

APPENDIX B

This is **G o o g l e's cache** of <http://www.gaymilitary.ucsb.edu/Publications/CanadaPub1.htm> as retrieved on Nov 7, 2004 05:56:42 GMT.

G o o g l e's cache is the snapshot that we took of the page as we crawled the web. The page may have changed since that time. Click here for the **current page** without highlighting. This cached page may reference images which are no longer available. Click here for the **cached text** only.

To link to or bookmark this page, use the following url: [http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:WZfGciPQwAEJ:www.gaymilitary.ucsb.edu/Publications/CanadaPub1.htm+gay+\(canada+OR+Canadian\)+military+october+1992&hl=en&start=1](http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:WZfGciPQwAEJ:www.gaymilitary.ucsb.edu/Publications/CanadaPub1.htm+gay+(canada+OR+Canadian)+military+october+1992&hl=en&start=1)

Google is not affiliated with the authors of this page nor responsible for its content.

These search terms have been highlighted: **gay canada canadian military october 1992**



CSSMM

Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military

Effects of the 1992 Lifting of Restrictions on Gay and Lesbian Service in the Canadian Forces: Appraising the Evidence

By Aaron Belkin and Jason McNichol

April, 2000

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A new study of gays and lesbians in the **Canadian military** has found that after **Canada's 1992** decision to allow homosexuals to serve openly in its armed forces, no negative consequences occurred. The study, titled "Effects of the **1992** Lifting of Restrictions on **Gay** and Lesbian Service in the **Canadian** Forces; Appraising the Evidence", was sponsored by the Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the **Military** at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

Key findings are as follows:

- Lifting of restrictions on **gay** and lesbian service in the **Canadian** Forces has not led to any change in **military** performance.
- Self-identified **gay**, lesbian, and transsexual members of the **Canadian** Forces contacted for this

I. Executive Summary

II. Introduction

III. Methodology

IV. Historical Context

V. Removal of the Ban Against Homosexual Soldiers

VI. Evolution of the Policy Change Since 1993

VII. Evidence of Outcomes for the Canadian Forces

VIII. Conclusion

IX. Bibliography

X. Personal Communication

report who have served since the ban was lifted describe good working relationships with peers in supportive institutional environments where morale and cohesion are maintained.

- The percent of **military** women who experienced sexual harassment dropped 46% after the ban was lifted. While there were several reasons why sexual harassment declined, one factor was that after the ban was lifted women were free to report assaults without fear that they would be accused of and subsequently discharged for being a lesbian.
- Before **Canada** lifted its **gay** ban, a 1985 survey of 6,500 male soldiers found that 62% said that they would refuse to share showers, undress or sleep in the same room as a **gay** soldier. After the ban was lifted, however, follow-up studies found no increase in disciplinary, performance, recruitment, sexual misconduct, or resignation problems.
- None of the 905 assault cases in the **Canadian** Forces from November, **1992** (when the ban was lifted) until August, 1995 involved **gay** bashing or could be attributed to the sexual orientation of one of the parties.

The study was written by Aaron Belkin and Jason McNichol. Belkin is Director of the Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the **Military** and Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Santa Barbara. McNichol is Doctoral Candidate in Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley. The research was funded by the Compton Foundation, located in Menlo Park, California.

This report is the most comprehensive study of homosexuality in the **Canadian** Armed Forces ever compiled. Information collected for this report was systematically gathered from publicly available primary and secondary sources. Methods included identification of all prior research on homosexual service in the **Canadian** Forces conducted by governmental, academic, and policy-focused organizations in North America; analysis of all 172 North American newspaper articles and wire service dispatches written between 1987 and 1999 relating to homosexual service in the **Canadian** Forces; interviews undertaken with eight senior representatives of relevant **Canadian** Forces units; snowball identification and interviewing of eleven major academic, non-governmental, and policy observers familiar with **gay-military** issues in **Canada**; and interviews with nine **gay** and lesbian soldiers in the **Canadian** Forces. Whenever possible, independent observations from multiple sources are compared to draw out common findings that are consistent among observers in different sectors (e.g., **military**, academic, non-governmental). During the interview process the authors sought to ensure that the universe of sources drawn upon was complete by repeatedly asking expert observers from different sectors for recommendations of additional sources of information. While it is possible that additional confidential information on outcomes not documented in this report may be maintained by the **Canadian** government, senior officials contacted for this study were not aware of any additional data. The final compilation of sources that informs this report thus reflects an exhaustive inventory of relevant data and opinions.

[Back to top](#)

II. INTRODUCTION

Prior to 1988, gays and lesbians were prohibited from serving in the **Canadian Forces (CF)**.¹ Openly **gay** recruits were prevented from enlisting, and soldiers who were discovered to be homosexual were dismissed. Any personnel who suspected another member of being **gay** was required to inform his or her commanding officer. This policy was relaxed slightly in 1988 by removing the order to inform, and by declining to dismiss soldiers who were discovered to be **gay**. Those soldiers who did not quit, however, were denied access to promotions, security clearances, transfers, and re-enlistment. **Canada**'s Department of National Defence argued that the special mission of the Forces necessitated an exclusionary policy. **Military** personnel feared that **gay** and lesbian soldiers would compromise operational effectiveness, as well as damage "cohesion and morale, discipline, leadership, recruiting, medical fitness, and the rights to privacy of other members" (NDRI 1993: 76).

This report draws together prior research on **gay military** issues, press coverage, **Canadian** Forces data, and interviews with senior officers, academic observers, policy experts, and enlisted personnel to provide a multi-method appraisal of how the **Canadian** Forces have been affected by the 1992 decision to allow equal and unrestricted participation by sexual minorities. Eight years after the policy was finally overturned, there is no evidence that any of the outcomes feared by proponents of the ban have occurred. The policy change has not resulted in increased levels of sexual misconduct, human rights violation complaints, or rates of sexual harassment. Further, the range of data collected for this study provides strong systematic and interview evidence that the lifting of restrictions on **gay** and lesbian service in the **Canadian** Forces has not led to any identifiable change in **military** performance. To the degree that the current evidence does suggest any trend, it would be toward more effective individual and unit performance as sexual minorities focus more on their work and new conflict resolution programs improve pre-existing tensions over racial, gender-related, and other interpersonal problems in the Forces more generally.

¹Original research and analysis conducted for this report were furnished by ELM Research Associates, an independent, non-partisan research consultancy.

[Back to top](#)

III. METHODOLOGY

Information collected for this report was systematically gathered from publicly available primary and secondary sources relevant to an understanding of **military** outcomes associated with homosexual service in the **Canadian** Forces. Sources and methods included: identification, retrieval, and analysis of all prior research bearing on homosexual service in the **Canadian** Forces conducted by governmental, academic, and policy-focused organizations in North America; content analysis of Nexis/Lexis search retrievals for all North American news articles and wire service dispatches relating to homosexual service in the **Canadian** Forces before and after the ban was lifted (1987-1999; n=172 articles); interviews undertaken with relevant **Canadian** Forces units and their senior representatives (n=10 individuals); snowball identification and interviewing of major academic, non-governmental, and policy observers familiar with **gay-military** issues in **Canada** since the ban was lifted (n=10 individuals); and interviews with sexual minority participants in the **Canadian** Forces who were located through the cooperation of leading non-governmental and **military** human rights organizations (n=9 individuals). **Canadian** Forces representatives

43

were chosen by asking academic, non-governmental, and policy experts for suggested contacts who were knowledgeable about the **military's** policy on homosexuality, and then using snowball identification techniques to identify other interview subjects.

This report relies on a multi-method approach to compare and synthesize evidence provided by a variety of sources in order to draw conclusions. Whenever possible, independent observations from multiple sources are compared to draw out common findings that are consistent among observers in different sectors (e.g., **military**, academic, non-governmental). During the interview process, we also sought to ensure that the universe of sources drawn upon for the study was complete by repeatedly asking expert observers from different sectors for recommendations of additional sources of information. While it is possible that additional confidential information on outcomes not documented in this report may be maintained by the CF, senior officials contacted for this study were not aware of any additional data. The final compilation of sources that informs this report thus reflects an exhaustive inventory of relevant data and opinions.

[Back to top](#)

IV. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

A. *Canadian Forces Policy Towards Homosexuals Before 1988*

The policy of the **Canadian** Forces before 1988 was outlined in regulation CFAO 19-20, entitled "Homosexuality-Sexual Abnormality-Investigation, Medical Examination and Disposal." This administrative order stated that, "Service policy does not allow homosexual members or members with a sexual abnormality to be retained in the **Canadian** forces". The **Canadian** Forces would not permit openly homosexual men and women to enlist, and any soldiers discovered to be **gay** or lesbian were to be dismissed. The order further required other personnel to inform on fellow service members who they suspected were homosexual. The **military** handled investigations of suspected service members' sexual orientation through its Special Investigations Unit .

B. *Legal And Political Pressure For Change*

The CF policy on homosexual service members came under increasing judicial and political scrutiny after the passage of the **Canadian** Human Rights Act (CHRA) in 1978 and the **Canadian** Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1985. While the **Canadian** Human Rights Act did not explicitly cover sexual orientation, it required employers to justify exclusionary or restrictive policies. The **Canadian** Charter of Rights and Freedoms, considered analogous to the U.S. Bill of Rights, also did not include sexual orientation in its enumerated list of prohibited grounds of discrimination. Section 15 of the Charter did, however, enable the restriction of other forms of discrimination if so ruled by the courts (Park 1994).

A review of federal regulations in 1985 by the Justice Department determined that the **Canadian** Forces were potentially in violation of the equal rights

provisions of the Charter in a number of areas, including its discrimination against gays and lesbians (Gade et al. 1996). In response to the Justice Department's findings, the Department of National Defence conducted a survey of 6,580 soldiers to assess the potential impact of a removal of the ban on homosexual soldiers. The survey found that **military** personnel, particularly men, were strongly against removing the ban. Service members expressed concern about all aspects of serving with gays and lesbians; 62% of male soldiers stated that they would refuse to share showers, undress or sleep in the same room as a **gay** soldier, and 45% declared that they would refuse to work with gays. Many also stated that they would refuse to be supervised by a **gay** or lesbian soldier (Zuliani 1986). The Department of National Defence's Charter Task Force recommended in its Final Report that the exclusionary policy toward homosexuals be retained, arguing that the unique character and purpose of the Armed Forces necessitated the restriction of gays and lesbians. Given the aversion toward homosexuals in the **military**, the report concluded that the "the presence of homosexuals in the CF would be detrimental to cohesion and morale, discipline, leadership, recruiting, medical fitness, and the rights to privacy of other members." It further declared that "the effect of the presence of homosexuals would [lead to] a serious decrease in operational effectiveness" (NDRI 1993: 76).

C. Development Of An Interim Policy

In response to the Final Report, a new Minister of Defence announced his intention in January 1988 to modify the existing policy only slightly. Under the change, the **Canadian** Forces would not knowingly enroll homosexuals. If servicemen or women were discovered or announced themselves to be **gay**, they would be asked to leave, but they would not be dismissed. Those who chose to stay would not be eligible for training courses, security clearances, transfers, promotions or reenlistment. The **Canadian** Forces had already removed the obligation of service members to report on suspicions that another soldier may be homosexual (Park 1994).

In spite of the measures taken by the Department of National Defence, pressure to change the policy on homosexuals continued to increase. As court decisions extended the rights of gays and lesbians under both the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Human Rights Act, Michelle Douglas and four others filed separate suits against the **Canadian** Forces that directly challenged its policy toward homosexuals. In August 1990, the Security Intelligence Committee ruled that the **military** ban against homosexuals violated the Charter and found in Ms. Douglas' favor. The Committee concluded that the **military** had not established that Ms. Douglas' sexual orientation made her a security risk; instead, a "simple association" with a suspected lesbian was enough to make her "a potential threat to the security of **Canada**". The Committee also criticized the **military's** "deplorable" conduct in its investigation against Ms. Douglas.

In preparing its appeal in the Douglas case, the Department of National Defence concluded that it could not meet the standard of proof required for a "reasonable limitation" argument under Section 1 of the Charter (NDRI 1993). While the Chief of the Defence Staff General John de Chastelain privately informed members of Parliament that the ban was about to be lifted late in 1991, the federal government delayed in the wake of an adamant refusal by some Conservative MPs to support the policy change (Harper 1991). Finally, facing a case it knew it could not win and lacking the leadership needed to defend its policy, the Department of National Defence agreed to settle the case against Michelle Douglas in **October 1992**. In so doing, the **military** acknowledged that its

policy of exclusion violated the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and it consented to the immediate repeal of that policy (U.P.I. **1992**; Bindman et al. **1992**).

[Back to top](#)

V. REMOVAL OF THE BAN AGAINST HOMOSEXUAL SOLDIERS

The policy change in **October 1992** concerning **gay** and lesbian soldiers in the **Canadian military** was less an affirmative order than a dismantling of existing policy. General de Chastelain issued a press report that declared:

The **Canadian** Forces will comply fully with the Federal Court's decision. Canadians, regardless of their sexual orientation, will now be able to serve their country without restriction. (cited in NDRI 1993: 77)

In a communiqué entitled "Homosexual Conduct," the Chief of Defence revoked CFAO 19-20 and all related interim policies. The **military** would henceforth make no distinction between its heterosexual and homosexual soldiers. He expressed his "full support" of the Federal Court's decision and stated his expectations of support of the policy change within the chain of command. General de Chastelain also declared that "inappropriate sexual conduct by members of the forces, whether heterosexual or homosexual", was unacceptable (cited in NDRI 1993: 78; see also Park 1994).

National Defence Headquarters issued a "Questions and Answers" sheet for use within the CF that explained the change in policy. This message included likely concerns and emphasized that homosexual and heterosexual soldiers would be held to the same standards of behavior:

Q31: Will such activities as dancing, hand holding, embracing between same/sex members be accepted at mess social functions?

A31: Standards of conduct for homosexual members will be the same as those for heterosexual members. Common sense and good judgement will be applied and required of all members. (cited in NDRI 1993: 78)

No accommodation exceptions for homosexual or heterosexual troops were allowed, since it was decided that **gay** and heterosexual service-people could share living quarters. A "Post-Announcement Action" was issued by the Assistant Deputy Minister of Personnel to provide **military** leaders with guidance to "communicate the rationale for the change, encourage its acceptance, and respond to the personal concerns of the CF members" (cited in NDRI 1993: 78), and a CF Personnel Newsletter was also disseminated that described the policy change.

Because the courts provided the impetus for change, senior leaders endorsed the change and encouraged the members' sense of duty. Senior political and **military** leaders believed that reliance on equal standards for the conduct of gays and heterosexuals was the best chance for success of the policy, since it focused on behavior rather than a transformation of individual values or beliefs. The **military** made no effort at the time to change individual members' attitudes about

46

homosexuality. Instead, the CF promoted the policy change through unequivocal answers to specific questions about appropriate behavior (Park 1994).

In December **1992**, the CF issued a new regulation (CFAO 19-36) entitled "Sexual Misconduct." CFAO 19-36 was to be used with an amended version of personal harassment regulations to detail what constituted inappropriate sexual conduct for both homosexual and heterosexual soldiers. Sexual misconduct was defined as "an act which has a sexual purpose or is of a sexual or indecent nature and which constitutes an offence under the Criminal Code or the Code of Service Discipline" (cited in NDRI 1993: 423). Under the personal harassment regulations (CFAO 19-39), sexual harassment was defined as ". a type of personal harassment that has a sexual purpose or is of a sexual nature including, but not limited to, touching, leering, lascivious remarks, and the display of pornographic material" (cited in NDRI 1993: 431).

The revocation of the ban on openly **gay** and lesbian soldiers did not, however, settle the issue of the soldiers that had been dismissed or denied promotions because of the former policy. Each case was reviewed separately by the **Canadian** Forces.

[Back to top](#)

VI. EVOLUTION OF THE POLICY CHANGE SINCE 1993

A. SHARP Anti-Harassment Program

The **Canadian** Forces did not institute a separate program to handle same-sex sexual harassment or personal harassment based on sexual orientation. The Standards for Harassment and Racism Prevention (SHARP) program was implemented by the Department of National Defence in 1996 to increase general awareness among its civilian and **military** workforce about harassment and racist conduct, including harassment based on sexual orientation. The program was mandatory for all personnel and included separate courses for employees, those in leadership and managerial positions, and investigators and mediators. The program provided information and exercises designed to effectively prevent, recognize, and handle harassment and racist conduct.

The SHARP phase of harassment awareness has been completed, and the CF has now entered the second phase of its anti-harassment effort. The second phase of the program, which focuses more extensively on skills to handle harassment situations, is being developed by the Directorate of Gender Integration and Employment Equity and is due sometime during the summer of 2000.

The SHARP materials provide a useful window into how issues of same-sex harassment have been incorporated into the CF anti-harassment policy. The SHARP workbook lists sexual orientation in its explanation of prohibited grounds of harassment. It further states that:

harassment on the grounds of sexual orientation and hazing are not specified in DND's civilian policy although both these behaviours are clearly prohibited. It is more important to recognize a behaviour as harassment than attempt to categorize it. (SHARP 1996: 9)

In its discussion of systemic harassment, which is defined as ".behaviours which could constitute harassment yet which are considered acceptable behaviour (normalized) in the workplace" (SHARP 1996: 10), the SHARP workbook and companion video use an example related to sexual orientation. It provides snippets of dialogue among four subordinates, including such comments as "He's the best sergeant I ever had. He can't be no fag," and "He could be a fag; he's got those big ears so a guy could hold him from behind." The workbook then asks a series of questions related to the dialogue, followed by a declaration of the prohibition against harassment based on sexual orientation:

This video shows not only how systemic harassment is perpetuated, it also depicts examples of harassment based on sexual orientation. Despite how you feel about someone's sexual orientation, you do not have the right to harass them at work. There is no reason why one's sexual orientation would affect job performance. However, harassment negatively affects the job performance of a **gay**, lesbian or bisexual.

Every member of an organization has to feel that he or she is a valued member of the group. If an employee does not feel valued, then that employee will not produce at his or her highest level. Regardless of one's sexual orientation, everyone deserves an "even playing field." Skill and ability should be the only criteria upon which people are judged. (SHARP 1996: 11)

The SHARP section on sexual harassment and sexual misconduct uses gender- and orientation-neutral terms in describing specific behavior that would be classified as harassment or misconduct. Examples such as leering, requests for sexual favors, derogatory name calling and sexually suggestive gestures are listed without regard for the gender of either the harasser or the target. Sexual harassment by someone of the same sex, or abusive comments about one's sexual orientation, fall under the general sexual harassment framework. The sexual harassment exercises include an example of same-sex interaction and anti-**gay** comments. In the answer section for this example, the workbook highlights the problem of comments which "perpetuat[e] the myth that all homosexual men will make sexual advances toward them" (SHARP 1996: 47). It further emphasizes that sexual harassment is not limited by sexual orientation.

Sexual harassment can be exhibited by anyone, regardless of their sexual orientation. Unfortunately, the men in this video do not recognize that the behavior they fear from the homosexuals is the same behavior that they exhibit toward the females. (SHARP 1996: 47)

B. Extension of Benefits

On June 13, 1996, a **Canadian** federal human rights tribunal ordered the federal government and federally-regulated companies to provide the same medical, dental and other benefits to **gay** and lesbian couples as heterosexual common-law couples. The tribunal further ordered the government to review its statutes and regulations within 60 days to identify any provisions that discriminated against same-sex couples. The Treasury Board announced in July that it would not appeal the ruling, although **it did** seek judicial review of the time period allotted for review of the statutes (May 1996; May and Bindman 1996).

The CF Human Resources Office distributed a memo in December 1996 outlining the policy of granting same-sex partner benefits to **Canadian** Forces personnel. Same-sex partner benefits were to include: compassionate leave, leave without pay for spousal accompaniment, **military** foreign service regulations, isolated post regulations, and relocation regulations. Same-sex partners would also be entitled to dental care and health care plans as dependents. Compassionate leave and leave without pay for spousal accompaniment were immediately implemented at this time, since the expansion of these benefits could be achieved through a broader application of existing regulations. Other benefits required formal changes in the Queen's Regulations and Orders and are still in the process of being implemented.

The December 1996 memorandum stated that same-sex partners would be considered dependents for the purpose of benefits. To be entitled to benefits, a same-sex relationship would be recognized if:

...for a continuous period of at least one year, a member has lived with a person of the same sex in a homosexual or lesbian relationship, publicly represented that person as his/her life partner and continues to live with that person as his/her life partner. (Canforgen 1996: 2)

Canadian Forces members with same-sex partners could obtain benefits by completing a form similar to that used for common-law spouses. These forms, included in a January 1997 memorandum, required service personnel to inform the CF of their request for recognition of the relationship; to provide their names, ranks and addresses; and to "solemnly declare" that: 1) the partners are of the same sex; 2) that they have resided together "in a homosexual or lesbian relationship" for a continuous period of at least one year; 3) that they publicly represent each other as life partners; and 4) that they continue to live together as life partners. The **Canadian** Forces also provide forms for the notification of a change in relationship status due to death, separation or cessation of co-habitation, and for the reinstatement of a relationship that had been officially terminated (Hurl 1997).

In April 1999, a report by the National Defence revealed that 17 claims for medical, dental and relocation benefits for **gay** and lesbian partners of soldiers had been filed in 1998. All of the requests were made by women. The first claims were made in 1997, although figures for that year are not available (The Edmonton Sun 1999). The number of requests appears low even given the **military's** own estimates that 3.5% of its service personnel were **gay** and bisexual even before the ban was lifted (Wenck 1995). Michelle Douglas, whose suit against the **Canadian** Forces precipitated the lifting of the remainder of the ban, suggested that the low figures were likely due to a hesitancy by service members to out themselves by requesting benefits. She declared that "[Gays and lesbians] have operated in a climate that has not been very inviting to them, nor encouraging, nor supportive, for a very long time" (The Edmonton Sun 1999).

In June 1999, the federal government agreed to settle cases before the **Canada** Pension Plan appeals board to allow same-sex partners to receive survival benefits, including **military** pensions. Ten days earlier, **Canada's** Supreme Court declared that the Ontario Family Law Act was unconstitutional because it limited the term "spouse" to heterosexual partners (The Gazette 1999). More recently, members of the CF Legislative and Regulatory Service have been at work with legislators on the language for Bill C-23. The bill, if passed, would require that same-sex partners be considered common-law partners under the law. This would

enable the **military** to handle all common-law relationships, whether heterosexual or homosexual, with the same paperwork. All remaining benefits relating to 'dependents' in the existing **military** regulations could also be extended to same-sex partners (LaBelle, personal communication, February 24, 2000).

[Back to top](#)

CSSMM

[Home](#) | [Press Center](#) | [Mission Statement](#) | [Board of Advisors](#) | [Newsletter](#)
[Teaching Resources](#) | [Research Resources](#) | [Publications](#) | [Programs](#)

This is **G o o g l e's cache** of <http://www.gaymilitary.ucsb.edu/Publications/CanadaPub3.htm> as retrieved on Nov 1, 2004 16:03:42 GMT.

G o o g l e's cache is the snapshot that we took of the page as we crawled the web. The page may have changed since that time. Click here for the **current page** without highlighting. This cached page may reference images which are no longer available. Click here for the **cached text** only.

To link to or bookmark this page, use the following url: [http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:dI3KtTjCD4UJ:www.gaymilitary.ucsb.edu/Publications/CanadaPub3.htm+gay+\(canada+OR+Canadian\)+military+october+1992&hl=en&start=2](http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:dI3KtTjCD4UJ:www.gaymilitary.ucsb.edu/Publications/CanadaPub3.htm+gay+(canada+OR+Canadian)+military+october+1992&hl=en&start=2)

Google is not affiliated with the authors of this page nor responsible for its content.

These search terms have been highlighted: **gay canada canadian military october 1992**



CSSMM

Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military

VIII. CONCLUSION

The CF removal of the ban on **gay** and lesbian soldiers occurred only after a number of years of judicial and political struggles. Senior Department of National Defence personnel and a sizable number of heterosexual soldiers worried that a change in policy would seriously compromise the mission of the **Canadian** Forces. Fears of sexual harassment by homosexual soldiers, increasing rates of **gay**-bashing, resignations, and refusals to work with homosexuals spurred continuing support for exempting the **military** from the protections proscribed under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Because the CF is entrusted with the fundamental task of putting soldiers' lives on the line to protect the interests of **Canadian** citizens, both at home and abroad, **military** personnel were wary of a policy change that they felt could compromise the operational effectiveness of the armed services.

Once the demise of the ban was imminent, however, Chief of Defence General Chastelain and other **military** leaders took decisive steps to create a smooth transition. They dissolved any distinction in the regulations between heterosexual and homosexual soldiers. They made it clear that the policy change had the full support

Press Center

Publications

Mission Statement

About the Center

Newsletter

Teaching Resources

Research Resources

Grants & Fellowships

Programs

How Can I Help?

Belkin and McNichol, "Effects of the 1992 Lifting of Restrictions on Gay and Lesbian Service in the Canadian Forces: Appraising the Evidence"

I. Executive Summary

II. Introduction

III. Methodology

IV. Historical Context

V. Removal of the Ban Against Homosexual Soldiers

VI. Evolution of the Policy Change Since 1993

VII. Evidence of Outcomes for the Canadian Forces

VIII. Conclusion

IX. Bibliography

X. Personal Communication

of the CF leadership. The Department of National Defence outlined the standards of behavior that would be expected of all **military** personnel, regardless of sexual orientation, and it widely distributed both those standards and the changes in regulations. Perhaps most importantly, the **military** leadership emphasized the distinction between beliefs and behavior. The personal attitudes and decisions of individual soldiers would be respected, but soldiers would be expected to put personal feelings aside to accomplish **military** objectives and to uphold the law.

In the years since the removal of the ban, the CF has continued to move forward in its full integration of **gay** and lesbian soldiers, and it has done so as part of a larger effort to reduce harassment and discrimination of all types among its personnel. In these efforts, sexual orientation has been neither singled-out nor ignored as a potential source of conflict. Among other objectives, the SHARP program strove to overturn common stereotypes about **gays** and lesbians, and the CF is now developing more sustained anti-harassment training. In keeping with federal mandate, the **military** has also been amending its regulations to ensure equivalent benefits for same-sex soldiers.

The success of these steps has been borne out by all of the available evidence. An examination of all of the studies conducted in the year after the removal of the ban revealed not a single reported case of resignation, harassment, or violence because of the change in policy. Follow-up with the officials in charge of sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, and human rights complaints have reported few if any incidents related to sexual orientation. Sexual and personal harassment rates have actually decreased between **1992** and **1998**, and a conflict management official has declared that he knows of no recently filed cases related to sexual orientation. CF officials, **military** scholars, involved non-governmental and political leaders, and **gay** soldiers have all concurred that the removal of the ban has had, to their knowledge, no perceivable negative effect on the **military**. The issue of **gay** and lesbian soldiers in the **Canadian** Forces has all but disappeared from public and internal **military** debates.

While the removal of the ban may not be universally liked among heterosexual soldiers, it does appear to be universally accepted. Despite potential differences, personnel appear to be able to get their jobs done in a manner that does not compromise their effectiveness. For sexual minorities who serve, the change has been less about publicly declaring their sexual or transgender orientation than about being able to do their work well without fear of "being found out" or losing their jobs. The removal of the ban has resulted in a decrease of fear and anxiety and improved access to personnel support systems for soldiers who self-identify as sexual minorities. For the **military** as a whole, the non-discrimination policy has also increased its potential pool of qualified recruits.

[Back to top](#)

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, Barry D. 1993. "Winning Rights and Freedoms in **Canada**." In *The Third Pink Book*, edited by A. Hendriks, R. Tielman, and E. Veen. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

- Adams-Roy, Major J.E. 1999. Harassment in the **Canadian** Forces: Results of the 1998 Survey. Ottawa: National Defence Headquarters.
- Adams-Roy, Major J.E. 1999a. Harassment in the Primary Reserves: Results of the 1998 Survey. Ottawa: National Defence Headquarters.
- Bindman, Stephen. 1990. "Air Force Lesbian Wins Back Her Job." in The Toronto Star (Toronto). August 16: A3.
- Bindman, Stephen. 1990a. "Dismissed Lesbian Suing **Military**." in The Toronto Star (Toronto). February 5: A3.
- Bindman, Stephen. 1991. "**Military** to Delay Lifting Restrictions on Hiring Gays." in The Gazette (Montreal). **October** 11: B1.
- Bindman, Stephen. 1991a. "**Military** Opens its Arms to Gays; New Policy Lifts Ban on Hiring, Promotion, of Homosexuals." in The Gazette (Montreal). **October** 10: B1.
- Bindman, Stephen. **1992**. "Lesbian Forced to Quit Loses Bid for Old Job: **Military** Rejects Recommendation to Re-Hire Ex-Air Force Lieutenant." in The Vancouver Sun (Vancouver). May 11: A3.
- Bindman, Stephen. 1992a. "**Military** Refuses to Reinstate Lesbian." in The Toronto Star (Toronto). May 11: A4.
- Bindman, Stephen, Southam News and Herald Staff. **1992**. "**Military** Gives OK to Gays, Lesbians." in Calgary Herald. **October** 28: A1.
- Bronskill, Jim. 1998. "Study Urges Ottawa Apologize for **Gay** Purge: Public Careers Ruined During Cold War." in The Gazette (Montreal). November 24: A11.
- Canforgen. 1996. "Same-Sex Partner Benefits." Ottawa: National Defence Headquarters.
- Edmonton Sun (The). 1999. "Few Soldiers Claiming Same-Sex Benefits." April 12: 13.
- Farnsworth, Clyde. 1991. "**Canada** Ending Anti-**Gay** Rules." in The New York Times (New York). **October** 11: A3.
- Gade, Paul A., David R. Segal, and Edgar M. Johnson. 1996. "The Experience of Foreign Militaries." In Out in Force: Sexual Orientation and the **Military**, edited by G. Herek, J. B. Jobe, and R. M. Carney. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gazette (The). **1992**. "66% of Canadians Would Allow Homosexuals in Armed Forces." December 14: A7.
- Gazette (The). 1999. "Gays Get Survivor Benefits." June 1: A9.
- Greenway, Norma. 1993. "Clinton Faces Political Bloodbath Over Gays Issue." in The Gazette (Montreal). January 28: B6.

- Hansen, Major R.J. 1993. Personal Harassment in the **Canadian** Forces: 1992 Survey.
- Willowdale, Ontario: **Canadian** Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit.
- Harper, Tim. 1991. "Ban on Gays in **Military** Still in Place, PM Says." in Toronto Star (Toronto). **October** 11: A11.
- Harper, Tim. **1992**. "Tories Give Up on Plans to Let Gays in **Military**." in The Toronto Star (Toronto). January 25: A3.
- House Armed Services Committee. 1993. Policy Implications of Lifting the Ban on Homosexuals in the **Military**. May 4, 5.
- Hurl, D.J. 1997. "Same-Sex Partner Benefits." Ottawa: National Defence Headquarters. January 14.
- Hustak, Alan. 1993. "Officials Fear U.S. Furor [sic] Over Gays Could Affect **Canadian** Troop Morale." in The Vancouver Sun (Vancouver). February 8: A4.
- Kinsman, Gary. 1996. The Regulation of Desire. Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- Lancaster, John. **1992**. "Many Allies Allow Gays in the **Military**; **Canada**, Australia Are Latest to Drop Exclusionary Policy." in The Washington Post (Washington, D.C.). May 11: A3.
- Macleans. 1996. "A Tortuous Road; Quietly, Gays Are Making Progress on Rights." May 13: 24-5.
- May, Kathryn. 1996. "Ottawa Accepts Ruling on Gays: Same-Sex Partners of Civil Servants Get Benefits." July 16: A1.
- May, Kathryn and Stephen Bindman. 1996. "**Gay** Public Servants Cheer Benefits Victory: Ruling Expected to Have Impact in Private Sector." June 14: A1.
- National Defense Research Institute (NDRI). 1993. Sexual Orientation and U.S. **Military** Policy: Options and Assessment. RAND, Santa Monica.
- Ottawa Citizen (The). 1991. "Human Rights: Federal Waffling Shameful." December 9: A10.
- Park, Rosemary. 1994. "Opening the **Canadian** Forces to Gays and Lesbians: An Inevitable Decision but Improbable Reconfiguration." in Gays and Lesbians in the **Military**: Issues, Concerns, and Contrasts, edited by W. J. Scott and S. C. Stanley. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Pinch, F. C. 1994. "Perspectives on Organizational Change in the **Canadian** Forces." U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Alexandria, VA.
- Pond, Frank. 1993. "A Comparative Survey and Analysis of **Military** Policies with Regard to Service by **Gay** Persons." in Policy Concerning Homosexuality in the Armed Forces, hearing held by Senate Armed Services Committee. April 29.

- Pugliese, David. **1992**. "Gay Ruling Has No Effect on Forces." in The Ottawa Citizen (Ottawa). August 8: A4.
- Rayside, David. 1990. "Memo to Harriet Sachs and Clayton Ruby, Re: Douglas vs. H.M. The Queen." December 3, 1990.
- Rayside, David. 1998. On the Fringe. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Senate Armed Services Committee. Policy Concerning Homosexuality in the Armed Forces. April 29.
- SHARP. 1996. "Standard for Harassment and Racism Prevention." Course materials provided by the **Canadian** Forces.
- Schmitt, Eric. 1993. "Gay Soldiers No Problem Elsewhere, Experts Say." in The New York Times (New York). April 30: A16.
- Swardson, Abbe. 1993. "No Problem with Gays in Ranks; **Military's** Restrictions Lifted Last Fall." in The Washington Post (Washington, D.C.). July 6: A8.
- Toronto Star (The). 1990. "Secret War on Gays." August 19: B12.
- Toronto Star (The). 1990a. "Lesbian Battles Ottawa over Security Clearance." March 26: A9.
- Toronto Star (The). 1995. "Ottawa Grants **Gay** Staff Some Spousal Benefits." November 24: A11.
- U.P.I. **1992**. "**Canadian** Court Says **Military** Must Accept Gays." **October 27**.
- Ulbrich, Jeffrey. 1993. "**Canada** Lifted Ban on Gays in **Military** Without a Ripple." in The Associated Press (Toronto). January 29.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO). 1993. "Homosexuals in the **Military**: Policies and Practices of Foreign Countries." United States General Accounting Office, Washington D.C.
- Vienneau, David. 1989. "Human Rights / Key Charter Fights **Gay** Fights for Career in **Military**." in The Toronto Star (Toronto). April 15: D5.
- Walsh, Mary Williams. **1992**. "**Canada** Now Far Ahead of U.S. in Recognizing **Gay** Rights; Justice: Nearly Two-Thirds of the Provinces Prohibit Discrimination. The **Military** Now Accepts Homosexuals." in Los Angeles Times (Los Angeles). December 29: A1.
- Washington Times (The). 1993. "**Canada** Example Cited on Gays in the **Military**." January 28: A2.
- Watson, Laurie. 1991. "**Canada** to Allow Gays in **Military**." in UPI (Ottawa). **October 10**.
- Wenck, Karol. 1995. "Briefing Note for Director of Public Policy." Ottawa: **Canadian** Forces. August 25.

Wintemute, Robert. 1995. Sexual Orientation and Human Rights: The United States Constitution, the European Convention, and the **Canadian** Charter. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Zuliani, R. A. 1986. "**Canadian** Forces Survey on Homosexual Issues." Charter Task Force, Department of National Defence, Ottawa.

[Back to top](#)

X. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION

Adams-Roy, Major, **Canadian** Forces. Human Resources Research and Evaluation. January 24, 2000.

Beaton, Sharon. Captain, **Canadian** Forces. Recruiting Enrollment Training School Headquarters. February 5, 2000.

Beler, Steven. Major Sr., **Canadian** Forces. Directorate of **Military** Gender Integration and Employment Equity. January 21, 2000.

Bissonette, Alain. Captain, **Canadian** Forces. Provost Marshal Spokesperson. January 19, 2000.

Cousens, C. Reserve Major, **Canadian** Forces. February 5, 2000.

Douglas, Michelle. Former Lieutenant, **Canadian** Forces. January 23, 2000.

Durand, Sylvia. Sergeant, **Canadian** Forces. Technical Communications Specialist. February 5, 2000.

Fisher, John. Director, EGALE (**Canada**). February 2, 2000.

Forget, Marcel. Captain, **Canadian** Forces. February 8, 2000.

Granatstein, J.L. Director, **Canadian** War Museum. February 3, 2000.

Harrington, Lynn. Retired Corporal, **Canadian** Forces. February 8, 2000.

Herek, Gregory. Professor, University of California at Davis. January, 26, 2000.

Kelly, Rosemary. Retired Sergeant, **Canadian** Forces. January 26, 2000.

Kinsman, Gary. Professor, Laurentian University. February 5, 2000.

Kristianson, Connie. Professor, Carleton University. January 28 and February 13, 2000.

LaBelle, Diane. Civilian, Legal Counsel. Legislative and Regulatory Service. February 2 and 24, 2000.

Leebosh, Derek. Environics Research, Toronto. February 10, 2000.

- Leger, Paul. Staff Sergeant, **Canadian** Forces. February 8, 2000.
- Leveque, Steve. Civilian, **Canadian** Forces. Executive Directorate on Conflict Resolution. February 4, 2000.
- MacKay, D.S. Captain, **Canadian** Forces. Directorate of **Military** Gender Integration and Employment Equity. January 18 and February 28, 2000.
- MacLennan, Rose Marie. LCdr, **Canadian** Forces. Directorate of **Military** Gender Integration and Employment Equity. January 21, 2000.
- Morton, Desmond. Professor, McGill University. February 3, 2000.
- Pepper, David. Ottawa Carleton Regional Police Department. February 10, 2000.
- Rayside, David. Professor, University of Toronto. January 19, 2000.
- Reid, Tim. Former Captain, **Canadian** Forces. February 11, 2000.
- Stiehm, Judith. Professor, Florida International University. January 27 and 28, 2000.
- Siksay, Bill. Assistant to MP Svend Robinson (British Columbia). February 10, 2000.
- Wenek, Karol. Civilian, **Canadian** Forces. Directorate of Policy Analysis and Development. January 20, 2000.
- Wild, William. LCdr, **Canadian** Forces. Directorate of Human Resource, Research and Evaluation. January 24, 2000.

[Back to top](#)

CSSMM

[Home](#) | [Press Center](#) | [Mission Statement](#) | [Board of Advisors](#) | [Newsletter](#)
[Teaching Resources](#) | [Research Resources](#) | [Publications](#) | [Programs](#)