

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43(2), our members are to be dividing their time from this time on.

When I go to a store and buy a box of apples, if they are half rotten I am not going to buy the whole box. That is why I cannot buy this bill. There are some good points in it, but it is too bad that the merits are plumb spoiled by a number of items that are absolutely wrong.

• (2110)

I want to quickly mention alternative measures. Maybe it will help my lawyer friend across the way to know that I agree with the lawyers in their issue of the *Law Times* when they ask a question I asked. An editorial in the *Law Times* asks the question: Is the minister dispensing justice, or are his attempts at change another failed attempt at social engineering? I could not agree more with that law book. The minister has spent two years here trying to be a social engineer, not a Minister of Justice. I think he needs to straighten up his act.

I object to the alternative measures for the reasons I have mentioned. I object to the idea that we have come up with C-37, the tough legislation that is supposed to deal with young offenders, and then turn around and come out with a sentencing bill that puts in a clause that says 16 and 17 year olds who go to adult court are still going to be treated at sentencing as if they were juveniles. If they are going into adult court, they should be prepared to take adult sentencing. Even children in schools have told me that is the way it ought to be.

I want to make another quick comment with regard to something I read in *Hansard*. The hon. government whip dared to say that I am painting all teenagers with the same brush because I mentioned 16 and 17 year old hooligans. I did mention that, but I resent that comment. Thirty years of working in a school certainly ought to command a little respect for what I have done and how I treated students.

I can assure the government that 95 per cent of the time I spent with about 5 per cent of the youth, about 4 per cent of them were disciplined and about 1 per cent were serious problems. I do not paint them with the same brush. I reject that kind of thing.

I swear to goodness that if I were walking down the street and there were two people beating up on another person, had him down and were really working him over, I for one guarantee that I would make an effort to stop it. I would not stop to ask if the victim was gay or see if he was black or what. It would not make any difference. I would stop it, because that is the way it ought to be. You do not allow it to go on.

To hear these people talk, you would think I would lift him up and say: "Oh, you are gay, well then carry on". How stupid can you get? I resent those kinds of remarks and the implications.

I would like to say that I have a brother-in-law who is black. I love that man just as much as I do any brother-in-law. His children are also very black. I love every one of them, my nieces and nephews. I do. I happen to know a little bit about what it is to be involved with prejudice, because I have seen it happen to them. I know it can happen, and it should not happen. If we think for one moment that this kind of legislation is going to deal with it, we have to think again. It is not.

I want to talk about one other thing that really amazes me. I would like to find out how many employers throughout the country hire their staff and tell them: "You work for me, and if you go out and break the law make sure you do not go to jail for more than two years and I will keep you on the payroll". That sounds pretty stupid to me. Good grief, we are telling the taxpayers of the country that it is okay if we go out and break the law as long as it does not cost more than two years incarceration and they have to keep paying us and keep us on the payroll, so we had better make sure that if we get sentenced it is for only 18 months. Good heavens. We are pretty good, though; we got it changed from five years to two years.

The last thing I want to talk about is section 718.2. I did not even really want to address it. I firmly believe the courts are doing an excellent job of handling hate crimes now. I have seen numerous reports coming from the courts that verify that they are dealing with it effectively. They are doing a great job in that respect.

I only wish they would do that much for every crime, so we would not have to have caveat and other groups joining up all over the nation crying for justice and not getting it.

• (2115)

In the nearly two years I have been in the House I have not seen one piece of legislation that will make one person in the country any safer, not one.

**Ms. Augustine:** Bill C-68.

**Mr. Thompson:** That one most of all. Let me consider section 718.2. If they are doing their job then why are we including sexual orientation? That is a good question.

My, my. I heard my colleague say a minute ago that if we included it in this legislation it would be the first time it has ever been included. I have heard comments from the commissioner of human rights who says that if this is put into legislation it will get into the human rights act; it will get into the charter; and it will get into many more things.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Thompson:** That is what they want and they are making it very clear. That is why they are cheering. That is what they want.

I am speaking for myself; I am not speaking Reform policy. I want the whole world to know that I do not condone homosexuals. I do not condone their activity. I do not condemn homosexuals. I do not like what they do. I think it is wrong. I think it is unnatural and I