

*Criminal Code*

It will be recalled that, at the time, the measure was known as Bill C-195.

—or the bill amending the Criminal Code, introduced last week in the Commons by the Minister of Justice, Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

In Mr. Gabias' opinion, the proposed amendments concerning abortion and homosexuality are unacceptable. Consequently, he wishes that the Canadian people and the public bodies would exert pressures in order to oblige the federal government to take these clauses out of the bill.

"Every time a people has legalized homosexuality, such action has led to pure and simple decay," he commented. In so doing, the hon. member for Trois-Rivières emphasizes the fact that he speaks as a Quebec citizen and as the father of a family.

Therefore, he is taking a logical approach without forgetting that he is a public figure, a politician, a member of a provincial government. But what he seems to be considering in particular, and which is very important, is the fact that a legislator in all matters must act logically as a responsible family head.

From the strict viewpoint of the drafting of the text, the matter of homosexuality, that is clause 7, is unacceptable. At the present time, under the legislation anyone who commits buggery or bestiality is liable to imprisonment for 14 years and anyone who commits an act of gross indecency with another person to a five-year imprisonment. How could two consenting persons over 21 years of age commit these acts and not be liable to criminal charges whereas other persons. Also, over 21 and also consenting could be heavily penalized for having committed similar acts whenever there were more than two persons participating? Does a crime cease to be a crime on the ground it was committed by one or two persons only? Shall we say that homosexuals are sick people who should be cured rather than punished? In that case, are not those who practise this vice in a group also sick persons?

And this is signed by Roger Bruneau who concludes:

In brief we prefer the logic of Mr. Yves Gabias and we agree with him that the Canadian citizens and public institutions should exert on the federal government pressures strong enough to compel it to remove from the bill clauses 7 . . . , dealing with homosexuality.

● (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, let us grant such permission only to 21 year-old adults and tomorrow we shall witness demonstrations organized by the 17 and 18 year-old youth. Holland has recently given proof there is some truth in this.

Dutch homosexuals demonstrate—

This is from a recent issue of a Quebec newspaper.

About a hundred homosexuals and lesbians put up a noisy demonstration yesterday in front of the Dutch parliament to protest against a law of the country making sexual relations between adults of the same sex liable to four years in prison.

According to the demonstrators, this legislation is inhuman, discriminatory, and inconsistent since it allows homosexual relations between adults on the one hand and between minors of 16 years old at least on the other hand while forbidding it between both of these groups. Sexual relations between an adult and a consenting girl of at least sixteen are also permitted.

This implies, claim the homosexuals, that a man of 70 is free to give vent to his passions with a consenting adolescent . . . with the blessing of the government.

And note this, Mr. Speaker,

The supporters of the third sex distributed to the members of Parliament small candy hearts bearing slogans such as: "love", "sweet kisses", etc.

Mr. Speaker, homosexuals are said to be sick people; I feel that those sick people know how to do things very well.

We now ask: how is it that the British parliament has already passed a similar bill? How is it that the Canadian government is about to do the same? The Canadian Intelligence Service gives us an explanation in the Supplement to Bulletin No. 7 dated April 1968, and I quote:

Canadian justice is rebuilding its foundations.

Scientific humanism is replacing the gospel as the foundation of Canadian law.

First reading has just been given in the Commons to an omnibus bill containing various measures intended to "modernize" the Canadian Criminal Code. This bill introduced by Minister of Justice Trudeau contains, among others, two measures the first of which would facilitate abortion by increasing the number of grounds . . . and the second would legalize homosexuality between adults. And, on the other hand, not among future plans but among the achievements—

—were other plans.

Again in the same article, and I quote:

—Peter Newman, correspondent of the *Toronto Star* in Ottawa, in his article of April 25, 1967, made this comment about Mr. Trudeau:

"He (Mr. Trudeau) also keeps in mind certain aspects of a creative implementation of the law. He says the Department of Justice should be considered more and more as a body designed to plan the society of tomorrow, and not only as a legal adviser to the government—"

Let us take notice of that idea of a creative law and of a Department of Justice directed more and more towards the planning of the society of tomorrow. We find here the idea that a Department of Justice does not exist above all to enforce law and maintain order but to use the law so as to change and rebuild social order. Thus the law, which was the framework of order, becomes an instrument of revolution.

We find here once again the idea of a new basis for the law, made up of changing sociological theories and a morality determined by public opinion. Such a concept destroys the very basis of western civilization, such basis, which has its