

*Criminal Code*

Yet, alcoholics can be treated, as can the mentally ill.

When I am told that homosexuality is to be legalized because homosexuals are abnormal or ill, I say that the government is remiss in its duty when it opens the door wide without first trying to protect society in general.

The first duty of the government is to protect the citizens. With regard to legalizing homosexuality, I remind the government that when legislating outside of natural laws, one errs most of the time. With his experience, the minister has surely been aware of this for a long time.

We are told that this applies to consenting adults, to majors. It is illogical to refer to persons of 21 years of age or more. And why not to persons of 20 years of age? Or 19 years of age? Or even 17, who are also mature? Why limit it to people of 21 years?

Let us see how illogical this measure is.

The bill says: "Between any two persons, each of whom is 21 years or more of age". What has majority got to do with it? As if persons of 18 or 19 were not as mature, in some cases, as those of 21. I do not understand it. It is said here: "between two consenting adults."

The minister knows quite well that, in general, homosexuals do not wait until they are attracted by persons of age. They are rather interested in youngsters. The minister will tell us that to attack youngsters would be a crime.

The minister knows quite well that those people now considered as criminals under the law if they attack youngsters will not stop there if they are permitted to make love with consenting males of 21.

• (4:50 p.m.)

It is actually said: "Between consenting males of 21". I say that the minister opens the door wide and that it may be dangerous.

Those people will find all sorts of pretexts to be able to pick up, youngsters to try and relieve themselves, and this is exactly what homosexuals are looking for: It is not, then, to make love with persons of age which is important. The minister knows it. This does not interest them much.

I know it by experience also, as a lawyer, because I have not often seen persons of age who like to indulge in homosexual acts. Homosexuals are mostly inclined to pervert youngsters and the minister opens the door even wider.

The minister will say that they will be punished. The police will not be very much interested in chasing homosexuals after the passage of this legislation. They will be left free to do as they please. So the following consequences shall ensue. Instead of voting legislation to help homosexuals cure themselves since they are really sick, the way is cleared for them to act more freely. They are told that what they are doing is legal without any restrictions, except of course where young people are concerned. This will not prevent the 21 year-old homosexuals to covet them.

The government is making a mistake when it claims that it helps these people. It shirks its duty because the first obligation of a government is to legislate in order to protect society as a whole.

If there are people on the borderline, sick human beings, they should be cured and helped. Government must pass legislation, have clinics and make grants to associations which will be able to cure such people. There is no mention of that in the legislation. The minister will say that such a matter falls under the jurisdiction of the provinces. Nothing is said about action to be taken, grants to be made to the provinces so that facilities for treatment may be provided for homosexuals. This legislation is simply negative.

Instead of facing the problem, the minister simply closed his eyes and said: We shall choose the easiest way, we shall legalize the law and we shall not hear anything more about homosexuality.

The same thing will happen as when capital punishment was abolished in 1965. We witness today in the province of Quebec and in the others a large increase in crime.

Even if we talked for days and days, I feel that it would not make much difference. The government has made up its mind and my hon. friend the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté)—who tells me not to get angry—knows quite well that if he were on our side and could vote freely, he would be the first one to vote against the legislation to legalize homosexuality and abortion.

We at least can vote freely on those questions. We can vote freely but the minister and the members of the Liberal party have been instructed to support the bill blindly and at any cost without any regard for their conscience, their philosophy or their background. At least, our leader has allowed us to vote according our conscience and I thank him publicly.