

*Criminal Code*

submit that we are getting out of a frying pan into a fire. "Health" as defined by the World Health Organization or by a final year medical student on an examination paper, entails a tremendous area—economic, social and emotional... Again, it is going to come down to interpretation of what you mean, what we in London mean, or what somebody in Ottawa means by "health"... This is going to be the problem in including "health" as well as "life".

In this definition, have we not the true way of thinking of an expert who wants the bill on abortion and homosexuality to be withdrawn, so that a Royal Commission of Inquiry can define, first of all, what is "health"?

Dr. Walters added further:

—There is difference of opinion in the medical profession. When you have a group discussing this in a specialty, or a multi-specialty—the general practitioner group—you have differences of opinion on a purely medical basis. If it could be established only on the life of the mother being endangered there would be much firmer solidarity.

As soon as you get into health you are into a very grey area again.

And in order to make myself quite clear, since in this house, on the government side, some hon. members are physicians I shall quote a statement published in the March 20 1963 issue of *Le Soleil* and made by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) before the Richelieu Club—and I am thinking of the government members who are muzzled and cannot cast a free vote in the house, because it was explained by the hon. member for Hull—and I quote:

If in the past the province of Quebec has protested against the federal regime, it was because the Quebec members in Ottawa have not sufficiently emphasized the Quebecers' stand—

If the hon. member for Hull, who doubles as a doctor, is able to make such a statement and can say that the "deputation" who, most of the time, was a liberal "deputation", did not achieve its purpose, we should not be surprised that even today not one member from the province of Quebec dares to express the slightest opinion.

That is why I feel some sympathy for the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce who spoke a very good English but delivered a very good speech a short while ago because he has at least the courage of its convictions and he told the house what he had in mind. The same cannot be said of the one we refer to as the whip of the Liberal party. The members of the house have experienced—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Dumont:** —Caouette's whip.

● (9:20 p.m.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I believe the hon. member for Frontenac is wandering away from the amendment now under study and I would ask him to come back to it and to stay with it as he did at the start.

**Mr. Dumont:** Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to say that the Liberal party whip, who has felt Caouette's whip, is unable to obtain from all government members a precise definition of the word "health". I have received a six-page letter from one of his electors in which he expressed his opposition to the omnibus bill and stated that there were strong supporters of proposals that would at least have watered down the omnibus bill which, in my opinion, should not be accepted. I shall read a few lines from it:

The party whip received my communication on April 2, during the long session and the holidays and as he is a cipher in Ottawa, I wonder if he suffers from locked jaws—at first I had read blocked—whether he is deaf and dumb or whether he is stuck to his seat.

So, in the six pages, this elector defines accurately a government member who prevents the house and the whole country from knowing what is meant by the word "health". We know that the hon. member for Chambly is very efficient, that he fully understands the problem. So, we simply ask him to have the courage to give an answer to his electors and to speak up in the house and define, as we are doing, the word "health".

At page 548 of the standing committee on this bill, we find this and I quote:

I know what life is, but I am not sure what health is... "health" is a very ambiguous term, I think it is fine for the legislature to use it, but somebody else is going to have to interpret it. This is the problem with many laws. I think "life" is clearly defined. We all know what we are talking about and we can, as a profession, say that this woman's life is going to be lost.

We deal with housing, with food, with education, we deal with so many things we know very little about. We know it affects the life of the mother, but it is a very difficult problem to decide that you are going to snuff out one life for a nebulous thing called "health", which we all would like to have so that we do not lose our life.

And on page 553, we find this:

I think the doctor could give medical evidence concerning the life of the patient under such and such circumstances, but I would submit it is leaving too much to the medical profession to interpret the word "health".

Considering all those objections, all those things that the Canadian people need to