

DEMAND FOR SAME SEX MARRIAGE WAS A HOAX

Same-sex marriage was undemocratically passed into law in Canada in June 2005. The then Liberal government, aided by the secular media, argued that same-sex marriage was necessary on the basis of “equality” for homosexuals who were supposedly experiencing painful discrimination because they could not enter into legal recognized marriages with their same-sex partners. This, it turns out, was a lie.

Certainly many homosexuals themselves made clear at that time that same-sex marriage was not a concern in their community. For example, Gareth Kirkby, then managing editor of the homosexual newspaper, Xtra West, stated back on September 6, 2001, that:

In our culture, we haven't created the same hierarchy as has heterosexual culture. We know that love has many faces, and names, ages, places... We know that a 30-year relationship is not better, no better, than a nine-week, or nine-minute, fling – it's different, but not better. Both have value. We know that the instant intimacy involved in that perfect 20-minute [sic]...in Stanley Park can be a profoundly beautiful thing. We know a two-year relationship where people live apart is as beautiful, absolutely as beautiful, as a 30-year relationship where people live together. We know that the people involved in an open relationship can love each other as deeply as the people in a closed relationship...

Mitchel Raphael, Editor-in-Chief of the Toronto-based homosexual magazine, “Fab” stated in an editorial in the May 5, 2005 issue:

The gay marriage movement in Canada has been spearheaded by a handful of lawyers and a few homo activists who most queers couldn't name if their lives depended on it. For a multiplicity of reasons – queer apathy, for one – there has been no mass gay movement supporting same-sex marriage here in Canada.

Yet, Liberals working in close collaboration with the homosexual lobby group, EGALE, assisted by a compliant media, pushed through the same sex marriage bill despite the views of the public as well as of the homosexual community itself.

Those who opposed same-sex marriage for very valid reasons could not get a word in the media or in Parliament where very little dissent was permitted. Those who objected to same sex marriage were curtly dismissed as bigoted reactionaries willfully discriminating against deserving and decent same-sex couples who only wanted to publicly pledge and commit their love.

It turns out, however, according to recently released statistics, that pledging their love by legal marriage is not high on the agenda for homosexuals. Recently released federal figures from Statistics Canada indicate that less than 5% of homosexual Canadians have bothered to marry since same-sex marriage was legalized in 2005.

What is more, the lies and distortions by the media, and former Liberal government on this issue are still continuing. This was disclosed from a surprising source – namely the Ottawa Hill Times in its September 24, 2007 issue in an article written by its regular columnist, Tom Korski. The Hill Times, by the way, is a prominent newspaper distributed to all the politicians and bureaucrats on Parliament Hill on a weekly basis. In short, it's read by everyone who counts on Parliament Hill. The article points out that the Canadian media is still covering up for homosexuals on the same-sex marriage issue by its failure to report the small number of homosexuals who have actually married in Canada and further that the media still takes its propaganda direct from the homosexual lobbyists EGALE. This only proves what we already know – the secular media is nothing more than a propaganda machine for the politically correct.

As usual, the ever prescient Gareth Kirkby of Capital Xtra makes clear how the work for same-sex marriage was a total waste of time and money. In an editorial in the October 18, 2007 issue of the newspaper he sums up the same-sex

marriage issue as follows:

Remember the headlines as media picked up on the propaganda of pro-marriage forces, like EGALE and Canadians for Equal Marriage? The headlines that claimed we were flocking to city hall and churches to get the deed done as courts legalized same-sex marriage province after province. And again, similar headlines as the lobbyists claimed we were rushing to say our vows out of fear that Stephen Harper would reverse federal legislation allowing marriages nationwide. EGALE claimed last October that 10,000 couples had married. It was a lie. Very few among us are eager to embrace marriage rights...

Didn't we just spend a decade and by some estimates \$2 million to wage this fight? Didn't we just put all our other major issues virtually on ice because some couples, a few lawyers and a couple of out-of-touch lobby groups decided that same-sex marriage was the only thing that really mattered...

Marriage is a heterosexual institution designed by the church, endorsed by the state, with the intention of controlling the sexuality of women and by extension, their husbands. [Sic]...

I don't expect the wedding rate will pick up. We have something better in our relationships, something that allows for a variety of friendships, f... buddies, lovers, sisters and exes. We don't put all the pressures on one person ...

We don't need the limitations of marriage. So we're taking a pass. But what a waste of time and money, and a tragic diversion of focus, in that decade-long fight. Let's move on to more important work.

The following is the revealing article on same sex marriage published in The Hill Times (September 24, 2007).

Republished from *The Hill Times* By Tom Korski , Monday, September 24, 2007 E-Mail: News@hilltimes.com

This just in ... less than five per cent of gay Canadians wed since 2005

For all the hype and histrionics, new data show gay Canadians are just mild about marriage. Ironic, yes?

The Commons, courts, and churches were spurred into years-long debate over the issue in the belief it was vital or at least relevant to the gay community. Yet recent federal figures show less than five per cent of gay Canadians have wed since the country legalized same-sex marriage in 2005.

The number was not widely reported. Instead, a media image depicted gay Canadians enthusiastically embracing traditional roles at the exact moment the rest of society spirals into family dysfunction.

"Thank heavens for gay marriage," wrote Globe and Mail columnist Margaret Wentz. "Without it, the most ancient of all our social institutions would be in even worse decline than it already is."

Other journalists advised readers "the nuclear family is fading away," (Edmonton Sun) and that "same-sex couples are taking the reins," (CTV.ca), or mocked "The myth of the perfect family," (Vancouver Sun) and lamented "there is no such thing as traditional family anymore," (Moose Jaw Times Herald).

In one comically inelegant phrase CTV National's Lloyd Robertson told viewers, "If you're part of a so-called traditional family where the children are raised by a mother and father who are married, you seem to be a declining breed."

Breeders in decline: How's that a Happy Father's or Mother's Day card?

Media mythology was helped along by lobbyists like EGALE, the group Equality for Gays and Lesbians that campaigned to amend marriage law. EGALE also petitioned the federal government to alter the wording of 2006 census forms to encourage the reporting of gay unions.

A gay journalist, John McKellar, once wrote of EGALE's campaign, "Despite the impression you get from the media, marriage barely shows up on our community's radar screen." EGALE's focus was "nonsense," he wrote in a 2005 National Post essay.

New data prove McKellar was right.

Census surveys found only 7,465 gay married couples in Canada. It is a fraction the number cited by gay lobbyists. Then-EGALE organizer Laurie Arron last October 24 told CTV NewsNet "over 10,000 same-sex couples have gotten married." An even high number 12,438 was cited in a Nov. 20 news release.

"There are more and more all the time," he told a reporter. Resulting coverage was, well, dizzying. "Gay and lesbian couples are marrying at a dizzying pace," gasped the Victoria Times-Colonist.

Media failed to note the actual incidence of same-sex marriage was miniscule.

StatsCan three years ago calculated the number of homosexual and bisexual Canadian at 316,900. It was the first enumeration of its kind (see StatsCan Daily, June 15, 2004, "Community Health Survey" pg. 9). The number of married couples – 7,465 or fewer than 15,000 men and women – represents only 4.7% of the community.

When census data was released, StatsCan compiled background information to explain the subject to reporters. "It was available to anybody who asked for it," a statistician told me. How many asked for it? "Not many."

Instead, some media sought the help of gay lobbyists in depicting just the right image of same-sex relationship. CBC-TV's Sasa Petricic illustrated a Sept. 12 story on family demographics with a young gay couple, Kevin Smith and Neil Pengelly, strolling with a baby in a Toronto park. One of them, Smith, said other gay people were eager to "have the family life they've always wanted to have."

Petricic concluded, "All kinds of policies which were drafted in a different era for a different Canada will have to reconsidered now. ... Laws on custody and divorce will have to be rewritten."

The inference was misleading: 95.3 percent of gay Canadians do not choose "family life" as shown by the TV couple.

Interestingly, Smith, Pengelly and baby were videotaped strolling through the identical park in a similar story on CTV National that same evening.

How did rival TV networks use the same couple to present a Leave It To Beaver image of gay married life? CBC refused to comment; but a CTV spokesman confirmed the network contacted an unnamed "prominent gay and lesbian organization" for assistance with its story. It declined to name the organization. The result seemed to be a staged stroll for the cameras.

Less-scripted coverage might have provoked interesting questions of public interest.

Such as, why are gay Canadians so ambivalent about marriage? Who does EGALE really speak for? And do Ottawa's gay lobbyists deserve the media platform they enjoy?

WHAT THE 2007 ONTARIO ELECTION REVEALED

The Ontario election is quite a story. It laid bare, not just the Ontario political situation, but, also, for the most part, the political scene in most of Canada. It did not indicate that the Liberals are once again on the ascendancy, even though the seat distribution was 71 Liberals, 26 Conservatives and 10 NDPs. What it did disclose was that a Conservative party cannot hope to win an election without the support of social conservatives.

John Tory, the Ontario Conservative leader, is a Red Tory. He was once an advisor, in the 1970's and 1980's, to former Ontario Conservative Premier Bill Davis. The latter consistently took the middle or liberal position in his policies, which led to his successive victories. What Mr. Tory did not understand was that politics in Ontario and in Canada, as a whole, have changed. Canada and Ontario have moved, by incremental steps, to right of centre in the intervening years – despite the newspapers' constant left wing positions, as well as those of other media outlets, especially the unflinchingly left wing CBC.

The move to the right has been so slow and imperceptible that it is only now that we can look back and marvel at the change. Mr. Tory mistakenly trod in Mr. Davis' exact footsteps, taking the middle or so-called "moderate" position in his policies, believing that he would attract the voters from the middle. At the same time, he cast the social conservatives the supposed gold coin of extended funding for faith-based schools. The "gold" of his coin, however, was dross as even the supporters of Christian and Jewish schools balked at this policy since it would also provide funding for Muslim schools. Many believe the Muslim schools will be funded by Middle East interests, as well as the Ontario government. As a result, these schools would likely teach Muslim students much more than the Ontario school curriculum, such as Sharia Law (Muslim Law), as well as create future soldiers for the Jihad (holy war).

In keeping with his red conservative philosophy, Mr. Tory proudly supported same-sex marriage and was a prominent presence in the Toronto Gay Pride Parade in June 2007, beaming proudly at his supposed "tolerance" for marching in the parade. He did not grasp that his presence at the Gay Parade sealed his political doom. No social conservative can stomach Mr. Tory.

The turnout at the Ontario election in October hit a record low, breaking even the record set in 1923 of 54.7%. In fact, only 52.6% of the eligible voters in Ontario went to the polls in October, 2007. We can be certain that many of the no-shows at the polling booths were social conservatives.

Conservative Leaders Today

A Conservative leader today can no longer ride under the banner of conservatism without having a platform of conservative policies based on genuine conservative values. This is not to say that he must support all the conservative causes. The voters are not ready for that – yet. A conservative leader must also appear to be reasonable and "moderate" in some areas in order to accommodate the middle ground so as not to appear as one of those scary "right wing ideologues". Social conservatives understand this, and are willing to accommodate some so-called "moderate" policies, since we know that we do not have the mass to win an election on our own as yet. We can wait. But, there are certain issues on which we will not support a conservative leader. That is, a conservative leader must protect and support the traditional family, on which the future of society depends, he must support those laws that uphold the fabric of society, such as laws prohibiting illicit drug use, prostitution, pornography, euthanasia, etc. Also social conservatives insist on lower taxes, security, both internally and externally, with a strong police force and tough legislation against violent crimes and terrorism – the latter, fortunately, included in the federal Throne speech in October, 2007. To promote policies in contradiction of these and other basic conservative values is to fatally alienate social Conservatives without which there will, with certainty, be no conservative victory.

On September 22, 2004, REAL Women wrote to the then members of the Ontario Conservative caucus advising them that unless their leader, John Tory, pulled back on his policies, to represent the views of social conservatives (which included abandoning his policies in support of same-sex marriage and homosexual rights) that social conservatives would not vote for him and that he would be defeated in the next provincial election. He did not pull back and, as a result, lost not only the election, but also a seat for himself in the legislature. The inept Liberals, who should have been defeated in Ontario for numerous reasons, are now laughing with glee over the even greater ineptitude of the opposition Conservatives. The election was the Conservatives to win – if only they had understood that the political game has vastly changed in today's Ontario.

The Referendum on Changing the Voting System

The referendum on changing the voting system from the present system of first-past-the-post to the proposed Mixed Member Proportional system, whereby the political parties could appoint 39 of the legislators in the provincial legislature, based on the popular vote their parties received in the election, was soundly rejected by the voters.

In order to pass, the MMP system required 60% approval. Instead, it received only 36.7% approval, with 63% disapproving of the change. This is similar to what occurred in PEI, New Brunswick and British Columbia when they tried to change the voting system. However, the British Columbia vote was very close and another referendum will be held in British Columbia's 2008 provincial election.

The proposed change in B.C. is much more complicated than that proposed in Ontario. In fact, it was so complicated that few apparently really understood it and, therefore, it is believed, many just went along with it. We hope that the same phenomenon will not occur in the next B.C. referendum on a proposed new voting system.

A New Ontario Conservative Leader

The Ontario Conservatives are planning a leadership review in February, 2008. At the time of writing, Mr. Tory insists he plans to fight to keep his job. It will be a pity if he does, as REAL Women can safely predict that, if so, the Ontario Liberals will win again in the 2011 election.

Hopefully, however, the Conservative party will be reading the political ashes of its defeat in Ontario and will choose a leader more suitable for these political times – which means one who is more attuned to socially conservative values..

WHY WE CANNOT TRUST THE MEDICAL AUTHORITIES ON GARDASIL HPV VACCINE

Medical health authorities have repeatedly assured us that Gardasil, the vaccine injection given to young girls to allegedly prevent cervical cancer, is perfectly safe. For example, the National Advisory Committee on Immunization, a group of medical specialists, endorsed the vaccine last February. The Society of Gynecologic Oncologists of Canada claims the vaccine is safe, as does Dr. David Butler-Jones, Canada's Chief Public Health Officer. The Canadian Pediatric Society and the Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Canada have also endorsed the vaccine.

These medical authorities, however, are puzzled, and at the same time indignant, that the use of this vaccine still remains controversial, ever since it was rolled out in lightening speed after Ottawa announced a \$300 million funding package for participant provinces. After all, they reason, they have approved the drug, so what is the problem? Surely their expert opinion should be sufficient to allay the public's fears about the drug?

The reason the public has good reason to distrust the judgement of these medical authorities is because of its experience with them. It is a fact that the public has heard many similar assurances about other drugs, and used them to their lasting regret. For example:

In the 1960's, thalidomide was pronounced a safe drug for pregnant women experiencing morning sickness. It was not safe, as thousands of adults with flipper arms and legs can attest.

In the 1960's, the birth control pill was developed and women were assured that its use had no harmful side effects. The pill is the most popular form of contraception – used by 12 million women in the U.S. alone. Studies now report that the pill can be the cause of a greatly increased risk of stroke, heart attack and blood clots if taken for eight years or more. (British Journal of Medicine, September 16, 17, 2007.) A study in 2007 by Professor Ernst Rietzeschel of Ghent University in Belgium has established the likelihood of finding plaques in arteries increased by 20 to 30% every ten years of pill use.

Merck Frosst, the manufacturer of Gardasil, also developed a much-acclaimed painkiller called Vioxx, that was subsequently used by thousands of individuals suffering from arthritis. Unfortunately, the drug had the side effect of causing heart attacks and strokes. As a result, the medication was taken off the market in 2004 and Merck Frosst has just made a \$4.85 billion settlement with 60,000 claimants in the U.S. There has as yet been no settlement with claimants in Canada.

By 2001, 15 million women in the U.S. alone, as well a millions of women in Canada and abroad, were taking hormone-replacement therapy (H.R.T.). It became one of the most popular prescription drug treatments for menopause, supposedly to allow women to lead a long and healthier life. However, in July 2002, estrogen therapy was exposed as a hazard to health, rather than a benefit. It was found to constitute a potential health risk for post-menopausal women by increasing risks of heart disease, stroke, blood clots and breast cancer. The question lingers unanswered, as to how many women may have died prematurely because their physician prescribed this medication? A reasonable estimate would be tens of thousands of women. (New York Times, September 16, 2007).

Europe's largest drug manufacturer GlaxoSmithKline developed and sold the diabetic drug Avandia, its second best selling product last year, but which was subsequently linked to a higher risk of heart attacks according to a study released in May 2007. This caused sales of the drug to drop 38% and gave rise to thousands of class action suits against the drug company.

These are just a few examples of the here-today gone-tomorrow nature of medical wisdom. What we are advised about with confidence one year is reversed the next. One of the contributing factors to this reversal is that the kind of experimental trials necessary to determine the truth about the medication is excessively expensive and time-consuming and very often does not happen. Hence, the problem with these new drugs so enthusiastically recommended by the medical profession.

It is alarming that Gardasil's approval was based on the testing of only a few thousand patients and almost not at all (only 1200) on young girls, 9-13 years old, who are targeted for injection of the drug. (See REALity Sept/Oct 2007, p. 5)

As its marketing plan, Merck Frosst used lobbyists with access to important public officials. In Canada, Ken Boessenkool, now with the public relations firm of Hill and Knowlton in Calgary, lobbied the federal government on Merck Frosst's behalf. Mr. Boessenkool was a former advisor to Prime Minister Stephen Harper when he was opposition leader. Jason Grier, former executive assistant to Ontario Health Minister George Smitherman, also lobbied on behalf of Merck and Ontario has now decided to administer the drug to young girls. Even though only approximately 2-5% of women have Pap smears with cell changes due to HPV, the medication was pushed as a preventative cure for cervical cancer. However, no mention was made of the fact that the drug does not protect against other sexually transmitted diseases, such as chlamydia, herpes, hepatitis, trichomoniasis, gonorrhoea, syphilis, HIV, AIDS, etc. It's all promotion; facts do not count.

The long-term consequences of Gardasil are not known. The manufacturer admits this and agrees it does not know its effect on young girls' cancer risk, on their immunity system, on their reproductive system, or its genetic effects. In due course, we will know this, possibly in twenty or thirty years from now when these young girls, the innocent subjects of the Gardasil experiment have become grown women and then report the consequences of their having taken the medication in their childhood on medical advice.

American Society for Colposcopy & Cervical Pathology FAW on their website

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Merry Christmas to you and to your family! Amid all the seasonal activities, concerts, food preparations, and decorating that are going on right now in your home, thank you for taking a few minutes out to contemplate the news in this edition of REALity, and to read my column.

At this time of year my mind is drawn to the broken families who will not be celebrating their holidays “en famille”. I think especially of the children who will not be celebrating Christmas with both of their parents, because it has been so dictated by the court: children who have little voice in the courts when their parents divorce. Often, their true wishes are ignored – their emotional welfare seemingly disregarded as lawyers and judges reach arbitrarily into their lives with the big stick of the law to wrench them from the embrace of one parent. Children desperately need the love, support and presence of both their parents to nourish them in their lives.

During Christmas and over New Year’s this year, please keep such children in your prayers. Pray for justice to come back to our land and to our courts. Pray that traditional marriage and the family will once again be protected by law and statute in Canada for the sake of our children. Pray for the thousands of parents, with aching hearts and empty arms, who will be denied the joy of the company of their children this special time of year. And thank God for your own family.

May God bless you and keep you, and grant you His Peace which surpasses all understanding this Christmas, as many Canadians mark the anniversary of the birth of His Son, Jesus Christ, who came to reconcile man to Holy GOD through his death and resurrection. This reconciliation is a magnificent gift for us all.

Until next time,
Laurie

INCOME SPLITTING FOR TAX FAIRNESS TO FAMILIES

One of the major failures of Canadian governments over the years has been the refusal to implement tax policies beneficial to the family unit. Enamoured with expensive top down social engineering, governments have left Canada with high taxation which has crippled family formation and brought into play more control by the government in what should be strictly family only decisions.

Status of Women Canada has also failed to represent family oriented women, leading to women’s loss of freedom to choose full time homemaking and child rearing. Instead, every effort has been made to draw women into the paid workforce, according to feminism’s simplistic measure of “equality.” That is, hundreds of millions of tax dollars have been spent chasing the failed feminist dream of female independence from family, and this has exacerbated Canada’s problems, since we can no longer replace our population, a basic requirement for economic viability. This loss in population is due in part to high taxation requiring women to forsake any career but that of one in the paid workforce.

Ironically, women’s full employment is both a symptom of unbridled capitalism and radical socialist ideology. See: Desperate Swedish Socialist Housewives at www.profam.org for an expose of the ideological battle over family economics raging internationally for over a century.

REAL Women has repeatedly called for family oriented taxation because the family is the basic unit of society. (See REAL Women Makes a Presentation to the Subcommittee on Finance, REALity Nov/Dec 2005.) The great majority of Canadians place a high value on family life and young Canadians still hope to live happy married lives with spouse, children and grandchildren. (See “The Misrepresentation of Family Statistics,” of this issue.) The government should be encouraging these views by making it easier for families to give birth to and raise their children – not to punish them for doing so.

Conservative Government Initiatives

The present Conservative government, however, has in fact taken some commendable initiatives to recognize the family unit:

It has returned tax dollars to Canadian families via the popular \$1,200 a year Universal Child Care Benefit. This was

instrumental in shifting votes to the Conservative Party in the last election. This policy sensibly supports Canadian parents, the primary caregivers and early childhood educators par excellence. The UCCB treats all children equally without favoring children of dual income families.

Other Family Initiatives by the Conservatives

The last Conservative budget (March, 2007) announced a new \$2,000 child tax credit for parents with children under 18 years of age, providing up to \$310 per child in tax relief. The budget also provided that the value of the spousal tax deduction be made equal to that of the principal earner, a gender equality measure not hostile to the family unit. Pension splitting for retired Canadians was announced in October 2006, which recognized that spouses work together as a unit – with pensions being deferred family income, not just monies allotted to the bread winning spouse.

The October 31, 2007 Economic Statement (mini-budget) announced long overdue broad-based personal income and corporate tax deductions. It raised the basic personal deduction from \$8,929 to \$9,600 for 2007 and 2008, and to \$10,100 for 2009. Some analysts have recommended raising it further to \$15,000.

Still Work To Do:

Even with all these welcome changes, there is still something very important left yet undone. Pension splitting has highlighted the fact that it is unfair that family income itself cannot also be split for couples for taxation purposes. That is, a single family income should be split between the couple, both paying separate taxes on it, thus reducing the amount paid.

Income Splitting

Currently, in households where one parent, usually the mother, chooses to care for the children at home, the tax burden is significantly higher than for the household which chooses to go the dual income route. [See: Tax Penalty of Single-Income Families, REALity May/June 2005] This drives mothers into the workforce and children into substitute institutional care, which is an unacceptable interference in the autonomy of the family. Public policy should be neutral on issues of career choice for women, and should treat women at home and in the workplace with equal regard.

Further inequity exists in that some provinces offer income splitting opportunities to some professionals, for example doctors and dentists in Ontario, through incorporation of their practices, opportunities which are not available to all Canadians in all provinces. See: Splitting the Difference is Easy for Some: Ontario doctors, dentists can flow income to families Commenting on income splitting through incorporation and pension splitting, the financial analyst who authored the above-referenced article concluded:

...unfairness seems to be the norm when it comes to uneven taxation on split incomes. Just ask Ontario lawyers and accountants who are helping medical professionals enjoy a tax benefit they themselves are denied.

Government Surplus Offers Opportunity

The present Conservative government should be commended for a significant reversal toward more conscientious taxation of Canadian families announced in its mini budget this fall by returning tax dollars to needy families. Huge recurring federal surpluses, obviously a result of excessive taxation and expanding government power, offer an excellent opportunity, however, to finally take measures to make Canadian taxation further family friendly by income splitting for married couples. This would recognize the contribution that parents make to society when they sacrifice to give birth to and pursue the formation of the next generation of Canadians.

Library of Parliament research estimates that the cost to the federal treasury of income splitting for all Canadians would be \$1.5 billion annually. This is a fraction of the projected government surplus for this year which some analysts predict is headed toward \$23 billion, making it the highest on record. (Mounting Surplus Spurs Calls for Tax Cuts,

Canwest News Service, Sept 29, 2007)

Feminist Objections

It is interesting that whenever the issue of income splitting has come up over the years, strong objections to it has been made by feminists -- objections to which the Liberals always listened. Feminists see women as perpetual victims. They fear that income splitting will inhibit equality between men and women by requiring women to reveal their income to their husbands, and that it would serve as a disincentive to the employment of mothers. But Statistics Canada informs us that women are primary wage earners in 29% of dual-earner couples and studies show that women outnumber men in universities in North America 3 to 2. Women cannot always be viewed as economically unequal to men and would benefit equally from tax relief. In addition, feminists, who claim to speak for all women, ignore the fact that when the family unit benefits from lower taxes through income splitting or tax deductions, women also benefit. When the male family wage earner keeps more earned money in his pocket, his entire family benefits, including women. This is not according to the strict feminist dogma aimed at controlling women's choices, hence the noisy feminist opposition to income splitting.

Conclusion

While special interest groups were pampered during Canada's infatuation with liberalism, the family suffered severe blows to its autonomy. Bureaucratic concern for the family wage is almost non-existent as even Statistics Canada now focuses on "household income", assuming that a family can no longer be supported by one income, but must have at least two workers earning salaries in order to function.

A nation cannot thrive without strong families. Liberals try to belittle this fact as a mere whim of "social conservatives" or the "religious right." Objective analysis however, clearly proves that nothing could be more dangerous to the collective future of Canadians than continued neglect of family oriented economic and social policy.

Please contact the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and your MP, thanking them for advances made in developing a more family friendly taxation system and encourage them to include income-splitting in the spring budget of 2008:

Their addresses are as follows:

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper
Office of the Prime Minister
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A2
Fax: 613 941-6900

The Honourable James M. Flaherty
Minister of Finance
Department of Finance Canada
140 O'Connor Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G5
Fax: (613) 992-8320

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

THE MISREPRESENTATION OF FAMILY STATISTICS (How to Lie With Statistics)

When the results of the 2006 census were released in September 2007, the media gloated that the traditional family was in steep decline and that alternate family forms were here to stay. Their interpretation of the census material, however, was selective and reflected their own left wing ideology, rather than the facts.

Married Couples a Majority

While headlines shouted “Married people now in the minority” (Ottawa Citizen), attention was diverted away from census results which showed that “married-couple families accounted for 68.6% of all census families.” Common law couples represented 15.5%; lone parent families 15.9%; and same-sex couples 0.6% of all couples. (The Daily, Statistics Canada, September 12, 2007).

Headlines blared sensationally “married people are a minority”. However, the distorted figures were obtained by including “1,310,790 children aged 15 to 17 [as unmarried], though children cannot legally marry under 18 in most provinces except with written permission of parents”. (The Hill Times, Sept 24, 2007, Statistics Canada Counted Over One Million Children as ‘Unmarried’ in Report). Statistics Canada also counted 1.4 million widows and widowers as single. In fact, a majority, i.e. 51% of adult Canadians are married, 12% separated or divorced, 6% widowed, and 31% never married.

True, the trend is a decrease in marriages and an increase in common law and lone parents but the majority of adult Canadians are married and want stable long-term marriages. As Reginald Bibby, sociologist at the University of Lethbridge stated “What Canadians want is a traditional marriage but they aren’t getting it.” (Ottawa Citizen, Dec 6, 2004). According to his research, 90% of teenagers intend to marry, have children and stay with the same partner for life. REAL Women believes that public policy should help them achieve this noble goal.

Mixed Message on Divorce Statistics – Which Divorce Rate?

It is often stated that the divorce rate in Canada is about 40% and that it is 50% in the United States. This particular divorce rate is calculated by dividing the number of divorces by the number of marriages in any one year and multiplying by 100. This is often interpreted as indicating that almost half of North Americans are divorced. Pollster Lou Harris has written, “The idea that half of American marriages are doomed is one of the most specious pieces of statistical nonsense ever perpetuated in modern times.... Only one out of eight marriages will end in divorce. In any one year, only about 2 percent of existing marriages will break up.” In Canada, the 2006 census found that 8.1% of Canadians were divorced at the time Canadians were asked the census questions.

The crude divorce rate is calculated by counting the number of divorces in any one year for every 100,000 people in the population (this includes children). For 2003 in Canada it was 223.7 per 100,000, or 0.2237%. A chart of divorce rates from 1921 to 2003 can be found in the Nov/Dec 2006 issue of REALity.

Another divorce rate is calculated by counting the number of marriages that dissolved by the 30th wedding anniversary. For Canada, it was 14% in 1969; 30% in 1975; and 38% in 2003. It is also referred to as the Total Divorce Rate by the 30th wedding anniversary.

In Canada today, there are approximately 70,000 divorces a year, approximately 150,000 weddings a year and approximately 6,000,000 stable married couples.

Domestic Violence

The area of “domestic violence” is equally fraught with misrepresentation. Feminists demand more and more government funding to publicize “violence against women” yet rarely is the public exposed to the Statistics Canada finding that there is a fourfold difference in rates of violence against women living in common-law relationships

compared with women in registered marriages (9% and 2% respectively. A Statistical Profile 1998, Statistics Canada).

This report also states that the strongest predictors of wife assault are:

the young age of couples (18 – 24 years)
living in a common-law relationship
chronic unemployment on the part of the male partner
low income
low education.

These fundamental causes are never addressed by well-funded bureaucracies perpetually lamenting “domestic violence”.

Men also Victimized by Violence

While much publicity is given to violence against women, forgotten is the finding by Statistics Canada that “An estimated 7% of women and 6% of men in a current or previous spousal relationship encountered spousal violence during the five years up to and including 2004....” (The Daily, Statistics Canada, July 14, 2005)

Quebec Values Differ

The media also fails to report the fact that statistics for the family in all of Canada are greatly distorted by statistics from Quebec, whose values differ quite markedly from those of the rest of Canada. For example, the media did not, for the most part, point out that that the total increase in common law marriages in Canada was due to Quebec, where common law marriages increased by 20.3% between 2001 - 2006, thereby distorting the national figures. Common law couple families in Quebec accounted for 44.4% of the national total. In fact, Quebec has the largest number of divorces, suicides, common law relationships, and abortions, as well as the lowest birth rate in all of Canada. Obviously, Quebecers are free to choose their own values and lifestyle. A problem arises, however, when their profoundly different values skew our national statistics, falsely indicating that Canadians are much more liberal than they actually are.

Conclusion

A familiar saying among researchers is “Statistics don’t lie but statisticians do.” It is unfortunate that tax funded research and media reporting indulge in highlighting negative social indicators, rather than presenting an unbiased, comprehensive picture of social factors affecting Canadians.

GAY PRIDE PARADES ARE PAST THEIR PRIME

Homosexual activists have played it both ways. On the one hand, they argue they are just like everyone else. They love deeply and permanently and want to marry and be parents, living out their lives just like heterosexuals do. This apparently is not the case. (See article, “Demand for Same Sex Marriage was Based on a Lie”.) Yet, on the other hand, they are “proud” of their subculture, which was established in the 1970’s and 1980’s, as exemplified by the gay pride parades where men dress like and pretend to be women and vice versa. Some also march nude in these parades except that they wear shoes and therefore, according to the absurd decision of a Toronto area Crown counsel, are not really nude in violation of S. 174 of the Criminal Code. The exhibitionist members of their community gyrate obscenely on their floats – it is sex, sex, sex all the way. Sex appears to be the be all and end all of their subculture, which promotes cruising, i.e. rampant sexual contact with many unknown partners, all mixed with drugs and alcohol in order to fuel these sexual encounters. Sexually transmitted diseases (STD), AIDS and anal cancer (HIV positive homosexuals are 9000% more likely to develop anal cancer according to the February 2007 issue of the International Journal of STD and AIDS) do not matter. Who cares, as it is the “good times” that count.

Thousands of by-standers come to watch the circus that a gay parade has become. They laugh derisively at the vain and foolish participants, while scorning and ridiculing their “culture”. That is, the crowds come for the weirdness of the parade, and are happy only when the show displays and entrenches the grossest behaviours of homosexuality.

These parades, with their growing commercialism, because corporations want to benefit from the generally well-off homosexual consumer, do not further the homosexual cause. Politicians, thinking they are displaying their “tolerance” by walking in the midst of this chaotic and hedonistic exhibitionism, are, in fact, displaying their lack of discernment: they fail to understand what the parade is really about – exhibitionism and narcissism promoting quite literally, a deadly form of sexuality. If homosexuals want to end what they claim is discrimination against them and gain acceptance and credibility, they have a strange way of doing so. The homosexual community itself seems to have become aware of this. Organizers for these parades are becoming difficult to find, and many homosexuals are not even interested in attending their own parades.

For example, the Ottawa pride organizers acquired a whopping \$130,000 debt and most homosexuals in Ottawa could care less (Ottawa X-press, August 23, 2007). In Vancouver, the president of the Vancouver Pride Committee called a meeting on September 6, 2007, about the gay parade there. The result? A scant turnout of only three people.

In REALity Nov./Dec. 2002, page 9, “Dispute Among Homosexuals Over Gay Pride Parades” further examples were given of disputes among homosexuals themselves about the future of gay pride parades. The writing is on the wall for these so-called “pride” parades. They do not conjure up gay “pride” as much as they conjure up the physical and soul destroying sickness of the homosexual lifestyle.

BABIES AND MATERNITY LEAVE

A specialist in neonatology at the University of British Columbia, Dr. Rebecca Cook, mother of two small children, took only three months maternity leave for her first child and two months leave with her second child. This short period of time off was due to the fact she was undertaking extensive training in her specialty at the time of her children’s births.

Dr. Cook subsequently carried out a research project, spearheaded by B.C. Children’s and Women’s Health Centre, to determine the effect on a baby of the mother’s early return to work after giving birth. Dr. Cook admits that she fully expected the research to confirm that the length of maternity leave had no bearing on childhood development. To her shock, her research disclosed quite the opposite. That is, she was totally wrong in her assumption that a mother’s early return to work would not affect her baby. Instead, her study, published in the September 2007 issue of the journal *Early Human Development*, reveals that women who rush back to work after giving birth place their babies at risk. She found that the less time a new mother stays off the job, the more likely it will be that her child’s motor and social development will be impaired. The chance of impairment dropped by three percent with each extra month taken off by mothers after birth. If a mother took a full 24 months off work after birth, there was no link established to the child’s social and motor impairment.

Further, in July 2007, Tom Schuller, Director of the Branch of the Paris-based Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) called the Center for Education Research and Innovation, which just published a book, “Understanding the Brain”, a summary of current knowledge about brain science, stated that there is no scientific support for institutional child care.

This all discredits the statements made by representatives of the child care lobby group, the Child Care Advocacy Association of Canada (CCAC), when it testified before the Senate Social Affairs Committee on April 20, 2007 (See REALity September/October 2007, page 9, “The Child Care Issue Still Haunts Us”.) In the CCAC’s testimony, they stated, at page 20-4-2007, 20:13, as follows:

Unless you are trained in the understanding of the development of young children and the benchmarks of their growth, you can be caring but you cannot be necessarily knowledgeable in those pieces. We see that in day-to-day

work with children.

Grandmas, aunts and informal neighbours, are wonderful and nice to children, but they do not have those important skills. It is important to look at a trained work force.

What nonsense! As if a mere two year early child care development course could possibly match the intense bond and love and one-on-one care provided by a loving, concerned parent or relative in a child's life.

If only all mothers could stay home with their child for two years after birth! Like most things in life, however, this is not so simple. Many new mothers must return to work for financial reasons, to secure their careers, or because of various reasons they do not choose to be a stay-at-home mum. As well, the financial costs of a two-year paid maternity leave would be onerous, not so much for the government, but for small businesses which would find such a long leave extremely difficult to manage.

The Need for Parental Care

One way to assist parents in providing parental care for their children in their early years is for the government to lessen the tax pressure on families with young children. In this regard, it is especially important that the government implement a policy of income splitting for families, (See article on Income Splitting) Such a measure will not be the answer for all Canadian families, but it certainly will make a massive difference for many families, which will then have more financial flexibility to allow one parent to remain at home during the early years, if they so choose. It will also make a great difference to new babies whose best interests will be served by having a parent at home. These babies are our future: their well-being is ours.

FRED PHELPS ASSISTS HOMOSEXUAL EFFORTS

When former homosexual NDP MP Svend Robinson was arguing in 2003-04 in favour of his private members Bill C-250, to amend the hate crime provisions in the Criminal Code to give special protection to homosexuals, he was hard put to come up with any examples in Canada of homosexuals who actually were experiencing "hate".

He therefore called upon the supposed threat being made against Canadian homosexuals by a U.S. alleged Baptist Minister Fred Phelps from his supposedly Westboro Baptist church located in Kansas, U.S.A. Mr. Phelps is known for his outrageous picket signs supposedly upholding Christian beliefs against homosexuality. One of his better-known slogans is "God Hates Fags". Mr. Phelps had conveniently, at that time, threatened to enter Canada in connection with Bill C-250 (Mr. Phelps was subsequently refused entry into Canada by the Immigration Department).

Mr. Phelps' name also arose in Canada in 2001 when REAL Women was a part of the No Committee which included Campaign Life Coalition for Quebec, the Christian Heritage Party and a small evangelical church in Montreal to raise objections to the Gay Games scheduled to be held in Montreal in 2006. The Royal Bank refused the No Committee the right to open a bank account on the grounds that the Committee was discriminating against homosexuals by raising objections to the Gay Games. In response to many complaints to the Royal Bank about its refusal to permit the No Committee to open a bank account, Mr. David Moorcroft, Senior Vice President of the Royal Bank of Canada gave as one of its explanations for the refusal that the No Committee supposedly has the support of Fred Phelps and the Westboro Baptist Church. This was preposterous as well as damaging to the Committee's credibility. As a result, the No Committee promptly sent Mr. Moorcroft a registered letter dated September 18, 2002 advising him that his statement on the alleged Westboro Baptist Church support of the No Committee was false and defamatory and unacceptable. Mr. Moorcroft immediately ceased making the allegation.

It turns out that Fred Phelps is not a Baptist Minister, his actions, however, do raise sympathy for the homosexual cause and at the same time bring into disrepute and ridicule the Christian faith. Further, according to Wikipedia and Kansas Voter View, Mr. Phelps is a registered Democrat who ran in five Kansas Democratic primaries including Senator

and campaigned for the then Senator Al Gore in the 1988 presidential campaign (photos back this up) culminating in invitations to both Clinton-Gore inaugurations.

Mr. Phelps lives in a large upscale home with his grown children, several of whom are graduate lawyers. Mr. Phelps and his family mysteriously arrive to picket across the country during sensitive times in the cultural war between homosexuals and mainstream society.

Mr. Phelps' most recent picketing has been at military funerals of fallen American soldiers in Iraq. He alleges that his pickets are to "thank" God for terrorist killings of American troops as punishment for America's embrace of homosexuality. But, his picketing at the military funerals conveniently also draws attention to the controversy surrounding the U.S. invasion of Iraq and the Democratic party's opposition to it.

Mr. Phelps and his family, with no known source of income, lead a very comfortable upscale life. He has no church and no congregation. There is no doubt, however, that Mr. Phelps' picketing is very helpful to the homosexual cause.