

If I might comment on that answer, Mr. Speaker, I note with a considerable amount of astonishment that in speaking on matters of life and death the minister stated, and I quote:

—most important of all I understand that these particular studies were carried on in 1976.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the most important factor of all is not when these studies were carried out but whether the experiments were carried out on live human beings. In this connection, the minister stated three times that “no operations were performed on any live human material”.

Section 206 of the Criminal Code provides that a child becomes a human being within the meaning of the code when it has completely proceeded, in a living state, from the body of its mother.

In the experiments described in the “Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism”, we are told—and I would be happy to table these journals, if necessary—that the babies came into the hands of the scientists following the procedure of hysterotomy. This is a method of abortion which removes a living and not a dead baby as opposed, say, to saline abortions. The same records described some of the subjects of vivisection as having reached the age of 25 weeks in fetal age. Fetal age, of course, is about two weeks behind what the normal age of gestation would be, judging by the date of the last menstrual period. In other words, from an obstetrician’s point of view, these babies would be two weeks older, which is important in considering their viability. This is an age when doctors of the Women’s College Hospital in Toronto can now frequently manage to ensure the life of a child.

Having established that the child was removed live from the body of its mother, we now face the question of whether it was still alive at the time at which the heart was punctured which, again, according to the same reports, occurred immediately after hysterotomy; that is, when the baby was still alive.

Again, referring to the records in the “Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism”, we find that 8 cc’s of blood were removed from some of the subjects. On the authority of several independent scientists with whom I have been in contact, it is well nigh impossible to remove that amount of blood from the heart of a subject whose heart was not still pumping. Furthermore—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It seems to me that the hon. member for York South-Weston (Mrs. Appolloni) is pursuing a line of argument which differs from the statement given by the acting minister in answering the question yesterday. She does so under a question of privilege. Even if I were to accept her argument, I have some difficulty. The minister made a statement to the House yesterday in answer to her questions saying that it was his information that experiments were carried out on non-living material and that no experiments or actions were carried out on living material, or words to that effect.

If the minister reported that to the House and he was in error, that may be something that might be investigated or pointed out to the House. If it is a matter of argument or

*Privilege—Mrs. Appolloni*

dispute, however, how do I find a procedural matter involved in it? The member for York South-Weston (Mrs. Appolloni) is beginning with an argument, and I say to her that even if she pursues it to a successful conclusion and convinces me that there is a case to be made that in fact some experiments were carried out on living fetuses and, therefore, the minister’s information was erroneous yesterday, there still is no question of privilege. It may be a disagreement with the minister, or maybe his information was wrong. It may be worth while bringing it to the minister’s attention to see whether or not it can be corrected, but I do not see that it can lead us to a procedural discussion.

● (1510)

**Mrs. Appolloni:** Mr. Speaker, obviously I am in your hands and I want your guidance. The point is that it appears extremely difficult for me to dispute what was said by the minister, and I believe his information is erroneous. Therefore, if his information is erroneous, my privileges as a member were at least infringed upon.

**Mr. Speaker:** This is where I have to part company. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Crombie) is here. He appears to want to participate and perhaps he can shed some light on it. But I cannot accept the basic proposition put forward by the hon. member that, if the minister made an error yesterday, that gives rise to a question of privilege today. As I say, I have given the member an opportunity to point out her side of the argument to the minister, but it seems to me to be a dispute with the minister and his interpretation.

**Hon. David Crombie (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I will not deal with the question as to whether or not we are dealing with privilege. As you know, sir, and as the hon. member knows, I was not in the House yesterday when the acting minister spoke on my behalf.

The matter is of some concern to me. I think I share many of the views of the hon. member on the whole question. But I think what we are talking about is what the appropriate facts are in the matter. I can reassure the hon. member, and through you, sir, invite her to meet with me and the whole of the department. As I understand it, information coming to the department is at her disposal as well.

I do not want to deal with the question on a matter of fact. We may have different views on the whole of the matter and we may share views, but I would at least like us to share the same information. Therefore, although it may not be a question of procedure, as you so state, I would like to make the offer to meet with the hon. member so that we can at least share the same information, whether we agree with that information or not.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then perhaps after the matter has been pursued in that way, if the hon. member for York South-Weston thinks she has any procedural argument, then I can hear it at that time.