

been asking for for several years, all hon. members could follow the dictates of their own conscience. They should not be forced to take a particular stand by the leader of a party or a Prime Minister who even subjects his party to a continuous dictatorship.

Finally, the fourth part of the amendment moved by the hon. member, referred to, and I quote:

(d) all the remaining clauses of the bill.

We, of the Ralliement Cr ditiste, were in favour of this amendment and I think it sets a good example to the Minister of Justice. I hope the committee will heed this amendment to divide the omnibus bill in four separate bills.

Moreover, I would ask the Minister of Justice and the members of the committee to give special attention to a comment we received this morning from the Canadian association of automobile drivers to the effect that—

Refusal to submit to the breathalyzer test should not be considered a criminal offence.

I think this constructive criticism should be examined very seriously for it would be a shame if an individual who refuses to submit to the breathalyzer test were to have a bad record for the rest of his life. I will therefore ask the minister to give serious consideration to this suggestion.

May I tell the minister—I referred to this a moment ago—that there are certainly some very good things in the bill, such, for instance, as the means to control the use of firearms.

We are compelled, at the present moment, to oppose the omnibus bill, for the reasons I mentioned earlier. On the other hand, it has its good points and we would like to see those passed.

I would also like to remind him that, with the youthful drive he has demonstrated in drafting some bills, he said himself that he wanted the bill split, a statement for which I congratulate him.

I might tell him also that, the other day, I met the secretary of an hon. member who told me: "If I had been a delegate to the Liberal convention, I would have cast my vote for the Minister of Justice, to have him as our leader." Had he been chosen, no doubt the bill would have been split, for I am quite sure the orders come from above, from the "big chief", thus bringing dictatorship in the very midst of a party where people, like the Minister of Justice, are not free to say what

Criminal Code

they think. If it may be of some comfort to the minister, I will tell him that, happily for us, that hon. member's secretary is a cr ditiste, and she has promised she would go on voting for us.

I thought that the amendment moved yesterday by the hon. member for Calgary North was very responsible and I shall like now to make a few remarks, after listening last night to the parliamentary leader of the New Democratic party, the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis).

I am surprised that as a socialist in Canada, the hon. member for York South does not realize that England, with its abusive legislation in every field—according to him the present bill does not go far enough—is courting disaster. As a socialist in Canada, he should understand better, in the light of the British experience, that by passing too strict a legislation, Canada is courting disaster and ruin.

These are somewhat the remarks I wanted to make about what he said, namely that the bill should be harsher.

Since those who spoke before were not lawyers and that I am not one either, I shall quote now an excerpt which I found quite relevant in a letter addressed to the Marquis of Argenson:

The reason I became so disgusted with the law is the abundance of useless notions with which they wanted to fill my mind. "To the point", that is my slogan.

We, of the Ralliement Cr ditiste, want to be aware of things concerning morality or the various bills which can affect tremendously the life of the Canadian people. Having listened to all those lawyers, I shall say to them: When justice has spoken, humanity must also have its say.

I am part of humanity, as the father of a family.

It is at home that I have the opportunity to exchange views, to discuss things and this is why I think that we should not listen to free thinkers who believe that, with a frank discussion of these things, it will no longer be possible to accuse society of dissimulation and hypocrisy.

We admit that hypocrisy, to cover up sins and moral perversion, has always existed. Men have always secretly attempted to hide every kind of scandalous behaviour for the simple reason that, because what they do is wrong, they prefer darkness to light.