

I am writing as a parent, who, having followed the hearings to date on Bill C-6, has some very real concerns and questions. Most of these concerns are overlapping but I have tried to outline them in such a way that it provides some clarity, as follows:

1. The Definition of Conversion Therapy

This is a key component of each of my concerns. As I explain each one, I have tried to lay out **‘the case for a clear definition’**. Not only does the current wording of this bill leave the door open to interpretation and expansion, it does not reflect the current generally accepted understanding of Conversion therapy, that include such abusive therapies as drug, hormonal and shock treatment, and worse. I expect that there is very little opposition to banning these torturous and ineffective practices.

Q. Justice Minister Lametti says that the bill protects ‘good faith conversations’ and that therefore there is no need for amendments, however, during the hearings statements have been made that clearly outline that this is not the case. What is the truth? **Point: the case for a clear definition**

2. How will this law restrict the ability of parents to protect young children?

Current data clearly shows the **increasing [prevalence](#) of online child sex grooming, luring, exploitation and trafficking** which presents new challenges for parents. To date the hearings have not addressed how the fallout will be handled. This bill is a predator’s dream, as the law itself can be [used as a tool](#) to groom and lure a child. Clouding boundaries, questioning inhibitions, doubting parents, are weapons predators use against children in order to exploit them. **Point: the case for a clear definition.**

Q. How would a parent prepare, protect and address their child regarding this type of exploitation and abuse, if our ability to articulate these very real dangers could be deemed as criminal? What would a parent be allowed to say and not say in order to stay within the law?

Q For children sexually abused and exploited, would the sexual confusion caused by the abuse be allowed to be explored, and if so, in what way? Could a child confused that they might be gay, because their first sexual experience was through a violation from a same sex predator, be allowed to explore this with a parent?

On the topic of **transgender issues**; this is an arena that is still heavily under debate within the medical community. The idea that ALL human beings should be respected and not discriminated against, is to me an obvious ideal and I would think embraced by most people. However, all decisions in life come with ambivalence. Meaning, there are pro’s and con’s when making decisions. Transitioning is no different and, in my opinion, a major life altering decision, one that increasingly people are finding they want to reverse. Restricting the ability to explore all sides of such decisions, ESPECIALLY between a parent and their child who [does not have the ability to fully understand consequences](#) of decision making as their frontal lobe is not fully formed, denies reasonable expectations around informed consent. In my mind, it is the inherent right of a parent to navigate these waters with their child. **Point: the case for a clear definition.**

For those that [find themselves in this situation](#)...

Q. Who will pay for mental health services and any surgeries they might require because they were not fully informed?

Q. What reparations will they be able to seek for not only the physical, mental and emotional damage they have incurred, but future damages in their life both in relationships and in having children?

3. Restrictions to conversations with family members, teachers, pastors, doctors and other counsellors and educators.

I have been very concerned listening to the hearings on this Bill. Using isolated anecdotal accounts of bad parenting and bad counselling to reflect [the millions of good parents and counsellors](#) is as prejudicial as the what this law is intending to prevent. They remove context from the individual, and more importantly the uniqueness of every child and the understanding of them that only a parent can have.

Q. How would this work, while still respecting other values, and freedoms of thought and religion?

Q. How would societal support systems be implicated by the passage of this bill in its current form?

Q. Would taking a child to religious services or giving them a Bible or Quran be deemed coercive? Could these things not be deemed a “practice” as stated in the bill? Can we read these books but not utter them verbally...or just not interpret them?

Sexuality is a part of who we are. It is not the completeness of who we are, and that completeness is different for every person. There is no greater example of this than the very small sampling of people who have presented so far in the hearings on Bill C-6.

There is no one standard of what the “right” context should be. There is a vast array of personal variables that go into making decisions such as this (Gay, Bi, Trans, Christian, Muslim, Jew, Atheist, Child, Adult, sex assault victim, etc), that is as unique as we are as individuals. If we are to enact a law it must address and protect all groups, and allow them to explore fully the goals they have for their life based on those variables.

This law as written stands to cause more harm to more people than it will protect.

Respectfully,

Sarah Morrison