

Pension Acts

committee came back during the summer recess to spend three weeks of their so-called vacation on committee work in order that veterans organizations across Canada would be given a full hearing. This is what I call participatory democracy. I am a little tired of the negative reports coming in which downgrade Parliament and its members. But in this case at least, I think the public and certainly the veterans appreciate what we have tried to do.

There are three things which please me most in this legislation. First are the proposed changes to the benefit of doubt rule. I and many of our colleagues feel that if proper attention had been given to the benefit of doubt rule, a great deal of the changes in the legislation might have been redundant. Second, I am very pleased to see this new attempt at giving greater independence to adjudication tribunals, because in a great many cases it is not enough that justice be done. If some of our veterans believe they are not receiving an independent hearing, they go away with a feeling of injustice even if they receive a monetary reward.

Third, what I like in this legislation is the attempt to give the Hong Kong veterans the special treatment which we all know they have long deserved. I would be remiss if I did not say that the final good result is due to the fact that the Hong Kong veterans have a very fine organization which has worked hard over 25 years to obtain final adjudication. Even though they have often been discouraged and have suffered from the disabilities about which they have complained, they have been heroic and the victory is all theirs. Even though I and my colleagues, as well as all members of the House, regret that it has taken this length of time for the legislation to be passed, as I am sure it will be very shortly, this Parliament has given the Hong Kong boys what they have long deserved.

I am a little disappointed that we did not do more on the subject of multiple disabilities, but our committee will go on working. It has been a good committee in the past and I am sure we will get our teeth into the subject. We will not take no for an answer. The matter of multiple disabilities has not been properly handled. I think most of us agree that an automatic increase should be written into veterans legislation so that they do not have to come back cap in hand. These veterans are getting older and their needs are greater. Surely this is one group of people who should not have to come to Parliament cap in hand to ask for something that other branches of our society receive.

I have not checked the third point that I want to mention, but I think the attendant's allowance should be looked into more fully. In many cases the woman has suffered, not only during the war but in the 25 years since the war. The sacrifice has been made by the wife and the family. In very serious cases where an attendant's allowance is needed, it is often the wife who is doing the nursing and we should try to pay her in line with the current remuneration which a nurse in civvy street is receiving. If she has given up a career in nursing to look after not only her husband but a service man or woman who has served Canada well, this matter should be at the top of the list in priority.

[Mr. Bigg.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MacLean: Mr. Speaker, before we go on to the adjournment debate, may I ask the acting House leader what business will be placed before the House tomorrow and for the rest of the week?

Mr. Francis: It is my understanding that the Canada-New Zealand trade agreement will be the first item to be discussed, followed by the Export Development Act which will be considered tomorrow, following which the House will consider the Juvenile Delinquents Act. I cannot say anything beyond that.

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION**

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

**CRIMINAL CODE—SUGGESTED REMOVAL OF
ABORTION PROVISIONS**

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, on the third weekend of last November the Liberal party's policy conference meeting in Ottawa voted four to one in favour of removing the matter of abortion from the Criminal Code. The following day I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) whether he would be guided by that democratic and overwhelming decision of his party and submit such legislation to Parliament this session. He replied that the government had already stated in the Speech from the Throne what they were prepared to do this session, and of course that was to promise a special debate on abortion. As far as I am aware, the date for that debate has not been fixed.

I contend that we have had plenty of debate on the abortion issue. What we need now is legislation to remove the whole matter of abortion from the Criminal Code and to leave it, like every other medical procedure, a matter to be decided between doctor and patient; also, to leave it a matter to be decided, as far as the affected people are concerned, according to their own conscience. At its annual convention in Winnipeg last June, the Canadian Psychiatric Association took essentially the same position. In its August issue the Canadian Medical Association Journal commented editorially in part as follows:

• (10:00 p.m.)

In adopting this recommendation the Canadian Psychiatric Association clearly recognized the underlying moral aspect of