

*Criminal Code*

An amendment in the same terms as the one moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce was proposed in the standing committee on justice and legal affairs of this parliament on March 27 last. It was proposed by my good friend the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan). The standing committee considered that amendment and rejected it. So that in supporting the bill as it stands I am supporting the committee report as it stands, that standing committee of this House of Commons having rejected an identical amendment.

As minister responsible for this bill I want to say that there were parts of the bill that did not survive that committee. I have accepted those parts of the committee report that went against the original bill.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** It is because I believe that members of parliament on both sides of the house should have their day, that they should have an opportunity to scrutinize the legislation, to cross-examine the minister and his officials, to question the witnesses and to make it a collective decision in their own good judgment, that I submit that the committee decision of this parliament, as opposed to the decision of the committee of an earlier parliament which was hopelessly divided on the issue, ought to govern the will and wishes of this House of Commons.

**Mr. Aiken:** Would the minister permit a question?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I will in a minute. It is for that reason, despite the obvious sincerity and the wealth of argument introduced by hon. members who support this amendment, that I urge them to support the justice committee report and to support the bill as it stands. I suggest to the members who are supporting this amendment that the words in the bill itself more adequately and conclusively convey the meaning that they themselves wish to convey than do the words that they are offering to the house.

**Mr. Aiken:** Would the minister now permit the question that I was going to ask him. Does he feel as strongly about the report of the committee on transport as he does about this one?

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

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad I did not take that question in the course of my speech.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to inform the house that we are not the ones who delayed the debates of the house since, as soon as this bill was introduced, we asked that the clauses on abortion and homosexuality be withdrawn. Everything else would have been passed in three days. As the government refused to listen to the voice of truth, we have to acquaint the people with that truth.

That is why I begin my remarks by answering to the minister who just made remarks on the difference between the clause in this bill and the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) which, in my opinion, is but a drop in the ocean.

He would have the whole Canadian people believe that by changing the word and adding "seriously her health", that could bring about some changes. We still say that we object to abortion as it is advocated by the bill, as well as to the clauses concerning homosexuality. Let these two clauses be deleted from the bill, and then you can go on discussing wheat, housing, etc.

Therefore, with regard to the bill before us, we must define what is meant by the word "health". I think that this bill was meant to clarify the Criminal Code. Would this purpose be achieved by a legislation allowing abortion on "health" grounds? I think that is the main question we should ask ourselves.

A study of the 880 pages of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the standing committee on health, welfare and social affairs, enables us to make various interpretations of the word "health"; interpretations given by witnesses who were defending one position as well as the other.

You will not mind, Mr. Speaker, if I do not quote all of them, because I know I have only 20 minutes, but I shall take the liberty, at least, to point out a few statements made by authorities on the matter.

That is why I am wondering why the minister and the members who pretend to be justified in voting in favour of a bill that would promote abortion, have not travelled across Canada and repudiated the amendments we are moving. Why are there so many protests to the effect that these amendments should be deleted from the omnibus bill? Once and for all, why not establish a royal