

*Criminal Code*

We in the house have had enough of irrelevance and waste of time, and I would ask you to enforce this rule if the hon. member continues to be irrelevant. I ask you to direct him to discontinue his speech if he continues to be irrelevant. You have interrupted him four times already and have asked him to be relevant but he has flagrantly disregarded your remarks. I ask you to enforce the rule, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I thank the hon. member, that is exactly why I made certain comments on the last call to order.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand), I refer to the same standing order which reads:

Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the house, or of the committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance—

● (5:30 p.m.)

I should like to emphasize another side of the question, as the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce has not done so. When the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) rose to speak, he asked the Chair's permission to make a quotation. You called him to order without knowing what the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) wanted to say or quote. I believe it is one of the first calls to order that could not come under standing order 34(2).

This call to order may have caused the hon. member for Portneuf to lose the thread of his ideas, of the matter in hand, since psychologically speaking, it is more or less what usually happens.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask you to kindly allow the hon. member for Portneuf to pursue his very interesting and brilliant remarks.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. Both hon. members made their remarks very clear to the Chair. I thank them most sincerely and ask the hon. member for Portneuf who still has a few observations to make, to kindly limit his remarks, this time, to the amendment.

**Mr. Godin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for having thanked my colleagues and I am coming back to the amendment through a last quotation, which is the most important of all, and I am still quoting from a speech delivered

in Prague in 1869. There are only three lines, I quote:

At the appointed and predetermined time, we shall unleash the revolution which through the ruin of all classes of Christendom, will enable us to enslave all Christians once and for all.

That is why, I asked a while ago for the benefit of what nation shall we have to yield? Are modern wars, with the modern weapons we know, putting the authors of that speech in fear of a revolution in Canada? Is it to be feared that Canada will be actually destroyed before being taken over? Would that be the means they have found—abortion—to prevent us from reproducing ourselves, so as to be able to seize the country without any trouble? Is Canadian parliament the tool of those people?

Those are the questions that come to my mind in the face of the statements of the minister who again opposes a very simple amendment which reads:

"therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than four members, two of whom shall be qualified medical practitioners and one a psychiatrist appointed by the board of that hospital, as well as a clergyman, or spiritual advisor.

The minister told us that he actually urged people, women, to see a psychiatrist or their clergyman.

Now, if the minister agrees, we do too, and we want to make even surer. Promises and unwritten commitments are not good enough. That is why the hon. member for Brandon-Souris moved this amendment, merely because he wanted the wishes of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to be spelled out in the act. It is nothing else. That is why I still support the amendment in question.

Now—as I repeated a while ago—is there anything more drastic than abortion to complete the infamous work of the pill? Since it is related and precedes abortion, I feel that it is closely related to the amendment in question, and considering the fact that the pills are not entirely satisfactory, might the bill not be designed to help pharmacists?

When we know that a woman can conceive only 60 days a year, why all the publicity, for instance, about the famous pill and why speak about abortion? Why speak about abortion for a period of 60 days per year? And considering that a woman—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.