

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

Before long, like some other countries, that proceeded the way we are doing tonight, we will have to legalize homosexuality, and soon afterwards, we will also have to pass a legislation in order to legalize marriage between homosexuals. (Laughs). We know of some countries that have legalized that. Having reached a certain degree of ridicule, why should we not put such a provision in the omnibus bill, to show to the Canadian people the real purposes the government has in mind by introducing this legislation? The least we can say, if we declare homosexual people to be sick persons, is that a few years ago, the federal legislators believed homosexual people were criminals. If at that time they provided in the Criminal Code penalties for homosexuals, why should they not today, since they are inclined to think homosexuals are sick people, delete from the Criminal Code, all that concerns homosexuals? Why not remove from the Criminal Code what we considered in the past as criminal and that we now regard simply as an illness? Does the Criminal Code, for instance, provide for penalties in the case of people with T.B.? Are penalties imposed on the mentally ill? Why then should we think of legalizing the status of homosexuality which is a form of sickness?

I claim that this bill was introduced—and this is unfortunate—by persons who perhaps wish to protect homosexuals. The mere thought of that is saddening, but we have to say it in the house. Apart from homosexuals, who could claim their freedom under Bill No. C-150?

If you want really to help those people, if you consider them to be sick, let us treat them as such, and removed from Bill No. C-150 all that deals with homosexuality.

If lawmakers associated in the past homosexuality and criminality and if they consider nowadays that homosexuality is a disease, let us introduce an amendment to the Criminal Code to remove everything that is related to homosexuality in Canada.

Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I must regretfully interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired half a minute ago.

[*English*]

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, since there are only a few minutes to go may I call it ten o'clock?

[Mr. Rondeau.]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, I just wish to confirm that tomorrow, according to the terms of the special order passed earlier today, we will be having a discussion on the federal-provincial conference.

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION**

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

[*Translation*]

**NATIONAL PARKS—QUEBEC—CREATION OF PARKS IN THE PROVINCE**

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, I have already asked the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) many questions on national parks, on the organization and development of a federal park in Quebec.

Once again, tonight, I wish to raise that matter in order to get from the minister a more precise answer. However, I have no intention to blame him too openly, because the matter before us offers reason to complain.

Mr. Speaker, while Quebec politicians speculate on the political status Quebec should have in America, the taxpayer loses every day considerable amounts of money because his leaders ignore the practical aspect of things, refuse or fail to take advantage of some federal programs which are real financial windfalls.

Such a negligence exists in several fields. Tonight, I shall restrict my remarks to one of them: federal parks. May I say right away that at the end of the fiscal year 1967-68, the central government had paid \$262 million for the establishment of federal parks. Quebec got nothing of that amount, Mr. Speaker.