

FRANCE REJECTS SAME-SEX MARRIAGE

France, along with other European nations, may be on the road to perdition with its extremely low birthrate and the resulting economic problems. Nonetheless, France obviously cares, and cares deeply, about those children that it does have. With a birth rate of only 1.76, France desperately wants to protect the children that have been born to them.

At the request of the President of the National Assembly, Jacques Chirac, a special 30 member multi-party "Information Mission" was created to propose changes in French law to better protect the rights of children and to reflect changes in the French family.

In carrying out this responsibility, the Mission traveled to Spain, the U.K., Belgium, The Netherlands and Canada. The visit to politically correct Canada must have given them quite a shock! These countries, with the exception of the U.K., have all made same-sex marriages legal.

The Mission's Report was tabled in the French National Assembly on January 26, 2006. This wide ranging report touched on many aspects of children's lives, including same-sex marriage, adoption, and procreation of children by way of the new medical technologies.

To the great credit of the Mission, it chose as its guiding principle the best interests of the child because it said, "it is the responsibility of society, and especially its legislative bodies, to ensure that children are able to develop harmoniously". According to the Mission's report, this principle led to the Mission's decision to affirm and protect children's rights and the privacy of those rights over adults' aspirations. This is a refreshing change and a far cry from the situation in Canada where adult demands for rights and privileges override any rights or concerns for children.

Another refreshing approach was that the majority of the Mission was of the view that when children's lives are the issue, legislators must act very cautiously and calmly to seek a social consensus, rather than trying to bring about changes through a legislative revolution (quite different from the same-sex marriage debate held last June in Canada's Parliament).

What is amazing about this report is the logical and common sense way in which it approached the hot button issue of same-sex marriage. The report stated that "marriage is organized around the child and marriage is not merely the contractual recognition of the love between a couple; it is a framework that imposes rights and duties, and that is designated to provide for the care and harmonious development of the child". Thus the Mission concluded that children who represent the future of society must be defended regardless of developments in other countries that fail to protect children from same-sex marriages. The report seriously criticized the studies on same sex parenting that claimed that same-sex parenting carried no ill effects for children. The Mission noted the lack of scientific rigor, inadequate samplings and the flagrant lack of objectivity in these studies.

The report went on to say, forthrightly, that foreign examples demonstrate that countries that have made marriage available to same-sex couples have all, simultaneously or subsequently, authorized adoption by those couples and developed systems for assisted procreation or surrogate gestation, to enable those couples to have children. The Mission totally rejected this along with same-sex marriage.

Adoption of Children

The Mission recommended that the current rules in France on adoption should remain. That is, the Mission recommended that adoption should only be permitted by married and single individuals. It rejected "making adoption available to unmarried couples because of the lesser permanency of such couples and the fact that there is no judicial

involvement in the event of separation". They concluded that children require legal and emotional security that only marriage provides and that same-sex parenting introduces additional discontinuity for the adopted child.

According to the Report, adopted children have already suffered the trauma of being abandoned, and, quite often, being uprooted. They must therefore be given the greatest possible protection from the risk that their parents will separate, and that marriage offers children this legal security.

Medical Justification for Assisted Procreation

At present, French law allows assisted procreation for medical reasons only, to counteract sterility arising from pathology, or to avoid the transmission of a serious illness. The reason given for limiting this process is the fact that it is a very expensive procedure (15,000 euros or \$20,306 Canadian dollars), covered by social security. Therefore, the Mission concluded that such procedures should be available only for medically justified reasons. The Mission sensibly concluded that expanding access to medically assisted procreation to same-sex couples would be opening the door to procreation for convenience, independent of any medical consideration. Further, the Mission argued that making assisted procreation available to all women, and without any medical reason, would result in discrimination against male homosexual couples since only lesbian couples would then benefit from such a policy.

Therefore, the Mission rejected any expansion of medical technology to procreate children.

Finally, the Mission stated it was opposed to the insemination of single women, because it would encourage the birth of fatherless children, which would be against the best interests of the child.

Surrogate Motherhood

The Mission opposed the legalization of surrogate motherhood because:

1. it causes the disposal of a human body, i.e. the transferring of the surrogate created child to a couple who arranged for this medical procedure; and
2. it causes the breakdown of maternal filiation or relationship lines.

Further, the Mission stated that surrogacy denies the bond that grows between mother and child during pregnancy and opens the door to a wide range of abuses and for this reason, it deemed surrogacy unacceptable.

Summary of the French Mission Report

In a few simple, forthright statements, the Mission Report has put in perspective the entire issue of same-sex marriage, adoption of children by same-sex couples, and the procreation of children based on the "wants" or desires of adults, but not the best interests of children. The empty arguments, political maneuvering and lies that have permeated this debate in Canada are exposed by the French Mission Report. Canada's policies on same-sex marriage and children are based on extreme political correctness devoid of common sense, mature thought and analysis. Under Canadian policy, children are incidental tools used to advance homosexual rights. Fortunately, France refused to go this route and is one nation that has got this matter right.

SAME-SEX MARRIAGE ISSUE RETURNS IN CANADA

Prime Minister Harper stated, during the recent election campaign, that if he were elected Prime Minister, he would re-visit the issue of same-sex marriage in Parliament. Subsequent to the election, he stated that he would raise this issue, not right away, but "sooner, rather than later".

Although we do not know exactly when Mr. Harper will call for a vote on a motion to re-open the same-sex marriage

issue in Parliament, we do know, from our analysis of the views of the MPs on the issue, that such a vote will be a very close one.

Our deep concern is that Mr. Harper will suddenly announce, without warning, that a vote on the same-sex marriage issue will be held, for example, the following week, and we will not be prepared for such a vote.

Even though we do not know the exact date of the vote, there are several facts that we do know:

The life of the minority Harper government will be approximately 18 months at best. Therefore, we can expect another federal election, at the latest in the summer or fall of 2007. However, the opposition parties could "gang-up" on the minority conservatives in a no-confidence vote and the government could go down to defeat earlier. But, for their own reasons, the opposition parties may not want to bring the government down earlier, and, on the weight of probabilities, the Harper government may hold on until the summer of 2007. On the other hand, senior journalist Douglas Fisher in an article in the Toronto Sun on March 5, 2006, stated that he believes the Harper government will be short lived because the government bureaucracy will undermine it. He also believes the Liberals, who regard themselves as the natural governing party, will do everything within their power to remove the Conservatives from office, the sooner the better.

Mr. Harper wants to enter the next election with the reputation of a sound manager, not as a social conservative (which he is not anyway). Therefore, he will want the hot button issue of same-sex marriage to be gone and forgotten by the time the next election is called. For this reason, we can expect that Mr. Harper will not want a protracted debate by conducting Justice Committee hearings on the issue, which would extend the debate.

Previous Justice Committee Hearings

In this regard, it should be noted that previous Justice Committee hearings which began in early 2003, at the personal request of the then Minister of Justice Martin Cauchon, were a farce: Despite the lengthy hearings, the Committee never issued a final report. This was due to the arrogant and profoundly undemocratic decision of Chief Justice Roy McMurtry of the Ontario Court of Appeal, who ordered that same-sex marriages should become law immediately. This decision ruled out further parliamentary debate as well as any possibility of an appeal to the Supreme Court. Later, when the same-sex marriage Bill, C-38 was sent to the Justice Committee for review in the spring of 2005, the House of Commons and Senate Committee hurried through a mere handful of witnesses in a perfunctory performance: The Committees never intended to give Bill C-38 an in-depth review. Instead they merely rubber-stamped it on behalf of the ruling Liberal government. Under these circumstances, an in-depth review of same-sex marriage in Canada would be well justified. We must insist that such a review take place. Even though Mr. Harper will be reluctant to engage in such a high profile procedure, it is a matter on which he should proceed, providing that Parliament agrees to re-open the issue.

Any delay in calling for the vote in Parliament on whether the marriage issue be re-opened, at least provides a window of opportunity to strengthen support for the traditional definition of marriage - a definition that crosses time, cultures and religions. It is a definition which protects vulnerable children, who thrive best when raised by a mother and father from whom they learn both their gender identity and roles. Moreover, if same-sex marriages are to continue to be legal, we know that polygamous and other such unacceptable partnerships will be legalized in Canada. (See REALity, January /February 2006, Polygamy Marriage Around the Corner, p.11)

Religious Organizations Vulnerable

This coming vote on marriage will also be extremely crucial for religious organizations in Canada, because, contrary to the former Liberal government's assertions, religious groups will inevitably be subject to legal challenges if the legal definition of marriage remains unchanged and continues to include same-sex partners.

The federal legislation permitting same-sex marriages, The Civil Marriage Act, which received Royal Assent on July 20,

2005, provides in S.3, that officials of religious groups are free to refuse to perform a marriage not in accordance with their religious beliefs. However, this provision has no force or effect in law. This is because the legislative authority, in respect to marriage, is divided between the federal Parliament and the provincial legislatures. Under the Constitution Act of 1867, Parliament has competence to determine the capacity to marry, e.g., who may marry whom. But the provinces, under the Constitution Act, have jurisdiction over the solemnization of marriage.

The Supreme Court of Canada, in the Same-sex Marriage Reference, which was handed down on December 9, 2004, confirmed that the provision purporting to preserve religious rights in the federal Civil Marriage Act has no effect. The court concluded that this provision was superfluous because it dealt with a matter of provincial jurisdiction only. The court did assure religious groups that the freedom of religion provision in S. 2(b) of the Charter of Rights would protect religious officials from being compelled by the state to perform marriages of same-sex couples. However, the court also stated that in situations where there is a "collision of rights", the court would be obligated to balance and delineate these colliding rights. This is not reassuring because, in all the cases in which the courts have adjudicated religious freedoms versus homosexual rights, the latter's rights have always triumphed.

A recent example of the collision between religious rights and homosexual rights occurred when the BC Human Rights Tribunal, in 2005, ordered the payment of a fine for "hurt feelings" apparently caused by members of a Catholic Knights of Columbus Council in Port Coquitlam, BC, when they refused to rent their hall to a lesbian couple who wished to use it for their wedding reception. That is, there was a collision of rights between religious freedom and homosexual rights and the homosexual/lesbian rights triumphed. Although the decision acknowledged the right of the Knights, because of their religious beliefs, to refuse to rent the hall to the lesbian couple, they nonetheless, were fined for causing "hurt feelings" and had to pay costly legal expenses to defend themselves.

Another recent case occurred in the province of Manitoba, where a Mennonite-owned summer camp was charged with discrimination by a homosexual male choir because the camp refused to rent the camp premises to it. This case is to be argued before the Manitoba Human Rights Tribunal in the spring.

It is clear that if the definition of marriage continues to include same-sex couples, religious organizations in Canada will be drawn into expensive litigation in order to protect themselves from accusations of discrimination and will be on the losing end when their rights collide with homosexual rights.

In short, the same-sex marriage legislation has created serious problems which warrant our deepest concern.

Therefore, there is much at stake concerning the vote in Parliament on whether the debate should be re-opened. It is crucial that we must become active to ensure that Parliament re-open the debate and then let the majority vote in support of the traditional definition, i.e., a union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others. This will be the last opportunity we will have to do so.

In this regard, REAL Women, along with a number of pro-family groups in Canada, have sent a joint letter to all the religious leaders in Canada - Sikh, Hindu, Muslim, Catholic, Protestant etc., many hundreds of them - requesting that they become involved in this debate, not only for spiritual reasons, but also because of financial considerations due to extensive litigation that is now occurring and will continue if the definition of marriage is not changed.

It is also crucial that individuals become engaged in the forthcoming motion on re-opening the debate.

Please contact your MP on this matter. It is preferable if you meet personally with your MP (accompanied by 6 individuals, if possible, to increase the impact) or, failing that, write a letter. Unfortunately, we have learned that e-mails are not an effective method for getting the message across to MPs, even though they are preferable to no contact at all. Please meet your MP or write that letter without delay. This is our last opportunity to return the traditional definition of marriage to our country.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The other day my husband and son were checking out the newspaper to find out what movies were showing in town, but they could not find anything which they would wish to see. They usually enjoy a good action picture, and they are certainly not prudes, but the fare that was offered was so obscene or violent, or so favourable to the homosexual lifestyle, that they decided instead to stay home and watch television. This was not much better, but at least there were several unobjectionable movies and programs on the menu.

As noted film critic Michael Medved comments in *Hollywood vs. America*, "Hollywood no longer reflects - or even respects the values of most American families. On many of the important issues in contemporary life, popular entertainment seems to go out of its way to challenge conventional notions of decency."

There certainly is a dearth of decent family-oriented movies today, and it is a puzzle why they are produced. Certainly it is not the profit factor, because movies with controversial themes do not earn nearly as much revenue as many of the family-friendly films. For example, as one movie writer conceded, as of February, 2006 the five films nominated for major Academy Awards collectively accounted for little more than 200 million dollars, "barely a ripple next to Hollywood's 2005 domestic revenues of \$8.95 billion..." The real moneymakers in 2005 were movies such as *Star Wars: Episode II - Revenge of the Sith*, and *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*.

The traditional family stands for traditional values which fly in the face of the "liberal" Hollywood endorsement of themes which include gratuitous violence, obscenity, pornography, sexual deviation, and outright animosity toward mainstream religious values. Consider, for example, three of the top Academy Award nominees. The highly-touted *Brokeback Mountain*, which I understand is beautifully filmed, is still basically the story of two homosexual "lovers" whose actions are destructive to themselves and their families. *Capote* is the story of a homosexual writer who is willing to lie and cheat for the sake of his "art". *Transamerica* is the story of a transsexual. It was a surprise to many that *Brokeback Mountain* did not win awards as expected; perhaps the homosexual agenda was simply pushed too hard.

Television is no better. No longer is controversial material limited to late-night viewing. Even in the middle of the day one must be circumspect when channel surfing, especially when children are present, because there is so much graphic sexual content.

One of the "justifications" for outrageous programming and movies is that the producers are willing to take risks in order to protect "artistic integrity". Somehow I doubt this is the real reason. It is far more likely that many of those persons who are in control of the entertainment industry have an agenda to change society in order to reflect their own jaded tastes. Unfortunately, they have to a great extent succeeded.

If you are like me, objectionable movies and television shows are of little account personally, because I simply do not bother to view them. That is fine for those of us who have already developed positive moral values, but what about our young people? They are growing up inundated with visual messages that promote unhealthy sexuality and violence, and they cannot help but be affected.

What can we do to counter this evil? First of all, in an age-appropriate manner, we should have open and honest discussions with our children. There is a lot of garbage out there, and our young people cannot avoid being exposed to it. Help them to recognize when they are being manipulated by the movie or television media. Provide them with solid values, and with well-reasoned arguments to support their beliefs, so that they can stand up for themselves when challenged. So often, when youngsters leave home for college or university, they are ill-prepared to defend the Judeo-Christian values with which they were raised.

REAL Women of Canada always urges its members to take an active role, if at all possible, to promote traditional values. One way to help counter the anti-family agenda, for example, is by contacting the sponsors of offensive television programs. Recently two U.S. television programs which were downright blasphemous were cancelled,

thanks to a powerful letter-writing campaign by members of the public. We can also relay our concerns to the owners of theatre chains. It was due to public pressure that the Famous Players Theatres removed an advertisement promoting same-sex marriage. If enough people protest against objectionable films (and I do not mean by picketing - that seems only to provide unwarranted publicity), then eventually the message might have an effect.

And of course we must continue to pray that there will be a change of heart on the part of those who are presently in control of the entertainment industry.

THE FEMINIST SHELL GAME

300 women claiming to represent all Canadian women met on Parliament Hill in February to supposedly celebrate their work 25 years ago, which resulted in the inclusion of S.28 in the Charter of Rights. Section 28 guarantees that the Charter's provisions apply equally to male and female persons. Ironically, Section 28 of the Charter has turned out to be unused, unproven and without effect, according to the decisions brought down by the Supreme Court of Canada on the Charter.

This feminist meeting in Ottawa, true to form, was funded by the Status of Women and other government departments such as the Department of Justice, and government tax-supported agencies such as the National Film Board, Law Commission of Canada, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and International Development Research Centre (IRDC).

The conference was an all-party project, Liberals, NDP and red Tories, celebrating together. Former Liberal Minister of State for Public Health, Carolyn Bennett, booked Parliament's ballroom for this grand occasion. All the old-time feminist agitators were there. Doris Anderson, former editor of *Chatelaine* magazine when it was in its feminist prime, Beverley Baines from Queen's University who was involved with the feminist constitutional committee meetings 25 years ago, and who currently is one of the lesbian authors of the Status of Women\Justice funded paper which recommended that polygamy cease to be a criminal offense. Lesbian Senator Nancy Ruth [Jackman], generous funder of all things feminist such as the legal arm of the feminist movement LEAF [Women's Legal Educational Action Fund], feminist journalist Michele Landsberg and wife of UN gadabout, Stephen Lewis, and Flora MacDonald who recalled that it was Joe Clark who moved the inclusion of Section 28 in the Charter of Rights which motion she seconded. Flora MacDonald was the inspiration of the political phenomenon known as the "Flora Factor" whereby delegates in a leadership campaign pledge support for a candidate but which does not translate into votes for the candidate. At the 1976 Tory leadership race, in which Flora MacDonald was a candidate, she made the phenomenal blunder of requesting that every Canadian woman send in \$5 to support her campaign. Probably she doesn't even understand today, blinded by her feminist blinkers, that women (and men) do not vote on the basis of anatomy. By this request, Ms. McDonald offended the majority of thoughtful, intelligent women across the country by the implication that she should be supported simply because she was female. She equally offended men for the same reason - all of which easily explains the "Flora Factor". Others in attendance at this feminist fest were former Liberal Cabinet Ministers Elinor Caplan, Sheila Finestone, Hedy Fry and Senator Lillian Dyck. Current members of Parliament included Liberal Parliamentary Leader Bill Graham (Rosedale) and Liberal MP's Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Manitoba) who is the former chairwoman of the House of Commons feminist Standing Committee on the Status of Woman [FEWO]. (See Reality Jan/Feb 2006), Bonnie Brown (Oakville, Ontario) and NDP leader Jack Layton (Toronto-Danforth, Ontario) and his wife, Olivia Chow (Trinity-Spadina, Ontario), former NDP leader and MP Alexa McDonough (Halifax, Nova Scotia), former NDP MP Margaret Mitchell and former president of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women and former MP Lyn MacDonald.

The new Tory "girls" on the block present at the conference were recently elected José Verner, (Louis-Saint-Laurent, Quebec) the current Minister of International Cooperation and La Francophonie and Official Languages, Bev Oda (Durham, Ontario), (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Status of Women) and MP Lynn Yelich (Blackstrap, Saskatchewan) a member of the previous House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women (FEWO).

The conference was advertised widely, but approximately only 300 women mustered the energy to attend when the feminists had expected well over 1000 participants. These meager numbers were directed to sit in the front rows, "we want this to look as packed as possible", as CPAC (Canadian Parliamentary Channel) was taping the proceedings to be run over and over again in the coming months - just as though this feminist gathering had significance.

All in all the old gang of feminists were there for three main purposes:

1. push for national day care;
2. push for a proportional representation electoral system with quotas for females; and
3. revive the dead, or at least, dying feminist movement in Canada.

The feminists had issued a clarion call for women to attend their conference funded mainly by several departments and agencies referred to above, administrated under the former Liberal Government, but also it was financially supported by the three major political parties, Liberal, Conservative and NDP, the Canadian Medical Association Public Policy Forum, BMO Financial Group, and the Ontario Elementary Teachers Federation among others.

Quotas for Female Politicians

In May, 2001, the feminists formed an organization called "Equal Voice" to try to get more women elected to Parliament by way of a quota system which they plan to have integrated in the proportional representation electoral system (See Reality Jan/Feb 2005). They propose to do this in two steps (so as not to alarm the natives!) The first step is to build consensus for a referendum on changing the electoral system from first past the post to proportional representation, and then to ensure that such a system includes a quota for females. The Advisory Board of Equal Voice includes, former MP's Kim Campbell, Sheila Copps, Marion Dewar, Judy Erola, as well as Barbara Hall (former mayor of Toronto and now Chairwoman of the Ontario Human Rights Commission), former NDP leaders Audrey McLaughlin, Alexa McDonough, Lyn MacLeod (former Ontario Liberal leader), Flora MacDonald, MP Anita Neville and Senator Lucie Pepin.

Doris Anderson lamented the lack of female MP's at the conference. She said, "It's got to be changed! ... It's worse than ever. We were 43rd in the world and now we're 45th and going down fast. It's a priority of this conference along with day care!" Bonnie Diamond, Governor General's Persons Award winner, past executive director of National Association of Women and the Law (NAWL), now executive director of MATCH International, warned that we are living in "urgent political times." We are facing global fundamental forces such as the "US, Vatican, Islamist agenda" and there's also "Focus on the Family, well funded, living in Ottawa and circling Parliament Hill." Demonstrating the hypocrisy of feminist support for equality, she stated, "I disagree that we need more women regardless of the belief system of women. We need women in all parties but only women who steadfastly commit to uphold women's equality. We don't need women who will go forward and speak publicly against the gains that women have already made." To loud applause she declared "I urge women who have power to form a sisterhood in all the legislatures to help offset the male bias until we hit that critical mass."

Jean Crowder, NDP MP (Nanaimo-Cowichan, British Columbia) stated that "without incentives like quotas the system doesn't significantly change." Judy Erola stated that political parties are outdated, "we have to change the way the parties function." While Conservative MP Lynn Yelich suggested that the job has to be number one when you are a member of parliament, others pressed for a global quota strategy at all levels, a quota for every position in the party structure. Some wanted quotas to include not only gender but disability, sex diversity, First Nations and other disadvantaged groups, and female quotas at the Cabinet level.

Equal Voice recommends a massive effort at "education" at the Federal, Provincial and Municipal levels as well as outreach into schools from the elementary to secondary level. Michele Landsberg recommended a course in "Women's Studies" be mandated in every high school in Canada.

Feminist Entertainment

A feminist gathering is not complete without a hootenanny.

A 1960's style sing song was popular, complete with feminist irreverence as Linda Palmer Nye quoted anarcho-communist Emma Goldman "If I can't dance I don't want to be a part of your revolution." She sang the following to the tune of Faith of our Fathers:

Faith in first ministers, living still
Trading our rights against our will
O would we could but abort them all
Guilty they'd be of such chauvinist gall
Faith of our rights and equality
First ministers, a blight on thee. Oh men.

Hoots of laughter and cheers emanated from former and sitting parliamentarians in the audience. There was derision of "our Harper Valley Parliament Hill" (peals of laughter), loud applause for NDP luminaries, and annoyance with cutting the deficit which was labeled "economic fundamentalism"- another new form of patriarchy

And the Conservative party supported this conference?

JUDGE ABELLA IGNORES THE LAW - AGAIN

In a justice system with integrity, a judge who has a conflict of interest or a personal bias in a particular case immediately recuses him/herself i.e., withdraws from the case. This is necessary because a bias toward one side of an argument creates a denial of justice in that it precludes a fair hearing. This practice of withdrawing from a case in which a judge has a conflict of interest, is not only common sense, but also is the decent and right thing to do.

This apparently is not the situation in Canada. In our twisted, manipulative and interventionist judicial system, it seems that a judge holding a specific bias, favourable to one side, is regarded as contributing a unique "understanding" or "insight" to the case and, therefore, his/her involvement in the case is regarded as an advantage. This is apparently what occurred in a decision handed down on January 26, 2006, by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Air Canada vs CUPE* (Canadian Union of Public Employees).

This case dealt with the issue of whether Air Canada discriminated against flight attendants, a female-dominated group, by paying them differently for work supposedly of "equal value" to that performed by mechanics and pilots, who are predominately male.

This whole case rested on a provision (s.11) in the Federal Human Rights Act, which provides that it is discriminatory for employers to pay different wages to men and women in the same establishment who are performing work of equal value. This provision was inserted into the Act in 1977. It was based on the ludicrous feminist theory that mischief arises when there is a wage gap between disadvantaged women, who are in gender segregated employment and are paid lower wages due to their work being undervalued, in comparison to the wages paid to men in a male dominated group. This "discrimination" supposedly occurs even though the males may be performing quite different jobs from those of the female group. That is, the issue does not deal with a failure to provide equal pay for equal work, (the law since 1956) but rather the mischief lies in the failure to recognize that the female work is of "equal" value to the work performed by men and, therefore, wages must be the same for both groups.

Determining the "value" of differing jobs is not easy since it is invariably a subjective determination. But, no matter. Although this feminist concept is ridiculous, it was enshrined in the law so it must be complied with. The issue in this case arose in regard to the wages paid flight attendants, (a female dominated group) and pilots and mechanics, (male

dominated jobs) in which it was argued that their respective work was of equal value.

Not to denigrate the important work of flight attendants, but, it seems apparent that serving meals, distributing head sets and in general making passengers comfortable, although important, is considerably different from the training, skill, and responsibilities of airline pilots and mechanics upon whom the lives and safety of the passengers totally depend.

The question before the court in this case was whether the jobs in question could be properly compared on the basis that these employees performed work of equal value and were in the same employment establishment.

S.10 of the Guidelines adopted in 1986 to assist in the interpretation of equal value stated that "employees of an establishment include all employees subject to a "common personnel and wage policy".

In this case, the three categories of workers had separate and distinctive collective agreements and branch-specific manuals that applied to their specific bargaining units. That is, the guidelines indicated that the different groups were not subject to a "common personnel and wage policy" as set out in the Guidelines.

The Federal Human Rights Tribunal had ruled that the wages of flight attendants could not be properly compared to those of the two other groups since "they did not work for the same establishment" based on the fact of their separate collective agreements etc. The Federal Court - Trial Division agreed. However, the Federal Court of Appeal ruled that the three groups were all part of a single, integrated business and their wages should be compared on the basis of their equal "value". The Federal Court of Appeal then referred the case back to the Human Rights Commission to commence comparing the "value" of the three separate occupations.

On appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, the latter court agreed with the Federal Court of Appeal. In a decision, co-written by feminist Justice Rosalie Abella, (her first since her controversial appointment to the court in 2004), she concluded that the three groups were working for the same "establishment" and, therefore, their jobs should be compared for their value to determine whether their wage gap was caused by discrimination.

The Feminist Career of Judge Abella

It can be fairly stated that Madam Justice Abella has been a feminist ideologue throughout her legal career. She scampered up the ladder of success, not so much because of merit or legal ability (she actually practiced law for only a few years), but, rather happily for her, because of a combination of factors, such as her political connections, politically correct views, gender and her minority status religious faith. With these assets she could do no wrong. In the course of her career Madam Justice Abella has fancied herself as a latter day Joan of Arc, using her appointed positions to whack away at perceived injustices, frequently apparent only to herself. She has laboured to change the law in different areas, not according to established principles and precedents rooted in the law, but rather in accordance with her own narrow perspective on feminism and human rights. A 1998 decision, in the Ontario Court of Appeal Rosenberg case, she concluded that homosexual partners were entitled to survivor benefits from their partner's pension plans. She also stated in that decision:

...elected governments may wait for changing attitudes in order to preserve public confidence and credibility. Both public confidence and institutional credibility argue in favour of courts being free to make independent judgments notwithstanding those same attitudes.

Further, she stated in a public speech in October 2000, "the judiciary is accountable less to the public's opinions and more to the public's interest", and that the judges "serve only justice".

She obviously followed her own advice in the Air Canada case. She concluded that, in her judgment, the provision on equal value (S. 11 of the Human rights Act) indicated that the wages of the employees in the case could be compared for purposes of determining whether their work was of equal value. In reaching this decision, Judge Abella did not

look to the current Guidelines for an interpretation about whether the employees worked for the same "establishment". Instead she turned to previous guidelines, no longer in effect, which better suited her purposes.

Thus, Judge Abella (with the remaining six members of the Court obviously bowing to her superior understanding of the issue), flew in the face of the actual law as written on the current regulations, and, relegated the collective agreements of the employees to secondary status in order to create a new definition of a regulated establishment. This creative writing has permitted the trumping of supposed sexual discrimination over the written law. Best of all for Justice Abella, this case gave her the opportunity to write into law something she could not do in 1984 when she served as the sole commissioner on the Royal Commission on Equality in Employment. In that Commission's report, Judge Abella had recommended that the Human Rights Act be amended to extend or broaden the job comparisons of equal value to outside those groups which were employed in the same establishment. With this decision, she has done just that.

There is something very wrong with our justice system when a judge can sit on a court to "read into" the law one of her own previous recommendations. What a blatant lack of objectivity at the highest court in the land! It must be very satisfying for Madam Justice Abella to do so - but it most certainly denigrates the integrity of Canada's justice system.

CHILDREN RESCUED FROM CHILD CARE

Former Liberal Prime Minister Paul Martin made a number of foolish statements during his two years in office. However, perhaps one was more lacking in wisdom than others, in that during the 2004 federal election campaign, he stated that his party would hand over five billion dollars to the provinces to cover the cost of a national child care program. He then went on to say that he would use the Quebec government's "universal" \$7 a day child care system as his model. Judging from recent information on the Quebec model of child care, Canadian children may have been rescued from disaster by the defeat of the Liberal government, which has terminated Mr. Martin's preferred national day care project.

Background to Quebec's Child Care System

The Quebec child care policy began in 1997, the centerpiece of which was the provision of child care spaces for all children aged 0-4 at a parental contribution of \$5 per day. In 2004, the price was increased to \$7 per day. Children were eligible, whether or not the parents were working. The cost of this program for the Quebec government was \$1.56 billion annually, which, in 2004, represented 45% of all of Quebec's provincial budget for families. This new child care policy led to a very large increase in the use of government child care, and a sizeable increase in the labour force participation of married women. The rise in the government child care utilization reflected, however, according to analysis, a reduced use of informal child care arrangements which had been "crowded out" by this new subsidized child care. Partly because of this large "crowd out" of private care, the taxes generated by the new maternal labour supply fell far short of paying for the costs of the increased child care subsidies.

Studies Analyzing the Effects of Child Care Policy in Quebec

In July 2005, a study was released, carried out on behalf of the think tank C.D. Howe Institute by economic professor Michael Baker, from the University of Toronto and Professor Kevin Milligan, University of British Columbia and Jonathan Gruber of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The study was based on the National Longitudinal Survey of children and youth which follows the progress of a large, nationally representative sample of Canadian children. This study found "robust evidence" of marked negative effects on children placed in the Quebec child care facilities. These negative effects included hyperactivity, inattention, aggressiveness, motor/social skills, child health status and illness. Moreover, the analysis found that the child care program led to more hostile, less consistent parenting, worse parental health and lower quality parental relationships.

Almost all research on child care is subjective in nature. Ratings on the quality of child care centres, for instance,

involve a researcher sitting in a daycare making judgments about the interactions of children and teachers. While these results are typically presented as objective facts, they are properly more to be considered opinions. However, in this case, the consistency of the results suggested to the authors the validity of their conclusion, namely that the more access to formal child care in Quebec, the more pronounced the negative impact on both children and their parents.

Why Quebec Child Care Is Detrimental to Children

The obvious question arising from the above study is why the impact of Quebec child care provisions is so detrimental to children.

The answer lies in another study carried out on 1500 day care settings in Quebec. The evaluation was conducted within the framework of the Quebec Longitudinal Study of Child Benefits which annually surveys 2,223 children representative of children born in Quebec in 1997-98. The study was conducted in 2004 by Christa Japel, Professor of Education, University of Quebec in Montreal, Richard Tremblay, Professor, Department of Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine and Psychology at the University of Montreal, and Sylvana Coté, Assistant Professor at the School of Psychoeducation at the University of Montreal. The results of their study included the following:

1. 61% of the Quebec day care centers met the criteria for minimal only quality in that although they ensured health and safety for children, their educational component was minimal.
2. 12% of the child care centers did not reach the minimal quality and were rated as inadequate.
3. Only one-quarter (27%) of the day care centers provided good quality child care that offered services appropriate to the children's development and to which constitute a stimulating environment.
4. In all types of day care settings, the quality of communication and interaction between staff and children was their greatest strength, but the quality of the educational and hygiene provisions were especially problematic.
5. Children who attended the government operated day care centres were generally from more privileged backgrounds than the children who did not. It found that families earning more than \$60,000 comprised 60% of the children in the government's child care spaces, and that children from families earning incomes of less than \$40,000 a year made up less than 20% of the total enrolments.
6. The overall quality of the day care attended by children from less privileged families was significantly lower than that of those attended by children from more privileged families. In this regard, in a previous study published two years ago in the Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, Ms. Coté had found that children from troubled high risk families did benefit from "quality" daycare. However, such "quality" child care for these at-risk children was usually not available. That is, it appears that children from dysfunctional homes could benefit from high quality child care, which, unfortunately is often not available to them.

It is also alarming that the staff to child ratio in the Quebec day care system is extraordinarily high:

- 1 year old - one worker for five (5) children
- 3 year old - one worker for eight (8) children
- 5 year old - one worker for ten (10) children

Any mother who has cared for just one 1 year old child knows how trying and exhausting it can be - but five, one-year olds to care for at the same time, is an impossible task. Just to meet the children's physical needs would be difficult, let alone meeting the emotional and intellectual needs of these little ones.

Further, it is significant that the current Quebec guidelines require only 2.75 square metres of floor space per child, which includes toys, chairs and tables. This is less floor space than is allotted an ordinary work cubicle in a business operation. Children need space, time, love and devotion, not overcrowding with stressed care givers.

The description of child care as being the "warehousing" of children is tragically apt in regard to children in many Quebec child care centres. Because of the inadequacies of the Quebec system, the study recommended the following changes in the Quebec child care plan:

Re-examination of child: worker ratio and the minimum space required per child;

Expansion of centre based child care in low income neighbourhoods and for certain other targeted interventions because the present system has not only failed to reduce social-economic disparities but may instead have aggravated them.

Even though the Quebec government is spending \$1.5 billion annually on child care, fully half of the children under four years of age have not yet been accommodated in the government regulated child care plan. Yet, perhaps these latter children are the lucky ones as revealed by the two recent studies.

WORLD CONGRESS OF FAMILIES IV

Warsaw, Poland, May 11-13, 2007

The World Congress of Families IV will be held in the Warsaw Congress Centre, Warsaw, May 11-13, 2007. The Congress Centre is located in the heart of the city with easy access to major hotels, which will have special group rates. Convents in the area will also provide accommodation at very affordable rates. The Centre has the capacity to hold over 3,000 persons, and has excellent translation and audio-visual equipment. A program for pre and post Congress tourism opportunities is also being prepared for those who may want to extend their visit in Poland.

Why Poland?

The reason why Poland was selected as the location for the fourth World Congress is due to the pivotal role Poland now holds in the European Union (EU). As stated in the article, "Europe: Marches to Its Death," the EU is in its death throes. It is being destroyed by its rabid rejection of its Christian roots, the denial of the economic problems caused by its low birth rate, and the promotion of abortion, euthanasia and homosexuality.

Poland, on the other hand, a member of the EU, has resolutely rejected such policies and proudly promotes its own rich cultural heritage and religion, including the importance of the family and the sanctity of human life. It rejected the socialist-led government that has been in power since the fall of communism in 1989, and elected the pro-life/family Law and Justice Party. Prime Minister Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz has publicly stated that homosexuality is unnatural, the family is natural, and that the state must stand guard over the family.

Lech Kaczynski, who, as Mayor of Warsaw, banned "gay pride parades" two years in a row, has recently been elected President of Poland.

Poland's Turbulent History

The strength of Poland through its long and turbulent history has always been its determination to protect its heritage. Poland has no natural protective borders, such as mountains or the sea, and is bordered by Russia on one side, and Germany on the other. As a result, it has been overrun many times by conquerors, but Poland has never submitted its spirit to its conquerors' will. Throughout its difficult history, Poland has determinedly continued to be Poland. Its great composers continued to compose, its writers continued to write, and Poland preserved its language and faith, never succumbing to the external pressures to change.

So today, Poland has taken on the role of helping Europe from itself due to the fact that the World Congress of Families, held in Warsaw, will invigorate and encourage those remaining faith-based Europeans to carry on with their beliefs and values, assured that they are not alone.

Why Poland then? Europe is almost lost; to the demographic winter and to the secularists. If Europe goes, much of the world will go with it. Almost alone, Poland has maintained strong faith and strong families. Poland has saved Europe before. It is likely she will save Europe again. On family and population questions, Europe is the battleground

in the early years of the 21st century, and Poland is the pivot point. It makes abundant sense that The World Congress of Families IV meet among the brave people of Poland.

Poland Overjoyed by the Proposed Congress

Offers to support the World Congress of Families IV in Warsaw have come from Marek Jurek, the Speaker of the Lower House of Poland's legislature, called the "Sejm", from eight members of the Polish Senate, the Law and Justice Party, the Polish Farmers' Party and the Advisors on Family Affairs and Educational Affairs to the Prime Minister of Poland, Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz. The Catholic Church in Poland, under Archbishop Kazimierz Majdanski, has formally endorsed WCF IV as well.

The Strength of Poland

In addition to its strongly held belief in faith, life and family, Poland is also a physically secure and well-organized country that is sympathetic to the West. It is a member of NATO and a supporter of western objectives in establishing democratic principles and the rule of law.

Because Poland is a country of emigration, rather than immigration, it does not have a dissident, ideologically based population, which has caused so much harm recently in Spain, England and France. A visit to Poland will mean a safe, fascinating voyage into a different culture full of history and old world charm.

Congress Meetings:

The First World Congress of Families convened in Prague, The Czech Republic, in March, 1997. Over 700 delegates from 200 organizations in 43 nations took part.

The World Congress of Families II (WCF II) convened in Geneva, Switzerland, in November, 1999. Over 1,600 delegates from 270 organizations in 65 nations attended WCF II, with strengthened numbers from South America, Africa, the Middle East.

The Third World Congress (WCF III) occurred in Mexico City, March 29-31, 2004, with over 3,000 registered participants (well above our goal of 2,500) from 75 countries.

At the World Congress of Families IV (WCF IV) scheduled for May 11-13, 2007 in Warsaw, Poland, it is anticipated that over 3,500 delegates from over 75 nations around the world will attend.

The Importance of the World Congress Meetings

The World Congress meetings serve a vitally important role in that they compile well-researched papers on the importance of the traditional family. Each Congress also prepares a Declaration on the Family which nations may use as a guideline or standard to assist them in developing their own policies.

It was good news to learn that six of the "new" members of the European Union - namely the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Latvia, Poland, Lithuania and Estonia all formally endorsed the March 2004 Mexico City Declaration of the World Congress of Families. One of the members of the Drafting Committee of the Mexico City Declaration, by the way, was Gwen Landolt, our National Vice President.

The World Congress IV in Poland will draw large delegations from Eastern Europe as well as the nations from the former Soviet Union. Attendance from pro-family groups in Western Europe, especially Germany and France, will also be likely. It's shaping up to be the most exciting dynamic and productive World Congress of Families to date. We hope you will consider joining in the international celebration of life and family.

Further information on this World Congress will be included in future issues of REALity as the information becomes available.

WHO IS IN CHARGE AT FOREIGN AFFAIRS?

Having been a presence in the United Nations for many years, REAL Women of Canada has been witness to the remarkable zeal with which the Canadian delegations have promoted an extreme liberal agenda. With the conservatives narrowly gaining power, we were curious to see if something as minor as a federal election would have any effect on the powerful leftist movement our country has led at the UN, up until now. It hasn't. It was business as usual for the Canadians, at the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, held February 27 to March 10, 2006, in New York, where delegates from around the world gathered to discuss women's participation in development and decision making.

Perhaps the newly elected Conservative government was only just settling in, so reasonably, could not make any substantial changes in foreign policy. However, we should expect Canada's international role to reflect the conservative mandate to protect family values, fundamental human rights, and national sovereignty, particularly as modern foreign affairs extend far beyond peacekeeping and foreign aid to include a host of serious moral and social issues.

The current problem with the UN Canadian mission is that our chief representatives and negotiators are leftist ideologues who are engaged in promoting questionable ideas, such as 'sexual rights', 'reproductive services', and 'gender mainstreaming'.

For example, in drafting this year's document at the Commission on the Status of Women, Canada's delegation promoted and supported such terminology as 'sexual rights', which is interpreted to include homosexual marriage, decriminalized prostitution, and child sexual rights, all of which the conservative party claims to oppose.

The Canadian delegation also supported the term 'reproductive services', in the document which previous Canadian delegations have admitted is interpreted to include abortion. Since abortion is legal in Canada, the only reason the delegation would promote it at the UN is to apply pressure on other nations to change their national abortion laws in compliance with our demands. Is this reflective of the Canadian spirit?

Even more bothersome, the Canadian delegation, at this Commission on the Status of Women meeting, supported the concept of creating quotas for female candidates in elections. This is the very same proposal put forward at the feminist February conference. (See article *The Feminist Shell Game* p. 6). Who is giving direction to the Canadian delegation? Is it the feminists from their command post in Ottawa, instead of our Minister of Foreign Affairs, Peter MacKay? REAL Women of Canada's representative, Ginger Malacko, spoke with the Canadian negotiator on this controversial subject and was told that Canada would support the demand for quotas, depending on the formulation of the language and which nations were promoting it! Does this mean that Canada will allow the UN to meddle in our electoral process if our buddies in the European Union tell us to? Of course, the real question is: does our new conservative government support the idea of electoral quotas for women, or does it mean we have a renegade delegation on our hands that is moving forward, unchecked, under the direction of the feminist sisterhood?

On the other hand perhaps, however, the Canadian delegation at the Status of Women meeting was making a last ditch effort to push personal beliefs before the conservative government can interfere. It's interesting however, that just weeks ago, at a foreign affairs consultation in Ottawa with non-government organizations, which REAL Women also attended, Canadian officials stated that they would not change their approach and that delegations would follow through with existing Liberal government directives.

In summary, either the conservative government feels that there is no need to make changes in the way Canada negotiates at the UN, hasn't had the time to change the situation, or perhaps believes breaking away from the status quo will be too controversial. Canada has been a strong promoter of abortion, homosexuality and left-leaning democracy for a very long time. It will require a level of diplomatic skill and backbone to make the appropriate adjustments to our foreign policy.

After all the election buzz about integrity and accountability, who is ultimately accountable for what goes on during UN negotiations? What we need is some clear leadership from Ottawa that will make Canadian foreign policy representative of current Canadian law and Canadian tradition and the views of the Canadian public, rather than the ideology of the feminist extremists who dominate the Canadian delegation. Shouldn't these feminist delegations be sent into retirement and be replaced by individuals more in tune with the views of the Canadian public? What we need is a Conservative government that isn't afraid of being conservative.

EUROPE: MARCHING TO ITS DEATH

It is an extraordinary fact that Europe is marching to its death. The Population Reference Bureau (PRB) in its report, entitled "2004 Population Data Sheet", released in November 2004, estimated that the European Union population will fall by 96 million by 2050, even if it gains 600,000 immigrants a year. That is, to sustain its present workers-to-retirees ratio, Europe will require an astonishing 13.5 million more immigrants.

European Union's Birth Rate

For the European Union as a whole, the average birth rate is only 1.5 children per woman, with several countries with a birth rate of less than 1.3 - such as Greece, Spain, Germany, Italy and some countries in Eastern Europe. Ben Wattenberg, in his book, "Fewer: How the New Democracy of Depopulation Will Shape our Future", warned that never in the last 650 years, since the time of the Black Plague, have birth and fertility rates fallen so far, so fast, so low, for so long, in so many places".

This low birth rate has led to the undermining of the entire social security system in major European nations. The choice is stark: reform the pension, unemployment benefits and social security now, or risk crippling economic and social costs down the line.

However, reform proposals in Europe have met with a backlash. In fact, this backlash was one of the reasons why German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder lost his position in Germany's recent election. The fact is that Europeans are not prepared to be deprived of any of their benefits, no matter how necessary this is for the viable future of their country.

Decrease in Economic Productivity

The low fertility rate has already decreased economic productivity in the European Union. In the 1970's, European nations' annual growth averaged almost 3%. But from 2001 to 2004, the annual average was 1.2%. In 1974, the European Union countries held unemployment at 2.4%, but in 2004 the rate was 8.9%. By 2050 the European Union share of local productivity will shrink by nearly half from today's 18% to 10%.

It should be pointed out here that although Canada's birth rate is as low as those of the European countries, our economy is booming due to huge energy exports. However, what will happen when this comes to an end? Our destiny will be the same as that of Europe.

European Union's Debt Burden

The low fertility rate and ageing population has led the European Union to face debt burdens worse than those experienced during the Second World War. According to the Financial Times (April 2004), European Union countries, including Germany and France, will see their debt grow to over 200% of gross domestic product by 2050. Such negative momentum has not been experienced on such a large scale in the world's history.

Europe's Inaction to Problems

Tragically, in general, the European Union is immobilized by its low birth rate and economic problems which are rapidly turning the European Union into one of history's "has beens". Too many people are benefiting from the status quo to provide the stamina to change, even though the status quo is simply not sustainable. Europeans seem to find it too strenuous to have children, to stop illegal immigration, or even to reach out to vary its sources of immigration. Europeans are just too comfortable to change their ways, or perhaps too self absorbed to take notice of the warning signs of looming disaster.

Immigration from the Muslim World

The void caused by the low birth rate in the European Union is being rapidly filled by Muslims. Islam is robust, assertive, and ambitious, and Muslims reproduce in large numbers. Some 5% of the European Union, or nearly 20 million persons at present identify themselves as Muslims. If current trends continue, the number will reach 10% by 2020, which is not that far away. At present demographic rates, by 2020, the majority of Holland's children under 18 years old will be Muslim.

Most Muslims in the European Union are content to be law abiding and culturally integrated, and are resourceful and industrious citizens in their adopted countries. However, there are other Muslims who feel alienated as evidenced by the riots that recently shook France, the train bombing in Madrid several years ago, as well as by the subway bombing that took place in London in July, 2005. Muslim sections of Paris, Rotterdam and other European Union cities are already labeled "no go zones" for non-Muslims, including armed policemen because of these violent Muslims.

Some Muslims refuse to assimilate because they believe they have a religious duty not to integrate. The isolation of such young Muslims, particularly those of the second-and third-generations, indicates they are no longer strongly connected to their family's country of origin, nor do they intend to become part of their adopted country. Instead, they form their own Muslim conscience from the Internet, books, videotapes and audiotapes as well as from radical "experts" and local Mullahs (religious leaders).

Thus, in this constantly morphing environment, an increasingly radical Islam is emerging within the European Union. Disconnected from their homelands, isolated from their non-Muslim neighbours and fellow workers, and alienated from their elders, these young Muslims find the strange disembodied, globalized radical Islam very appealing.

This serious situation has proliferated as a result of cultural tolerance which, since World War II, has slowly turned Europe's attitude into a surprising self-loathing of western culture, and especially of Christianity, although the latter is the very foundation of Europe.

Europe's Rejection of Christianity

This rejection by the European Union of its Christian heritage was apparent when its proposed Constitution was drafted: It completely ignored Europe's Christian past, which for centuries generously served Europe and was the very heart of European culture.

According to columnist Mark Steyn, Europe's decline is directly linked to its hostility toward its very roots, which is the Christian faith. Europe's rejection of what Christianity teaches about faith, morality and family has made the continent assume a different world view. This has led to Europe's attempts to eliminate every last trace of Christianity from its midst. For example:

1. In 2002, the European Union's Parliament adopted reports providing legislation and budgeting for the "harmonizing" and provision of access to abortion throughout the European Union. This same report also included a full-scale attack on Christianity, particularly against Pentecostals, Evangelicals, and Roman Catholics.

Ironically, the treaties that formed the European Union (the Rome Treaty and the Maastricht Treaty) stated explicitly that health services and medical care (which includes abortion), are not within the competence of the European Union Parliament. Yet, as early as March 9, 1999, a resolution by the European Parliament stated that it was in support of the legalization of abortion.

2. In June 2005, an Italian, Rocco Buttiglione, a devout Roman Catholic, was forced to resign his candidacy for the position of Justice Commissioner for the European Union Commission as he had stated, during his confirmation hearings, that he believed that homosexuality was a sin, and that a child was better off with a mother and father.

As a result of his truthful, but politically incorrect statement, and his withdrawal, he was replaced by the fierce anti-Christian, secularist, Franco Frattini.

3. In October, 2005, the European Union's Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of European Union (PACE) adopted a resolution which recommended that European Union Countries ensure that women not be subject to religiously inspired policies and laws, such as abortion law. The resolution went on to state that its members must:

Ensure that the freedom of religion and the respect for culture and tradition are not accepted as a pretext to justify violations of women's rights, including when underage girls are forced to submit to religious codes [where] their access to contraception is barred by their family or community.

4. In December 2005, a 40 page opinion from the European Union network of Independent Reports on Fundamental Rights criticized a proposed treaty between the Vatican and Catholic Slovakia, which prohibits medical professionals from participating in abortion and other procedures because of their faith. This report also included the following provisions:

- * Countries where assisted suicide is legal must provide easy access to these services, and medical doctors may not deprive any person from the possibility of exercising effectively his or her rights as guaranteed under the applicable legislation.

- * Any violation of rights to marriage for same-sex couples or transsexuals should not be tolerated, and public authorities must ensure officers are available to celebrate these unions.

- * Pharmacists should be obliged to dispense drugs to which they are morally opposed, including the abortifacient pill, regardless of their religious conscience.

5. In January 2006, the European Union Parliament passed a resolution against "homophobia" and urged member states to ban "homophobia", which it equated with racism, xenophobia, anti-semitism and sexism. Although the resolution is legally non-binding, the new European Union's Justice Minister, Franco Frattini, announced that nations that did not eliminate all forms of discrimination, including the approval of homosexual marriages, would be subject to sanctions and eventual expulsion from the European Union.

Discord in the European Unity

REAL Women has attended many UN conferences where we have cringed whenever delegates from the European Union speak. We know with certainty that they will be putting forward totally unacceptable anti-life / family proposals. Sadly, Canada's delegation works at the UN, hand in glove with the European Union. These two entities work in tandem to eliminate from all UN documents protection of religion, and life and family.

REAL Women has assumed over the years, that the European Union countries were united in their anti-life / family positions as expressed at the UN. This, however, is apparently no longer the case. There is a growing conflict between the "old" European Union nations, which initially numbered 15 nations and included Germany, France, Britain, Denmark, Spain, Greece etc. and the "new" 10 member nations, which mostly come from Eastern Europe. These "new" European Union countries, such as Poland, Latvia, Slovakia, the Czech Republic and Estonia refuse to permit homosexual unions (as does Italy), and oppose the European Unions Parliament's resolution on homophobia and

abortion and euthanasia.

Further, to the anger of France and Germany, who fancy themselves are the leaders of the European Union, these eastern European nations supported the US on the War in Iraq. The independence of these Eastern European countries is derived from the many years they were held under the heels of dictators, such as Stalin and Hitler. These countries refuse to be ordered around by others now - no matter who they may be, as evidenced by their rejection of the European Parliament's anti-Christian policies.

Summary

Unless there are immediate changes in Europe, one of the most brilliantly successful societies will collapse due to its lack of cultural confidence, and offspring. The only question left will be whether Europe will go peacefully into the night or through convulsions and violence.

REAL WOMEN OF CANADA CONFERENCE

Saturday, June 3, 2006 Cariboo Christian Fellowship 7200 Cariboo Road, Burnaby BC

Annual General Meeting: Friday, June 2, 2006

Cariboo Road Christian Fellowship

5:45 p.m. Italian Dinner (Speaker TBA) All Welcome \$20.00

7:15 p.m. REAL Women of BC AGM

8:00 p.m. REAL Women of Canada AGM

(Members only for AGMs)

Conference Schedule Saturday, June 3, 2006 Cariboo Road Christian Fellowship 7200 Cariboo Road, Burnaby BC

8:00 - 8:45 a.m.	Breakfast Social and Registration
9:00 a.m.	Opening and Welcome Lorraine McNamara, National President
9:15 - 10:00 a.m.	Senator Anne Cools The Positive Constitutional Relationship Between the Courts and the Parliament of Canada
10:00 - 10:45 a.m.	Ginger Malacko REAL Women Working at the UN
10:45 - 11:15 a.m.	Refreshment Break
11:15 a.m.	TBA
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch and Socialize with Speakers
1:30 - 1:45 p.m.	REAL Women of Canada National Award
Presentation by	Lorraine Mcnamara, National President
1:45 - 2:45 p.m.	Heather Stillwell Effective Political Activism at the Local Level
2:45 - 3:00 p.m.	Refreshment Break
3:00 - 4:00 p.m.	C. Gwendolyn Landolt REAL Women On the Go: Our Future Work
4:00 - 4:30 p.m.	Questions fo Speakers and Wrap up

OUR SPEAKERS

SENATOR ANNE COOLS

The Honourable Anne Cools is a graduate of McGill University and was appointed to the Senate in 1984. Senator Cools was instrumental in creating social services to assist battered women and families in crisis. She was an instructor in the Faculty of Social Work at the University of Toronto, Senecs College and Ryerson Polytechnic Institute in Toronto. She continues her work in the Senate to help strengthen troubled families and is deeply committed to the concept that children need meaningful involvement of both their mother and father after divorce.

GINGER MALACKO

Ginger makes her home in Lethbridge, Alberta. She spent her teen years actively working with youth groups which strived to uphold high moral values.

She has represented REAL Women at many UN conferences since 1999. As a lobbyist she attended 16 sessions, commissions and/or summits at the UN in New York and Geneva covering moral and social issues including and pertaining to women's rights, aging, cloning, population, environment, children's rights and human rights.

Her most recent conference was the Commission on the Status of Women in New York from February 27 to March 10th 2006.

HEATHER STILWELL

Trustee for the Surrey Public School Board. She has served on the Board for 13 years. Heather is the Past President of Surrey Delta Pro-life, BC Pro-life & Alliance for Life. She is a founding member of the Christian Heritage Party of Canada, an outspoken common sense advocate for parental rights, family values and the right to life. She is married with 8 children and 7 grandchildren.

C. GWENDOLYN LANDOLT

A founding member and National Vice-President of REAL Women of Canada, Gwen is a graduate of the Faculty of Law, University of British Columbia and was called to the BC Bar. She has worked in private practice, as a Crown Prosecutor, and with the Federal Justice Department. She has written numerous briefs and articles with special emphasis on constitutional issues, in particular the Charter of Rights. She is married with 5 children.

[Click Here to download your copy of the Conference Registration Form](#)

This is a PDF file you must have Adobe Reader.

For more information: Contact Sharen Frewing
Tel 1-604-434-6737 Email: frewing@shaw.ca

Conference Registration Fee:

\$65.00 if payment is received before May 12, 2006

\$75.00 if payment is received after May 12, 2006

\$50.00 for spouses and students

Friday Night Italian Dinner, entertainment and speaker

\$20.00 Please register before May 31, 2006

To register for Conference and Friday night dinner,
contact Lillian Middleton, Tel 1-604-597-0448 Email: middleton@telus.net