

or use of that law through the making of regulations by the Governor in Council, which is a normal procedure following passage of legislation by the house. In my view the effect, if we were to accept his amendment, would be to negate the power the house obviously wanted to confer on the Governor in Council to make regulations so that this part of the law could be operative. The effect would be to take away the power that this house wished to grant to the Governor in Council to make regulations. This, of course, was rejected by the house when it voted on that amendment at the report stage.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If there are no further contributions, the Chair once again thanks hon. members for their contributions. Before reverting to the debate on the motion for third reading of Bill C-150, I might advise the house as to the business to be dealt with at the time of adjournment.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Stafford)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—ban on tobacco advertising; the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart)—Transport—Chapleau, Ont.—closing of part of C.P.R. shops.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CRIMINAL CODE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner that Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be read the third time and do pass.

[Translation]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): We are now on third reading of the omnibus bill intended to legalize unrestricted abortion and homosexuality and quite a number of other practices, since it contains over 120 clauses.

Criminal Code

When the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) rose to move third reading, and when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre took the floor after him, both claimed to be the champions of democratic parliamentary rights, emphasizing the fact that hon. members had been free to talk and to vote on the various clauses of the bill.

I do not share the opinions of these two hon. members for the simple reason that they are not consistent with the facts.

The Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre stated essentially that members had had the opportunity to express their views separately on every part of the bill. That is not correct.

On second reading and at the committee report stage, more than 44 amendments came before the house. They were combined in order to facilitate the discussion of this legislation and the voting procedure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, every time we voted on the amendments, the members did not vote necessarily for or against such or such clause of the bill, but rather for or against each amendment. To say that the members had the opportunity of voting freely on every one of the clauses in the bill does not tally with the facts, since the members did not really have to vote for or against such or such a clause of the bill, but for or against the various amendments.

And the same could be said about the committee stage, the second reading and the committee's report stage.

We did not have any opportunity yet to vote for or against such or such a clause of the bill.

The members have not have the chance yet to say whether they approved or rejected abortion.

● (5:20 p.m.)

They could only vote for or against such and such an amendment moved by such and such a member and, therefore, what the Minister of Justice and the member for Winnipeg North Centre said, and I want to stress this point, is not correct.

As for us, as far as this disputable bill is concerned—because we are not at all sure that the bill meets the wishes of most Canadians and that the majority of Canadians have asked for it—we are inclined to think that it was not even asked or wanted by the people, but that it was forced upon us by a strong-minded prime minister and by officials who do not always carry out the wishes of the people.