

Criminal Code

but that should not prevent us from taking a stand on the breathalyser since we support the clause dealing with the breathalyser.

The minister puts us in an awkward position; we will have to vote against the breathalyser and against firearm control, simply because the bill contains some clauses which encroach on the hon. members' freedom.

Hon. members as conscientious and as able as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, an expert in procedure, who asserts himself every day, since he was elected to this house, as the champion of the rights of Parliament, and also the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), and all the other supporters of democracy, will recognize that we cannot, if we wish to be honest, vote on the bill as a whole. We should be permitted to vote separately on the various subjects dealt with in the bill.

If however the minister rejects our suggestion, let him tell us what link there is between the breathalyser and abortion.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I wonder if the hon. member would allow me to ask a procedural question? Would he not agree that on Friday of last week we had a clear opportunity to vote on the government's proposals on abortion when we voted for or against the amendment moved by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau)?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I support the comments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. However, I do not necessarily think that the hon. members can really vote separately and freely on the divided bill. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will see that the sections relating to abortion form a complete entity. They could make up a bill.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I thank the hon. member for permitting me to ask a supplementary question. Did not the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford specifically deal with the abortion package, namely clause 18, and have we not therefore had a clear vote on that, which was not mixed up with anything else?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: As I have said, since the beginning of this debate, we have introduced only amendments. The house has had to vote on these amendments, but it has not yet had the

[*Mr. Fortin.*]

opportunity to vote on the substance itself of the amendment.

When the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has introduced an amendment at the report stage regarding lotteries, it has been briefly discussed. As concerns his amendment regarding lotteries, which I consider complete, it tended to delete:

—from clause 13 thereof paragraph (a) and paragraph (b) of sub-section (1) of the proposed new section 179A of the Criminal Code.

When the house voted on April 22nd on his amendment regarding lotteries, we voted in favour of the amendment which aimed to delete from the bill the sections regarding lotteries. Therefore his amendment dealt with the whole section.

As to the majority of amendments brought forward, they were limited, inasmuch as they did not aim to delete a whole section, but a word or two only. In brief, the house did not have to make a decision on the subject matter of the bill, but rather on the amendment aiming to a slight amendment of the bill.

In my opinion—and the member for Winnipeg North Centre is aware of it—we did not have the opportunity to make a decision on abortion. We voted on the amendment, and the same goes for the other clauses. Actually, we could make up a complete act with the clauses relating to abortion only.

All the clauses concerning lotteries, firearms control and pari mutuel could make up a bill as well.

The minister, with the assistance of his advisors could split the bill so that it might be possible to vote subsequently on the various clauses, and the minister will agree with me on that point.

I would ask the minister to tell us if this is possible, and if hon. members really had the opportunity to express freely their opinion on the various parts of this bill. We did not, and there is no relation at all between abortion, homosexuality, breathalyzer, etc. The minister should not try to make us believe that voting on amendments means approving the bill.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, this has been a long and important debate. I am not one of those who have been critical of those who have spoken at great length in the debate of the past few days nor