

Criminal Code

sex to another. I thought this would be a simple proposition. I have found it is not a simple proposition.

I have read that the deciding factor is quite often one which occurs while the child is in the womb; the mother's mental attitude is affected. This may or may not be the case; I am not in a position to argue. In most cases I think these people do not like what they are. It is time society did something to prevent their being blackmailed and being subjected to the other fears they now have. It is time society provided them with the right to live their own life, provided they do not hurt someone else.

While in this organization I also learned that all the homosexuals and lesbians with whom I came in contact were agreed that they were opposed to those who corrupted the young. They are not interested in the business of prostitution and disliked it as much as you and I when it concerned the young. They are not interested in spreading their affliction, if you can call it that. They are interested in making it possible for them to live as near a normal life as possible. I think society has an obligation to allow them to do that.

We have heard that in Ottawa there are some departments in which this practice has had an effect on those who did not belong to a particular cult. The story is that you did not get a promotion in that case. I have also heard these people say that they have all the smart people in the world, all the rich people in the world, and one day they will be in control. I do not expect this will happen, but I do not think we should build a society that hounds a person for something that he cannot control. Surely any member who is broad minded at all will agree that the most society should demand from an individual is that he should conform to the rules of society or should not hurt society by his non-conformity. If what he does hurts anybody else, that is, if the other person does not consent, then there should be a provision covering that in the law.

In the bill that I presented I included the provision that one should be 21 years of age or more before he or she would fall under the provisions of the Criminal Code in this respect. Most people when talking about this matter consider that you really have to go back to the Bible to understand the problem. You read in Revelations the things you are not supposed to do, the women you are not supposed to marry and the relationships you are not supposed to have. You look in our

[Mr. Peters.]

Criminal Code and see that almost all the ecclesiastical prohibitions are included in our law. I have not read them for some time. Some of them may have had reason behind them, and some not. But it seems to me that this provision with regard to homosexuals should also include married persons under the age of 21.

Hon. members may not have studied the subject and be aware that many of the things commonly done heterosexually between married people are not within the ambit of the Criminal Code at the present time. If these things are done in the back seat of a car, they can constitute an offence whether or not the person is married or whether he or she is under the age of 21.

Mr. Woolliams: The back seat of a car is a public place.

Mr. Peters: It may be considered to be a private place, but I suggest an amendment should be included to cover married couples if one is under 21 years of age. Many sections of the Criminal Code are very worth while. I have had a great many complaints from my constituents, and I am more interested in those complaints than in the form letters received from constituents of other members.

I now refer to the gun legislation. It is interesting, when considering the gun legislation, to remind ourselves that some of its implications are the result of our exposure to United States propaganda. United States leaders have been assassinated in recent years and on these occasions there has always been a hue and cry in that country to take away guns from the American public. On the other hand, the Americans have always said they have the right to bear arms. We, in Canada, believe we have the right to bear arms. The Americans believe they have this right. Their thinking in this respect stems in part from their frontier days, and some from the movies about frontier days rather than present day circumstances. It is interesting to compare two questionnaires put out, one in my riding and another in a southern Ontario riding represented by one of my colleagues. The questionnaire in my area referred to the restriction on rifles, shotguns, the use of revolvers and revolver clubs. My constituents were opposed to almost any restriction; yet in the constituency of my colleague from southern Ontario the people said all these things should be restricted.