

would happen if they are found out. As a result they stay in the closet. That means a tremendous cost in personal happiness and tragic consequences at times given what happens to some people if their sexual orientation becomes a matter of public record.

I have a friend who is mildly homosexual. He is also happily married with one or two children. He was fired from his job as a teacher because the police decided to crack down. They were surveying a particular washroom in a city in Ontario and he was one of the people charged with a very minor offence. However, it was enough to have him fired from his job and virtually destroy his personal life over a substantial number of years.

If people are concerned about the well-being of young people in our schools and the danger of their being accosted by teachers, then let us talk about the fact that this occurs from time to time with male teachers who molest or interfere with young female students. It is just as indefensible when it is done by a heterosexual teacher as when it is done by a homosexual teacher. In either case, everyone agrees it is not acceptable behaviour. However, what we are talking about here is people who have a job or who wish to rent an apartment or do business with a particular company. They should not be prevented from doing so because they happen to be homosexual. That is what the proposed amendment in this resolution would do. Nothing more. It would mean that homosexuals would no longer have to fear their career can be brought to an end because of discrimination not for what they do but because they may have that orientation.

The present situation leads people to lie. If they admit to being homosexual when applying for a job, they can now quite legally be denied a job. If found out after many years of successful and productive work, they can be fired with no regard at all to whether or not they ever did anything improper.

The question we are dealing with here is that of people being victimized solely by reason of their sexual orientation. I can speak from personal experience. Nine and a half years ago I hired a riding assistant. He was the former President of the Gays of Ottawa, a homosexual organization active in this city for some 20 years. He was an activist, therefore, in the gay community. I have to confess I had a certain trepidation about that. However, he was the best applicant for the job. Recently he moved upwards in his career and took another job. I pay tribute to him for being one of the finest riding assistants any provincial Member of Parliament has had. I would also point out that in all of those years, in a riding with a substantial Catholic, Italian, French and West Indian population, groups who might share some of the concerns expressed here, that concern has not been expressed. At most, perhaps once in those nine or ten years. There was no problem at all except in the minds of certain Members of Parliament. I call on those Members of Parliament to take heed of their Government and the subcommittee.

### *Equality Rights*

What is being asked is that we simply acknowledge the fact that whether or not one approves of other people being homosexual, other people are homosexuals. They did not make the choice but it has happened to them. They should not suffer discrimination in their economic or social lives because of their sexual orientation. That is all that is being proposed here and I call on Hon. Members to allow this matter to come to a vote before six o'clock.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Darryl L. Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine):** Like some of my hon. friends who have spoken tonight, Madam Speaker, I should like to say a few words about Bill C-212 or even amendment No. 11. I should like first of all to indicate that I am married and the father of four children. For us, and I mean our society, our churches, what really matters is our children and those who will come after us. I suggest this is something the House should always take into account when dealing with any legislation.

With all due respect for the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin) and the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart), I should like to add something. If the House is going to adopt legislation to allow exceptions in our society, where is it going to stop?

• (1750)

[*English*]

When debating an issue such as the one before us this evening we must look at it very clearly. A few moments ago the Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) said that the state has no business in the bedrooms of the country. I accept that premise. However, we are not talking about being in the bedrooms of the country. We are talking about being in the RCMP and the Armed Forces. We are talking about people who are saying, "You have to let me in because I am homosexual, because I am a woman and want to sleep with a woman or I am a man and want to sleep with a man". That is not the issue.

Whether we are NDP, Liberal or Progressive Conservative we must respect the laws of our society. If we go along with homosexuality we will become like the African tribe that believed in castration. Within one generation they became extinct. We cannot do that, Madam Speaker. As the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) indicated, the former Minister of Justice said that there is justice for all. We stated that. We are committed to the principle that all Canadians should have an equal opportunity to participate as fully as possible in our society. I agree 100 per cent with that. However, if I want to apply to the RCMP, the Army, the Air Force, or the Navy, I should not be able to say that I must be hired because I am homosexual. We hire people in these forces to protect society, and we must continue to do that.

**Mr. Cassidy:** No homosexuals need apply.