

*Criminal Code*

But each and every one of these contentious subjects will be before this whole house—not a standing committee, not a committee of the whole house, but this whole house with Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Let us take, for example, the provision regarding abortion and let us suppose the standing committee does not change it and the bill comes back with the clause in it which would provide for the changes the government has suggested; there will be members in this house who do not want to support those changes. I am sure that one of them, with a seconder, will move that Bill C-150 be amended by deleting that clause. That amendment is debatable with Mr. Speaker in the chair. There is a certain limitation in that the first speakers can speak for 40 minutes, and after that members may speak for only 20 minutes. But at the end of that debate the bells will ring and a vote will be taken.

What will that vote be? It will be a vote on the issue of abortion by itself. I may say that those of us who do not think the abortion provision in the bill goes far enough will be in a position to move another kind of amendment, that the abortion provision be made more in keeping with modern understanding of this problem. That amendment will have to be voted on. So I might go on with regard to homosexuality; it will be singled out and voted on by itself. If there are people who do not like the proposals regarding breathalyzer tests, there will be an amendment moved that singles out this subject by itself.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** If the house so chooses. If a member so chooses.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** So long as there are two members who want to see a change, one moving a motion and one seconding it—

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Exactly.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**—there will be a vote on that issue. I, for one, like some others, am strongly opposed to the idea of state lotteries. I have already planned to present an amendment, if the standing committee does not do it, to delete those portions of clause 13 of the bill which provide for state lotteries. When the vote comes on my amendment, if I have the privilege of moving it, that will not be a vote on a whole package. It will not be a vote on several things some of which a member may like and

some of which he may not like; it will be a vote on the issue of state lotteries by itself, just as if it were a separate Bill. So I say that every contentious issue in this bill, every issue about which hon. members have strong feelings, will come up for an isolated vote, a vote by itself.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Can come up.

**An hon. Member:** Yes, can come up.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** My hon. friends are saying, can come up. They are right, technically speaking. But I suggest that if there is a strong feeling about it, members will make the amendments and in that sense the votes will come.

● (10:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Any member who wants a vote, and can find a seconder, will get a vote.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** That is absolutely right. I suggest that those members who now say they will not be able to vote for this bill, because although there are some things in it which they like there are others which they do not like, will not be able to use this excuse when it comes to voting on specific amendments at the report stage. As the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth) said, you cannot take a bill like this and divide it into 120 bills; in a matter like this you have to deal with it in a package. But particularly under our new rules there will not only be the opportunity but the obligation to stand up and be counted on every one of these contentious issues. I think we should not have any more of this nonsense about our not having the opportunity to vote separately on these issues. We will get the opportunity when we reach the report stage of the bill. It is an opportunity members will not be able to escape.

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

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I do not like split speeches any more than I like split infinitives—

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Or split bills.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**—but I see it is ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.