

Privilege

That is absolutely false since I took no part in that election.

... and that, should the need have arisen, he could have counted on the support of the Union Nationale to ensure his own re-election.

Intelligent people, Liberals as well as supporters of the Union Nationale, did me the honour of voting for me.

In all fairness to Mr. Pouliot, it must be added that in the circumstances he did not have to go against his feelings in echoing Mr. Duplessis' opinions, which he shares altogether.

The answer to that is that I am surprised that the press gallery still retains a correspondent who is a dishonest mercenary, a man who, to his own misfortune, has learned to read and write. Otherwise he would have known the joy of living . . .

Mr. Speaker: I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member. He is of course entitled to correct the way in which his remarks may have been interpreted and such comments as may have been made on the subject. He must not, however, go beyond the necessary correction. Right now I feel that he is launching upon a personal attack on someone who happens to be a full member of the press gallery who is not here to defend himself. I believe that the hon. member must limit his remarks to making the necessary correction.

Mr. Pouliot: I will paint his picture Monday, Mr. Speaker.

(Text):

MR. NICKLE—EXPLANATION OF REMARKS MADE IN DEBATE ON FEBRUARY 18

Mr. Carl O. Nickle (Calgary South): I rise on a question of privilege, to make an explanation in order that a capable and respected member of the press gallery, Mr. James R. Nelson, may not be unfairly criticized because of my references in this house yesterday to an article written by him and appearing in the *Calgary Albertan* of Wednesday, February 17. I have now learned that this article, built around an interview with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Arsenault), was written by Mr. Nelson last January 27, and was transmitted to various newspapers, including the *Calgary Albertan*, by teletype on that date. I have no firsthand information, of course, as to why the *Calgary* paper deferred publication until February 17, by which date the opinions and perhaps the personal hopes expressed to Mr. Nelson by the hon. member for Bonaventure, and accurately set out in Mr. Nelson's article, had been completely outdated by new developments in this house. I submit, sir, that no blame can be attached to the author of the article because of this.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

CRIMINAL CODE

INQUIRY AS TO PROHIBITION OF THE SALE OF INFANTS OR CHILDREN

Hon. Stuart S. Garson (Minister of Justice): Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Richard) asked me a question to which I replied as follows:

Replying to the hon. member's question I would say that the present Bill No. 7, which is now before the house, does not specifically make it a crime to sell infants or children.

Later the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell) made what I thought was a very good suggestion, that perhaps this rather bald reply should be amplified for the purpose of being read outside of Canada. I would, therefore, like to amplify it.

Under Bill No. 7, an act respecting the criminal law, which is now under consideration by this house, all common law offences will be abolished. Under Canada's present Criminal Code, however, Canadian crown prosecutors may lay charges for offences which are defined by the code and may also prosecute offences under the common law and statute law of Great Britain, which laws were in effect in the British North American colonies at the time of confederation and were continued in effect in the new Dominion of Canada by the British North America Act.

Since the sale of babies is not defined as a crime in the present Canadian Criminal Code, naturally the answer to the question as to whether that sale is an offence under the present Canadian law may be sought in an examination of the British common and statute law still in effect in Canada. There might be, although I am not suggesting there is, an old anti-slavery statute which prohibited the sale of human beings into slavery and which prohibited the sale and traffic in human slaves. The hon. member for Ottawa East, with whom I have spoken since, tells me that this is not the crime he had in mind yesterday when he asked me this question. He is concerned not with the sale of human beings into slavery but the traffic in unlawful adoption of babies born in Canada and the taking unlawfully of such babies to other countries for adoption there.

This being so, there is not any purpose in our legal staff making any minute examination, and it would have to be minute, of the common law of England for the purpose of seeking an answer to my hon. friend's question. As is well known, there has never been the slightest trace of human slavery practised in Canada at any time since long before confederation. Hon. members need not