

*Criminal Code*

finger on the problem and came up with clear-cut solutions to matters that we have been discussing here for more than three weeks, but that report has been shelved. And, at the same time, the minister tell us that the findings of surveys conducted in other countries have been studied and that he and the government reached the conclusion that abortion should be legalized. As for our own surveys, the reports are shelved. They deal with that very problem, but we disregard them.

Those reports should at least be read, because the problem of juvenile delinquency is a serious one and it is not to be settled by such legislation; the sense of responsibility and respect for others should be instilled in people.

We must lead man to his genuine development rather than pushing him back and only with laws respectful of the human being will we help man to progress.

Instead of trying to copy what the British parliament and others are doing, why do we not try to devise systems that would be truly Canadian. Let us lead the way with new ideas. Let us not make any mistake about that. Those methods, which I think are true, will be much more expensive than the ones proposed by the government, but they will surely bring better results. There lies the whole difference.

I should like to be brief. But I wish to come back to what I was talking about at the beginning of my remarks and tell the minister that we cannot accept to vote on the whole undivided bill at the third reading stage. In my opinion, this goes without saying and he will admit it.

In all fairness, no member, whether from the government party, the Progressive Conservative party, the New Democratic Party or ours, can vote on so many varied questions as breathalyzer tests, lotteries, etc. We must, as members, vote sensibly for or against breathalyzer tests, lotteries and abortion, with all due respect for individual freedom.

If the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or the Minister of Justice refuse to recognize that it rests with parliament to vote honestly, let them give instructions to government members, if they wish, but they should not compel the opposition to vote for or against the bill. They have no right to do so. The government has no right to impose such a procedure on us.

I urge the minister once again to respect our rights. We insist a great deal on that, because in our opinion, it is essential that the

right of each member to vote freely be respected in the house, if not, our only conclusion will be that government wanted at any cost to have this bill passed and that it is a dictatorial and undemocratic government.

I challenge any hon. member, especially government members who are in the same predicament as we are, to prove that I am wrong. They are faced exactly with the same problem as we are, Mr. Speaker. Let them explain whether it is really possible for them to vote for or against the whole bill? Let just one of them rise and tell us whether he can do it or not. If they are honest with themselves, they will admit that there is no connection whatever between abortion, the breathalyzer and so on.

We can at least ask the hon. Minister of Justice that on third reading hon. members be allowed to vote on the various parts of the bill. I keep on about it, because in my opinion, from the procedural standpoint, Parliament has been cheated from the word go. They wanted us to believe that Parliament had been able to exercise its rights, that we were able to vote on each of the various sections of the bill.

The minister said earlier that hon. members could have taken a decision on the various clauses of the bill. This is quite untrue, and once more I protest against such falsehood; because actually, members of Parliament have not yet voted in the house or in committee on any of the sections of the bill. We have only had the opportunity to vote on the various amendments.

Let us be honest once and for all, and admit that members were not free to express themselves on that matter. Could the hon. members, those on the government side especially, tell us if they are really free to vote sincerely and honestly on the bill as a whole.

• (5:50 p.m.)

The minister is looking at me and listening to me right now. I thank him. It seems to me that such a request is in fact acceptable and in order. As for the procedure he has in mind, it is not in order. We cannot, because of its very serious consequences, vote on the bill as a whole.

At the stage of the third reading, the minister should subdivide the bill according to subject-matters and let us vote separately on the various sections.

That should allow the Liberals, Progressive Conservatives and New Democrats to decide in favour of abortion. We shall vote against