

Criminal Code

Mr. McQuaid: If the hon. member wants to vote against that clause, he will have to vote against the whole bill. I am assuming that the amendment he says he will submit will be defeated in committee. I submit this is a reasonable assumption. The bill will then come back to us in its complete form with the lotteries clause of which the hon. member disapproves, and he will be required, as will I and every other hon. member, either to reverse himself and vote for the whole bill or vote against it.

I suggest that this places hon. members on the horns of a dilemma, and this should not be. Every member of this house should have the privilege of making a choice. I suggest, too, that deep down in his heart the Minister of Justice and many other members on the other side realize that what I have said is correct. But, as the minister says, the bill is not his bill. It is identified, he said, with the indelible print of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). The Prime Minister is the one who says the bill must not be divided.

Apparently there is not a man on the government benches who dares stand up and say no. Apparently there is not a man on the government benches who has the courage to say that he will follow the dictates of his own conscience irrespective of the representations made to him by the Prime Minister. It appears to me there is not a man on the government benches today who dares go into a cabinet meeting without first hanging his free will with his hat and coat in the cloakroom. There is not a man who dares to go in there and dispute anything the Prime Minister suggests to them as being good. The government and this parliament are being ruled, and as a result are suffering, by the iron hand of the Prime Minister.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre argued the other day that you could not divide a bill such as this into 120 parts. I agree. Certainly you cannot take this bill and divide it into 120 parts, and nobody suggests that you should. But this is a bill—and for all I know it may have been designed this way—which can very conveniently be broken down into parts, as was so ably pointed out a few days ago by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). The bill very conveniently lends itself to the divisions that he outlined: Clauses referring to abortion, clauses referring to homosexuality, clauses referring to lotteries and gambling, and all

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

the remaining clauses. This is a very convenient and more or less natural breakdown of the bill, and there is absolutely no reason why the government should not allow this division to be made. It is a division which would allow every member of the house to vote against what his moral convictions tell him is bad and at the same time to support what he knows is good. It is a division, I suggest, to which every member of this house is entitled, and to refuse it may very correctly be categorized as one of the greatest injustices ever perpetrated by any government against the elected representatives of the people.

The minister said the other day when he introduced the bill that these amendments have been tested by public opinion and have received a popular mandate. At page 4719 of *Hansard* he is reported as having said:

We believe it has been tested favourably with the people of Canada and has met the approval of the people in a general election.

The only thing that was tested in the June 25 election was the personality of the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Justice, the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) and everybody else on the other side of the house know that that is true. There was no national examination of the principles of this bill. From my own experience at least, I never heard homosexuality, lotteries or abortion mentioned during the whole election campaign. We were privileged to have the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in our province during the election campaign, and I am sure that he never raised these issues with the people of our province.

I am quite prepared to suggest that the greater percentage of the electorate of Canada did not even know that these issues could possibly arise, but even if they did I still suggest that that does not give a clear mandate to the other side of the house because I would remind them that more people voted against them on June 25 than voted for them. If it was an election issue, then I suggest that more people said "no, we do not want it" than said "we do want it" because the figures will show that at that election 54.5 per cent of the voters of Canada voted against the government while only 45.5 per cent voted for them. It is true that they were able to secure a sufficient number of seats to form a government, but it is not fair for them to rely on what they term the tremendous vote they received.