

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS
Monday, 13 July, 1987

TIME — 2:30 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRMAN — Mr. C. Santos (Burrows)

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Penner and Storie; Hon. Mrs. Smith (Osborne)

Messrs. Birt, Connery, Maloway, McCrae, Santos, Smith (Ellice)

APPEARING: Mr. Edward Tetrault - Private Citizen

Mr. Len Alexiuk - Private Citizen

Ms. Darlene Wiptenberg - Private Citizen

Mr. Ed Enns - Private Citizen

Ms. Ann Kent - Private Citizen

Mrs. Margaret Reimer - Private Citizen

Mrs. Gretta Friesen - Private Citizen

Mr. Charles Quappe - Private Citizen

Mr. Lloyd Bloomer - Private Citizen

Ms. Brenda Labalu - Private Citizen

Mr. Lee McLeod - Private Citizen

Mr. Alphonse Carbone - Private Citizen

Mrs. June Fetterly-Wiebe - Private Citizen

Mrs. Joy Kulik - Private Citizen

Mr. William Smith - Private Citizen

Mrs. Mary Fetterly - Private Citizen

Rev. Robin Pifer - Waverley Fellowship Baptist Church

Mrs. Joy Milne - Private Citizen

Mr. Ervin Nachtigall - Private Citizen

Mr. Geoff Casey - Private Citizen

Ms. Francine Bouchard - Private Citizen

Rev. John Oldham - Private Citizen

Ms. Noreen Stevens - Private Citizen

Mr. Peter Williams - Private Citizen

Mr. John Genaille - Private Citizen

Ms. Susan Taylor - Private Citizen

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Bill No. 47 - The Human Rights Code; Code des droits de la Personne

* * * *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: The Standing

Committee on Privileges and Elections, the hearing of presentations.

First on the list is Edward Tetrault, private citizen. Mr. Tetrault.

MR. E. TETRAULT: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it's my understanding the NDP Government of Manitoba wants to pass a bill called The Human Rights Code, Bill No. 47, to protect the rights of certain groups of society.

It is also my understanding that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms says in section 2 that everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion; freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression; freedom of press and communication; freedom of peaceful assembly; and freedom of association.

However, Bill 47 wants to add to these entrenched rights by giving additional rights to a person or persons and I believe, if they give these additional rights, it takes away the freedoms and rights from other people. The government, if it passes this bill, will be moving closer and closer to what I believe is almost totally dictating to employers or non-profit organizations who to hire, who will be promoted, who almost will receive different pay scales, whether it be a French-speaking Francophone individual, whether male or female, whether it's a visible minority, a homosexual or an English-speaking female or maybe even, if there are some left over, a white English-speaking male.

The NDP and Liberal Parties in Manitoba say that they want to do away with discrimination by allowing the bill to pass, but I believe that they will be discriminating against the majority. The government, under the NDP and the support of the Liberal Party, want all people, Christians and non, to teach and to believe that homosexuality is right in lifestyle and sexual activity and is normal human behaviour.

However, I definitely tend to disagree with that. People have come forth and stated by facts and talking about the different lifestyles, stating that homosexuality is inherent. I choose not to believe that. By the readings that I've read and by the other briefs presented, it is a learned way of lifestyle and it's not an inherent lifestyle. So what I believe is you're bringing in a bill and a legislation to bring in and to allow these to be equal, homosexuals to be equal with the others, and I believe it's totally wrong.

I believe to teach or to allow government interference in one's Christian faith which is based on God's written word in the Bible is wrong. At the present, the government is forcing its views and teachings upon our children in our public school system that homosexuality is an alternative lifestyle to normal husband-and-wife relationships which God has blessed.

Right now, I live in St. Vital and we went through a little battle a few years ago with the Family Life

curriculum. In it, one of the major things in that curriculum was that the NDP Government and the Minister responsible, Ms. Maureen Hemphill at that time, was forcing through a lot of the Family Life curriculum which taught abortion as an alternative to birth control, which taught homosexuality is an equal lifestyle. I thought at that point - I have a couple of boys who weren't in school yet, but it became very concerning to me that we have a group of people who have been voted into office and who have chosen to rule and reign and bring in legislation, saying this is what we want you to learn; this is what we want you to teach.

Even though the majority of people who were showing up were protesting against that Family Life curriculum, it was still pushed through. It's still in the school and I believe today that it's throughout all of Manitoba pretty well. If it isn't this year, it definitely will be in September in its fullest. I hope that this committee here is listening to the majority of people who are coming forth who are not for this bill, but who are against it.

I believe that this party, the NDP, has been voted in by the majority of the people and to the majority they must listen. As far as I know in what I've been reading and what I've been hearing and the people who I've been talking to, the majority are definitely not for this bill; they are against this bill. They don't believe in homosexuality as an equal lifestyle.

(Mr. Chairman in the Chair.)

The people, they say as far as another homosexual, it is said that every 10 out of 100 are homosexuals. I've got a lot of friends; I think I got more than 100 or people I know. I'm in sales and I meet a lot of people, and I don't have anybody coming up to me and saying, hey, I'm a homosexual. I believe that maybe there are 2 percent, 3 percent or 4 percent, maximum. I think it's the same way as it was in the St. Vital school curriculum with the battle there. There was only a few for it. Yet for whatever reason, this government in all its wisdom decided to go against the majority and force in what they wanted.

So I hope that you have a change of heart and, as these people come forth and as we talk to you, that you will have an open ear, that you will listen.

But I also believe that God's word, the Bible, which most of our present laws, the good ones, are based upon, condemns homosexuality as a gross sin, and that homosexuality brings ruin and illness to the individual in a nation which allows this type of cancer to grow unchecked.

The Bible clearly speaks, Sodom and Gomorrah, it doesn't matter. Jesus said, how many times, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. He spoke and said, hey, if you commit homosexuality, you cannot inherit the Kingdom of God. He was not against the individual. I'm not standing up here - I'm not against any individuals. But I'm against the act and what it represents, the evil behind it. And I think the Bible also says that, when the righteous are in charge, the people rejoice; but when the wicked are in charge, the people sigh or the people moan.

I think as we would allow this type of lifestyle, as we would allow this type of individual people, and as we've entrenched their rights, I believe it takes away from my rights because I have a couple of boys. What is

going to happen is that you're going to come along and say to my life, we're going to force you to have your children to have homosexual teachers. And as I said, I don't believe homosexuals inherit it. Homosexuals seduced and made homosexuals.

So I believe that at this present time, if we bring this legislation in, we're only going to bring in more corruption, we're only going to bring in more problems. You're going to accumulate the present fact of AIDS that's coming into this nation right now. I believe that we're going to go right out of balance if we bring in this legislation.

I believe if you give them rights, you take rights away from me. I believe we're going to get right out of balance. We're going to get right out of whack with it as we let the minorities - and I'm not against minorities, understand that - but as we give more power to the minorities, the 3 percent or 4 percent take away from the 94 percent, the 97 percent. As we give more power and authority to them, where is the majority standing today?

I come from a French background; I am a Francophone. But unfortunately today, if I don't fluently speak my French and I try to get a government job, whether it's federal or even provincially now, the bureaucracy of everything that's coming into legislation - as I try and approach all of this - I almost have to be a total Francophone to get a job, a decent job, or even again a promotion as is my understanding of what's going on in the government.

I'm really concerned about which direction we're taking. Now, I believe in French and English. But I don't believe that we should cater to all the French 100 percent. I think it should be equal. Where there is 7 percent here in Manitoba who are French, give them 7 percent of the jobs, make it equal. If you want 4 percent of homosexuals if they're here, give them 4 percent of your jobs. But don't try and force everybody to say, hey, you've got to hire them, you've got to have them, we want to have sweeping powers to force you to hire - every job and every place has to have a homosexual. There's not going to be enough to go around. We've got to have an understanding of this.

Also, we've got to look at the presence of AIDs right now. We've got a growing problem in North America. There's a phenomenal book out called, "The AIDS Cover-up." I can't remember the author's name right now but, if you read it, boy, the costs we're going to pay right now and if we condone it and if we look at it, it's costing big dollars out of my pocket and out of yours. Just think of the research and the problems it's going to cause. I mean, it's growing at such a rapid rate, it's going to bring our country, as well as the United States, to economic ruin. I mean, look at the research. You know, we're going to bring an end to our Medicare as we know it right now in Canada.

We're going to have to start paying exorbitant rates just like they do in the United States, just because we've got to put so much money into research for this AIDS, and it is growing at a rapid rate. I don't really believe, after I read that book, that I can believe what I read in the press or what the government is saying about this present predicament that we have right now in North America.

One individual stood up today and said it's grown 2400 percent in San Francisco in the last five years.

What's it growing everywhere else? And the cost of it is just going to be astronomical.

As we condone it, as we pass Bill 47, and we say we want to have it part of our rights, all we're saying is we're condoning the cost of it that goes along with it. I believe these people should be helped. But I believe as we give them equality and they can come out in the open and they can do with it whatever they want to do and go in their gay baths and have their 10 and 30 and, as the person stood up today, have all their crowds and pass AIDS from one to another. As we allow these things to happen, it's just going to cost us a fortune and it's going to break our government.

I think that the Medicare that we presently enjoy, the cost of medical research treatment to benefit the 2 percent or 3 percent will destroy what benefits the 97 percent right now. I think we should have a close look at everything we're going to do before we have this final reading on this bill and go through with it.

I also believe this bill will also take away my right as a parent to consider the morals of the individual my boys are about to come into contact with. I'm very concerned about that. I don't want my boys coming into contact with homosexuals. I don't want homosexuals going down the hallways of the school hand-in-hand. I don't want homosexuals at work with young men coming out from high school and forcing them, saying you know, you've got to work with that guy, and being concerned. I think it's a major concern, especially for a man like me. I have two boys and I'm really concerned about it. I don't want my boys being seduced in any way, shape or form. I don't want them looking at that, and say, oh, that's an equal lifestyle, son.

I'm going to tell them that lie? And then I read from the Bible and Jesus doesn't condone it. No way. We have to have an understanding that there cannot be equality, there cannot be. According to everything that we understand, according to the Judeo-Christianity that we have in North America and all the laws that we base it on, yes, we can say, equality of rights. I'm equal rights. They have as much rights under the Canadian Bill of Rights as anybody else has. I don't see any reason why we should let them go hand-in-hand and force all the boys and the girls of Manitoba to have homosexuality forced down their throat because we choose to put a bill in.

I think it is wrong. The understanding is, we have to stand before God and God's going to judge this whole thing. The Bible says that only the fool says in his heart that there is no God. Well, you can say, I'm not going to be judged because there is no God. Well, you can place your position where you want to be, but the thing is we will stand before Him whether you believe He is or not. We will, because the Bible says that God created the heavens and the earth, He created man and everything. And we've got to understand that God is in control of the governments. God places whom He wants to place and God brings down whom He wants to bring down.

The thing you've got to realize - I believe if you pass this bill in, this bill is anti everything that Judeo-Christianity believes in Manitoba. You can have an understanding that it's going to be very hard on you, I believe. If the government wants homosexuals as schoolteachers openly flaunting their beliefs on my sons,

I will be, by law, unable to protest. Or if I place my children in private schools, Christian or not, this government will force these schools to hire homosexuals as teachers under this new bill because, if Christian schools or others do not hire them because they are a homosexual, that school will be discriminating against this individual and the government will step in and say, we've passed Bill 47 to protect these people and you have to hire them or we'll take over your school or your non-profit organization, as I believe, after reading this Bill 47, that's what type of powers it gives the government. It says, either we'll fine you or we'll have you closed down. I believe that's going a little too far as a democratic government in this day and age.

This bill gives the government sweeping powers which interferes in the life of the normal citizen to this extent, and it has gone beyond the authority and the mandate which the people have given it. I believe that the majority of these people openly have spoken and said they're not for homosexuality. They're not for the equality or the entrenching of the equal rights for these people.

I believe we have enough in our Canadian rights, as I have said before, and I believe we have an opportunity here to squash this bill and I believe that this bill should be squashed and, if you don't want to squash the bill, have a free vote in the House. If not, if you don't want to have a free vote, why don't you have a mandate for the people? Let the people vote on it; let the majority of the people make a decision on this bill instead of just a few minds getting together and just saying, we're the NDP, we're the Liberals and this is what we want to put in, but we're only about - I'm sorry, how many - 37 is that right. I have my numbers wrong - (Interjection)- 31 of the two combined, thank you - and say we have the mind of the whole body of people. I think that, if you want to do it that far, bring it to the whole body of people and let them make up their mind.

So I really encourage you to make up your mind according to the majority of the people, not what you want to do. I encourage you to make up your mind according to the word of God, and I know I can go on the word of God, as presented to you about homosexuality.

A person stood up here and said he was a minister and he said we use the word of God for our convenience. Well you know, God doesn't change. The Bible says, in Malachi, 3:6, "For I am the Lord, I change not." Jesus said, in Matthew 13:8: "Jesus Christ is saying yesterday, today and forever." His views on sin have not changed. His views on homosexuality have not changed. His views on pornography and all these other sins this individual was talking about have not changed.

But the thing is, I don't think we should, as a government who is supposed to be for the people and voted in by the people, be coming in and bringing in their minds saying, we don't care what the majority of people say, don't let what happened with the school curriculum come in and say, hey listen, what the majority of people - I don't care how many people come in and protest. We came in there and there was a fight. It was hot and heavy there because the people didn't want this taught. They didn't want abortion taught as an alternative birth control system. They didn't want homosexuality taught as an alternative lifestyle. What you're doing now, after two years, saying well we kind of got the storm calmed down a little bit, let's push it a little further.

I don't think, as far as my understanding is, we don't have a socialist government dictating to me what we're supposed to have. I believe we live in a very free country, and I think those freedoms that we have of expression are here today and I'm grateful that I can come and express my opinions and my views. But I'm concerned that if we get enough of these bills, sooner or later, I won't have that opportunity to come and express my concerns and my views.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions?
The Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Mr. Tetrault, have you read the bill?

MR. E. TETRAULT: Yes, parts of the bill. I can't say I read the whole thing because, some of it, I didn't understand.

MR. H. SMITH: The second thing, do you believe in discrimination against homosexuals?

MR. E. TETRAULT: No. Like I say, I don't discriminate against the person, but I think the homosexual act itself is wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions?
The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Tetrault, you said that the Almighty put the government where it is, and I think it's just living proof that the Lord does work in mysterious ways.

MR. E. TETRAULT: Amen.

HON. R. PENNER: In the same vein, I understood you to say that the Lord, about whom you're talking, appointed me Attorney-General.

MR. E. TETRAULT: Well, it's a cross all of us have to bear.

HON. R. PENNER: Indeed, I expect you to do that.
Thank you very much.

MR. E. TETRAULT: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions? Thank you, Mr. Tetrault.

MR. E. TETRAULT: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Len Alexiuk, private citizen.

MR. L. ALEXIUK: Anyway, I'd like to thank you for the privilege of coming here to speak, Mr. Chairman, and committee, ladies and gentlemen. I am thankful for the privileges and the freedoms given in this province to the individual private citizens and the people of this province. I think it's a privilege to live in this country and here. I know that this government presently in Session and ones previous to it have taken large strides to protect the freedoms of the individual, and we are grateful for that. Certainly, there's no liberty like this

probably anywhere else in the world, except maybe in the United States or Great Britain, and it's hard to match.

These freedoms that we have are entrenched, I believe, are practised because they are of benefit to the majority of the people. The majority of the people see that they are for a public good and, although they might to a certain amount affect what we do, what we say, where we go, or how fast we drive on the highway and other things like this, we see that generally speaking it's for the best that we adhere to the laws of this country.

However, this law that's coming up - and I don't pretend to be acquainted with it. If I said I read it or understood it, I don't, because I don't understand the force behind it, why someone would want to project this type of lifestyle upon the people of this country. It has been shown to be destructive. It has been shown to be detrimental to the lives and health of people.

We have heard a lot just from the previous speaker and I can go on with the Bible point of view that it's sacred to both Jews and to Gentiles and to Christians as well. We know we're well acquainted in what it teaches, but I think we have to look at the course of history as well where the Bible has been consistent and also the course of history has been consistent where people have turned from what is right, from what is good, and followed the wrong way, followed the things that are contrary to Scripture and indeed, in a very short time, suffered the consequences for it. I believe this is what we're seeing now. This is what we're seeing now in the AIDS epidemic, the consequences of it with regard to medical health care, the antagonistic view of one country against another, one type of person against the other because we don't know who's carrying the disease and just how rampant it really is.

I also would like to say that I'm not against or don't dislike the individual. As a Christian, as a person who professes to be a Christian, we must love people and I do love people as individuals, but there are certain things that are wrong and we can't condone them. We can't say that good is bad and bad is good. It's one way or the other, and we can't say that we have a loving God if we don't acknowledge also His purity and His sanctification. There's no point in saying that He hasn't affected us if we don't change our lifestyle.

Anyway I just, at this point, would like to thank you for the privilege again for speaking, and I don't think I have any other things to add at the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Hearing none, thank you, Mr. Alexiuk.

The next presenter is Lloyd Peters, Steinbach Ministerial Association; Bob Shelton, Garden Park Baptist Church; Duane Burden, private citizen; Lloyd Peters, private citizen; Joan Martens, private citizen; Mrs. Peter Meyer, private citizen; Jane Unrah, private citizen. Darlene Wiptenberg, private citizen.

Darlene Wiptenberg.

MS. D. WIPTENBERG: That's correct. I want to thank you for the privilege of speaking to you today. I just returned about a month ago from working in L.A. over a period of two years on my Masters in Christian Education. I've been working in a counselling series

Monday, 13 July, 1987

with people: family groups, marital groups, individuals, and this is a real great concern for me in the area of seeing this - this bill going through - as not a moral issue and not seeing it as a behavioural choice pattern that a person takes. If you realize that, or if you believe that a person is not in control of the sexual preference that they take, that they are born with a sexual dysfunction or a sexual standard that is different from what we have known beforehand as heterosexual; if you're comfortable with that, with believing that a person does not have a choice, then this bill should go through.

But I believe that if you do so, you're ignoring the testimonies and the witnesses of many people who have over the years taken a look at the sexual preference that they have made and realized that it is dangerous and dysfunctional and that it is detrimental to the family system, that it actually destroys families. We're going to have to change our whole definition of "family" if we continue with this, if we put this bill through.

If you realize that it is a behavioural choice pattern, you must not be able to put it alongside things like race or sex or even religion. My experience does not coincide with the desires to put this bill through and I just wanted to come and speak on that on behalf of the children that I've worked with and the families that I've worked with and all the experience I've had in the educational system.

I'd like you to excuse me for my choppiness. I wasn't prepared to speak this early and I would have liked to have heard some of the people before me. Yet I want to thank you for this opportunity to realize that, as a private citizen and as a person who is working with people who are under a lot of pain and a lot of pressure from dysfunctional family systems, my request is that we oppose this Bill 47.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Hearing none, thank you, Darlene Wiptenberg.

Mr. Kurt McGifford; Mr. Peter Meyer; Kerry Winslow.
Mr. Ed Enns, private citizen.

MR. E. ENNS: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

I have a written copy for all of you. Do you want it now or do you want me to . . .

A MEMBER: Now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed, Mr. Enns.

MR. E. ENNS: Okay.

As a concerned citizen of the Province of Manitoba, I am very much opposed to the contents and implications of Bill 47.

Bill 47, if passed, will give rights and freedoms to homosexuals in this province far exceeding those of the straight community. Why is this government so intent on giving this special status to a small minority of people in Manitoba when they already have all the rights they need under the new Canadian Constitution, the same rights you and I have?

Homosexuality is a disease of the mind and should not be considered an alternate lifestyle. This government should seek ways to cure it, rather than protect and thereby promote it.

As everyone is aware, AIDS is the modern day plague and epidemic that is devastating the world over. We also know that homosexuals are the main propellant in spreading AIDS. Back in the early 1900's - some of you will remember that - when polio and tuberculosis were rampant in this province, all those who contracted these diseases were quarantined and isolated from society to prevent the disease from spreading. Yet, with Bill 47, the government proposes to give AIDS victims, mainly homosexuals, liberties and freedoms in the public places far surpassing those which polio and tuberculosis patients ever dreamed about, when they by rights ought to be quarantined and kept away from the public. Instead of giving the homosexuals and the homosexual community more freedoms and rights, the government should entertain a bill to quarantine homosexuals and AIDS carriers to prevent the spread of the dreaded AIDS which will kill thousands more than polio and TB did combined.

What rights will I have to a hospital bed for surgery, for such a thing as appendicitis in a few years, when most of our hospital beds will be occupied by AIDS patients, the result of the homosexual lifestyle which the government seeks to condone through the passing of Bill 47? Already there is a real shortage of hospital beds. Weekly, we hear of hospitals closing wards due to lack of funds. Where will the additional funds be found to treat all the AIDS patients? Where will the additional funds come from that will be needed for medical research in a cure for AIDS? Already there is a shortage for research monies. Have you, as a government, considered the ramifications of the passing of Bill 47? Will there be medical help or a hospital bed available for your children or grandchildren in the future? Or will the homosexual community claim a monopoly on these services?

Bill 47, instead of deterring homosexual activity, actually promotes it as an alternate lifestyle with special rights surpassing the Canadian Constitution. I urge the government to work to cure the disease of homosexuality, not to promote it.

When is the government going to bring in legislation to give the same proposed rights to the unborn who are murdered in this province every year?

If Bill 47 is passed, all government MLA's who voted for it should be subjected to a compulsory AIDS test to determine if they are in a conflict of interest.

Homosexuality is not only a disease, it is also a sin. God ordained that sexual relations should be between husband and wife only - man and woman. AIDS, the result of homosexual sin, is a judgment from God. It was for this sin that God destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, as we read in the Old Testament. God is also judging the world today because of sexual sins, as he declared in his word he will do.

I've attached part of Romans, chapter I. I've outlined verses 18-32, which says: "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all the ungodliness and wickedness of men, who suppress the truth by their wickedness . . ." - and then going on to 26 - ". . . Because of this, God has given them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones in the same way as the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men and received in themselves

the due penalty for their perversion." I believe God is judging the world right now because of the immorality of our generation, and sexuality is just part of it.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Hearing none, thank you, Mr. Enns.

Mr. Dave Perry, Walter Grymaloski, Anne Diachun.
Ann Kent - do you have a brief for us? Thank you.
Ann Kent, private citizen.

MS. A. KENT: Thank you for the opportunity to speak this afternoon.

I am a member of a lesbian mothers' support group; I'm a lesbian mother. What I want to present is a personal statement from one of the women in the group who did not want to make it herself because she is a teacher and feels vulnerable for that reason.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please speak louder.

MS. A. KENT: I'm going to present a personal statement from one of the members of our group who felt too vulnerable to come and speak on her own behalf.

"I understand that the hearings to include sexual orientation in the Manitoba bill of rights are starting in the Legislative Building after the middle of June this year.

"I am writing to say how much I feel that gay and lesbian people need protection under the law. I am a lesbian mother and teacher. Due to the lack of legal protection, I have been living alone with my teenager since the separation from my husband.

"Other women in my position are considering remarrying and setting up a new household but, because I have a female partner rather than a male one, I have not felt free to consider any kind of living arrangement. I fear for a possible custody case, as it is currently possible to discriminate against a lesbian mother on the basis of sexual orientation alone. And I fear for my job, as the school, the students and the students' parents are all at liberty to object to my potential private life, even though how I live has nothing whatsoever to do with the subjects I teach and, in no way, impinges on the life of the students or the school.

"I want to see an end to this kind of fear and discrimination, and I want the same protection under the law that I enjoyed during the years that I was heterosexually married. I have not become a different person since the end of my 15-year marriage, and my concerns are much the same as before. It seems that potentially I have lost a great number of civil rights, the right to my job, the right to live in peace with my child, and I want to see these rights reinstated and not to be demoted to a second-class citizen.

"I would like to present my point of view in person but, due to the lack of the very protection I am asking for, I find it impossible to make an appearance at these hearings or to give my name and address. Nevertheless, I hope the government will see fit to make a change in the present state of affairs affecting all gay people."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since you don't present your brief, do you want to answer some questions?

MS. A. KENT: I wouldn't mind telling you a little bit about the group.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are any. Are there any questions?

A MEMBER: She wants to tell about their group, Conrad.

MS. A. KENT: A friend and I started this group about three years ago because, both of us being lesbian parents, we felt we weren't at liberty just to talk to any parents about issues having to do with our lives and our children.

In the past three years, we've had about 50 lesbian mothers come to the group and make use of it in various ways, as sometimes legal resource, mostly just as a support group to discuss frustrations that they felt they couldn't talk about with just general parents and to share ideas on how to deal with situations like how to deal with the schools, what risks we might be at in dealing with teachers, fears for our children's safety at school, should it be known that their parents were lesbians.

Custody is, I think, the biggest one for all of us, whether it be by the father of our children or the grandparents or family who don't approve of our lifestyle or child welfare agencies; and in dealing with social services and whatnot, not knowing what is available to us or where we are protected and always feeling like you're not. I guess I'd just also like to say my own personal feeling, that I don't think this is a question of morality at all, but we are here and we will continue to be here. We are human and we deserve the same dignity and the right to live without fear in our lives.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions?

The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: You said that you didn't think this was a question of morality. The Parliament of Canada thinks it's very much a matter of criminality in the case of buggery and bestiality, to the extent that the federal Parliament thinks that people involved in those pursuits could be or should be imprisoned for up to 14 years.

The brief that you read from says that the person who wrote it hopes the government will see fit to make a change in the present state of affairs affecting all gay people. Would that include gay people, males or females, under the age of 21?

MS. A. KENT: I can't speak for this woman who wrote.

MR. J. McCRAE: Can you speak for your support group?

MS. A. KENT: I can't speak for the support group either. I could speak for myself though.

MR. J. McCRAE: Well perhaps you could speak for yourself then.

MS. A. KENT: I think the rights of all gay people, regardless of their age, need to be protected, including those under the age of 21, yes.

MR. J. McCRAE: So that, just to make sure I understand, you're saying that these protections should

be available for people engaging in criminal activity for which the penalty is imprisonment for up to 14 years?

MS. A. KENT: No, I said that I think that the rights of all gay people, regardless of their age, should be protected in the same manner that all other Canadians' rights are protected.

MR. J. McCRAE: That's clear enough, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. E. CONNERY: I don't know how well you know the friend that you read her presentation from on her behalf. She was married for 15 years. Was she a homosexual during that time or did she become homosexual some time after she was married or after her divorce?

MS. A. KENT: I don't know that information, and I couldn't divulge it here anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions? There being none, thank you, Ann.

The next presenter is Margaret Reimer, private citizen.

MRS. M. REIMER: Mr. Chairman, committee members, ladies and gentlemen, I'm really thankful to have the opportunity that I can speak to you. I'm a mother of two children and five grandchildren. I'm very thankful to be a Canadian citizen, to live in a free country. One who has come from the Communist country, born there, I really appreciate this freedom and I would like the freedom of this country to be upheld.

As one who is concerned for the welfare of Canada and Manitoba, I want to speak in regard to Bill 47. This bill, in section 9(2), has the phrase "sexual orientation" which I am strongly opposed to, because this would give special protection and privileges to a segment of our society, namely, homosexual, lesbians, bisexual people in their lifestyle. These people are already under protection under the existing law of the Charter of Rights, just like all Canadian citizens are. The lifestyles of homosexuals, lesbians, bisexuals are not acceptable to many in our society, in fact, are increasingly detrimental to our society.

I believe the Bible clearly states that homosexuality is a direct contravention of the word of God, because it says in Leviticus 18:22: "You shall not lie with a male as with a woman. It is an abomination to the Lord." Homosexuality is not a genetic condition, but unnatural behaviour caused by rejection of the Creator. The Scripture passage that I would quote for that was Romans 1 and Mr. Enns, just prior to my speaking, quoted that passage. Homosexuality is a sin according to the Bible, and sin can be forgiven and cleansed if people who are sinning in this way would call on the name of the Lord and repent. It is the lifestyle of the homosexual that is unacceptable, not the individual who commits that sin.

If this phrase, sexual orientation, is passed, I feel it will infringe on my rights, on my family's rights. When my grandchildren could have teachers who are homosexual or lesbian, they would pass on their values and lifestyle to them because, what we are, we pass

onto others. If this phrase, sexual orientation, is passed, it will be detrimental to our country, bringing upon it the judgment of God. Just as God judged Sodom and Gomorrah for their sin of homosexual practice, he will judge our country. It might not be today or tomorrow, but God is not slow in keeping his promises, as some understand slowness. He is patient with us, not wanting anyone to perish but that all would come to repent and be saved.

I endorse all that has been said by Pastor Neufeld this morning and Pastor Feldbusch, as well as those who spoke against the passing of the bill with the inclusion of the phrase "sexual orientation." I plead that you listen carefully to what the opposition to this bill have to say, and come to the decision to defeat this bill. By the grace of God, I pray that you will have that wisdom.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question?
The Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Just a question, you mentioned about homosexuals in the schools. I'm just wondering if I could pose an example. If you had an apartment for rent and someone who was a homosexual came to rent the apartment, would you want the right to refuse on that basis?

MRS. M. REIMER: Absolutely, absolutely. In fact, we do have an apartment and that would be a very great

MR. M. DOLIN: Okay. The other question: If one of your children or grandchildren was being taught by a teacher presently before the act was passed, who you found out through admission or through some other reason that person was a homosexual, would you take steps to see that person was - go to the school board or go to the principal to get that person removed?

MRS. M. REIMER: Absolutely.

MR. M. DOLIN: Okay, thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there questions? Hearing none, thank you, Mrs. Reimer.

The next presenter is Mr. G. Zacharias. Mr. Zacharias?
Mrs. G. Friesen, private citizen.

MRS. G. FRIESEN: I'm not a speaker at all, but I felt so great about this. I'm really against this bill and I do not want it to come in so I have to, with God's help, speak today. - (Interjection)- Gretta, two t's.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Penner, members of the Legislature, ladies and gentlemen, I'm against Bill 47 because I believe it is infringing on my rights, especially religious freedom. I do not want homosexuals teaching my children or grandchildren. Schools, day care centres or group homes could be forced to employ those whose code of conduct and sexual orientation is incompatible with the established purposes and guidelines of the institutions. The legislation could affect the traditional rights of religious groups to hire only those staff members whose lifestyle is faithful to the beliefs and practices of the religious community.

It undermines the unique status of marriage and the family as the fundamental unit of our society. It could lead to the eventual legalization of homosexual and lesbian marriages and of child adoption.

I believe God's word is the greatest power on earth so I would like to read, as you've heard, but I'm going to read from verse 22, Romans 1:22-32, because I think this speaks more than anything I can say:

"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful, who knowing the judgment of God that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

God does love all persons but He does not love the lifestyle of the homosexual and the lesbians. And He is willing to accept them if they repent of their sin.

Our country was built on Christian principles, and I hope we are not going to lose our Christian freedom by this act being passed. Hebrews 4:12: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions?

The Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: What church are you associated with?

MRS. G. FRIESEN: Bethel Baptist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Other questions?

Thank you, Mrs. Friesen.

The next presenters are Bill and Christine Sudak; James Saltvold; George Back.

Mr. Charles Quappe.

MR. C. QUAPPE: Ladies and gentlemen, this is not a human rights issue; it is a question of morality.

The sexual orientation of homosexuals is in direct contravention with the laws of nature, which is the

reproduction of our life on this planet. It is also against God's law, and is clearly stated in the Bible in the third book of Moses, chapter 20, verse 13: "A man shall not sleep upon a man as upon a woman; this is punishable by death." This is God's law.

I do not want these people to teach my children or grandchildren. If you are of different colour or creed or nationality or suffer from a visible handicap, these are human rights questions and such individuals should not be discriminated against.

But if one acts against accepted conventions, this is not a question of human rights. If we accept this behavior as normal, soon fathers who prefer to have sex with their daughters or mothers wanting to sleep with their sons or in-laws, would they say that sexual orientation should also be accepted?

If our learned friends and lawmakers have any problems in arguing with groups wanting such behavior made law, all they have to read is the Old Testament. Sometimes however, one gets the impression that these elected officials deem themselves higher than God in rewriting the Bible. If we had stricter laws and place to identify these perverts, the case of an Indian lad who was taken home by one parent, a gay - that was down in the United States, from Manitoba - who only took these boys in to use them in his sexually oriented and perverted activities. This Indian boy finally killed this man. Unfortunately, this poor boy is still serving a jail term for doing something that was only right in regard to an ethnic upbringing.

No matter how many laws are put into place to so-called protect these people's rights, they will never be accepted by the normal population, as the behaviour of homosexuals is against the basic instinct of man.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions?

The Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: What church are you associated with?

MR. C. QUAPPE: I'm sorry, I cannot hear you.

MR. H. SMITH: What church are you associated with?

MR. C. QUAPPE: I am not associated with a church.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions? Hearing none, thank you, Mr. Quappe.

George Back; Terry Machnik; Eugene Romanec; Helen Kennedy; Lorna Dyck; Rick Hefford; Ian Semour. Lloyd Bloomer, private citizen.

MR. L. BLOOMER: Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, I am thankful for the privilege to appear on behalf of concerned citizens in our free and democratic society and I pray that it will always be that way.

I want to say at this time that I love the sinner, but I hate the sin. My father-in-law lies buried at Dieppe, having given his life that oppressive, totalitarian governments could not come to our land and impose upon us laws contrary to our God-given freedoms. I remind you that our founding fathers were committed to our God, having dominion from sea to sea. I'm not living in the past, but I have learnt much from it. I am

very much of today and I oppose Bill 47, section 9. I also oppose Harvey André's pill-pusher upper bill, apartheid in South Africa, among other things, and I abhor the flagrant abuse of power that works to the detriment of society at large, appeasing a small minority.

I believe that this act will further contribute to the degradation of society and destruction of our good, moral fabric. I don't believe that this was the upbringing of you legislators sitting here around this table, and I ask for a return to the good moral values of our forefathers, which I witness here along these walls.

I suggest to you that there are 100 times as many righteous perogy pushers in our great province as gays and lesbians and I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, you are going with the flow, but you are off in a muddy slough. I suggest you check the public barometer.

This is a very contentious issue and you haven't heard nor made allowance for people to be heard from Thompson to Tolstoi or Beausejour to Boissevain. These people, as well as the Brandon Police force, want to be heard, and I don't believe this government is of, for and by the people.

I don't want to impose a threat upon you and I would like to believe that you are logical thinkers, desirous of remaining in power and, for this reason, I ask you to tune your ears to what the majority are saying. We have been praying for a breaking of ranks, that the conscience of the legislators would not allow such a terrible disaster to befall our province.

We are with you, Mr. Walding and Mr. Scott, and all the rest who choose to keep our land glorious and free, free from the onslaught of the actions of a Sodom and Gomorrah era, not fearing man or what he can do to you, but fearing an Almighty God.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions?
The Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: What church are you associated with?

MR. L. BLOOMER: Is that relevant?

MR. H. SMITH: Well, because you're talking about this whole question of religion and basically to know if we have the same people from the same organization. I think we have a lot of same numbers from one or two churches.

MR. L. BLOOMER: Where do you come from? What church do you go to?

MR. H. SMITH: I'm not coming before this committee, asking about, talking about . . .

MR. L. BLOOMER: And I'm not required to answer that question either. You have my name and address and phone number. If you want to follow me on a Sunday, you can find out where I go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a point of order being raised. The Attorney-General on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: I believe the Member for Ellice's question is out of order. If somebody appears as a private citizen, then we're to take them as appearing as a private citizen and we should not ask. They can volunteer.

MR. L. BLOOMER: Thank you, Mr. Penner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the information of the public, the witness has the privilege not to answer any questions.

The next presenter is Dr. Tom Snowden, representing the Social Concerns Committee of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, Manitoba and Northwest Ontario.

Brenda Labalu, private citizen.

MS. B. LABALU: Good afternoon, honourable Chairman, members.

I'm an industrial engineer and right now I'm a mother. I'm not sure where to start; I have a few points. I'll try and be as brief as I can.

I'm a little concerned about what's happening to our families, and I believe we need to raise the standard, so to speak, against what we want in our country. Our forefathers fought so hard for freedom, for a country that's free, and I think if we had bigger issues, things like homosexuality wouldn't even come across the table, but it's because we don't have any major wars. People across the world are fighting. My husband was from the Sudan and he escaped from prison and he came over here, and he has recently left me to look for work down east.

I've really noticed with my daughter how she almost craves male attention. Whenever I am with friends, with her grandfather, how she will not rest until she is in a male's arms. I'm really concerned with the fact that if we pass this bill, we see children pick up so much when they're so young. They know when there's unrest in the home, they know, and a little one like her knows when she needs attention from a male, and we are different. There are things that I can't give her.

I'm a little concerned about what would happen if I died tomorrow and a homosexual couple was allowed to raise my daughter. Where are her morals coming from? What is she going to learn? Is she going to be able to relate to men and women, or is it just going to be men? Is she going to have a good attitude toward all of society? You know, it's really interesting, but we can become very polarized when we associate ourselves with only one group of society.

Now if I just hung around with engineers, sure I'd have a good time, but you'd better believe I would become very narrow-minded and I believe that's what makes our country strong, is the ability to associate with different peoples from different walks of life. I have friends who are on welfare; I have friends who are far above me in the social scale, but that helps to keep your objectivity. It helps to keep you informed of what's going on; it helps to open your mind. Where there is ignorance, it leads to hate.

Now I've had homosexual friends but I've really noticed - and I'm sure you'll see here today that there are a few - but they are all together. They cling to one another for support. Now that's okay, but you tend to

get very polarized when you only hang around certain sets of people. I do not want my daughter - I don't believe it's good for anybody to just be raised up in a very small area with a very small influence. I think the only way to true democracy is to be open-minded.

I've got a question for you. I was in a bar a few days ago, and I know we've been hearing a lot from Christians, self-professing Christians, but when was the last time you went alone to a bar? Did you ever talk to anybody? Because people who will not name God as their Lord or whatever it is, they know what's right or wrong. They're not interested and, for the most part, they're uninformed or they don't feel their social responsibility because we've become very lackadaisical in this country. We have so much that we don't appreciate. I had occasion to be in a bar last week and I was amazed at the response. I didn't find anybody open to it. I have a friend who is gay and he was not for it. When I was living overseas, it's quite rampant in Europe, and you've really seen the destruction of the family, the social order.

Okay, the third point, history can teach us a lot, an awful lot. You know great nations didn't fall apart necessarily because they were at war. Unified people can fight their very strong enemy but, when you've got people who are polarized, who don't have unity, you can't fight. You can't stand up for what you believe in, and I believe we need to make a stand here of where we want our country to go because destruction starts from within. It doesn't start from outside.

There's always corruption, but you need to decide where your country wants to go. I would really encourage you to allow the members to vote on a one-to-one basis because I think you'll find out. Go to a supermarket, don't go to a church, because you've heard people from the church. Go somewhere where there aren't church people. Go ask them, you'll find out they're not interested in having homosexuals being allowed to raise their children or to teach their children, and I believe that they have rights.

My heart goes out to them because, you know, if you're really hurt, you can turn away from the opposite sex and I guess I was fortunate. I was lucky I found a good guy. But you know that's not the answer.

It's not something you're born to; it's something that you learn because of circumstances, or hurt or a bad family relationship. Because one parent couldn't give as much as he or she should have, you turn the wrong way. But there's hope that it doesn't need to be that way and I think we need to really decide where this is going. It's not going to stop here. If this bill gets passed, you better believe it's going to be going on; it's not going to stop. So I think we should really consider where we want our country to go.

And I want to thank you for letting me speak. I really appreciate the privilege. This is something my husband paid for very dearly in his country, to try and speak up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Hearing none, thank you Mrs. Labalu.

Lee McLeod, private citizen.

MR. L. McLEOD: Mr. Chairman, honourable Chairperson, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to record

my strong opposition to the inclusion of the term "sexual orientation" in Bill 47, both on the grounds that in human rights legislation this measure is legally unnecessary to those of us who are committed to heterosexuality as our God-given nature-affirmed foundation for spiritually and emotionally healthy families, and indeed for undergirding personal sexual relationships.

This bill will give disproportionate power of influence to people in our society who practise a homosexual or bisexual lifestyle, an aggressive and vocal minority.

I am convinced also that social agencies, child care and educational institutions, churches, employers and other citizens must have the right to set standards of conduct compatible with their traditions, beliefs, purposes, and preferences. I will take a very dim view of the moral fibre of this government should NDP members not be released to a free vote, and will certainly withhold personal support to this government should Bill 47 be passed in its present form.

Further I would like to add so I am not written off as some religious radical that, as a citizen of Canada apart from my religious convictions, apart from Christian faith, I would be just as opposed to this bill in its present form.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Hearing none, thank you, Mr. McLeod.

Donnie McLean, McLean, representing Morality and the Nation.

Mr. Alphanne Carbone, private citizen.

MR. A. CARBONE: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for allowing me to speak. I wish to address the committee today on this bill. I would like to voice my opinions based on biblical principles on it.

First of all, past history has proven, that before the fall of every civilization, three sins had become epidemic. They are homosexuality, incest and pedophilia - sexual child abuse. These very things which were instrumental in the fall of past civilizations, are widespread in today's society.

Homosexuality is not a medical or psychological problem, but rather the matter of satanic bondage. It is not a biological problem nor is it inherited. Homosexuality is a sin against nature, a sin against society, and a sin against God.

The homosexual community maintains and extends itself by recruitment through enticement, usually preying upon those they have working contact with, preferably the young and inexperienced.

The implications of Bill 47 are far-reaching. While it grants superior rights to a minority, it infringes upon the rights of the majority in the following ways: (1) social agencies such as Big Brothers, Big Sisters etc., could lose their right to set their own standards of conduct for volunteers; (2) school day care centres or group homes could be forced to hire those whose conduct and sexual orientation is not in line with the guidelines of these institutions; (3) it could affect the rights of religious groups to hire only those staff members whose lifestyle is faithful to the beliefs and practices of the religious community; (4) it undermines the unique status of marriage and the family as the

fundamental unit of society; (5) it will facilitate the exposure of the AIDS virus to the uninfected population since the homosexual is the primary carrier of this disease; (6) since gay rights was introduced in 1978 in San Francisco, there has been a 2400 percent increase in sexual diseases.

Homosexuality is in direct opposition to the word of God as in Leviticus 18:22 and I Corinthians 6:9. It distorts the distinctions and the roles of male and female, Genesis 1:27. It is an unnatural behavior caused by the rejection of God, Romans 1:22-32. Sodom and Gomorrah were both destroyed because of the very sin of homosexuality, Genesis 19:1-38.

In conclusion, I would like to say that to give superior rights to a minority group and force the rest of society to accept this degenerate, demented lifestyle is ludicrous. It amazes me how an abnormal hellish behavior is given precedence over the norm. May I remind you that God created Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve?

We as Canadians have been blessed by the rights and freedoms that we have, and I thank God for them. However, when one's rights superimpose upon the rights of others, that's where we must draw the line.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions?
The Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Carbone, just a question, you quote from the New Testament and the Old Testament here. I was wondering, there are a number of people in our society who do not adhere to the beliefs of either the New or Old Testament, who have different faiths. Should they have a right to exercise their religions in this society and practice their own beliefs?

MR. A. CARBONE: Yes. I believe, Sir, in Canada's Constitution, we do have the freedom of religion. That's our basic civil right. However, I don't know of any so-called religion in this world where homosexuality is practised freely and where they have their own religion. I can't think of Buddhism or Shintoism or Judaism or Moslem or half-a-hundred other different religions where it's actually promoted.

MR. M. DOLIN: No, I wasn't suggesting it was promoted. You are talking here about God and quoting morality. I understand that's morality according to the Christian religion, and I think you quoted reasonably accurately by saying there are other interpretations of morality which may not allow homosexuality but certainly would allow other definitions of morality.

Would you say that, where they are in conflict with Christianity, they should also have a right to be heard and to exercise their own morality as they see it in their own beliefs?

MR. A. CARBONE: Morality, as I see it, there's only one real form of morality, and that's the word of God. Whatever the word of God says, I believe it because I'm a born-again Christian and the Bible is fairly self-explanatory. It's black and white; it's not grey.

So, to me, your question, it seems to be going around in circles really. You can clarify, if you may.

MR. M. DOLIN: Just a final question, do you believe that atheists have a right to practise their beliefs, which is a belief that there is no God?

MR. A. CARBONE: They have that right.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions? Hearing none, thank you, Mr. Carbone.

MR. A. CARBONE: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is June Fetterly-Wiebe, private citizen.

MRS. J. FETTERLY-WIEBE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the panel. I'm not a public speaker and I'm very unprepared for this session, since I just heard about it this morning.

I am a mother of a pre-school child. I am very concerned about how our society is going in the future. I am very opposed to Bill 47. I do believe that God has created us in his image and He has created Adam and Eve, as stated before me with other speakers, and they've shown you examples in the Bible of where God specifically states that homosexuality is not right, that it is a sin.

I am opposed to Bill 47 because I believe my child should be raised on my Christian beliefs and opinions and not have to come into contact, through his teachers or through other people that he may come in contact in society with their belief. I'm fearful. There's enough backyard opinions, how children learn things, and peer pressure without this bill being passed.

One speaker who admitted to being a homosexual person stated that she's in fear of her job and her home life. Well, I'm in fear of my job and my home life too. When I was working, I was in fear of my job, but I am in fear of my home because this bill would understate my Christian beliefs and how our society is based on. I have learned though, through day-to-day living with my personal belief in God, that He will see me through. I still have that fear, but I have to learn how to trust in Him more personally.

Like I say, I wasn't prepared to give any statements this morning. I also know that, since my child is five years old now, he has learned a lot not from just what I tell him but my own example and other examples he sees around him. I would like this country to continue being free, like we have it now. There are other more important issues, I think, than changing this bill.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Hearing none, thank you, Mrs. Fetterly-Wiebe.

Joy Kulich, private citizen.

MS. J. KULICH: Yes, that's me. That was my sister, by the way, who just spoke, and I couldn't agree with her more, as well with a lot of other private citizens, mostly who have been speaking here today.

I'm a mother also and a wife, and I'm in fear with the AIDS disease. Mainly when my son goes to school, if he cuts his finger and there is another child who is

Monday, 13 July, 1987

beside him or whatever, that disease can be transmitted. I don't want to end up getting my kid into the hospital and then dying very shortly after that. I still feel he has a whole life to live ahead of him, just like we do. As far as I'm concerned, I think that this gay business should be just kept in the closet. I don't think that it should be open. As many people have quoted, God didn't create two men or two women, he created both sexes. That's all I have to say.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions?
The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, this committee, among other presentations, received a rather lengthy presentation from an organization known as the Winnipeg Gay/Lesbian Youth, with a postal address here in Winnipeg. Among their presentation was this printed brochure. The position that the government has taken and indeed many of those who are proponents for the action the government has taken continually point out that we're dealing with rights here, not with the issue of homosexuality; and secondly, the homosexual community is not reaching out to promote their lifestyle onto society in general.

I would ask you to comment or ask for your reaction to a statement made in this brochure.

MS. J. KULICH: Could you read it for me, please? I haven't seen the brochure.

MR. H. ENNS: I will read it to you. It's just the one that worries me. It says: "There seem to be few happy heterosexuals." I suppose that's true. We live in an age where we have many reasons to be unhappy, if you look at the condition of the world, the financing, the taxing.

MS. J. KULICH: But that could go the other way, too, though.

MR. H. ENNS: The farmers aren't too happy right now but, quite aside from that, it goes on to say: "Techniques have been developed to help you change either way you want to. Have you considered aversion therapy?"

Now this is directed to our youth. Would you, as a mother, take objection or would you consider that solicitation for that lifestyle, coming as it does from an organization?

MS. J. KULICH: First of all, there are millions and millions of brochures that go into print every day. This is just one example, as you said. Youth are very impressionable and, whatever way you swing, they're going to go with the flow. There are always followers. There seem to be more followers than leaders. So, of course, if there is a group that says, well, come this way, nine times out of ten, that child will follow.

Unfortunately, that's the way it does go, but what I believe in is that it should not be made public. Like, I don't talk about my sex life out in the open. I don't think it's anybody's business. That's why I think that they shouldn't either, if that makes any sense.

MR. H. ENNS: One final question, as a taxpayer, would it offend you if I were to be able to ascertain, say, tomorrow in question period whether or not this for sure was funded by government money, public money, the printing of it?

MS. J. KULICH: I would be ashamed.

MR. H. ENNS: And furthermore, if it were to be widely distributed in our public school system?

MS. J. KULICH: No, I'd be thoroughly against it and I'd be very ashamed that I am a Canadian.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions? Hearing none, thank you, Joy Kulich.

Randy Loewen; Mrs. May Winters; Jim Klause. William Smith, private citizen.

Mr. Smith.

MR. W. SMITH: Thank you very much for the opportunity of coming to the Legislature. I'm very glad that we do have a -(Interjection)- pardon? Yes, here's a brief incidentally. I'm glad that I have the privilege of being able to attend a meeting such as this and making my views expressed.

I am the father of two small children and I'm speaking as a concerned parent. I am, incidentally, not a member of any political party. I have no political ax to grind. I believe that my views are representative of the majority of parents here today and the majority of parents in Manitoba. My primary concern is for the protection of our children.

Now I believe that our government, the Department of Community Services, has done some positive things in this regard, notably in the maintenance of a Child Abuse Registry. I believe Mrs. Smith is responsible for this and I commend her for having this registry, because I believe that people who abuse children today should be known to our society.

In view of the fact that child abuse is such a widespread problem in North America and in Manitoba today; and in view of the fact that a good proportion of child abuse is of a homosexual nature; and in view of the stated intention of our Legislature - I've heard the comment from some sources that this act might be amended to condone homosexual activity among children as well as adults and, when I say children, I'm referring to the legal definition of a child, a person under the age of 18 years.

I believe that this legislation, one effect will be to encourage child abusers and to hamper the efforts of our police departments and of our social service agencies in protecting our young people, our children. This is not such a far-fetched scenario, because we read in our newspapers of how street-abused children of 11 and 12 years of age are labelled as street-wise by lawyers who are trying to defend men who would use children for their own sexual purposes, and thus the abused child is further victimized in our legal system.

My contention is that this legislation will increase the victimization of children, and it will bring legitimacy to a condition that our society generally looks upon as being deviant behaviour.

I believe furthermore that we must have compassion to those suffering from dreaded diseases like AIDS,

and I don't condone - I believe that violence is abhorrent toward any group of individuals based on what their preference is. I don't believe in violence toward any particular group, but I would suggest that treatment and healing should be the objectives in dealing with this social problem and not legalization that further sanctions the condition and compounds the problem. I believe that this legislation may be expedient and it may be trendy, but that does certainly not mean that it's good.

I would urge all MLA's to vote with their own conscience on this and not just follow a party doctrine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Smith, the Minister would like to ask some questions.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, I have two questions. One is: What is it in the legislation that leads you to think there is any condoning of sexual activity with children?

MR. W. SMITH: I heard the comment - you can correct me if this is incorrect - I believe it came from the Attorney-General that the legislation may be amended to include those under the age of 18 years old. Is that correct?

HON. M. SMITH: My understanding is, the intent of the legislation is to protect children under 18 and, in no way, to condone any sexual behaviour with them.

But my second question is, picking up on one of the earlier comments you made that you thought the majority of sexual abuse cases of children were of a homosexual nature.

MR. W. SMITH: I'm saying a good proportion.

HON. M. SMITH: Okay, I just want to sort of add that I have never seen research that would back that up, and I wanted to ask if you had any research studies that would back that up. If so, I would like to see them.

MR. W. SMITH: In an American study on child abuse - I'm not sure when this study was done - a very large proportion of attacks on children were of a homosexual nature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions?
The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Sir, on the issue that you've raised about condonation, if you listen to the Minister, if you listen to pretty well everyone else in the province, of people under the age of - actually the age is 21 for the purposes of the Criminal Code. We're talking about either protection or condonation. The Minister, being the Attorney-General, has not to my knowledge corrected the Winnipeg Free Press or any other news media which has reported that the government is considering or is planning to amend the legislation to change the definition of sexual orientation.

Given the lack of that retraction from the Minister, where does that leave you? What feeling do you have about what kind of legislation it is we're going to pass? Do you understand that there will be an amendment or that there will not be an amendment?

MR. W. SMITH: I really don't know, but I can say from what I understand, I feel this is a bad move for Manitoba, I really do. I just think it should be retracted.

MR. J. McCRAE: Would you expect your representative in this Legislature to vote either for or against legislation, when you don't know where the Minister stands on an issue as important as that?

MR. W. SMITH: I would sincerely hope that he would vote against it. I believe he will because we do have a Conservative MLA. However, if I had an NDP MLA, I would hope that he would vote against it too for the sake of our children.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, those of us who have chosen to express our opinion against this legislation do so with some fear. Nobody, I would like to think in this country, in this province, likes the word "discriminate" or likes to discriminate against anybody. I think you prefaced from your remarks in the beginning in the same way, never mind speaking of any violence.

But we discriminate regularly against behaviour patterns that society, as a whole, doesn't find acceptable. For instance, up until last year, it was permissible to smoke in this committee room, but we collectively sat around this table and said that we ought not to smoke at these hearings because it's offensive to many. For that reason, we discriminate against those who practise smoking.

What I'm saying is that I have no desire to harass, to hurt, to single out a particular group for any reasons. I want to see them offered the full measure of protection of the law, but the question I'm leading up to is that it is not unacceptable, in fact, it's a very everyday practice of legislators and society to discriminate against certain behaviour patterns which society as a whole, through their governments, finds unacceptable. We discriminate for many different reasons, for many different grounds.

Do you view this issue as analogous to that kind of situation? There is a behaviour pattern with respect to sexuality that is not acceptable to the vast majority of Manitobans, and I do not consider myself a lesser person or an evil person in certain instances for discriminating against them.

MR. W. SMITH: I believe that we do all discriminate against people in certain ways. We put lawbreakers in jail and certainly there are patterns. Mr. Dolin, I think, made a good comment before and I'd like to address this one. He made the comment, what would I do if I found out that my child's teacher was a homosexual?

Under existing law, if I found out that my child's teacher was a homosexual inadvertently, if he or she was not promoting himself as such, I think, if he was being completely professional, then that's okay by me. If, however, we introduce this legislation and he is given special protection and he can therefore perhaps slide in some of his ideas onto my child, I have every reason to be concerned, and that is where we're coming up with a big problem.

HON. M. SMITH: I just want to get back to this idea of young people. Do you believe that this legislation is changing the protection given to young people?

MR. W. SMITH: I most certainly do. I think it's detracting. It's making impressionable young people much more vulnerable targets for anti-social elements in our society.

HON. M. SMITH: Are you aware that the Criminal Code of Canada prohibits homosexual relations with young people under the age of 21 and that this legislation will, in no way, weaken that provision?

MR. W. SMITH: Why do we want to introduce it then, may I ask the Minister?

HON. M. SMITH: Again the question is: Does this legislation change the situation with regard to young people?

MR. W. SMITH: I believe it does very much.

HON. M. SMITH: Well, I guess I'm saying the intent is that it not, and our legal advice is that it does not.

MR. W. SMITH: As we all know, what's written and what happens after it's written are sometimes two entirely different things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions?

MR. W. SMITH: I'd just like to thank everyone for listening. I've taken up too much of your time already, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Smith.

MR. W. SMITH: Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of the record, the two names there, Mr. and Mrs. K. Nemez, written, private citizens, and Mrs. J. Renton, written, have already submitted some written briefs.

The next presenter will be Mary Fetterly, private citizen.

Mary Fetterly.

MRS. M. FETTERLY: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I'm not prepared for this and I'm not a speaker, so you'll just have to bear with me.

I'm opposed to Bill 47 for sexual orientation, for I am a mother of seven children and a grandmother of 10. I'm really concerned about the future of our children, not only learning from other people's experience, from reading, but I know from my own experience that children from birth to five years old are at a very impressionable age. Also, when they get bigger, they also need to follow the peers. The peer pressure to our young people is very great. So if this bill is passed and we'll have to hire the homosexuals, it will be easy for the children to pick up their habits or their way of thinking, even if it is opposed to their parents or to their society's rule.

Now, we may say that there should be freedom for all, but homosexuality as well as heterosexuality is a lifestyle one chooses. So that's a lifestyle they choose or a habit they choose. Now, if that right is extended to them, we may have to extend the rights to anybody

who wants to live in a hut with all the weeds and privy around them on our streets and say, well they are in the minority, they have the rights. But I wouldn't want any minorities to get the rights where I will lose my freedom, and not to say that we'd have to hire them or we'd have to rent a room for them if we have any - you know, for tenants - or we cannot refuse them anything because that would be against the law. That would be infringing on my freedom, because I wouldn't be able to say no to them if this bill is passed.

I'm really concerned about all our freedoms, and I don't think that the freedom should be given to any group that is the product of their own choice of how they want to live, whether they want to be homosexual or heterosexual. I've never heard of a heterosexual community asking for grants or asking for any help to promote their heterosexual ways. I think they should do it on their own money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Hearing none, thank you, Mrs. Fetterly.

The next presenter is Peter Dawes.

For the record, Linda Smith had submitted a written presentation.

Robin Pifer, representing Waverley Fellowship Baptist Church.

REV. R. PIFER: I must say I'm glad to be here today and have the privilege of coming before you, not only on behalf of our church but as a citizen. I've been in Manitoba for about a year now, and I'm very glad to be living in this province and hope to live here a long time, but I'm concerned at this Bill 47 in regard to sexual orientation. Our whole church is.

Under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in Canada, these people and this sexual orientation are protected. Why do we need such legislation now to give them further rights, which I think and we think is very detrimental to our society?

My former ministry as a pastor in Toronto was in the inner city of Toronto. I saw down there the wasted lives of people who lived this way but I also saw, through good counsel and through the power of Jesus Christ, the transformation of these people to a normal lifestyle, a biblical lifestyle. There is a verse that I think about as I approach each one of you this afternoon: "Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin or wickedness is a disgrace to any nation."

I also must say that governors are sent by the Lord to punish those who do wrong and to commend those who do right. Unfortunately, Bill 47 with this type of legislation that allows for any sexual lifestyle to be lived out is really commending those who do wrong.

I'm concerned, we are concerned as a church, for the families in our society that moral absolutes, moral principles, have gone to decay. In fact, immorality is being legislated here. The high standard which our country was built on is becoming no standard at all and we are concerned. We're also concerned with religious freedom.

As a church, will I, as a pastor, be able to teach and preach that homosexuality and the lesbian lifestyle is against God's moral law? With such legislation, I'm concerned because, in my preaching and teaching therefore, I'll be discriminating against those who live

this way. Unfortunately, I don't know where this legislation will go if it's adopted. I am quite concerned.

I'm also concerned, and we are concerned as a church, for our employers who hire, as we have many Christian businessmen in our church. Should they not have the right to hire someone who has high moral standards, high standards of work and high training? Should they not be able to not hire someone who does not fit into their job description?

As a government, as I talk to you this afternoon, I hope that you will not adopt this bill. We hope, as a church, that you will not adopt this bill because, under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms we have in Canada, each one is given sufficient rights.

As a church and as a pastor, we are concerned about the homosexual and lesbian communities in our city. We do not like their lifestyle; we're concerned about them. But we also know that, through the transformation of Jesus Christ in their lives, they can be new people.

Unfortunately, such legislation is only hindering our work as a church. The Bible says: "Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation. Old things are passed away; behold, all things become new." Some people in the audience this morning, or this afternoon rather, will say that these are old-fashioned views that we are talking about, but I really believe that this law is more old-fashioned than anything else. It's an old thing, not a new thing.

With this law, we are regressing. We are moving backwards in our society. I say to you and we say to you as a church that it is not too late to change now. Stop this bill. I hope, as legislators and as people, that this government will choose righteousness instead of wickedness. We pray this for you all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions?

The Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you.

Mr. Pifer, you mentioned moral absolutes. It's my understanding there are various churches within the Christian faith who all feel that they have some definition or idea of moral absolutes. Would you feel that is the case, that there may be differences between what is a moral absolute between one division in the Christian faith and another?

REV. R. PIFER: Could you give me an example?

MR. M. DOLIN: Well, for example, okay, an example would be that the Pope in Rome is the true authority, which I believe is part of the Roman Catholic faith.

REV. R. PIFER: I wouldn't consider that a moral absolute. It's not dealing with morality. It's dealing with position.

MR. M. DOLIN: Well, I think you've made my point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of this questioning is not to argue, but to clarify.

MR. M. DOLIN: I was just asking him. The reason I asked that question is perhaps because there are differences of opinion on what are moral absolutes.

For example, it is my understanding - and I'm no theologian, so I'm asking for your opinion on this - that there is a particular Christian sect in the United States and, I think, in Canada who believe that blacks are an inferior, subhuman race. Now this sect also, if you are talking about the Christian faith and hiring, somebody who is of this particular Christian sect would say it is legitimate, according to their version of the absolute truth, not to hire blacks.

Would you say that would be legitimate in their beliefs and should we, as legislators, adhere to those beliefs?

REV. R. PIFER: That is not something that we would recommend at all. In fact, that is not Christian.

MR. M. DOLIN: I wasn't suggesting that was Christian according to your interpretation. I'm saying, according to another Christian sect or what have you, it is their definition. Do you think they should have a right to act on that?

REV. R. PIFER: That is dealing with racial discrimination and it's quite a bit different from moral degradation and moral impurity. There is a great separation between discrimination in the Bible and moral impurity if one were to look at it.

The Apostle Paul and Peter, I believe, as well say that, under Christ, there is no Jew nor gentile, slave nor free. So therefore, the Bible condemns discrimination on the basis of a person. But the Bible does discriminate against those who are morally impure and really leading our society into, socially and morally, a state of real moral decay. We are concerned about that. In the Bible, there is a great distinction between discrimination, whether it be black or white, and moral impurity. And the Bible stands for purity. God stands for purity. We need purity in our nation. We need purity in this province.

MR. M. DOLIN: I gather, as a Baptist Minister, that is your interpretation of the Scripture. Is that correct? You know, I don't - do you claim to speak for all Christianity?

REV. R. PIFER: Well, yes, I do.

MR. M. DOLIN: Okay, thank you.

MR. H. ENNS: One of the difficulties that we have with this piece of legislation is that the government members, with the heavy hand of their Whip on them, are regrettably not allowed to vote their conscience. But for most of us, we are trying to accomplish something which is difficult - and I just want to pose a question to you, and I'll use your terminology - that is to separate the sin from the sinner.

REV. R. PIFER: Yes.

MR. H. ENNS: The government maintains that this bill is no comment on the sin. It does not condone homosexuality, the practice of homosexuality or - it's just neutral on that position, but is concerned about the sinner, in my scenario, and wants to offer a wider and more complete form of protection from possible

discrimination to the sinner without commenting on the sin. Now, my question to you is: On a moral question like that, is it possible to separate the two?

REV. R. PIFER: Yes. It can be separated, because the law is making a comment about the sin. It definitely is.

Unfortunately, we see in our society today a real move backwards and not forwards. This bill, in its section on sexual orientation, is a move backwards for our society and it is encouraging a sexual orientation that does and will lead to the moral degradation and decline of our society.

I suggest that each member of Parliament read Lee Antonio's book "The AIDS Cover-Up." There you will see a man who has done more research than most of the media, more research into what is happening, and you will see clearly that this lifestyle is leading our North American society into a real pit. And it's very scary.

MR. H. ENNS: I don't know exactly whether I got my answer, although I think you suggested that, in this case, it was not that easy. If your reading of the bill, the measure, indicates to you that it is commenting on the sin, then you understand our difficulty, in my judgment, to separate the two.

I'll use a more understandable example. We have, in the case of Mr. Keegstra or Mr. Zundle, who are the sinners who committed the sin of defaming, of spreading hate literature and the sin of anti-Semitism in these specific instances, we have no difficulty as a society in bringing, in that case, the sin and the sinner together and prosecuting them. You may wish to comment how effectively or not but, in those cases, that was done.

You see, I'm reminded - the Minister reminded us a little while ago when we were talking about the 18-years-and-under classification. Under the Canadian Criminal Code, the practice of homosexuality is a crime. It has been removed some years ago, I'd say to our detriment, but it has been removed as a punishable crime when it occurs with consenting adults. But it remains in effect as the Minister, the previous Minister to the Attorney-General, the Minister of Community Services reminded us that it is a crime under the Canadian Criminal Act if homosexuality involves those under the age of 21.

REV. R. PIFER: I think this bill is making a comment that homosexuality should be legalized, and it's because of the bill we are moving bit by bit so that a person under 21 will not be protected in time. I can see that coming. We're moving on gradually.

Unfortunately this sin, this lifestyle is really something that is taking away from our society. I really feel for the government. We pray for the government. We're concerned because this type of legislation will not allow in time the government to put forth laws to protect the majority of society from those who are carrying AIDS and other infectious diseases. That is very scary because, in Lee Antonio's book - I forget the statistics - but it will be in the millions in the next 30 to 40 years who'll be dying of this disease. If we, as Canadians, put legislation forth that is condoning behaviour that transmits and behaviour that encourages this, we're in a lot of trouble.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Pifer. I'll leave the committee room now to commit my sin of smoking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions?
Hearing none, thank you, Reverend Pifer.

REV. R. PIFER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is Joy Milne. Next is Ervin - this is Joy Milne, private citizen.

MRS. J. MILNE: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as I stand here before God, it's God first that I'm concerned about. This bill concerns me very, very much. I'm a mother of five children and grandmother of four, and a wife of a frustrated farmer at the moment.

This bill, I am very opposed to because, to me, homosexuality and the lesbian part is very sinful, it's very immoral and there's no doubt when it can be proven. I mean, we're all under God's law and I think we still are, and this is the book I go by and it's holy and good and it's never changed. It's the only book in all of history from Adam and Eve, when the time when God created this world and it has never changed, and you can't say that about any other book that there is. I will go into the Bible portions of it.

In Genesis, chapter 19, in verses 4 to 13: "Before they had gone to bed, all the men from every part of the City of Sodom, both young and old, surrounded the House. They called to Lot, where are the men who came to you tonight, bring them out so that we can have sex with them. Lot went outside to meet them and shut the door behind him and said, no my friends, don't do this wicked thing. Look, I have two daughters who have never slept with a man. Let me bring them out to you and you could do what you like with them, but don't do anything to these men for they have come under the protection of my roof. Get out of our way, they replied, and they said this fellow came here as an alien and now he wants to play the judge. We'll treat you worse than them.

"They kept bringing pressure on Lot and moved forward to break down the door, but the man inside reached out and pulled Lot back into the house and shut the door. Then they struck the men who were at the door of the house, young and old, with blindness so that they could not find the door. The two men said to Lot, do you have anyone else here, sons-in-laws, sons or daughters or anyone else in the city who belongs to you. Get them out of here because we're going to destroy this place. The outcry to the Lord against its people is so great that he has sent us to destroy it."

This, in itself, speaks a lot to me because God did just that. He did destroy Sodom and Gomorrah and to me, if legislation which in God's eyes would be wrong, the same as it is here, he'll seek to destroy it. He's sent members along already to destroy the wicked and help the good, so I just pray that you, as a government, can really, really think this issue over, that it is wrong and sinful to give the homosexuals their equal rights.

I don't discriminate. As a Christian, I love everyone and I truly do, but I do not agree with the sin that they are committing, and it is sinful. So I just pray that, by God's grace, you will use good judgment in turning the bill down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions? Hearing none, thank you, Mrs. Milne.

The next presenter is Ervin Nachtigall, private citizen. Mr. Nachtigall.

MR. E. NACHTIGALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the council.

I'd like to voice my opinion to that section of Bill 47 that deals with the freedom of sexual orientation, to which I strongly oppose. I believe I have reasons to do so, and I wish to voice these at this time.

I'm a father of four children, I'm married for 32 years and I'm living in this city for 34 years.

I have very great problems to tell my family, to tell friends, to talk to other people, that this kind of behaviour is normal and that this might be even beneficial to our society and that everyone has a right to live the way he pleases to do so. I would say, Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, then we do not need a government to govern a nation, to govern a province, if everyone can do as he pleases.

My opinion is this, if a person is to the benefit of our society that we can benefit and that we can gain from it, and that this society is protected against evildoers, against people who destruct and destroy society the way we understand it, then that is the obligation of our government. And in my opinion, if this bill is being passed, I see that this kind of behaviour - that in my mind is an ill behaviour - if nothing but being supported from our government. I could elaborate on that.

If we pass bills that protect this kind of group segment of our society, that is, it is certain we're destroying our society - and you know, Mr. Chairman, what I'm referring to - the moral issues, the basic fundamental issues of our families, then I would want to voice my opinion. Our council members, this government should be very careful in looking at this as a whole.

Our medical community, as we all know, has no answer to this problem. I'm talking about the result of this lifestyle, of the AIDS problem. There is no doubt in anybody's mind where that comes from. It clearly leads to this kind of sinful and immoral lifestyle, the result is AIDS.

If our government would support this way of lifestyle in order to give this freedom to live as I want to, it could say in other words, you live the way you like. If you become ill, we will put in a hospital and will pay for it. If more people would become ill, don't worry, we'll build another one, and the rest of the society will pay for it. Council, Mr. Chairman, that is not the answer.

If we will give up our basic moral standards, the family circle, where father and mother pray with their children and tell them to be honest, be true, be helpful, be loveful and our closest society, the family, is being destroyed by opening up our bedrooms and saying, you husband, get another man in if you like; you woman, get another woman in if you like. That type of behaviour is, as it was mentioned earlier and I fully agree, an ill type of behaviour.

Where I was growing up, there exists a Bill 175, STBG and that states this type of behaviour by someone has the tendency and the urge and the desire to be sexually fulfilled or pleased with someone of the equal sex. It cannot be said clearer, and that conduct that rules society is punishable.

I do not believe by passing that bill that it is helpful to our country, to our society. If you are dealing with an ill mind, by passing the bill and telling them you can continue to do so, that is not the answer. In my Bible, the answer has been given a long time ago, 2,000 years ago. People knew there was a God; they have rejected him. They have chosen their own lifestyle and, as a result of it, God has given them up.

If we were to believe that our government wants to support this kind of lifestyle that God condemns, then I suggest let's no more use the Bible anywhere than the - let's put the Bible away; let's no more use the Bible when someone becomes a citizen.

It was used when I became a Canadian citizen. Why have the Bible there and giving your word under oath, your allegiance to it if we, five minutes later, destroy it or neglect it or reject it and make our own laws? Government is set to have responsibilities and, when I became a Canadian citizen, we were told you people have privileges and I appreciate that very much.

At the same token, it was said you have also responsibilities and that's why I'm here today. I'm taking my place; I want to voice my strong objection to this kind of legislation, should it ever come through.

I read in the local papers a little while ago, just to emphasize that point, people were writing in regard to this lifestyle from the homosexuals. I'd like to rephrase that, this lifestyle is - and pardon me for saying it, but this was in our local paper - like an animal lifestyle. Then the answer was given at the same time, and someone who studied animal behaviour, he disagreed.

Council members, Mr. Chairman, the answer was given, and I'd like to mention it here, and it was said that type of behaviour is below animal behaviour. Animals do not behave that way. He said that writer - you will not find that in the animal world, that one animal would go to its same sex. And someone is going to try to tell me and to tell us who worship the Bible, the truth, to be good citizens, that it is a normal behaviour that should get legislated and be protected, and I say, no, and I say that is wrong.

I have worked for many years as a moderator. I have been a deacon for many, many years. I have to teach the senior class. This council, with this Chairman, with this government, expects me to say in the future that this is all normal. Never will I say that. We warn our young people and we tell them, very clearly, if man rejects God, God will let that person go, and the end is destruction of that very person and the end is destruction of our society. To help in that direction, medical professionals cannot help desperately trying. Give these people a clear answer. It is expected to come from you and that is, if someone lives that lifestyle, he has to bear the consequences, even if you don't believe in God.

In closing, I hope very strongly, as it was said earlier, this government would clearly give the freedom of their MLA's to voice their opinion, without any influence.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Hearing none, thank you, Mr. Nachtigall.

The next presenter is Laura Batchelor, private citizen; the next presenter is Cheryl Batchelor, private citizen. The next presenter is Geoff Casey, private citizen.

Monday, 13 July, 1987

Mr. Casey.

MR. G. CASEY: I thank you for the opportunity to speak to this committee this afternoon. I do want to voice a strong objection against the proposed bill. I haven't read the bill; I only have an idea of what the bill is about.

I think that what the homosexual community would like to have is dignity and respect from others. I'm sure they don't want other people pointing a finger at them in self-righteousness but I think that, if they want this on the part of others to treat them with dignity, they must themselves, I believe, treat their own selves and others within their community with dignity.

I just finished reading a number of portions of the book called, "The AIDS Cover-up" and it seems to be a book that's well-researched and a number of very good scientists, doctors, are quoted in there - a doctor, I think his name is Dr. Hazeltine (phonetic) from Harvard, and then there's a Dr. Curan (phonetic). It seems to be well-documented. Major medical journals are quoted. It doesn't seem to be a book about just one man's opinion, but he seems to have done very thorough research. After reading the book, it caused more concern for me than I already had, although I was very concerned in the first place about this proposed amendment.

In this book, he does expose the practices of homosexuals. I do not want to and I'm sure you would not want me to get into detail and I won't, but he shows, he explains and I think he just gives enough information for the reader to get an idea. I don't think he wants to pander to anybody's interests in that direction. But he does show that the lifestyle of homosexuals is very unsanitary. It involves a great deal of uncleanness. I know when I read what he had to say, he does in a brief section tell us - and my own response to it - I found it very upsetting to read this sort of thing that people can do among themselves with other people. I'm not surprised. I've been a Christian now for eight years, thank God, and I do believe that God has opened my eyes, as He has for other born-again believers, to the low depths of depravity to which we can, anyone of us - I don't want to point a finger at anybody - can descend without the help of God, without the grace of God. If then the homosexuals themselves do not regard themselves with dignity, do not treat themselves with dignity, then how can they expect others in the community to have treated them with dignity?

Several years ago, when I was a teenager, I was watching a program on CBS, a CBS program called "60 Minutes." They did an expose of the homosexual community in San Francisco. I found it a very alarming kind of program but very informative. You don't see too many of those programs these days, I don't think, but what did it show? Well, it showed citizens of San Francisco being very concerned. Why? Because when their children went to the neighbourhood park, what did they find? They find men waiting under the trees. They find men laying about on the grass in the park, and the neighbours in the community said we cannot send our children into those parks. What else did they find in San Francisco? They found a number of establishments where people torture themselves, where

they have all kinds of equipment for that purpose. This was part of the homosexual community.

Now we can say to ourselves, well, we don't have this sort of thing here in Winnipeg, so are you just being an alarmist? No, I don't think so. Because I think that the trend that's been happening down there with our neighbours in America, in the United States, is finding its way up here in the same way.

What I found on that program, I found corroborated in this book, "The AIDS Cover-Up." I found this a very informative book, because it does seem to show, he does seem to have good evidence that there are groups standing in the way of citizens learning about what AIDS is all about. I only have a smattering of knowledge myself, that's for sure, but he does seem to show - and he's talking primarily about the United States where the research is done - that there are groups who are covering up and are responsible for misinformation and for lack of information getting through, namely, the media in that country and also politicians in that country.

It seems that the homosexuals have been doing exactly down there what they are attempting to do up here, and that is, to keep pushing and pushing for legislation to protect them. So what's happened down in the United States it seems, at least according to what I have found in this book, is that because of this kind of legislation there has been a burgeoning of thousands of nightclubs for homosexuals, bathhouses for homosexuals. This researcher says that, when they look at the people with AIDS, of the homosexual men who have AIDS, 50 percent of their contacts were these bathhouses. I dare not describe to you what goes on in those bathhouses, especially as we're getting close to the supper hour. I think maybe that the homosexual community doesn't agree with these sorts of things because they're just not informed.

It seems to be part of the thesis of this book that it's the bathhouses and it's the nightclubs and it's essentially the unsanitary, sexual behaviour of homosexuals which is responsible for AIDS. I know my impression before I read the book, as I watched the television and saw some of the development of this AIDS thing, I thought what they're trying to do is they're trying to make it look as though this is not a homosexual problem but that it is heterosexual and it belongs to hemophiliacs and it belongs to other groups as well. But this book does seem to have clear evidence that it's a problem with the homosexual community and it's a problem with the kind of sexual lifestyle that they've adopted, which they try to portray to us as being normal, as being normal as heterosexual activity. Granted there is some heterosexual activity that is not normal too.

I do ask God for help to speak this afternoon. I don't want to just ramble on, but I do just want to make some points here. I think - if I can remember where I was here - he does seem to say that it is the homosexual activity that is responsible for AIDS. He says that - and I think he does quote medical sources in saying this; in fact, I'm pretty sure about it - in the United States, 70 percent to 90 percent of the AIDS cases are from the homosexual community.

Initially, when AIDS was discovered, it was called GRID, the Gay Related - I'm not sure - those are the first two words, I think so, yes. Gay Related Immune Disease, I think it is; Immunity Disease, something like that. And then because of the pressure of the gay

community and gay lobbying, intense lobbying in the United States, it was changed to a more generic name, AIDS, to help try and cover up the fact of the origin of AIDS.

I think that any parent who is concerned would want to read this book to see that not only do homosexuals carry AIDS. I just wanted to mention too. I did remember another statistic and that is, it was found that in Europe, 84 percent of the cases of AIDS were with whom? The homosexuals.

And I would be concerned as a parent. I hope someday to be a parent, Lord willing. I would be concerned because other diseases are carried as well and are indigenous or have their preponderance among the homosexual community, including hepatitis B. I read the statistic in this book that about 10 percent to 15 percent of homosexuals chronically carry hepatitis B. I wouldn't want a practising homosexual in the classroom teaching my children with the risk that he might be one of those 10 percent to 15 percent.

It's also stated in here that about 90 percent of homosexuals have that same disease one time or another in their sexual lifetimes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With due respect, Mr. Casey, how long - would you want to talk more?

MR. G. CASEY: Could I speak for longer? I don't want to just take up your time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are a lot of people waiting.

MR. G. CASEY: Okay, I'll try to wrap up then.

When I saw on the television Mr. Filmon's suggestion that the vote be made a private vote, I want to say that I do agree that is a very good idea. I disagreed with the reporter who seemed to think that this was some underhanded tactic on Mr. Filmon's part.

But I think that, given this kind of issue which cuts deep into the fibre of each person, I think each person who's involved in voting should have the choice or should have the opportunity to vote privately according to their conscience.

Others this afternoon have quoted from Leviticus and they've quoted from Romans, and I won't quote from them again; you've heard the quotes. But I would say this. It's argued that homosexuals were condemned in the Old Testament to death by God. The Bible does say that in Leviticus, that they were deserving of death.

Now, it is argued, I should say the argument is this, well, that was the Old Testament; but in the New Testament, the moral law is not done away with and that's why it's continued to be condemned even in Romans, where the Scriptures speak of men doing unto men what is unseemly. And when you read in this book what goes on, you can definitely see why the Scriptures say why men are doing what is unseemly.

I think that this proposed legislation, notwithstanding what the wording they say in the legislation, I think that what it says is it's conveying the message to the homosexual community that this lifestyle is normal and it's okay. I can conceive where, in a school, a principal may want to dismiss a homosexual on the basis of what he's teaching or in his practices. But if he is protected by this law, then he can say, listen, I'm a

homosexual, I'm being discriminated against. It does seem that the homosexual community does have a powerful lobby. It would seem to me that the outcome would be that homosexuals would be able to keep their jobs on the basis of the idea of discrimination.

I just wanted to say also that we can disagree with each other according to our opinions and I have found, and many others have found also, as born-again believers, that the touchstone for truth is God's Scripture. It's a sure guideline. I found in my eight years of being a born-again Christian that God has always been faithful to his word. I think that this proposed legislation would, in being a tacit approval of homosexuality, go against the word of God. I believe that's a very dangerous position to take, to be on a side that is different from God.

I don't think it's just a matter of interpretation. It's very plain to see if we read Leviticus; it's very plain to see if we read Romans. No matter whose theology is involved, it's clear what God's word itself says. I thank you for this opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Hearing none, thank you Mr. Casey.

Francine Bouchard.

MS. F. BOUCHARD: I'll keep this brief, and I want to thank you for this opportunity to be able to voice my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, and ladies and gentlemen, I appeal to you as a Winnipeg citizen with the hope that showing my concern will have an impact on whether or not Bill 47 will be accepted or rejected.

I am a Christian and a single parent, and I don't want our children who trust in us to be deceived into believing that homosexuality is an okay alternative as far as interpersonal relationships are concerned. These people want freedom that society can't give them, as they're going against nature itself. I hope, if at all possible, this government will not allow this influence to affect the future of our children, not to mention the future of our family life.

I don't want my son to be influenced by a homosexual teacher who spends seven hours a day with him or worry about a Big Brother who might introduce him to this kind of sexual activity. I could go on but, as part of the government, I do feel personally responsible to voice my opinion on behalf of the future of our children. I know we can't stop homosexuality but, by not passing Bill No. 47, I believe we can help in controlling homosexuality in some forms.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Hearing none, thank you, Francine.

MS. F. BOUCHARD: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Reverend John Oldham, private citizen.

REV. J. OLDHAM: Sir, I have a brief brief.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A very brief brief.

REV. J. OLDHAM: Brief brief.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

REV. J. OLDHAM: I commend you for holding these hearings and for having the tenacity to stay with us during this long session, and indeed the courage from all parties to struggle with trying to come to what might be a fair or just legislation regarding human rights.

The reality is, in my opinion, that a certain percentage of the general public are gay or lesbians. I believe, whether I support their lifestyle or not, that they are entitled to the same human rights, no more, no less, than I have as a heterosexual person.

As a pastor in the United Church of Canada for nearly 20 years, I have known homosexual persons as nurses, priests, pastors, teachers, mothers, fathers, civil servants, church members, fellow followers of Christ. The vast majority of them have been competent and caring in their professions and their positions. They have cared for me and I have cared for them along the journey of life. They are fellow human beings and, as such, desire the protection of the law and our human rights.

I am opposed to homosexual persons or heterosexual persons abusing other children or adults. There are gay and straight people who have sexual perversions. But the majority of both the gay and straight community are, in my opinion, moral, law-abiding believers in some higher power and desirous to live in peace with their neighbour.

While this is a personal submission, it does reflect the tone and the theme of the policy of the United Church of Canada in terms of Manitoba and the Northwestern Ontario Conference. Many submissions today appear to quote harsh and judgmental sentences from the Old Testament. I choose to base my theology and my morality on the compassionate teachings of a rabbi called Jesus.

His life, His message, His death, were all affirmations, in my opinion, of human rights for all people regardless of gender, race, creed, colour or sexual orientation. My submission, the basis of it, came to me in the form of a poem hymn this morning as I was walking. It's called "In God's Sight." It goes to the tune by Ludwig van Beethoven. I invite you to hum it later in the shower, but not to discriminate against Beethoven's rights, however deceased, I will refrain from singing it, but you can hum along if you know the "Ode to Joy." Anyone who wants copies of this after, I have a few extra. - (Interjection)- Yes. Ed knows I was never a good singer, even at his kids' weddings.

In God's sight, we are all equal, gay and straight, Native and white. We are created in God's image, called to live with joy and delight. While we're varied in opinion, we affirm our humble faith. We are kin with all creation, joining with the human race. In God's plan we are intended, rich and poor and young and old, to discover on life's journey spiritual wealth is more than gold. By God's grace, we're new creation - to quote Paul - the Christ spirit dwells within. So as siblings in God's kingdom, let us faith-filled life begin.

Justice is denied to others and to self when we decree that some people are excluded from life of equality. With empowerment of God's spirit, let us build

community that affirms all as God's blessing, hallowing humanity. We are called to live God's justice, seeking human rights for all. Guided by the Holy Spirit, as we live in reverence, all. Let us heed the prophet's challenge to treat all with dignity. Then we will with caring courage live a life that's holy, free.

I thank you for holding these public hearings on this issue and for considering my submission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions?
The Member for Portage.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Oldham, you're looking for protection for the homosexuals, and I admit the concern that I have is for people born homosexual. If they are, I have some concern. If it's an acquired habit, something that they develop as the time goes on, does the United Church feel that people should be protected when they've acquired or want something, they choose to go into where they -(inaudible)-.

REV. J. OLDHAM: Mr. Connery, my opinion on this matter is that, from my reading, there is a variety of evidence, somewhat conflicting. You perhaps have studied it, and others who are here in this session, regarding the causes of homosexuality. There are some who present the theory that it's the influence of a mother or a father, the influence of other people on a child developing. My own personal viewpoint, as I've researched the matter and got to know gay people more personally, is that in the majority of cases at least we're looking at something that they're born with. Now I know there are differences of opinions on that point, but my position from learning from the gay community is that the vast majority of gay people are born that way, just like I'm born heterosexual.

In terms of the United Church's position, I don't think there's a distinction made because one can never determine, Ed, whether one is born homosexual or one acquires homosexual traits in one's growing years or adult years. So I would think the United Church's position would be the same regardless, even though it really can't be distinguished.

MR. E. CONNERY: In the bill, it also says "bisexuality." Do you agree that bisexuals should be accorded the same -(inaudible)-.

REV. J. OLDHAM: I believe that all human beings are entitled to basic human rights. That is the basic principle that I affirm in presenting here, and I understand is the basic principle of the legislation, barring the Criminal Code in terms of lawbreakers, in terms of killers, breakers of the laws, obviously their human rights are denied them when they are incarcerated. But I'm a believer that this is basically an issue of human rights and justice, and that all people are entitled to basic human rights. And that's why I'm here.

MR. E. CONNERY: I'm curious, Reverend Oldham, you're representing the United Church and the United Church has come out strong. I wonder if you have polled all of your members of the United Church congregation on how they stand because the feeling that I get talking

with the members of my particular church and community is that they are not in favour of this legislation as the conference is.

REV. J. OLDHAM: My hunch on this one, and it's only a calculated hunch, is that the United Church of Canada and other major denominations have people who are in leadership positions who are prepared to lead. I am one of them and I am aware that there are many people in my congregation and my constituency of Fort Garry who are of a different opinion than I am, but that does not negate my responsibility as a clergyman to try to present my understanding of the gospel.

To my knowledge, there has been no poll taken across Canada of any denomination. I can't speak for others, but certainly the United Church of Canada, the only way we get a reading on where the United Church people are going in their directions, whether it's on capital punishment issues or on this specific issue, is at our annual meetings of Church Conference where there are lay and clergy delegates. But we do not have an opinion poll survey of United Church people.

MR. J. McCRAE: Sir, you spoke a moment ago and said that all humanity should have their basic human rights protected, and then you went to list a group of people who perhaps don't have them protected by virtue of criminal acts. The United Church has been quite vocal about this issue and I wonder why it has not asked the government to add to section 9(2) another prohibited ground, being that of prostitution.

REV. J. OLDHAM: Prostitution is not included in this legislation.

MR. J. McCRAE: Right.

REV. J. OLDHAM: And I wasn't in favour of it.

MR. J. McCRAE: Why are you not asking the government to do that?

REV. J. OLDHAM: Why aren't we?

MR. J. McCRAE: Yes.

REV. J. OLDHAM: Well, I am not here officially as a - I'm here as an individual who happens to be a United Church Minister, but I don't believe in prostitution.

MR. J. McCRAE: But you believe in homosexuality and bisexuality.

REV. J. OLDHAM: No, I do not believe in homosexuality. I believe that we are all created equal in God's sight, and that there are people of different sexual orientations in this world, as there has been down through history, and they should be accorded the same basic rights under the law.

MR. J. McCRAE: Some, I imagine many, would suggest that prostitution is another sexual orientation.

REV. J. OLDHAM: Well, no, I would doubt that very much.

MR. J. McCRAE: The fact is, Sir, there's nothing illegal about consenting adults engaged in buggery.

A MEMBER: Why isn't he being called for arguing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The members are gently reminded again that their questions are for clarification only.

MR. J. McCRAE: I'm very grateful, Mr. Chairman, that you're allowing me to speak today.

The Criminal Code -(Interjection)- here we go again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have certain rules by which people abide. If we don't follow the rules, there will be trouble.

MR. J. McCRAE: The Criminal Code, Sir, says that everyone who commits buggery or bestiality is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for 14 years. A little later on, in the Criminal Code, it says in section 158 that the section I just read to you does not apply to any act committed in private between any two persons, each of whom is 21 years or more of age, both of whom consent to the commission of the act. If the act of buggery was, as it was prior to 1969, an indictable offence in this country, would your position on equal rights for homosexuals be the same?

REV. J. OLDHAM: I have no need or desire or opinion regarding the issue of buggery. I'm here to speak about the issue of human rights, and you think they're connected. I'm not sure they are.

MR. J. McCRAE: Well, I'm not sure I got the answer to my question about prostitutes clear because, as you know, there's nothing illegal about prostitution in this country either. Certain aspects of solicitation in that direction are illegal, but prostitution itself is not illegal, so that you would deny a prostitute the right to obtain employment or you would want to protect a prostitute's right not to be fired, should that prostitute's employer find out that person is a prostitute, or you would deny a prostitute services?

REV. J. OLDHAM: I have no desire to make services for the prostitute today, if that's what you're asking.

MR. J. McCRAE: No. This bill, Sir, would guarantee Manitobans of certain persuasions the right not to be denied his or her job on the basis of sexual orientation.

REV. J. OLDHAM: Right, and I affirm that.

MR. J. McCRAE: And I'm asking you, why not on the basis of the fact that person is a prostitute?

REV. J. OLDHAM: Well, in reality, we are not denying prostitutes their occupation. They're working, I understand, quite well in the city. We're not denying that.

MR. J. McCRAE: The fact is that, for some people, that is a part-time occupation only and they need other employment as well. There are also protections here to keep the people from losing their jobs or evicted

from their homes. Would you like to see prostitutes protected in the same way is what I'm asking you?

REV. J. OLDHAM: Well, I haven't had a long time to reflect on this, obviously, but my basic opinion would be that all people are entitled to adequate housing and occupation. I certainly don't want to discriminate against any certain segment of people who deserve to have adequate housing - or what was your other clause, it was housing and . . .

MR. J. McCRAE: Housing and access to employment and the right not be fired. So, if the Honourable Member for Lakeside or the Honourable Member for The Pas or myself were landlords, you would like to see us forced to accept prostitutes living in our apartment buildings?

REV. J. OLDHAM: Forced to accept?

MR. J. McCRAE: Well, as Bill 47 would do in the case of homosexuals.

REV. J. OLDHAM: But it does not in terms of prostitutes. Like, I don't know why you're bringing that issue up when we're looking at the issue of the legislation as presented.

MR. J. McCRAE: Let me make it clear. As this bill reads, if a prostitute should come applying to me, as a landlord, to rent space, I'm entitled to say, no, you may not rent my space because you're a prostitute. Would you not want to protect prostitutes the same way you want to protect homosexuals?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't have to answer if you don't want.

MR. J. McCRAE: You don't have to answer.

REV. J. OLDHAM: No, I'm just trying out loud here, as I expect you are, re dialogue in this issue.

My basic position, that I think all people are entitled to basic human rights, regardless of their profession. Now if they are breaking the law, being a criminal, i.e., shooting someone or robbing a bank, I think that's clear. Now we're getting into some grey areas based upon certain kinds of behaviours and occupations, and it's going to be dicey and difficult to discern with clarity where one comes down on those positions.

MR. J. McCRAE: Well, that's exactly what the debate has been about for the last several days, about lifestyle. Now I'm asking you if, as a basis for discrimination, the lifestyle of a prostitute should be included in this legislation?

REV. J. OLDHAM: My understanding, if I can make some distinction, it seems to me when you use the phrase "lifestyle," a prostitute, for whatever reason, chooses to work as a prostitute - lack of income, broken home, whatever - but my understanding of homosexuality is that they don't choose to be homosexuals, that they are born that way, that a certain percentage of human beings around the world are gay. I see quite a distinction between a lifestyle that one

chooses, i.e., prostitution, or sexual orientation that is given to them in birth.

MR. J. McCRAE: In that case, I remind you of the question asked by the Honourable Member for Portage.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Order, order.

HON. R. PENNER: This is for clarification - on a point of order - not for debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again and again, members are reminded questions are permitted under the rules for clarification only. We are not supposed to debate with the witnesses, with the presenter.

The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General is a lawyer and should know this as well as I or better, that very often questions are put as hypothetical and the opinion of the presenter is asked for. That's what I'm about to do, and I was interrupted in midstream.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a point of order being raised. The Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I think if the Member for Brandon West would care to consult the rules under which we operate in Beausiesne, he would find that this is not a court of law. This is a committee hearing, the basic purpose of which is to hear members of the public.

Now, how asking the same question six times over or arguing with the witness allows us to do that, I don't know. I think it's very wrong in the sense of the rules, but I think it's also discourteous. We have a lot of members of the public who have waited a considerable period of time to make presentations. I think we should have questions for clarification only. We should not get into debate with the witnesses and show some courtesy to the rest of the members of the public, as is in the intention under our rules in Beausiesne, Mr. Chairperson. So I would ask you to call the Member for Brandon West to order and show a bit of courtesy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to hear him first. The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: On the same point, what I was asking was a question of clarification, Mr. Chairman. Here again I have been interrupted and, when honourable members complain about the time that is being taken to the disadvantage of the people who are appearing here, the time being taken up is in foolish points of order with the intention of trying to stifle this honourable member from asking questions. I object to that, and I'd like to be able to ask my questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't want to prolong this point of order business; we want to go on with the business. The Member for Brandon West may ask questions, but for clarification only.

MR. J. McCRAE: It's exactly what I was doing, Mr. Chairman. Sir, you were talking about choice and the

life of a prostitute being a life of choice, so I ask you about the life of a bisexual. Is that a case where they have this irresistible urge for both sexes and cannot control themselves, and therefore require protection of this bill?

REV. J. OLDHAM: I do not have the medical, scientific knowledge to respond to that question.

MR. J. McCRAE: Thank you.

REV. J. OLDHAM: I would like to leave soon so other people can have an opportunity to present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're not required to answer questions, Reverend John Wesley Oldham.

REV. J. OLDHAM: Then in that case, I will leave so others can present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. J. McCRAE: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Just for the record, Mr. Chairman, I had further questions about the rights of homosexuals under the age of 21, but the witness chose not to stay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next presenter, Noreen Stevens. Please proceed.

MS. N. STEVENS: I am a lesbian. That's a simple, forward sentence. It may shock or make uncomfortable some people in this room to hear me speaking in a forthright, proud manner about an apparent perverse, abnormal, sick, crime against nature. Those are their words, not mine. There are others in this room, gay men and women who understand how frightening it is to sit in this room or to stand in front of this podium under the close scrutiny of the video cameras which were present earlier.

I didn't come here today to defend my lifestyle, an exercise in futility in my experience. I came to affirm it and to express my opinion on Bill 47's power to initiate a change in negative public opinion re homosexuality and to eliminate, if only in small ways initially, the fear and oppression currently inherent in being a homosexual in Manitoba and in many parts of Canada and in the world.

I'm sure, in the course of these public hearings, many stories have been told of gay lives marked by incidents of persecution, oppression and humiliation. I know of many other such stories told to me by gay friends and lovers. On a personal level, I've been lucky in this regard.

In high school, I was openly gay and was accepted by a circle of good friends, albeit they were social misfits like myself. My high school's Family Life Program - and it's worth pointing out that this was in a small town, then Conservative Southern Ontario - included positive discussion of homosexuality as an alternative lifestyle.

It was even implicitly acknowledged that some of the students were gay, a point that's often overlooked in such programs. My lifestyle has been accepted and is supported by my family. The church in which I grew up and which for many years was important to me, the United Church of Canada, has a progressive attitude toward homosexuality.

In university, I entered a professional program which attracts many gay people, mostly men - that was in interior design. I'm accepted by my lover's family and there's always a place set at the table for me at family gatherings, something that's been important to me being 1,500 miles from my own family.

All in all, I'm able to paint a positive picture of my life as a gay woman, a gay woman in a straight world, but I consider myself to be quite lucky. And there's another side to this story of course, an omnipresence that is intertwined with every aspect of my life and the lives of all gay people, and that's fear.

Between the ages of 12 and 16, I became increasingly aware that I was gay. Underlying that process of discovery was sheer terror as I rolled around in my mind the social implications of my revelation. When I was 16, I said to myself in private, I am a lesbian. Opening my statement today with those words was scary. Saying it out loud to myself and feeling it hitting my eardrums at 16 was 10 times more frightening. In keeping such knowledge to oneself, only admitting it or articulating it to oneself is analogous, I think, to the philosophical question of whether or not a falling tree makes a sound if there is no ear to receive the vibrations. By that, I mean that I didn't feel that my coming out process was complete until those four little words had fallen on someone else's ears.

The fear and the moments preceding the imparting of that information to someone else for the first time, I think, ranks very high in the lives of most gay people. But that was my adolescence. I got older, everyone I knew accepted me. I live a satisfying, stimulating, fulfilling life. But the fear never goes away. I feel fear about letting my landlord into my bedroom to fix a socket. I share a one-bedroom apartment with my lover; there is one double bed in the room. Will he draw accurate conclusions and deny me living accommodations?

I have in the past worked as a child care worker. My co-workers were people with whom I wanted to be friends, intimately and openly. But while they were telling me about their dates and their marriage plans, I was saying little, lying or omitting the details of my life. I was afraid of losing my job. I think it's noteworthy in light of the discussion here today that my homosexuality is now known to the board and the staff and many of the parents of the children in that day care and, despite that, I continue to work there periodically as a substitute teacher.

Walking down the streets, I've been taunted, someone yelling out, "dike," or - and this is one I have never been able to figure out - "faggot." I tense, waiting for the person to recede into the distance, fearful that violent words might turn into violent actions.

I'm a member of the Winnipeg Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Committee which is organizing the first annual Lesbian and Gay Pride Day celebration on August 2, 1987. The activities will include a legal march or walk through downtown Winnipeg and an afternoon of outdoor entertainment. The poster for this event states that anonymity masks are provided - provided not because people are ashamed. We are very, very proud, but because we are afraid, afraid of being recognized and afraid of discrimination.

So what does all this have to do with Bill 47? The tabling of this legislation has elicited many angry,

Monday, 13 July, 1987

negative responses to the homosexual lifestyle and has provided a forum for the oppressors of homosexuals to present their arguments.

As I listen to them speak, I feel pain and anger, and "fear," that word keeps coming up. But what I notice more than anything is their lack of understanding of the issue itself, the homosexual lifestyle. Of course our system of government offers us, the homosexuals, and those sympathetic to our lifestyle the opportunity here at these hearings to counter their arguments and to educate their ignorance. What's unfortunate - and I've already pointed it out - is that fear prevents many among our ranks from carrying out that process, from standing here and making a statement.

Perhaps I'm being naively optimistic in believing that the passing of Bill 47 will act as a catalyst for change in the negative social attitudes towards homosexuality. But I do believe that the protection Bill No. 47, sporadic though it will be, will release homosexuals from the paralysis of fear that pervades their lives. When we no longer have to be constantly looking over our shoulders out of fear, we'll be able to channel our energies into the positive aspects of our lives, our communities and our governments. We'll be free to help our opponents to understand that our lifestyle is not a threat to their lifestyle.

Thank you for the opportunity of speaking today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Hearing none, thank you, Noreen Stevens.

Peter Williams, private citizen.

MR. P. WILLIAMS: I stand before you this moment because I have been attending most of these sessions. I had no intentions of speaking. But what has happened to me, as I have sat here listening, is that two very important factors have come to my mind and have been felt by my being that I've just got to talk to them.

I come to you as a heterosexual person, father of three children, one who has, in his life, been journalist, accountant, teacher. For the last 20 years of my life, I've been a pastor in the United Church of Canada, which I now am.

I have spent a lot of my study time in simply understanding what the sense of Christian ministry means. My Master's theses are on this subject. I take it very seriously and I come before you this day as one who doesn't want to share that part of my history but wants to share that part of me that has been moved by that history. I have two factors to share with you and I'll be as brief as I can. I tell you now that I am not going to hang around for the questions because, as the questions have been put, I have been very disturbed by them in the shifting of emphasis. So I'm going to make my point and I am going to leave.

The two points I wish to make though are these: I've been very concerned about the environment of this place. I don't think it's the fault of any particular person, Mr. Chair, on the council, on the committee. I'm not saying that. This must be a devil of a situation to handle. What I am saying though is that many people seem to have come to these events to share and to make known particular points of emphasis they have on their attitude towards homosexual persons may be, but also a certain theological position.

I would have hoped that something like this would have enabled us to come here and to talk about our position. The counter positions, the contrary points of view we have is healthy. We are not all made the same, we do have these different points of opinion. To hear them must be seen as a good feature of this whole thing, and I am proud that we are part of a community that allows us to do that.

But what I have noticed happening is that a lot of people-bashing has been going on. People have come to this podium for the intent of downing one other person or some other person or a group of persons, instead of making their case known so that we can all hear it. Believe it or not, there has been a lot of hatred and angry language used. That, I think, I find that as a very sad commentary on the maturity of our political structure. It has been going on all this day, and all the other days that I've been here.

I'm disturbed by that, and I'm very sorry because I think what that has done is it has shifted our emphasis and our thinking from the real issue, which is one of justice. We're talking here about whether or not some people under the existing codes and laws, human rights, are still justly treated or whether, with the existence of those laws that we may have, are still subject to persecution and some injustice. I don't know where some people have been, but just to live in our world is to know that some people are unjustly treated.

As a pastor, in the course of any week now, it hasn't always been this way for me but, in recent times, a day doesn't go by without somebody appears before me because they have been unjustly treated by someone: a wife battered, a child battered, a person denied the right to a job or a residence. The homosexual persons are somewhere in there, along with heterosexual persons. So when I see a bill like this - and I have read it - I have some measure of satisfaction, because I'm thinking at least that issue is being addressed.

The second point I wanted to make, if this sounds like me speaking as a theologian, I apologize because I don't intend to, but it does relate to the way we have used Scripture in these proceedings. It must be apparent to all of us that there are at least two, probably many, but there are at least two ways in which we can talk about our faith. I consider myself to be a man of deep spiritual faith. I know the God that I know. I know the place that a man called Jesus plays in my life. But there are obviously two ways in which we work this faith out within us.

One is in the whole area of what we might call absolutes. People live by those absolutes. They can be what some person has once said, what a Levite priest once wrote, what Paul thought and wrote down. It can be in any expression. It can be what the church in the Third and Fourth Century put into its creeds so that the barbarian races would not destroy the Christian faith. The absolute can appear anywhere, in the committees that have met down through the centuries since, but they are a person. This particular person is one who lives by that absolute.

I'm saying to you that person has every right to see things that way. If that is the way that person expresses their faith, they have every right, certainly in our society, to be that way and to say so. What they do not have a right to do, it seems to me, is to deny other people

the chance to say how their faith reaches them. I have not found the faith that I have through those absolute channels.

For me, it has come because somewhere in all this talk about what God's word is and what God's word isn't, in all that, it's come to me as a sense that what life is really all about is doing justice, loving mercy, being a person who accepts other human beings. Some of those other human beings are going to be strange to me. I'm not going to understand them. They are going to be alien in my kind of thinking. But I don't know why or where or how, but somehow I've picked up in my own faith journey the sense that my first duty in the eyes of God is to love that human being.

I may find out that they have a different sexual orientation to mine and then I need to sit down with them and ask them; and in the last two years, that's exactly what I've been doing. I wish that most of the people who have come to speak here had done as much because, when you are in dialogue with somebody, you know what happens? You don't hate them like you thought you did. You're not disturbed by their lifestyle as you thought you were, because you learned that woman, that man, is as capable of loving people, sometimes their children, as you are.

And that's exactly what's happened to me. I didn't start out as a supporter of homosexuality. Like most people, I didn't know very much about it but, because I have risked sharing my life with some of them, some have become my best friends. For me, this whole issue is a justice issue because, as long as my best friends can be denied work, can run the risk of being abused verbally, sexually, physically, then I am concerned, and I will continue to be concerned.

Thank you for letting me speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is John Genaille.

MR. J. GENAILLE: I heard about this and I didn't know whether it was a big issue, but it is. I know it will affect me, this bill. It affects the whole society, I think. The thing that I wanted to say is I'm against this bill because I've talked to people and I understand some areas where it could apply, like for instance, somebody said they're going to deny a prostitute the right to live in her apartment because she's a prostitute. I think you should not deny the right for somebody to live, even if she's a prostitute or a lesbian. You should let them live if you're a landlord; let them live there.

The thing is, for instance, in Christian schools, they shouldn't be allowed. If they come there and teach their way of lifestyle, this shouldn't be right, if they're teaching. But I don't think a homosexual would be teaching Christianity, because he or she would have to change to come in a Christian school.

Society should be protected from that, where they can't teach their way of lifestyle because I know for myself it's wrong, that lifestyle; it's not right. You know, by nature, a moose doesn't go after a male moose or a bull moose or, for instance, a wolf, they don't go after each other - male for male.

It's the same thing with human beings. Human beings should learn. They should know it's inordinate to go after the same sex. You're supposed to go after the opposite sex. That's just what I wanted to express and I guess that's about it. Did everybody hear that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Questions? Hearing none, thank you, John.

The next presenter is Scott Kennedy; Susan Taylor.

Since we are nearing adjournment time, do you think you could do it before 6:00 p.m. or, if not, then we will have you as the first one when we meet again before 7:00 p.m.

MS. S. TAYLOR: I think I can do it before 6:00 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. S. TAYLOR: My name is Susan Taylor, representing myself and my family who have asked me to represent them here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pull your mike down a little bit.

MS. S. TAYLOR: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS. S. TAYLOR: I said I'm representing myself and my family who couldn't be here today.

I think that, from what I've heard today, this is definitely a moral issue. There is a definite right and wrong. The question is though, is it right or wrong to discriminate, you know, nothing else? I see it as simply as that. I'm fully in support of this bill passing, and that's about all I have to say.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

What is the pleasure of the committee?

HON. R. PENNER: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

We'll meet again at 7:00 p.m. tonight.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 5:58 p.m.

BRIEFS PRESENTED BUT NOT READ

Brief presented by: Linda M. Smith, distributed to the Committee on Privileges and Elections re Bill 47 on 13 July 1987.

Bill No. 47, the human rights bill, is not in the interests of humans, but in the interests of those with deprived minds.

Romans, chapter 1, verses 24-32: "Therefore, God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, that their bodies might be dishonoured among them. For they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural; and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire towards one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error."

The Good News Bible, men do shameful things with each other and, as a result, they bring upon themselves the punishment they deserve for their wrongdoing.

Monday, 13 July, 1987

“And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper” and, although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.

According to Webster’s dictionary, “deprave, v.t., to make bad or worse; to corrupt; to pervert. depravation n.- d.a. immoral. depravity n.”

Leviticus 18:22: “You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is an abomination.”

Leviticus 20:13: “If there is a man who lies with a male as those who lie with a woman, both of them have committed a detestable act; they shall surely be put to death. Their blood-guiltiness is upon them.”

We are standing on guard, O Canada, we are standing on guard for thee. We are not just in concern and prayer for the future safety and well-being of our children, but also for our nation.

Leviticus 18, verses 24-26: “Do not defile yourselves by any of these things; for by all these the nations which am casting out before you have become defiled. For the land has become defiled, therefore I have visited its punishment upon it, so the land has spewed out its inhabitants. But as for you, you are to keep My statutes and My judgments, and shall not do any of these abominations.”

Take heed!

Brief presented by: Mrs. J. Renton.

Dear Committee Members/MLA's

I am writing this letter due to my personal knowledge of the issues surrounding Bill No. 47. I am a happily married working mother of four children between the ages of 15 and 25.

My knowledge of this issue comes through my 20-year-old daughter. She has, since the age of five, been involved and excelled in a number of sports. At the age of about 14 or 15, the people coaching, assisting and generally helping out on my daughter’s soccer and hockey teams, etc., began to change. There were fewer fathers and more young women - to be more specific - lesbians. They are only too willing to help.

They are there for practices and games, out to McDonald’s (and later to the local bar), and at socials

to help raise money for their sport. The young players respect these women (lesbians) who go out of their way to get personally involved with vulnerable teenagers who are easily influenced.

The lifestyle of these women is an easy come, easy go lifestyle that is very appealing to young girls. They go out for their drink after a game, have a little heart to heart chat, and that is the start of some very tight relationships. I personally know of a number of young girls (my daughter’s friends/acquaintances) who have been influenced by these lesbians to become involved in a homosexual lifestyle, much to the shock of their families and friends.

Do not be under the impression that, by passing this bill, every one of you will not be affected. If you are a parent or grandparent of a young girl who is involved in local community sports such as soccer, ringette/hockey, etc., you are already affected. Passing Bill No. 47 will only cause the homosexuals to come out in stronger force, with no restrictions on their influence on our young people.

Please, do not vote on this issue without considering all the ramifications. Please vote NO on Bill No. 47.

Brief presented by: Mr. and Mrs. K. Nemez (Inkster); Mr. and Mrs. J. Nemez (Swan River); Mr. and Mrs. A. Renton (Chlswd.); Mr. G. Renton (Chlswd.); Mr. and Mrs. R. Zell (Swan River).

Dear Committee Members/MLA's

We are writing to express our strong opposition to Bill No. 47. We do not believe that homosexuals as a group should be given special consideration under the law. Homosexuality is an immoral and unnatural lifestyle, and should not be sanctioned as acceptable by our government.

We are frightened and angered at the mere possibility that this legislation could lead to any or all of the following: the legalization of same-sex marriages, the legal adoption of children by a gay or lesbian couple, the inability of organizations such as Big Brothers to decline the applications of homosexuals who want to become Big Brothers, or the teaching of homosexuality as an acceptable alternative lifestyle in our school system.

As members of the voting public, we do not support any government or any MLA that supports this bill.