

contrast to a young 16-year-old. I am sure we all agree that, as a broad principle over the whole bill, we want to protect our youth.

It is an interesting personal observation that one of the main thrusts of this bill is to take away protection of young women over the age of 16. Young women used to have protection under the Criminal Code up to the age of 18 years, but in this area of the law we find the government backing out of the lives of that group in contrast to all of the other areas of our lives, particularly economic, where the government is becoming more and more involved.

Interestingly enough, some years ago when government played a very small role in our lives and people generally were uneducated, we had a higher moral standard that protected the young people. Now we find people are better educated and more sophisticated and the government is taking over more of our lives, so much more in economic matters, yet at the same time backing off on this matter of moral judgment and protection for young men and women between the ages of 16 and 18. It is an interesting inconsistency. If it is possible, I will raise that point with the witnesses. At present, religious controls and higher moral standards are declining. As parliamentarians, we are backing away when perhaps we should be stepping in to set a better and a higher minimum standard.

I do not have a lot of concern about people over the age of 18, which is the age of majority. I am not sure that we as a government should try to pass many laws that affect free consenting adults over the age of 18. But we should have extremely good laws on which we all agree and which should be enforced rigorously. We should back up our police forces in the protection of our young people. Clearly the same thing applies for mentally handicapped people.

In summary, on the first part, I am sure we can all agree that we should protect our youth, that we should be passing laws to support the family and that we should be supporting laws that promote a peaceful community. All of these aspects will be interpreted by judges. They will all be interpreted in light of the new constitutional provisions when our Constitution returns from the United Kingdom. That in itself will cause many years of uncertainty in this country as the new constitutional provisions are balanced against the specific Criminal Code matters.

May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

[Translation]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed Bill C-86, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1982.

[English]

It being five o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, notices of motions (papers), private bills, public bills.

Emergency Planning

● (1700)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[English]

Notices of Motions Nos. 22, 35, 1, 48, 28, 43, and 5 allowed to stand by unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

EMERGENCY PLANNING—P.C. 1981-1305, MAY 21, 1981,
REGISTRATION SI/81-76 JUNE 10, 1981

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta)
moved:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence, notes, minutes of meetings, memos, telegrams and communications relating to the order respecting Emergency Planning, P.C. 1981-1305, May 21, 1981, Registration SI/81-76 June 10, 1981.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the summer quiet was disturbed for me last July when I was informed of a news report in one of the Edmonton newspapers which said that the government had passed an order in council empowering the government to establish and administer civilian internment camps. Frankly, I found it hard to believe that the government had passed that kind of an order because I remembered speeches in the House of Commons during the constitutional resolution debate. I recall hearing the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien) in February standing in his place here in the House recounting what an injustice had been done to Japanese Canadians during World War II, and the ringing words "never again". That was his justification for bringing forward a charter of rights.

As I sat in the committee and in this House I heard those assurances repeated, that the experience of the Japanese Canadian and of any other minority group in Canada should never be repeated in the future history of our country.

I also remember being part of a minority group, the Mennonites, during World War II. As members know, most Mennonites come from German stock and they are almost all pacifists. Then came national registration and we were not allowed to register our nationality as Canadian. There were no Canadians during World War II as all of us had to register according to our national origin. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the tension in that Christian community, the members of which were all German, most of them pacifists, who had to register as Germans knowing full well that this would place a stigma on them resulting in community pressure all during the war years.

As a matter of fact, just a few months ago a relative of my wife told me of an experience she had had in a small Saskatchewan town, Drake, with a population of about 350. That Mennonite community wanted to conduct a bible school during the winter months, as was and still is so often the custom, particularly in prairie communities. They brought in a young man to teach that bible school, but the Anglos in that