

*Criminal Code*

The young girl or woman who asked for an abortion will get it anyway, but who will she go to then? After meeting with a refusal from the advisory committee, she will consult illegal abortionists. There will be plenty of such cases.

That is why such legislation, in all the countries where it was adopted, caused increase in the number of illegal abortions. We shall not be shocked by the haemorrhages brought on by the use of knitting needles, or of any kind of contraption.

Why do we not need this legislation? Because present statistics, at least those relating to Quebec, prove that the number of illegal abortions is decreasing to a very great extent. We are about to reach the zero point on this subject. Why? Because there are some misgivings. Since people are better educated, they know better how to manage. So abortion becomes useless.

Why then authorize abortions for quite sentimental and emotional reasons?

The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway brought in the argument of "the population explosion", which makes me laugh because, nowadays, at least in our region, large areas are abandoned and an increasing number of our rural parishes are deserted. There is an increasing shortage of manpower to the extent that it is impossible to step up the development of our immense country. The expression "population explosion" makes me laugh.

But, as the hon. member comes from Vancouver, perhaps she fears the yellow peril and in view of the great number of Chinese and Japanese people who are faced with a population explosion problem, I do understand her point.

• (12:40 p.m.)

Perhaps the hon. member is being influenced by the problems faced by Japan, India and China. But, what has that got to do with Canada, a country larger than the United States, almost as large as the Soviet Union with her 225 million people? It is absolutely inconceivable to talk of a population explosion in Canada, a country of 22 million people. This is something unbelievable, especially for us Quebecers and French-Canadians who can perpetuate our race only through child-birth, because we cannot rely on immigration to increase the population of our country.

For us, the best kind of immigration is made up by the children coming from the wombs of our women, and we want to look at

the problem more positively and encourage the raising of families, because we need them.

This argument about the population explosion is ridiculous, in my opinion, and it should be dropped, either in the Atlantic or in the Pacific, or in both.

Mr. Speaker, it is also regrettable that the only feminine voice we hear in this house—a charming voice which we love to hear as a rule—should express ideas which, in my opinion, are in opposition to those of the great majority of the population.

We said that we represented our areas, that we reflected the opinions of our people, but we become more and more aware that people think like that throughout Canada.

In support of this statement, I will recall the wonderful speech made by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) last night. His intervention was worthwhile, in my opinion, and set the record straight.

The hon. member said, and I quote:

—I will remind the minister that the onus is not on those members who are carrying on the debate because of their deep religious conviction and the dictates not only of their consciences but of the consciences of Canadians throughout the land, including Canadians in the area which I represent.

Mr. Speaker, Calgary is far from Quebec, far from Trois-Rivières, far from my constituency. But I realize that over there they have the same problem; most Canadians are opposed to abortion, just like the majority we are representing here as a minority. This is what the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway was saying earlier.

We are told that we are standing in the way of freedom, of democracy, that we are hindering the house. This is a manner of speech which to me does not reflect reality, since many members have been elected by a narrow margin.

And when two, three or four parties have put up candidates, the member elected by the people may get only 20 or 25 per cent of the votes in his riding. Therefore, we must conclude that 75 per cent of the people did not vote for the government. Thus the government is elected by about 35 or 40 per cent of the voters, which means that 55 per cent of the people were against the present government.

When we speak of majority, we should take this factor into account in the political system we have at this time. It is an anti-democratic system to the extent that it was said that the Pearson government was ruling with 37 per