

Criminal Code

The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) has spoken at length on the report submitted by Dr. Jutras to the committee on justice and legal affairs. This report demonstrates most eloquently the merits of our arguments.

I can well remember that after hearing Dr. Jutras' evidence, all the members of the committee were dumbfounded. They were all left gaping and no one put a question to the man who had just given us such an extraordinary demonstration of what life is.

I am of the opinion that we would make a serious mistake if we admitted that the human being exists only after he comes out of his mother's womb. This demonstration left us dumbfounded and I wish that all those who were present would attempt to deny it. I wish they would express their views or ask the questions they were unable to ask at that time.

Mr. Speaker, it is normal that we, who are only laymen in the matter, should rely on experts.

The experts prove that there is perhaps less difference between a child of five or six and a man of 21 than between the foetus at the moment of fertilization and at the end of pregnancy. There is less transformation before than after birth.

As stated by Dr. Jutras, we remember quite well part of the events which occurred when we were five or six years old. However, most cells from that stage have been renewed many many times, even if essentially the individual has remained exactly the same, because the human soul, the essential principle of individuality, cannot undergo any transformation. This is exactly what happens at birth. As many changes occur during adult life as from conception to birth.

● (4:30 p.m.)

This explains the importance of human life. When the amendment under consideration states that "those means are employed before the period of implantation", it is entirely normal since before that implantation it is impossible to speak of development.

As I see it, it is the reason for the amendment and that is why we should support it.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, too many members are not interested in this matter, and it is a disappointment to those who take their responsibilities seriously and would like the law to be well thought out so that they would not incur reproaches later on.

Let us really consider each of the amendments and the possible consequences if

adoption of the bill or rejection of the proposed amendments in a few years from now, led to complete chaos.

It is in a way what is happening in countries where, under the pretense of being in the van, abortion was authorized. In Japan, where abortion is obtainable on request for only a few dollars, the government is beginning to realize it made a mistake.

According to what a newspaper, wrote last week, the Japanese population is steadily dropping off and there will be no Japanese left within a century.

What is happening in England is hardly more encouraging. According to an article, in last week's issue of *Le Droit*, a doctor is supposed to have performed 62 abortions in one day, which is an unprecedented occurrence.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. In all kindness, I would like to remind the hon. member that he is not allowed to deal in a general way with section 18 of Bill No. C-150; he should confine his remarks to the amendment under consideration, introduced by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) which reads partially as follows:

—page 43, the "period" after the word "practitioner" on line 8 on page 43 and inserting the following words: "and",

(e) that those means are employed before the period of implantation."

The hon. member, together with a number of others, has been indulging in generalities on clause 18 and I would like him to confine his remarks to the amendment before the house.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you have taken the trouble to consider the question thoroughly, but I can tell you it is not just a matter of a period and—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The question is not to remind the hon. member the rules for the sake of a period but to ask him to confine his remarks to the amendment before us.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the proposed amendment would be to prevent people from being prosecuted for having procured abortion, this being, in fact, was impossible, since the impregnated ovule was not implanted.