it a while ago. This problem was raised a few years ago, and we know how the people reacted. Let us not complicate things, even if such occurrences are infrequent. One or two cases per year enough to raise a scare, and this will not lessen the so-called anarchy that exists throughout the world. It is not by legalizing the offences of sexual deviates that we shall solve our problems resulting from anarchy.

• (5:20 p.m.)

If homosexuality is to be legalized between two consenting twenty-one-year old adults now, Mr. Chairman, shall we be able to tell their age? It is difficult enough in the beverage-rooms of Quebec, for example, where it is forbidden to sell drinks to people under 21. It is a real headache in grills and in the hotels of Quebec. Why? Because the young girls of 15, 16 and 17 are all 21 years old and they can prove it. It is absolutely impossible to verify the age of people.

Besides, the law is so illogical, particularly the section now under study, that I can clearly picture the young lads 20 years 11 months and 30 days old—those who were born on the 28th of February will be real lucky—waiting impatiently under stress the opportunity to celebrate their 21st anniversary by jumping into the five arms of the blue eyed boy of their dreams. I do say five. So, we have here a most ridiculous situation and it is attempted to approve and legalize it. I have the approval of 100 per cent of the people, at least in my riding and in the rest of the province of Quebec. The very fact of having to speak of such a thing is scandalous itself and those who will object and say we are just being scrupulous, that these things are outdated and old-fashioned and that we are back, in Quebec, to the old days when the clergy was all powerful, those who say such things are absolutely wrong, in my opinion.

True morality is for everybody. It is not merely a question of religion but a question of being a human person, of respecting the human person. And even if there were thousands and thousands of such people, it would be unthinkable to legalize such a thing.

Otherwise, we should do the same in every other field. Once you legalize a disease you must legalize all others. That would be, Mr. Speaker, something utterly ridiculous. I therefore believe it is absolutely essential that we now vote for this amendment, that we reject clause 7 of the present bill for which we cannot see any purpose.

I heard a moment ago a member on the far right who said, in order to explain the terms "between married persons," that the government wanted to adopt the bill because, according to the present act, married people might be indicted for, gross indecency.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply ridiculous.

If I went and practiced exhibitionism with my wife, on the steps of a church or in a public place, it is only right that I should be arrested. But in private such things are quite normal. We do not do that in public. Is there anyone in the country who can say he has been arrested because he had marital relations with his wife? Just tell us because as far as I am concerned, it is just sheer madness.

Why are we presented with such an argument? Evasions were used to stick that into the heads of certain people, mainly of those who have been swept away by the wave of "trudeaumania." They were persuaded to adopt that bill after being told that it was ridiculous, that the law does not provide for that, since its present form, it could cause married people to be arrested.

To my mind, this is an absolutely disgraceful way of getting this type of bill passed.

There is no problem. When two consenting adults are alone, when they do not cause any scandal, when there is no witness, is there any problem? Are those people arrested? For them to be arrested, they have to be seen by someone.

I fail to see the reason for article 7. If two young men are in a hotel room in Ottawa, if no one is aware of it, they will not be bothered. If they engage in degrading homosexual practices, and others see them, a complaint will be lodged. There must be some complaint or other, or else, those acts which are contrary to nature must be committed in public.

We will always be against homosexuality. Besides, even if this bill allows homosexuality between persons of 21 years of age, it recognizes the fact that these acts must not be committed in public or cause a scandal.

According to the law as it stands, nothing has changed. Two individuals, alone, who have no witness, can do what they please, and in peace. That is one more reason in favour of the amendment to have this clause deleted. We would then give cause to all Canadian citizens to have a higher opinion of this house which is often called the great hall of the nation. We should avoid its becoming the great fall of the nation.