked why I recommend deleting the words "or would be likely". In my opinion, the expression: "would be likely to endanger" is too vague and would leave wide open the interpretation of this legislation.

And if I refer to the *Petit Dictionnaire Larousse*, I can read that the word "certaine-ment" means "assurément", (certainly) "in-dubitablement" (indubitably). As for the