

TRADITIONAL DEFINITION OF MARRIAGE NEEDS TO BE UPHELD

On December 9, 2004, the Supreme Court released its response to the reference questions submitted by the Liberal government with respect to proposed same-sex marriage legislation. In the ruling, the Court held that the federal government has the jurisdiction to legislate the civil definition of marriage and that the definition of marriage could in fact be expanded to include same-sex couples. With regard to the issue as to whether or not religious officials will be protected under the Charter of Rights from having to marry same-sex couples, the Court gave a strong assurance that their beliefs and convictions would be safeguarded. The question hanging in the balance at this time is whether or not Canada, as a nation, is prepared to go ahead and redefine the



historical and traditional definition of marriage.

Interestingly, the Court did not in their ruling explicitly state that the traditional definition of marriage is unconstitutional. Although Paul

Martin's government has stated its intent to change the definition of marriage, the constitution might not require that something of this nature be done. Early in the New Year, Parliament will

have the opportunity to debate the proposed legislation and make a decision. In the end, this issue may have to be decided by the people of Canada. If Canadians rally in defense of the traditional definition of marriage Parliamentarians will find the means and the will to make it happen.

Are you in favour of maintaining the traditional, historical definition of marriage? Yes ___ No ___

Do you think a national referendum is a vehicle that should be considered in this debate? Yes ___ No ___

Are you in favour of same-sex civil union recognition if that means preserving the traditional definition of marriage? Yes ___ No ___

Response and comments attached to questions raised with respect to agriculture. Yes ___ No ___

Please note any brief comments or suggestions below:
