

*Criminal Code*

Speaker? However, they want to allow youths 21 and more, to do the same acts that are forbidden in the case of younger ones: They are condemned and their life is wrecked.

I want to rise against this ridiculous situation and say to the minister, that if he deletes from the Criminal Code sections 147, 148 and 149, without passing intelligent legislation giving our young people the chance not to be accused in such situations, I say that he himself is guilty of a crime, and somebody should blow him up with a bomb, and I approve young people fighting with guns, if our society does not enact intelligent laws to promote development of the human being.

I think this is a serious situation. Everybody in this house is against protest, everyone is against young people getting together and holding demonstrations as they did at McGill University. Everybody is afraid, but nobody is taking his responsibility. We are ready to condone sexual acts between young people of the same sex—male or female—as long as it is in private, and for the same acts, young people, our children, are convicted and their life is wrecked. Some hon. members will say that this is not true. I would like them to read the statistics found in this same book. We have been blind ever since this debate started.

● (9:20 p.m.)

Do you know that 15,204 juvenile delinquents were not only accused but convicted in 1957 and 16,903 in 1958? There are more and more every year. In 1960, 18,706; in 1961, 19,659. These statistics are for 1961, the latest available.

At this rate of increase, we can guess what the number is now. The majority of these young people have no jobs. Instead of legislating to help them, we contribute to their delinquency while at the same time we organize our society according to a supposed evolution that makes it necessary to adapt ourselves to a pluralistic society, under the pretext that we must follow the advice of our good mother-in-law, England.

I heard members ask the minister where this bill originated? Can he tell us whether he received representations? In my opinion, the answer is quite simple and I will take the liberty to tell it to the house, by quoting the Prime Minister at the time he was Minister of Justice. I could say the same thing of the present Minister of Justice, because he has the same opinion. He is unable to break new ground, to adapt himself to the Canadian turn

[Mr. Fortin.]

of mind. He has to take his ideas from outside, from the United Kingdom. I quote:

Considerations which led to the introduction of these amendments in parliament are well defined in the following excerpt from the report of the committee set up in the United Kingdom—

In Canada, Mr. Speaker, the opinion of the Canadian people was not sought. Even if the Canadian opinion is against this bill, they don't care a hang. They prefer to follow the opinions of the United Kingdom. I have them here. The Prime Minister said, and I quote:

—are well defined in the following excerpt of the report of the committee set up in the United Kingdom under the chairmanship of Sir John Wolfenden. They led to the passage of a similar legislation by the United Kingdom parliament last July.

That is all what we can think of in Canada!

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to waste my time any further, but I think that is important. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) goes even farther than his predecessor. The former Minister of Justice decided that if Sir John Wolfenden had studied the question, it made sense. We, in Canada, are backward people; so he thought we should just follow suit.

But the hon. Minister of Justice tells him: It might be very interesting. We are going to investigate further and find out whether this is really desirable. I am quoting his introductory speech which, and you will see that it is really something.

Mr. Speaker, this situation so revolts me that I would willingly give 25c. to the hon. Minister of Justice and ask him to go and play in the traffic. The hon. Minister of Justice said—I am quoting:

A committee made up of twelve men and three women headed by Sir John Wolfenden, who had been appointed in the United Kingdom to study the law and the practice regarding homosexual offences and the treatment meted out to people found guilty by the courts of such criminal acts—

Let us imagine that committee! Do you want to know how this committee made its study in the United Kingdom, how many Canadians they consulted and how they studied the situation in Canada? The minister tells and I quote:

The committee took 32 days—

—neither 33, nor 31, nor 32, the minister kept a count—

—to examine witnesses and it met on 30 other days.

Eventually, they adopted that legislation. Today we, Canadians, are incapable of using