

Criminal Code

I continue:

—that any medical practitioner or hospital should be free to refuse to take part in such a medical technique.

That is the reason why I congratulated the hon. member for Gatineau a while ago for he seems to share the views of the experts.

I continue the quotation:

—that as such a technique involves the life of a human being... the decision should not be left to the sole will of the patient.

We are against:

—a bill creating false hopes among the people.

Heaven knows that the Liberal party has created false hopes since it coming to power.

And I go on:

—furthermore we ask that the hospitals entitled to perform therapeutic abortions be designated by the Physicians' College in each province so as to ensure the quality of the established standards.

We conclude:

—that is why the Q.A.H.M.B. is opposed to the present wording of the proposed Bill C-195 and would like to have it amended in order to restrict it to cases presenting serious danger to the mother's life.

This is precisely why I am convinced, without having discussed it previously, that the hon. member for Gatineau, in wanting to delete the word "likely" is trying to restrict pretty much the scope of the law. If we do not remove that word, well, an unwed mother or a pregnant woman will pretend to be sick. A pregnant woman is always a little sick. Right there is ground for abortion. Right now. In the case of a mother fearing pregnancy, she will be able under the existing law to procure her miscarriage. Within a year or two this will mean disaster.

We are told that in Canada because of the pill births have dropped by 40 per cent. In two years, births will have decreased by 60 or 75 per cent. We shall no longer need the Chinese to destroy us then. We shall only need abortionists to decimate the Canadian race. We shall import immigrants to replace these people who should have lived and who were killed by abortionists. We who are in the process of passing this anti-social measure...

Well, I believe that—

Mr. Marceau: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Gauthier: If that point of order is like the other previous one, Mr. Speaker, I shall continue with my comments.

● (9:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marceau: Mr. Speaker, I believe that my hon. friend has strayed from the question. I think he is always coming back to the same point.

I believe that—

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Marceau:—nothing is said about the amendment and that comments should be limited to the text of the amendment.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I might point out to hon. members that I can only hear one point of order at a time. I think out of courtesy to the hon. member for Lapointe I should hear his point of order, after which I will decide whether he has a legitimate point of order. If, following that, the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) has another point of order, I will listen to him and decide that. I did not hear what the hon. member for Lapointe said, so possibly he would like to repeat it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marceau: Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to say that my hon. friend is not speaking about the amendment. His remarks are of a general nature and would be proper on third reading.

Mr. Gauthier: On a question of privilege—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I might point out to the hon. member that I was listening to the hon. member for Roberval fairly carefully. Sometimes it is difficult to decide whether or not he is dealing directly with the amendment. I was trying to give him as much latitude as possible, while recognizing his right to express his point of view. I think that within fairly broad limits he is in order, but I also remind him that the Standing Orders are fairly specific on this matter. We should confine our remarks to the amendment before us. I know that the hon. member for Roberval, who has been in the house for a number of years, knows this as well as I do and I am sure he will try to confine his remarks to the amendment before us.