

Criminal Code

He said more or less that the hon. member for Simcoe-North (Mr. Rynard) was all mixed up, because he does not want to accept the assertions of this eminent doctor.

He said, at the beginning of the statement he made earlier, that the professor Mewett was wrong.

If the Minister of Justice is the only one who knows the consequences of the amendments to the Criminal Code, I think we should simply close the debate, go home and let the Minister of Justice take care of all this.

However, it seems to me that such is not the case. We were not elected to fully endorse all the proposals of the government, but rather to defend the views of our constituents, of the medical associations, of the hospitals and of the clergy, whether Catholic or not.

It is disconcerting to notice how unanimously the members of the Liberal party support Bill C-150 now under study.

I find it strange that the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who first sponsored Bill C-195 which has now become Bill C-150, used to blame the right honourable Lester B. Pearson about his way to deal with the members of the house. Indeed, as we can read in an issue of *Cité Libre* of 1963, he said, and I quote:

The Pope had spoken—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but at this point the house is really not discussing Bill C-150 but a specific amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary North for the hon. member for Ste.-Marie, seconded by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster. The Standing Orders are very specific on this point. They require hon. members to restrict their remarks to the amendment under discussion. Under the circumstances I would invite the hon. member for Abitibi, who knows the rules better than I, to try to confine his remarks as much as possible to the specific amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Thank you for your explanations, Mr. Speaker but I do not accept the statement that I know the rules better than you do for I do not boast of being a specialist in matters of procedure. I do believe, however, that the rules allow me to support or to oppose a bill and to do so I have to offer some kind of clarifications. That is why I

[*Mr. Laprise.*]

want to be specific about my reasons for supporting the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Williams) and to say why it does, indeed, seem strange to me that all the amendments we have so far suggested would always be defeated in the same way, as if everybody were wrong on this side of the house and the government members the only ones to be right.

I shall have the opportunity, in some further debate, maybe in the debate on the motion for third reading, to speak out my mind on the present leadership of the Liberal party.

The amendment now before us is quite acceptable for it also tends to clarify Bill No. C-150. Mr. Speaker, the fact that we are considering amendments tending to amend section 18 of the Criminal Code does not necessarily mean that we do accept section 18.

I would like to stress the fact that it was one of my colleagues who first presented an amendment for deleting section 18 from the aforesaid bill. Had we considered the section and had the house accepted amendment No. 19 as suggested by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), there would have been no need for debating section 18. Such is not the case, however, and were section 18 to be retained in Bill No. C-150, we would be bound to introduce amendments in order to improve the wording of this section and to make it less harmful to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an article published in the Quebec *L'Action* dated March 18, 1969, in which the Organized Medical Staff of the Laval Hospital of Quebec states for the second time for the guidance of the government and the public that its point of view had not changed.

Here is the statement of the Staff, of which Paul-Émile Gareau is chairman and Claude-D. Hébert, secretary. I quote:

The Medical Staff of the Laval Hospital studied carefully the bill on abortion introduced in the House of Commons by the Minister of Justice.

It has pronounced itself unanimously against this bill for the following reasons:

Mr. Speaker, those doctors could not have made this public statement without having given it serious thought.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The hon. Minister of Justice has raised a point of order.