

*Criminal Code*

on each amendment, it is not to do any filibustering on this bill, for our party did not ask for such a discussion.

Not only we did not ask for it, we actually asked for the very opposite, and last Friday, we voted with the Progressive Conservative members on a motion to adjourn the debate on Bill C-150, in order to proceed with more serious matters. So if people pointed a finger at us because the debate drags on, they would be labouring under a tremendous misconception.

The amendment before the house is a very short one. I will try, therefore, as on similar occasions, to be very brief, and to limit my remarks to the regular 20-minute period.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer, and I would not like to get entangled or lost in the maze of legal terminology. Many people act as if they were paid so much per word, which often results in the fact that their language in a written form, in its attempts at precision, becomes gibberish or, as in the case in hand, simply ridiculous and stupid.

Simple souls and laymen like myself have to smile when they read the various paragraphs under section 18, and come across things like this:

—a qualified medical practitioner, other than a member of a therapeutic abortion committee for any hospital, who in good faith uses in an accredited or approved hospital any means for the purpose of carrying out his intention to procure the miscarriage of a female person—

When we find this kind of language in one paragraph after another, we cannot help but be amused. The repetition of this ridiculous specification gives us some doubts. Many stout, corpulent members of this house should feel their bellies, just in case.

Did a woman's ovum ever go into orbit and drive a permatoozon back into the body of a man? This is what this useless specification would lead us to believe. My remarks will be found very stupid and yet the wording of the subsections of clause 18 does imply such stupidities.

One would think that the authors of this clause in the omnibus bill were so concerned with the fate of these poor Canadian women that they wanted to show them that this provision legalizing abortion was a precious present being offered exclusively to the mothers and future mothers of families, those who are indeed responsible for one of our greatest national resources, that is, the generations which will succeed us in this country which is

as big as a continent. Our motto "from sea to sea" could become "mother at sea".

These abusive specifications could also be construed as justifying the legislator who would have thus become a kind of Pontius Pilate who washes his hands so well that he dares determine, self-consciousness, without that he is quite in favour of abortion for persons of the female sex but, on the other hand, he certainly does not want the same authorization for persons of the male sex, like him.

All sorts of other interpretations could be put forth. May I be allowed to underline the most serious ones, those which would be likely to bring about confusion.

Let me take again paragraph (a) of section 18, which reads partly as follows:

—a qualified medical practitioner other than a member of a therapeutic abortion committee for any hospital, who in good faith uses in an accredited hospital any means for the purpose of carrying out his intention to procure the miscarriage of a female person.

Mr. Speaker, someone might give to the term "a female person" the following interpretation: a person still in embryo, that is a child in his mother's womb. If someone gave that interpretation, the legislation would mean that abortion is right provided the mother expects a girl. You see that that term may be confusing.

When the bill refers to:

—the miscarriage of a female person—

does that mean that if the unborn child were a male person, miscarriage could not be procured? You can see that that could be interpreted in such a way. I do not say that such is the purpose of the bill but it could be interpreted in that way by someone, and abortion would not be valid, then, if it were a boy.

And what would happen, Mr. Speaker, if some smart aleck came to see the doctor and requested an abortion for his girl-friend, basing his request on his own interpretation of section 18 (b) which reads as follows:

—a female person who, being pregnant, permits a qualified medical practitioner to use in an accredited hospital any means described in paragraph (a) for the purpose of carrying out her intention to procure her own miscarriage.

Mr. Speaker, it could be interpreted to mean that a female person cannot request the authorization, but a male person can. For an abortion to be authorized, the request would have to be made by a male person.