

AAHP
AIDS Activist History Project

Interview Transcript 54
2016.017

Interviewee:	John Foster
Interviewers:	Alexis Shotwell & Gary Kinsman
Collection:	Ottawa, Ontario
Date:	October 25, 2016

25 October 2016

Persons present: John Foster – JF
Alexis Shotwell – AS
Gary Kinsman – GK

[START OF TRANSCRIPT]

AS: The way we start all of these recordings is to say that we are talking to John Foster in Ottawa, and it is October 25, 2017.

GK: So, we're here to talk with John about his memories of Jon Gates, who was a really interesting AIDS activist. And maybe you could just start off by telling us how you got to know Jon Gates? How did you come in contact with him?

JF: Well. I have to back up just a little.s

GK: Sure.

JF: I was just coming off being the national secretary of Oxfam based in Ottawa in 1989. One of the first things I did was attend parts of the Montreal World AIDS Conference. And that was a key event in a number of ways, as you will recall, in terms of where we were with drugs, and where we were with the involvement of PWAs [People with AIDS] and so on. But also, for some of us, it was very much a turning point in terms of the international dimension. Not just talking about what was happening at home or in Toronto or Vancouver, or wherever, but what the relationship was between what we were going through and what was happening in Europe and Africa, and in a number of other places. And so a number of us caucused, particularly those of us who were involved in international development organizations. And we decided that we should do something collective, because our own organizations weren't really doing what they should be in terms of supporting overseas projects, or doing educational work, or affecting the understanding, or lobbying Canadian government policy. And so we did. That tended to bridge groups like the Canadian AIDS Society and the Legal Network with groups like Oxfam, the Canadian Council for International Cooperation, and the Red Cross. So, a gang of us formed, virtually on the floor there, in the hallways. One of the key activists came out of Manitoba, who was Jeffrey O'Malley. He is now in the upper reaches of UN [United Nations] organizations.

GK: So that's where he ended up. I remember meeting Jeff a long, long time ago. When he was a student activist at the Marx Conference in 1983 in Winnipeg. Anyway, sorry to interrupt.

JF: No. He was one of the spark plugs. And he also had played roles in international involvement organizations, and at the Canadian Council for International Cooperation. So we decided to form this group called ICAD [International Committee for AIDS and Development]. And having done

that and having found some measure of support through the CCIC [Canadian Council for International Cooperation] and other groups, we were looking for staff. Among the people who applied and who we interviewed was a tall gangly guy from Vancouver named Jon Gates. Now, there were other connections with Jon Gates in terms of Vancouver development activists and so on. People like Shauna Sylvester. And people also on the church side, because one of the key pieces of background to Jon's ethics and philosophy was the chaplaincy on the UBC [University of British Columbia] campus, and a United Church minister named George Hermanson. It was one of those places where certain students—and I remember this from my own University days in the late '50s—hung out, right? The perpetual talkers and philosophers and searchers and so on. I sort of conjured that was essentially what Jon was. When I heard him later on, speaking and talking, I could take it back to that period of formation, in part. So, Jon was interviewed and ultimately hired. That decision was a fairly big decision, in the sense that I don't think any of us on the committee—and we all had responsibilities for personnel and so on in our organizations—really conjured with hiring somebody who was positive. With a—I would say—with a capital P, in Jon's case, because there was no confusion about it. None of us, I think including Jon, had any idea about time horizons.

GK: Right.

JF: This was a period of – it's a period before the famous cocktail by about five or six years.

GK: Right.

JF: AZT [zidovudine] was out there, but nobody was entirely clear on its effects, positive or negative.

GK: Right.

JF: And there were other things in play -- the whole discussion about alternative hypotheses and so on. I think it's fair to say that the issue of access to medicines and the availability of medicines and even partially tested medicine – this was an urgent thing in the wind, and around and about. So Jon was hired, and moved to Ottawa to work basically under the umbrella of the Canadian Council for International Cooperation, but in this specific project on AIDS and development. And those of us who had been in Montreal and some others that were the table or the coalition; people like Ted Muse from the Red Cross, Richard Burzynski from the Canadian AIDS Society, and so on. There were – it's hard to say – six or eight people around the table most of the time. And we were discussing with Jon what the work would be. It was to some extent coming out of mid-air. We were creating the work. Some of us in our own organizations were experimenting with education, often in small workshops with the few people who were interested. Some were trying to examine whether there were overseas projects that they could support, and so on. So that was kind of the birth period in '89.

GK: So that's when he would have been hired, in '89?

JF: I don't remember the exact date and I haven't been able to find it in records. I may in the future,

but I couldn't find it.

GK: But it might have been, like, the fall after the AIDS conference?

JF: Yes. After the Montreal conference or later on in the winter. Certainly by 1990. I can check the date – I think. Jon was here in office, and by November 1990 a bunch of us headed off to the second international NGO conference on AIDS, which was in Paris. That was decided on as a key moment in orientation and connection and network building and partnership building early in Jon's stay with the organization. I remember it very clearly, very vividly – there were a number of Canadians, three were at least from Vancouver, Jon, Shauna Sylvester, Shirley Ross, myself and a couple of others. Of course, there were – in the AIDS world – there were all kinds of people there. I particularly remember Dennis Altman from Australia, but there were many, many people. And it was a joint educational enterprise in exploring what was the meaning of the international context at that time. And also collecting information and comparative information and ideas. As is clear in the film about Jon, a key part of his motivation was the desire to actually go to Africa, to have some ground level experience.¹ That continued until his death. It was always there as a possibility—next month or whatever. All of us probably postponed too long looking for the right opportunity. Now, let me just stop there for a moment. Maybe you have other questions about that period.

GK: Just in terms of whether you knew anything about Jon's other previous involvements? Because in the movie they did say he was involved in the union movement.

JF: Oh yes. Well, the thing you need to know about Jon is that his grandfather was the CCF and NDP Member of Parliament from the Kootenays, Bert Herridge – a very, very distinguished personality, who was in Canadian Parliament for 23 years, and maybe also in the BC Legislature. So, that was part of Jon's background and certainly part of his orientation. He was political, small p and capital P in that sense. Not so much in a partisan sense, but in the sense of recognizing the importance of legislation and legislative bodies and political change. So that was a big part of it. Then he also worked for Jack Munro and the International Woodworkers of America—the IWA in BC. In that period, which was an incredibly charged period, because that was the period of so called Operation Solidarity and all those efforts and fights and so on. So Jon was part of all that, plus he ran for the student council on UBC campus, and I believe won.

GK: Yes. I think so.

JF: He was very engaged. And that was part of what attracted us to him, of course, as well. Not only was he engaged, but, as you could see, in the film and if you would have known him, he was incredibly articulate. He had a wonderful vocabulary, and he had a very capable, excellent way of putting words together in a convincing – and often a very challenging – fashion. And maybe because he had the union experience there was nothing – let's just say he was fearless. He was brash. He was out there and challenging.

GK: Great.

¹ See [here](#) to view the film, titled *The Legacy of Jon Gates* (1993).

AS: I want to back up even a little bit more because I wanted to hear just right before the Montreal conference what it was like to be working with some of these organizations? If it was that you had to move them to think about AIDS or if this was something that was arising as a real obvious thing that needed to be done. How did it come to be that you all went to the conference?

JF: Well, I can't speak for the other Ottawa people although I think that people – I mean the Ottawa office of the Canadian AIDS Society, people like Richard and so on, people like Ken and the Red Cross, they were already there, so to speak. I was coming from Toronto at that point, having been in the United Church for almost 20 years as a staff person and so was very much in the Toronto maelstrom. But at a more personal level, I had three friends - Peter Mackay, Doug Wilson, and Rob Adamson - all of whom either got the news or revealed the news that they positive in that period. And two of whom died in the early '90s. I've worked quite closely with Doug Wilson who was also from Saskatchewan and we had a lot of mutual friends. So that was part of my own personal background. In terms of my work in the church and so on, I don't recall AIDS as a significant theme at that time, although it was out in the matrix. It was affecting people. But as a policy issue and so on, not yet, as I recall.

AS: And then at the conference, what was it like to encounter all these people from all over the world?

JF: The conference was a very highly articulated event. You know, ACT UP was there. And the Toronto people were there. People were taking all kinds of unexpected initiatives. They were basically breaking through the medicalization dominance of the whole thing, and the professionalization of that, and so on. Reminding people that these were actually living people who had something to say, and needed some respect. I think the conference was a real turning point, in that regard. You know, toward the end of my time at Oxfam I went to the Vancouver conference. I mean, it was light and day.

AS: In terms of the representation of people with AIDS?

JF: Well, yes. But also the spirit. The spirit, yeah. Anyway, there were so many issues in that period. The whole issue about visa admission into the States erupted. And drug by drug there was stuff going on.

AS: Every time a new drug would come.

JF: Well, yes, or the rumours of a new drug. Also, you know, there was so much unknown. I mean, there was so much insecurity. And so much urgency about trying something. Even though it really was blind.

AS: Yes.

GK: For sure. So, to come back to sort of – Jon is hired in office. He's trying to figure out what

to do. So what does the project sort of become, that he's engaged in?

JF: Well, in part, it was to move our own organizations. And to put AIDS on the agenda of bodies like the Canadian Council for International Cooperation, which, you know, had 100 different organizations who were members. It was to put the international dimension into discussions of the Canadian AIDS Society, and to begin to explore where CIDA [Canadian International Development Agency] and the Canadian government were at, and what needed to be done. Also I would say some self-education. Jonathan Mann came to Ottawa, so there were dinner conversations with Jonathan Mann. Things like that, to advance our own knowledge, because we really, we were neophytes in terms of this exploration. For some of us, this led to other activities, particularly in the policy area through the '90s. That became our main thing.

But with Jon [Gates], it was much more gathering the initial information about what to convince people about or to bring more vividly what was the actual situation at village level in developing countries, what were the relative resource possibilities. At the time, a pill might cost the equivalent of a year's expenditure per capita on health, and so on. Jon was gathering material and becoming equipped to speak and to articulate these things to challenge organizations that obviously had urgent needs at home. I think that the organizations succeeded. I haven't had much to do with ICAD [Interagency Coalition on AIDS and Development] for maybe five years or more, but it succeeded in building a bridge between AIDS service organizations and NGOs. I think that was important, and it led to investment and projects and all kinds of things. You know, in the case of Oxfam where I was, one of the places we worked was in South Africa. And one of the things that was going on in South Africa were people doing education through dramatization and puppets. So, those people were brought by Oxfam to Canada, but particularly to Northern communities and Native communities, where it was felt that that methodology might take off and so on. So, that was just one example, but other organizations had their own agendas.

GK: That's great. So, Jon makes these two speeches that tend to crystalize the message he sort of left us with.

JF: Yes. But that's almost at his death. That was '92. Part of what I would like to fill in is the gap, which had more to do with my own memories, but that it tells you something about him, which is evident in the movie, but because the movie is mostly filmed during his last weeks and months it comes through. But not, shall we say, with the exuberance that was characteristic.

GK: Right.

JF: I remember once going to a concert at the National Art Centre with Jon and some others. Jon had a cape. He was maybe close to 6'5 or 6'4 and he swept into the balcony of the National Art Centre with this cape. Well [laughter] and we his acolytes, so to speak [laughter]. Well, heads turned, right? I mean, this was a statement in itself. [laughter]. And he was not quiet spoken. You you don't remember what he was talking about, but he certainly attracted attention.

Another memory I have from the Paris conference, is that we Canadians decided that in our off hours we would search for the perfect chocolate mousse. This was Jon's agenda [laughter]. I have

somewhere a picture of him holding this huge goblet of a chocolatey substance [laughter], everybody's smiling and smirking and whatever. We did find it, I guess. [laughter] That was the period of the Gay Games in Vancouver. So, Jon's contribution to that discussion was to advocate in favour of the inclusion of croquet, as a game in the Gay Games. [laughter] So that gives you a little bit of flavor for his life.

GK: Yes.

JF: He was very creative. There was an element of, you know, the croquet thing was sort of an old Victoria sort of an approach to things. He was just wild. I think that's part of what kept him going, was that he could always see that other side. You know, in the film, I mean he turns yellow and then he turns brown. You know, because what was happening with jaundice and his liver, and still he could make jokes about it. You know, how many of us could go through that and find the energy to be somewhat entertaining about it? So, I think a lot of us were motivated in this joint effort to put AIDS on the agenda just out of loyalty to and love for him. That lasts. But he was before the speeches to the medical association and the national AIDS speech, he was working all that out and he was discussing that with people, with Grant in the movie, with Ken Muse, myself, and so on. Trying to explore how to articulate and also talking to people who were part of emerging PWA and AIDS organizations about how to pitch it. But at the same time, he was trying to go beyond. And that's where I see this, both the political background and the Chaplaincy discussion background coming through in his ethics, which were very Kantian and very articulated. And I think, if one goes through to the late '90s, to the Gore appearance at the UN [United Nations] through to Jonathan Mann into UN AIDS and into other things... in a way, you could see that theme develop. Not directly from Jon, maybe, but in terms of people who he influenced, perhaps. It was certainly prophetic.

AS: Yes. He was really understanding some of the key issues that people were going through.

JF: Well, yes.

AS: Can you just talk a little bit about what the different sort of strands of thinking or the central questions that he was working with in those years ...

JF: When you think about, you know, the time was really quite brief. He was trying to find through all of this where he could go. Whether it be Nigeria or elsewhere in West Africa. He was collecting information about the ground level situation in Africa constantly. I don't actually know what he was reading apart from a lot of reports and faxes. I don't know what he was examining intellectually. Someone like Lisa Abare would be aware of that. She spent down time with Jon. He was being pushed, shall we say, administratively. There's a little moment in the film which talks about bureaucracy, which wasn't just in the federal government or in the provincial government and so on. But, you know, around the table people like Richard Burzynski and Ken Muse, were, you know, exercising their attention to detail and to planning. So, Jon had to come up with plans and strategies. He was also being asked to speak to all kinds of groups, which he did. He was conscientious about that sort of thing.

GK: What would he usually speak about in the talks he would do?

JF: We were trying to organize workshops at a community level. I remember one that I did in Guelph, and it was probably 20 people. But what we were trying to do was to connect – if it was a development organization that was sponsoring this – to come and connect what they were doing and what they would be traditionally be working on. You know, anti-poverty stuff or food aid, or whatever, to the actual situation. And, for instance, what was going to happen if a generation was taken out of the mix? Or their parents. Or their children. Or whatever. That kind of stuff, which was fairly basic in analysis, I suppose. But it became much more sophisticated later on. It hits in the gut, so to speak.

AS: Yes.

GK: Yes. For sure. So, I now want to jump to the speeches, but what happens before them? I mean, are there other things you can think of that happen before those speeches?

AS: So he never did manage to get to go to Africa?

JF: No. He never got to go to Africa. It became his dream right through to the day that he died. It was part of what kept him alive, I think. He was – I mean, part of what was happening to us was, in a way, it's kind of maudlin. Or, what's the word... As people were employing him, on the one hand – and this is clear in the film – he was basically on a shuttle between dwellings and the Ottawa General. And he would go in, and his T cells – as he calls them, sleepy and dopey, etc – were either declared lively or not. And he would come home, and he was normally working all the time. I mean the computer, the laptop, went with him wherever he was going, and also the phone. And in the midst of all this, he was involved in two different properties in his personal life. Lisa and he bought a cottage in Halliburton, which we visited once as a gang. And that was a big part of life. And then towards the very end he bought a house in Gatineau. And, I mean, how he found—again, there's this byplay between the energy it took to do these things, but also what it gave him in terms of hopes and staying alive. It was a way for friends to help out, as well, in terms of the actual work of these things. For us as employers, as a committee, you know, this was all kinds of things. Like, do we keep him on? I mean, disability, all those kinds of issues, which we are talking about theoretically. Or which organizations we're dealing with, like CAS [Canadian AIDS Society] or whatever. But we were having to deal with this at a personal, direct level. So, that's part of what was going on, as well, in the time between '90 and mid '92.

AS: Do you think that his identity as someone living with HIV, and then AIDS, informed how he thought about the needs of people?

JF: Oh, yes.

AS: Yes.

JF: Jon was – he was not stupid [laughter] – he was making connections all the time, and that was

feeding his urgency. And he was working at what came through in the end, which was how to connect this with the real lives and survivability and ethics of AIDS professionals and PWAs.

AS: Everywhere.

JF: Yes. And it's still pretty tear jerking, in a way.

AS: Yes.

JF: It is. Anyway.

GK: So, maybe it is time to talk about the two speeches.

JF: Yes. And I wasn't at either of them. [laughter]

GK: But I heard the one at the Canadian AIDS Society that was given at King's College, which is part of Dalhousie in Halifax. And it was a very moving speech.²

JF: Yes. You could tell that.

GK: And I remembered it. Not that I actually could have told you who said it, except when you contacted us, I said, "that must be the person who said it!"

JF: Oh, really? You see, and I'm sort of assuming you would know about it. [laughter]

GK: No! [...] But it was a very moving speech and I think it was in May '92.

JF: Yes. '92.

GK: I don't know whether the Canadian Medical Association one was before or after that.

JF: I think it was before that. But it was directed to—it was a workshop at the annual meeting of the Canadian Medical Association. Some of the clips in the movie are from that speech. But most are from Halifax.

GK: Yes.

JF: Yes. So.

GK: So, you weren't at either speech. But could you tell us, maybe, what Jon was trying to accomplish with them? And you've probably heard at least the versions of the speech that are in the film.

² See [here](#) for the full text of Jon Gates' keynote address, "Solidarity or Abandonment and Betrayal" (23 May 1992).

JF: Well, maybe in some ways, in a period of many shocks, he was trying to shock people into awareness. But there's that moment where he's challenged about the fact that he's talking to people who, like him, are trying to survive. He says – he is basically accused of making a challenge which is life threatening to them – to which he replies, "Well if that's your choice, do it well, do it bravely. But the world should be changed." That's what's fundamental. In that, he's challenging the economic situation. In those days, it was structural adjustment, cutting down on subsidies for food, cutting down on household expenditures, medical expenditures, and so on. He's just saying, "We're all in this life boat together. Let's even it out."

AS: And so, he was pointing not just to people overseas and in developing places not having access to drugs, but also to that whole context of life and health.

JF: I don't know if he was thinking about North America very much, in terms of – in comparative terms, in the battles people were going through. But, you know, he had access through public funding to drugs, and so on. People from south of the border didn't have that kind of guarantee. I mean, they didn't have to go that far to put those same universal challenges into, you know, "Okay so are we." And also, on the other hand, this was a period when people also thought about boycotts. Remember? People wouldn't go to the conferences in the States because of the situation there, and so. So the idea of using boycott as an action was in the air a little bit, too, I think.

GK: Yes.

AS: So he was actually suggesting that people stop using meds?

JF: Well, no. He was advocating, as I understand it, they could use what they were on now, but he was looking to the future. Now the future, by the time of the Vancouver Conference – that was three years later – the future was then. The cocktail. He was looking – well, he didn't know it was going to be that – but he was thinking of a vaccination or a cure or something that would stop the disease, and that people would refuse to take it until it was affordable, accessible, etc. Until it was available.

GK: Available to everybody.

JF: Yes. And, you know, if you'd come then to, you know, twenty years later, and the UN agreements and the various strategies to get, you know, five million by then, and ten million by, you know, all that kind of thing. That was very, in a sense, prophetic. To fund it. And all this current discussion about the Clinton Foundation or Bill Gates or whatever. You know.

AS: It's still quite radical.

JF: Yes. It's still quite radical, but, I mean, things did happen. You know, that really changed, that he would be relatively happy about, but he'd still be kicking them in the sides.

GK: So at the Canadian AIDS Society conference, he was pretty well given a standing ovation.

JF: Oh, he was.

GK: But the other side of that was, I think, a lot of real anxiety about what he suggested because I think it was heard differently by different people. Because some people sort of interpreted it as, like, we're not going to take treatments until they're available to everyone in the world. Right? But he was more specifically talking about vaccines and new treatments. Right? Which was a really important point, but, I think that while people sort of like, what he had to say, they didn't see how to do it in a concrete way. But it was a very important challenge that he made.

JF: And emotionally people connected and burst into tears.

GK: Yes.

JF: Whatever they thought about it. You know, because they were facing somebody who was months away from dying.

GK: Yes.

JF: Yes. When he died - I actually don't remember the moment of his death, but we had a gathering which, as I recall, David Hoe in Ottawa organized.

GK: David is in Vancouver now. We just talked to him.

JF: Oh, okay. I haven't seen him for a while so that explains that. [laughter] He organized this lovely event. There's a room at the National Art Centre which is used sometimes for very small sessions or small performances. It's just an almost circular room with very high ceilings and walls, which I remember as kind of coppery, but I don't remember what they actually are. It was just—it was a wake where a number of people could speak, and so on. It was an occasion where a number of people who were loved and loved Jon could gather. It was a highly, highly appropriate moment, as I recall. If you trace those people who were involved with Jon and see where they ended up... ICAD, as I say, had a history which is still going on. Bruce Waring, Anja Costigan, and Michael O'Connor, a number of people all worked there, and carried all the work and the programs of organizations from Oxfam and Save the Children and even World Vision, and so on, were affected by that. We mentioned Jeffrey O'Malley and his career in the UN, and he's had a lot of influence on AIDS and AIDS funding since then. Some of us, as I say, went on in policy. I'm still – it would be an interesting PhD thesis or MA thesis. I think the paper that David Garmaise and I did on federal international AIDS policy was quite influential within the federal bureaucracy over a number of years coinciding, more or less, with the Chretien régime, and so on. And Richard Burzynski who went on to be instrumental in funding ICASO which was, you know, basically to strengthen the connections between all the AIDS service organizations north and south.

GK: Could you say what they actually stand for?

JF: International Council of AIDS Service Organizations. It's based in Toronto as well. But, yes, good

queen Richard. [laughter]

GK: Maybe just – unless you have other things to say – one question that has arisen more for me now after hearing you talk is: do you have any sense of what Jon would have thought about groups like ACT UP or AIDS ACTION NOW! or groups like that?

JF: Oh, I think he was aware of them and probably motivated, in part, by them. Now, I don't know about actual contact or interchange, because he was directed in a way in other directions. But he was not a person to retreat from being in the streets,

AS: Could you say – I mean, because one of the things that we are also capturing is just a little bit about what the context was in Ottawa at the time. So you might not have any memories about this, but about what the scene was like – the AIDS scene or the gay scene – in Ottawa then.

JF: I probably am not that much of an expert. I mean, I was very much involved in being the CEO of an international development organization, which was part of an international organization in terms of Oxfam. So a lot of energies were going into that. What we were trying to do was to be mutually supportive. And for a short time we had these twin organizations called FIDO / DIDO, which stand for Fags in International Development Organizations and Dykes in International Development Organizations. [laughter] It was very small. It was a few guys and gals who were working in CIDA or in Oxfam or in different organizations. Many of whom I still see around the streets of Ottawa. So that was just a little thing that we were working out how we were going to advance the cause in our own work places, and so on. And there were all those practical climate questions, which we were going through for people who had challenges or knew people who had health challenges, and so on. So that was part of it. But FIDO / DIDO didn't last too long. [laughter]

AS: I think it would be good to have FIDO / DIDO, like, just in terms of friends that I have in CIDA who go overseas and their partners can't come. It continues, and it's real. The domestic context is different.

JF: Yes. And, of course, a number of people who were in Foreign Affairs. You know, a good class analysis would still be highly appropriate. The sort of thing that Tim [McCaskell] does in his book about Toronto would have been good to have been done about Ottawa.

AS: There's some really specific things about Ottawa that – I've only been here for about four years – I'm just starting to learn about them a little bit. What it means to have so many people who are doing this really huge international work, but they still live in the city together. You know, and how that works – so that's good. Thank you.

JF: Yes. On the other hand, you know, partly from feminist point of view the work that a number of CIDA representatives did, and Canadian representatives did at the UN, in terms of women, challenges and policies and advancement and even institutional forms was, you know, until Harper, in the leadership. Hopefully it continues to be so now. Somehow that had to be rooted in some support back home at a personal level, as well.

GK: Is there anymore you want to say about Jon? Or maybe, to put it this way, if there was one thing you want to say about Jon for people to remember, what would it be?

JF: Exuberance and a good cause. That's it. He was not a dull bureaucrat. He challenged the medical myth approach, or medicalization approach, from a whole other side. Cultural, political, whatever.

GK: Well that's great. Thank you so much.

AS: Thank you so much for remembering him for us.

JF: Well, I am glad to have been sent back to remember. I mean, just personally, you know, I mean, Peter McGhee died just before, in '91. And then Doug. And then Jon. And you always ask yourself how you can respond to these things. So, the motivation continues to some extent.

GK: Just in case you don't know, Peter was Doug's partner. [to Alexis] I don't know if you would know that.

JF: Yes. And as funny as Jon was exuberant.

GK: Yes. Peter was very funny.

JF: And there are three novels and some short stories. Two novels that he wrote and one which Doug finished after Peter died. And short stories.

AS: Wow.

JF: And there's a movie about Doug called Stubblejumper.

GK: I've never seen it although I am in it.

JF: Yeah. Well you should definitely see it. [laughter] I met the guy who made it. Because there are all kinds of people in Saskatchewan who said they wished they had been interviewed, including me. It was really small budget.

GK: It's really good it was done. We may get back in touch with you around Doug and Peter. But we will have to see. We do have a lot of people talking about Doug already.

JF: Oh yes. And he had this little international sojourn because he worked on Latin American issues with us, with what was called Mission for Peace for a while, while he was ill. And we actually went to Washington together and lobbied Congress. Which was not AIDS related, It was Central America war related.

GK: Well Doug was about lots of things.

JF: Including culture.

AS: There is so much overlap in all of this.

JF: That's what I enjoyed about reading Tim McCaskell's book because it takes me back to the streets and byways and personalities and bedrooms of Toronto for a whole period. [laughter]

GK: This was really good, thank you.

AS: Thank you so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]