

*Criminal Code*

**Mr. Woolliams:** Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Yes.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I would like to ask the hon. member, through you, Mr. Speaker, how many prosecutions there have been under this particular situation since 1953, when the Code was amended. I can answer right now: there have been none.

• (9:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I thank my hon. friend for his question, and since I did not know the answer I thank him for giving it to me. But the point I am trying to make, despite the interruptions of my genial friend, still stands that the perspective that has been created yesterday and today is all wrong and is not in keeping with the real intent of clause 7. It is because of its real intent, namely to provide a relieving clause for people who are ill, that some of us are not only prepared to support it but are glad that it has been brought in.

One of the other things that has bothered me during the course of the debate, and perhaps has provoked me to get to my feet, has been the constant appeal to religion as though some of the interpretations of religion which we have been given are the final answer. It is not often in this house that I make a formal reference to any religious position, but I would like to say just this, that if true religion means anything it means compassion, it means understanding, it means concern for people, especially people who are ill. That is the objective of clause 7. I think this house should support it and reject the amendment that would seek to strike it out.

[Translation]

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to address again the hon. members and to tell them that I support the amendment to delete clause 7 of the bill now under consideration.

I should like first to call the attention of the house to an excerpt of a report presented by a commission under the chairmanship of Sir John Wolfenden of the United Kingdom. These 12 men and 3 women were asked to study the law and the customs with regard to offences concerning homosexuality and the treatment of persons convicted by the tribunals of such offences.

I want to point out that the government, according to its press release, relied upon

this report to prove that the bill to legalize homosexuality could be valid.

Here is what Sir John Wolfenden wrote and I quote:

With regard to the fact that a man who engages into homosexual acts with another man might want to do the same with young boys, the Commission reached the following conclusion:

In short, the evidence we heard suggests that the fear that doing away with the illegality of homosexuality between adults would lead to similar acts with young boys does not give sufficient ground to classify as punishable offences homosexual acts committed between adults, and in private, and the Commission suggests that such a change in the legislation is more likely to protect the young boys rather than expose them to danger.

It is certainly sheer nonsense to pretend that taking away completely from the Criminal Code the offence attached to homosexuality will not lead homosexuals to commit similar acts with boys under 21.

Just like the previous speaker, I feel that homosexuals are sick people and that sometimes they are unable to control their sexual impulse not only towards adults but also towards adolescents.

In my opinion, the passing of that clause would mean that young people would be continually threatened by the unbridled instincts of those sexual perverts.

I repeat that homosexuality is an illness and its legalization will not contribute to the progress of society but to its decadence because it can undermine the family, the cell of our Canadian society.

That same committee adds that homosexuality does not cause more harm to the family than adultery. That may be but, even so, the prevention or cure of such an illness would still be justified.

It is still more ridiculous to see how this government behaves while relying on nothing. I say while relying on nothing because there is not a single minister who can tell us which public or private associations have made representations to have that section included in the bill now before us. If, by chance, homosexuals made such representations, they would have to be ignored for, in my opinion, homosexuality is a psychological illness.

The government presents this bill as a form of progress while, it is a degrading measure.

According to the reports submitted to the committee, the United Kingdom, recently