

*Criminal Code*

Here in Canada, the government's refusal of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce proves that clause 18 of the legislation before us is a totalitarian measure.

Maternity leaves will become non-existent, for the benefit of Insurance companies which have been collecting fees for those leaves, for several years.

The Minister of Justice has said that he is against the amendment proposed by his colleague. May I go back to the amendment, of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce which proposes to modify Bill C-150, and I quote:

—by deleting in clause 18 the words "or would be likely to endanger her life or health" on lines 4 and 5 on page 43 and by inserting the following words:

"endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health".

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is against the amendment because pregnancy, childbirth, would not be considered as an illness by the Canadian government and consequently does not endanger the life of the mother.

Through his contract as an employer, the Canadian government proves that pregnancy does not endanger health because the Canadian government does not even grant a maternity leave to his "female" employees.

Generally speaking, female employees are fairly well treated. Regular work, time off for lunch, time off for coffee, weekends off, leave on important feast days, annual leave, accumulated leave, call it what you will, they benefit from them. All in all, we can say that the working conditions are fairly good. We are glad to work with secretaries in top condition and who retain their youth.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that when a human being is well treated, he or she stays healthy longer.

Mr. Speaker, none of the secretaries of the House of Commons, 80 per cent of whom are married have maternity-leave clauses in their contract. This shows that the government recognizes that pregnancy is not a sickness but a natural event.

In the legislation now before us, why give so much importance to pregnancy? Why try and educate by pointing out inexistent dangers?

Who else but the financiers would profit from section 18, legalizing abortion?

● (3:20 p.m.)

Maternity leaves are disappearing, the birth rate is falling and, as a result, there are less family allowances to pay, and all this is profitably replaced by taxes deducted at the source. So the question of abortion should not be raised in the parliament of Canada. Everything should be done to help the married woman to play her role in our society. It is well known that childless married couples not only are less costly to the state, but they pay more taxes as well.

Collecting taxes is important, but to make investments is a necessity. And for the survival of the country, the Canadian government should first take into consideration the opinion of the 70,000 Canadian women who expressed their views to the right hon. Prime Minister a few days ago.

It is obvious that the proposed amendment tries to clear things up and I hope that the government will take the opportunity to clarify this ambiguity and, hence, will prove that the participation of the people, the dialogue recommended by the head of the government not so long ago on the hustings was not a promise made in jest.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question?

[*English*]

The question is on motion No. 34, (Mr. Allmand) which reads as follows:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or would be likely to endanger her life or health" on lines 4 and 5 on page 43 and by inserting the following words:

"endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health".

Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost on division.

Motion No. 34 (Mr. Allmand) negatived.