

*Criminal Code*

It is unfortunate to realize that those officials are not responsible to the people, that they are not answerable to the people. Members of the house, the cabinet and the government are answerable to the people. That is why we must enact laws that people want, that meet their needs because we are answerable to the people for our actions, our statements and our attitude in the house.

In view of those principles, we urge for the umpteenth time the minister and the government to allow a vote on third reading on each and every clause of the bill. To vote on 120 different clauses is unthinkable. It is unthinkable and inconceivable. A member cannot be asked to vote on the bill as a whole on third reading. It is impossible to do so, unless one is irresponsible.

We would like to ask once again the Minister of Justice to seriously consider our request. We do not want to defeat the government. Such is not our intention.

We would like to pass a proper legislation that meets the wishes and the needs of the Canadian people, but we cannot imagine how members could vote for or against questions as different as the control of firearms, parimutuel systems, lotteries, breathalyzer tests, abortion, homosexuality and what not, included in the omnibus bill.

Mr. Speaker, who is so intelligent as to imagine that a responsible member of parliament can vote on a bill that contains so many various subjects which have nothing in common except that the Criminal Code deals with them?

The fact that capital punishment, flogging, homosexuality and lotteries are regulated by the Criminal Code is not enough to have us vote on those various subjects lumped together. It is antiparliamentary, Mr. Speaker. Hon. members should not be obliged to vote on this bill.

If the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) denies the freedom of expression and of vote within the Liberal party, it is his right, and he will be judged by his followers. The Prime Minister has no right to force opposition members, over whom he has no authority, to vote for or against the bill as a whole.

We appeal to the Minister of Justice who, in our opinion, is a responsible man—at least we hope he is, and we are inclined to think so—to allow a vote on every subject dealt with in the bill.

Let us divide the bill by subjects. Lotteries, abortion, homosexuality have nothing to do

[Mr. Fortin.]

with each other. Firearms control and breathalyzer have nothing to do with homosexuality and the other matters the bill is dealing with. We sincerely would like to be able to decide freely on each aspect of the bill.

It could easily be done. The dignity of Parliament would be preserved. Parliament is the ideal place where the rights of democracy can be enforced and where members can make a decision on various clauses of legislation, freely and with a clear conscience. The procedure pertaining to the vote must conform with the tradition of the house and the rights of members. Let us vote separately on each of the various matters of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we feel this is fundamental. The most important stage of a bill according to the new rules and procedure, is third reading, because it is going to end a debate that in this case may have been hard and long, but that was surely dynamic.

As far as we are concerned, we have defended the rights of democracy in the house. We have also been able to express the views of the majority of Canadians, whether the minister thinks so or not.

The government is proving its dishonesty in compelling us to vote for or against the bill as a whole. If the Prime Minister wishes to rule the roost and to compel Liberal members to vote on the bill as a package that is his right. He will be judged accordingly.

But he does not have the right to impose upon us a procedure that conflicts with our interests and with the basic rights of democracy which have always been acknowledged in this house.

We demand once more to be able to vote—and the right—an elementary, fundamental right—to vote on each section of the bill separately.

A vote on the breathalyzer issue will mean a vote on the breathalyzer issue. This vote will not bear the same consequences, from a social and economic standpoint, as will the vote on abortion and homosexuality.

I would like to put forward another argument. As for myself, I am in favour of the provisions on the breathalyzer, since it would protect drivers.

I am entirely against the proposal aimed at legalizing abortion. The Prime Minister, with the procedure which he is enforcing in this house, places me in the following situation; If I vote conscientiously and responsibly in favour of the breathalyzer, in accordance with the wish of the constituents of Lotbinière