## Criminal Code

that if any amendments are to be introduced, and suggestions as to what should be included, that would be the proper time—but not now.

Mr. Drew: With deference, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the Minister of Justice was as well aware as anyone in the house that the Criminal Code will be before the house. He has chosen this occasion to make a speech, and—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, may I-

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps if I might interrupt, the statement made by the Minister of Justice under the order for motions does not preclude discussion of the matter in committee of the whole, when the appropriate section is reached.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, I trust that you will-

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Drew: And may I also express the hope that you will indicate that there is only one Speaker in the house, because, with all deference, I propose to permit neither the Minister of Finance nor the Minister of Justice to assume the responsibilities of the role of Speaker.

Mr. Abbott: Or the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Drew: And, Mr. Speaker, I would submit for your consideration the fact that—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly comfortable standing here,—

Mr. Abbott: You look wonderful, too.

Mr. Drew:—until you can hear what I have to say.

Mr. Claxton: Why shouldn't you?

An hon. Member: You are losing ground.

**Mr. Drew:** Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the Minister of Justice, following a practice that has been long established, has made a statement. There has been an understanding that where a statement has been made, it is appropriate to make comments upon that statement, not for the purpose of entering into any debate, but for the purpose of presenting at least a balanced position in regard to the statement which has been made.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Drew: And it was not in any way with the intention of entering into a debate, but rather of making certain brief observations which I believe should be made, and which I believe would be helpful in proceeding to consider the matter when it comes up. On [Mr. Speaker.] those grounds I would ask your consent simply to make the observations that I had proposed to make.

Mr. Abbott: No.

**Mr. Speaker:** I took it that once the minister had spoken, the Leader of the Opposition had stood up and made his comment—

Mr. Drew: No.

Mr. Speaker:—when he said, "I take it that it is not the intention of the government to bring about the necessary legislation to prevent what has happened, in the matter of children." Perhaps he was not asking a question; perhaps it was just a form of speech, but when he resumed his seat at that time I thought he was through with his comments.

Mr. Drew: No.

Mr. Speaker: Then, if that is not so, I will listen to him.

Mr. Drew: Just so that the record may be clear, I was extending a courtesy to the Minister of Justice who had risen and asked to make a statement. It was for that reason; I had not even terminated the sentence I was speaking at the time. I had indicated that since this was the view I would point out that we are not dealing in this instance with a particular case in Montreal, so that there is no problem which arises as to the subject being sub judice. There is the simple problem before us as to whether there shall or shall not be provisions in the Criminal Code dealing with trafficking in children or in human beings.

**Mr. Abboit:** On a point of order, may I be informed, Mr. Speaker, under what article in Beauchesne we are proceeding with the present debate.

Mr. Fleming: The practice was set.

Mr. Claxton: No practice at all.

**Mr. Drew:** It is obvious that the interruptions did not permit me to conclude the sentence I had begun to make.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The Minister of Finance has raised a point of order. There is no section in Beauchesne to the effect that a debate at this moment is permitted. But it has been the practice—

**Mr. Claxion:** Of the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Speaker:** —not for many years, but it is one that was initiated two or three years ago, by a ruling whereby, when a minister makes a statement, the leaders of the three opposition parties might be permitted to comment upon that statement.