Criminal Code

Since newspapers are publishing advertisements in direct and public violation of the Criminal Code and since I can table a copy of such an advertisement which appeared yesterday in Le Journal de Montréal and which reads as follows:

BETTY FARHOOD CENTRE 7164 St. Hubert St., Montréal

Mrs Betty Farhood LEGAL! • INTERRUPTION OF PREGNANCY •

Attention

Pricel

Unbelievable

On request (Same day by gynecologists in licensed clinic)

Only centre in Canada approved by clinic near Montreal.

And a little further another add like:

BEEF SALE

Can be read

And considering the committee on therapeutic abortion-

Mr. Speaker: Order. If the hon, member wants to present a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43, would he please do so rightaway.

Mr. Matte: Thank, Mr. Speaker. According to Standing Order 43, I have to justify that motion, and that is why I was justifying it.

And since the committee on therapeutic abortion is defined in the code-

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the hon. member have a motion to present?

Mr. Matte: I will in a few seconds.

-is defined in the Criminal Code as having quite a different purpose than what that add suggests and section 159 of the code is quite precise in that respect and reads as follows:

(2) Every one commits an offence-

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Matte:

-who knowingly, without lawful justification or excuse,-

(c) offers to sell, advertises, publishes an advertisement of, or has for sale or disposal any means, instructions, medicine, drug or article intended or represented as a method of causing abortion or miscar-

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr.

That the Solicitor General order immediate steps to be taken against those people who trespass the law with impunity in order to restore the moral atmosphere of our country.

Mr. Speaker: Under Standing Order 43, that motion requires unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Matte.]

Mr. Speaker: As there is not unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

• (1410)

ORAL OUESTION PERIOD

[English]

AGRICULTURE

EGGS—JUSTIFICATION FOR IMPORT CONTROLS—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE PRODUCTION WILL NOT EXCEED DOMESTIC DEMAND

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the import controls on eggs from the United States recently announced by the minister will have an immediate effect on the price of eggs in Canada, and in fact have already had that effect, and in view of the fact that such import controls will touch off U.S. retaliation, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he is now in a position to respond to the charges made by the Food Prices Review Board that the import controls on U.S. eggs are without clear explanation or in fact justification?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon, member has made several statements which I feel are not accurate, such as the one concerning retaliation. He is going on supposition and not on fact. I stated in the House earlier that we followed the proper procedure concerning our agreements with our trading partners under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. I also said earlier in the House that we would make public and would table the agreements that we have with our provincial counterparts.

My officials have gone over the statement which the chairman of the Food Prices Review Board saw fit to give to the press first before giving it to anybody else. They have gone over the statement this morning and have found that we followed every accord, as we said we would do. I am amazed that she would say that I never suggested parliament would be informed. I said this procedure was according to the agreements and that they would be made public as soon as they were signed. We have nothing to hide in respect of CEMA at all. I am sure that if she wanted to really do her job she would tell the public of Canada why the price of pork is so high now.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the minister chose to attack the chairman of the Food Prices Review Board who is not in a position to defend herself in this House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McGrath: And it is a fact that the minister did bootleg the statement on Friday when parliament did not have a chance to reply.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: I would ask the minister if he has met the recommendations of the special committee in respect of the cost of production formula, and what steps has he