

Criminal Code

say is that I never heard it discussed. It may have been discussed in the hon. gentleman's constituency, but elsewhere nothing was said about it. I have searched and had the records searched to discover when the amendments contained in this bill became a cardinal matter of consideration by the Canadian people. My inquiries left me in the dark; the records have no information on this matter.

We have a strange situation here. At one time the minister made a clear statement to the effect that since certain portions of the bill had social and religious connotations he would expect the bill to be divided so that hon. members could vote according to their consciences. Now the minister takes a different position. His present position is the Prime Minister's. In effect he says, "This is a government bill; it must go through. Members supporting the government will have to line up behind it. If they do not they will know the consequences."

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): On a point of order, sir, may I dispose of the right hon. gentleman's point. He has referred to a statement I made just after I had received my portfolio. I said it was important for the will of the House of Commons to be tested on each clause. I never said the bill ought to be split.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The will of the House of Commons will not be tested on each clause under the present situation. Although I believe in the necessity of implementing many of the bill's recommendations I cannot and will not support a bill that contains two or three items with which I disagree thoroughly and in all conscience. No Member of Parliament should be required to support an entire bill of this nature which is to be submitted to a committee overwhelmingly Liberal in the make-up of its members. I will not allow myself to be led into a position of supporting an entire bill when I am irrevocably opposed to two of its clauses dealing with sex and abortion. I want to make that clear.

The minister also said in so many words that we would not be handed an omnibus bill. I have looked at what he said and I am sure that my interpretation of his remarks is correct. Yet we have been presented with an omnibus bill which, after second reading, is to be submitted to a committee composed overwhelmingly of Liberal members. Those members cannot call their souls their own if they disagree with the Prime Minister. Never during my period of office did the government

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

take the stand that a bill connected with the criminal law ought to be determined on the basis of a party vote instead of on the basis of a non-partisan vote.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Now I take the bill as a whole and summarize it in a very few words. The section dealing with passports is excellent. As a matter of fact Canada has been a type of communication centre for international passport fixing all over the world. You can get a Canadian passport with almost the same ease that you can walk into the House of Commons, provided you are elected. This is something that was overdue.

The next section deals with firearms. I know how difficult it is to bring about amendments in connection with firearms without denying the bona fide use thereof, but in view of the serious conditions existing in our country I can accept these amendments. The next section has to do with gaming, horse racing, parimutuels and lotteries. With all the difficulties confronting this government, just imagine section after section dealing with these problems and the minister designating what is to be done. This is almost the greatest thing that has happened since Hammurabi's codification of new principles.

Then follows the drunken driver section. I agree that action in this regard is long overdue. Week after week there is a massacre on the roads of Canada, a great portion of which would not take place were it not for drunken drivers or those under the influence of liquor. However, I think we should go a little further. There is nothing that a person operating an automobile fears more than the loss of his licence for a period of time. If you really want to put the fear of the Lord into drivers under the influence of liquor, make provision that those convicted under these several sections will not be in the position of being subject to a suspension of their licence but will actually have their licence suspended for a period of two years. This method has been successful in one or two states. It has had a tremendously beneficial result in preventing those who have been drinking from driving.

The headings, "automobile master keys" and "possession of instruments for breaking into coin operated device", are not very serious matters. They scarcely can be dignified by being expressed. The like of these matters has not been seen in amendments to the Criminal Code since 1892. Then there is the subject of harassing telephone calls. The only