

## Its about same sex sex, not marriage

Posted by


Monday, 31 January 2005 11:25 - Last Updated Monday, 31 January 2005 11:25

---

## Its about same sex sex, not marriage

Finally someone has written what is really wrong about same-sex marriage. Stan Persky has done a masterful job of providing the real reason behind the fight to save Traditional Marriage. Seems the Christian groups are being a little less than honest, maybe lets just say a tad less.

James Dobson makes more money off homosexuals than anyone. While I can't really say how much, his organisations pull in a ton of money fighting the gay bogeyman.



### [An affair with American Values](#)

If people accepted homosexuals, Dobson would be out of a job. The dollars are coming in and it is the homosexual that brings in the dough. Doesn't that make Dobson somewhat like a pimp?

Stephen Harper is one of Canada's pimps. Aside from agreeing with George Bush on just about everything, he knows Canadians have strongly rebuked the Bush agenda. Enter the wedge issue. He has rallied many folks, not enough, but hopes it will be enough to make him Prime Minister one day as he tries to hide behind saving traditional marriage.

It's really the homo part Stephen and his gang cannot handle, its seeing two guys kiss. We don't know if the thought of two women kissing bothers him but that is a story for the next election.

For now its HOMO sex according to Persky, that is keeping the "traditional marriage" folks up at night. You tell them Persky

[Rick Barnes](#) , GLBTQ Editor PEJ News

---

[The Marriage &#39;Saviours&#39;](#) By [Stan Persky](#) Personally, I'm not the marrying kind, so this really doesn't concern me all that much. But I've got a question about the same sex marriage debate: Does the opposition to gay marriage by the neo-Conservative Party of Canada, the Catholic Church of the True North Strong and Free, various Focus on the Family fanatics, and sundry other mostly religious groups (Christian Evangelicals, Muslims, Sikhs, Jews) really have anything to do with marriage? I say no. But if the opposition to same sex marriage isn't about protecting the

## Its about same sex sex, not marriage

Posted by

Monday, 31 January 2005 11:25 - Last Updated Monday, 31 January 2005 11:25

---

sanctity/purpose/tradition/celestialjoys of marriage, then what is it about? It's about, sigh, homosex. The opponents of gay marriage simply want to say/write-in-stone/legalise/enforce the idea that homosex ain't okay. The opponents of gay marriage were also the diehard opponents of all previous measures suggesting homosex might be okay, from the Trudeau government's decriminalization of homosexuality in the late 1960s to the Supreme Court of Canada's 2004 reference decision that legalising gay marriage is constitutional. They have a wonderfully consistent record, over a period of three decades, of battling every equal rights legislative measure, administrative order, and court decision that provided equal rights for gays. They believe that homosex is wrongwrongwrong, and same sex marriage is simply the latest soapbox from which to say so. It's also one of the last soapboxes left, which perhaps accounts for the tone of desperation in the opposition's rhetoric.

### **This ain't Texas**

I think the cat was let out of the bag when Catholic Bishop Frederick Henry of Calgary recently wrote in a pastoral letter to his diocese, "Since homosexuality, adultery, prostitution and pornography undermine the foundations of the family, the basis of society, then the state must use its coercive power to proscribe or curtail them in the interests of the common good."

Bishop Henry isn't worried about marriage, he's worried about homosex. So are Conservative leader Stephen Harper, Cardinal Aloysius Ambrozic, Cardinal Marc Ouellet and all the other princes of politics and pulpit who have weighed in on the debate. Well, maybe not Harper. It's hard to tell if he believes in anything or is against anything? - well, perhaps taxes. And of course he's worried about getting votes, though this wedge issue may not be a vote getter at all. At least, Globe and Mail columnist Margaret Wente, a self-declared small-c conservative, doesn't think so, and shrewdly declared in a column last week that Harper ought to stop imagining that he's on the stump in Texas. I suppose the same thing about vote garnering and ambiguous beliefs might be said about Prime Minister Paul Martin, whose government will be introducing the legislation legalising same sex marriage as soon as this week. Or, well, sigh-some-more, maybe Martin does believe in something beyond wanting to be PM, but it seems very, very vague, whatever it is. Fortunately, Martin's justice minister, Irwin Cotler, does believe in equality and did so even before he was elected to anything.

### **The Tories? trade-off**

Oddly enough, a dozen or so years ago, in 1992, the social and religious conservatives had a chance to forestall, at least for a while, the gay marriage juggernaut. Faced with a couple of court decisions recognising gay equality rights, the Progressive-Conservative government of the day, featuring Justice Minister Kim Campbell and Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, decided to do something clever. They decided to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to recognize that sexual orientation (or homosex) should be a category protected from discrimination, along with all the other categories, like women, religious believers, left-handers, people with a limp, latte macchiato drinkers, etc. However, the Mulroney government had a problem with their own caucus and with a lot

## Its about same sex sex, not marriage

Posted by

Monday, 31 January 2005 11:25 - Last Updated Monday, 31 January 2005 11:25

---

of their supporters. So, in order to get the homo-hating ?Family Caucus? of the Conservative Party and various religious groups onboard, the justice minister offered her colleagues a quid pro quo: if they?d support the amendment of the Human Rights Act to protect gays ?- something which they?d have to do in any case given the direction in which the courts were moving ?- the government would produce a human rights definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman. The justice minister made the same offer to a variety of religious and community groups with whom she was consulting.

Their answer? We like the marriage thing, but we don?t like the equal rights thing, so thanks, but no thanks on the whole package.

Despite the rejection by ultra-conservatives, the government went ahead, with caucus speeches by Mulroney, Joe Clark and the justice minister urging equality for gays. The bill was duly introduced, but died on the order paper, postponed due to the 1993 election, and the Human Rights Act wasn?t amended until 1996, by the Chretien Liberal government.

### **Where?s the harm?**

Back to the supposed argument we are having at the moment. Gay marriage opponents have been boxed into the corner of saying something very convoluted. It goes sort of like this: Well, we may personally not like homosexual very much, or at all, but we recognize that homos ought to be treated nicely and not discriminated against, but they shouldn?t be allowed to marry exactly like us normal people because, er, uh, we guess it undermines the something or other of marriage. . .

If there?s not really a marriage argument, is there a homosexual argument? I?m not the marrying kind, but I?m the homosexual kind, so here I have an interest. So far, I haven?t heard the argument, and I?ve been listening for a long time. The argument, given that we live in the kind of democracy we do, would have to show that homosexual causes harm, direct and measurable harm of the sort that leads us to criminalize certain acts. If homosexual doesn?t cause harm, democratic logic goes, then gays ought to have the same rights as everybody else, including the right to a marriage license.

Of course, so far, nobody?s been able to show that homosexual causes harm or is unnatural or warps the fabric of society, or whatever. All that people are able to show is that some people don?t like it, and think that God thinks it wrong. They?re also able to show that statistically it?s a minority sexual passion. But that?s not good enough for winning an argument in a multi-cultural, democratic society committed to constitutionally protected individual rights. In such societies, you can do what you want as long as you don?t cause direct, measurable harm to others. Everything else is a matter of taste. As for maintaining tradition, a vague final cri de coeur by anti-gay conservatives, we?ve altered lots of traditions, such as not letting women or aboriginal people vote, without the country going to hell in a handbasket.

### **Phoney debate**

So, instead of an upfront discussion about homosexual, we?ve been treated to an increasingly bizarre debate about same sex marriage. The opponents of gay marriage

## Its about same sex sex, not marriage

Posted by

Monday, 31 January 2005 11:25 - Last Updated Monday, 31 January 2005 11:25

---

are now trying to get us to worry about polygamous marriage and sex with your goat. Meanwhile, the various politicians have been weaseling around everything from possible elections to invoking the "notwithstanding clause." The latter refers to a last-ditch situation in which the Parliament, in order to overrule a court decision declaring gay marriage constitutional, would have to invoke a clause suspending certain rights provided in the constitution. Stephen Harper has been dancing around this possibility, only to receive a sharp slap on the wrist this week from an unprecedented group of the country's leading lawyers and law professors declaring that Harper's fudgifications are bordering on deception. The problem with the debate, as becomes increasingly clear, is that there's no substance to it.

I've read and listened to a lot of the daily blab about this topic over the last several months, but very seldom have I seen or heard anyone point out that the gay marriage debate is mostly a phoney debate, and that the real debate is about homosex. Consider it pointed out