

Criminal Code

roots in the Bible, being that man is related to God, that he is responsible before God for his actions and his life, and that he should be guided not by man-made laws but by God's commandments—

The implications of this new direction to be given to Canadian law cannot be overstressed, because it disregards its roots which were the Holy Scriptures to embrace "humanitarian" views.

Norman St. John-Stevas, in his important book *La Vie, la Mort et la Loi* has shown that it is in the name of this new morality, of this new god of science, that Christians are asked today to approve the legalization of homosexuality, prostitution, suicide, etc.

All those acts are forbidden by existing Christian laws. That such radical changes could thus be proposed reveal the deep moral revolution which has shaken Anglo-Saxon democracies, brought about mostly by the advocates of the "new morality" and the worshippers of the new god of science, who have succeeded in invading our institutions, universities, public schools, churches, communication media of press, radio and television, without overlooking our political parties.

Any change must at least seem justified. Those so-called reformists contend that God is dead, that there is no moral law of divine origin, and that therefore perversion and crime not only have equal rights with Christian morality, but actually have superior rights; which the reformists explain by claiming that Christian morality violate the right of peoples of the post-Christian era to do as they please.

This new set of morals, based on a humanist prejudice of complete independence in relation to God and His moral law, has been advocated in several documents published recently by modern humanists: the Kinsey report, for instance, which encouraged sexual freedom—

—the new morality of scientific humanists is about to become the common measure of courts of justice—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sorry to inform the hon. member that his time is up.

Mr. Godin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on for two more minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member's time has expired.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate for only a few minutes. I do so because I regret very deeply the turn it has taken and the kind of perspective that has been put upon clause 7 of Bill C-150. Frankly, I think that perspective is all wrong. One would get the impression, listening to many of the speeches that have been made on clause 7, that what it proposes to do is promote homosexuality and other sexual deviations.

Mr. Woolliams: No, I do not think that is true.

[*Mr. Godin.*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I say that this is the impression one gets.

Mr. Woolliams: Maybe; but I do not think that is true.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My hon. friend is saying that is not the purpose of the bill?

Mr. Woolliams: I say that is not true as far as the debate is concerned. I do not think that is right.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is entitled to his opinion, though it would be better if he expressed it from his own seat.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, I agree with that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has the floor.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I express the opinion, as one who has listened to the debate throughout, that this is what it sounds like. I would like to state what I think is the purpose of clause 7. I put it very simply—

Mr. Woolliams: This is pretty naïve.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My hon. friend may say it is naïve if he wants, but I have a right to state it in all its naïvety. Sections 147, 148 and 149 of the Criminal Code are not being deleted or changed. The law against various kinds of indecency and abnormality will remain. All we are doing by clause 7 is adding another section to the Criminal Code that is of a relieving nature. It will relieve the people who, in the view of the majority of us, are ill from the possibility of being tarred as criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is the kind of approach society ought to take toward homosexuals and people who indulge in some of these sexual variations, particularly when they are over 21 years of age. There seems to be a great deal of concern because there is a line drawn at 21. I am glad the line is drawn. This means we are still doing our best to prevent the spread of sexual irregularities. It means we are still doing our best to avoid the propagation of homosexuality; the force of the law is against this sort of thing. But at the same time we are saying that when people are adults, if they have a form of illness that expresses itself in this way, we ought not to attach to them the stigma of being criminals.