

## **THE CHALLENGE OF THE SAME-SEX MARRIAGE VOTE**

Prime Minister Harper has made it clear that there will be another vote on same-sex marriage. Indications were that the vote was to take place during the first two weeks after Parliament resumed sitting on September 18th, 2006. However, it didn't happen.

It has now been rumoured that this vote will take place in December. No matter when it is called, it will be a sticky wicket for a number of reasons, including the expected closeness of the vote, as well as problems inherent in the actual questions themselves. The first question will be whether the MPs wish to have the debate re-opened. If so, then the second question will be whether they are in support of upholding the traditional definition of marriage. Unfortunately, the first question changes the whole dynamics of the debate, since the vote will not be a simple question, for or against same-sex marriage, but whether the issue should be re-opened. Regretfully, there are some MPs who, although opposed to same-sex marriage, do not want the matter re-opened because they don't want the issue to dog them into the next election.

### **Next Federal Election**

The next federal election will probably take place in the spring of 2007 because there is a good chance that the budget will be defeated by the opposition parties. If not at that time, then an election may be expected later in the spring due to the possibility that the Senate will continue to refuse to pass legislation passed by the House of Commons. For example, one of Prime Minister Harper's priorities, the Federal Accountability Act, was held up in the Senate from June, and was returned to the House of Commons only in November with no less than 150 amendments. This bill was again debated and passed in the House of Commons and then returned to the Senate for approval where it now sits waiting for Senate approval. Treasury Board president, John Baird, blamed the Senate (64 Liberals and only 23 Conservatives) for gutting the legislation with its amendments and promised that the government means to have the bill passed into law. This indicates that a possible showdown between the elected House of Commons and the appointed Senate is looming. The average life of a minority government is approximately 18 months, and some MPs are already unstrung that the same-sex marriage issue will create problems for them in the next election - hence their reluctance to re-open the issue.

### **Defence of Religion Act (DORA)**

Even if the same-sex marriage vote is defeated, this may not mean the end of the matter. According to the *Globe & Mail*, (October 4, 2006) the government is rumoured to be considering a "Defence of Religions Act" (DORA) to permit public officials, such as Justices of the Peace and marriage commissioners to refuse to perform same-sex marriages for reasons of conscience. Further, such a proposed bill might also protect free speech rights of religious leaders and all others who criticize homosexual behaviour or who refuse to do business with homosexual organizations or to rent out their halls to homosexual couples, etc. The DORA would also protect individuals from the predatory hands of human rights tribunals on the homosexual issue.

In effect, introducing the DORA would breathe new life into the same-sex marriage issue, which may possibly be very pivotal to the 2007 federal election.

### **Homosexual Bullies**

There is no question that legal protection is necessary to put a stop to the bullying that is now going on against churches, schools, parents and other individuals who oppose the homosexual agenda.

These bullies use the sympathetic courts and human rights tribunals as their instruments of terror to stamp out dissent against them. In short, these bullies are trying to drive a faith-based, or a conscience perspective from the public square by intimidation and legal manipulation on the false basis that same-sex partnerships are "equal" or have the same moral value as heterosexual partnerships. This clearly is not the case. The union of a man and a woman creates children, whereas homosexual unions do not. Granted, not all heterosexual relationships produce children, but they are the minority or exception, since the vast majority of heterosexual relationships do produce children. The state takes an ardent interest in heterosexual marriages and encourages them by providing married couples with special benefits and recognition because heterosexual marriage is necessary for the orderly progression and future of society. Whatever homosexuals/lesbians may choose to call their relationships, they are not now and can never be "marriages."

Moreover, the legal and social acceptance of so-called same-sex marriages does not make them actual "marriages" and neither does it make their sexual preference either right or acceptable. Further, such unions cannot be justified on the grounds that their so-called "marriage" is a human right since there are no international human rights documents or treaties anywhere in the world that provide such a right. In fact, the human rights documents say the opposite i.e.: they define marriage as a union between a man and a woman. Further, homosexual arguments that the legal protection of their relationships is the same as protection on the grounds of race and gender are without merit. Race and gender are unchangeable, whereas thousands of former homosexuals now contentedly live heterosexual, faithful, married lives and are a living testimony of the falsity of the claim that homosexuality is an inherent or unchangeable characteristic. Try as they might, homosexuals have never been able to come up with any competent studies to establish that homosexuality is an inborn trait because this apparently is not the case. Same-sex "marriages" are merely artificial creations set up by the liberal courts and a coerced, undemocratic Parliament.

#### Canadians Vulnerable to Homosexual Attacks

It is obvious that some legal action has to be taken to protect free speech and religion in Canada from these homosexual bullies and their allies. The provisions in the Charter of Rights, which are supposed to provide this protection on both religious freedom and freedom of speech grounds, have shown themselves to be hopelessly inadequate for this job.

For example:

In B.C. the government contracted with homosexuals to re-write the entire school curriculum to make it inclusive of positive portrayals of homosexual culture and denied parents the right to opt their children out of such a propaganda initiative.

Roman Catholic Bishop Fred Henry and Pastor Stephen Boissoin of Alberta were the subject of complaints before the Alberta Human Rights Tribunal for publicly expressing their religious views on homosexuality.

The Catholic men's organization, Knights of Columbus ("K of C"), in Coquitlam, BC, was fined \$2,000 for refusing to rent its hall to a lesbian couple wishing to celebrate their wedding there. This was despite the fact that the organization had the right to freedom of religion, and the fact the K of C agreed to find the lesbian couple an alternate premise to celebrate their supposed union and despite the fact that the K of C also offered to pay the cost of printing new invitations for them.

Marriage Commissioners in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Newfoundland have lost their jobs because they refused to perform same-sex marriage.

A Toronto printer, Scott Brockie, was fined \$5,000 for refusing to print material for a homosexual organization and was ordered by the court to print the material.

A BC teacher and school counselor, Chris Kempling, was suspended for several months for writing letters to his local newspaper opposing homosexuality - even though he did so on at least one occasion in his capacity as a candidate in the federal election.

A Catholic High School in Ontario was ordered by the court to allow a homosexual student to bring his male partner to the school prom held on the Catholic High School premises.

The list of supposed offences above is only an abbreviated one of attacks on those holding differing views from those of homosexual activists. Many more attacks will take place if same-sex marriage is confirmed by Parliament in the upcoming vote.

#### DORA Creates a Firestorm

Predictably, the mere suggestion that the Conservatives may bring in DORA created a firestorm in the media, which went into full attack mode to oppose it. In fact, most newspapers were apoplectic at the mere thought of such legislation. An exception was the National Post, which, in an editorial on October 6, 2006 stated that the idea of a DORA deserved consideration. The editorial noted, however, that the provinces have sole jurisdiction over education, provincial human rights, human rights tribunals and the solemnization of marriage (i.e. marriage commissioners) and therefore any federal legislation cannot reach into these areas. The federal government, according to the editorial, does have jurisdiction over the Criminal Code (i.e. hate crime provisions) and the federal Human Rights Tribunals and DORA could be applied there. This is an accurate analysis, as DORA would not have any effect provincially because it is the provinces that have jurisdiction under the constitution for religious and civil rights.

Globe and Mail columnist John Ibbitson had a "take" on the Conservative government's DORA. He stated in his column of October 5, 2006 that a constitutional challenge of DORA would help settle "nagging and unsettled constitutional questions on the limits in which Ottawa can intrude in areas of provincial government ..." He also went on to say that DORA might also influence a large number of voters who are not bigots but who do feel that the gay rights agenda has become relentless and is threatening traditional freedoms of religion and speech. As a result, he said such voters would not see a Defense of Religion Act as dangerously homophobic. Instead, they would welcome it as a sensible insurance policy against present and future excesses by zealots of all persuasions. This too may be an accurate assessment of the situation.

Certainly the homosexual issue has created ongoing problems for society and Canadians are now having serious concerns about them.

A Compas poll in October 2006 found that:

- 72% of Canadians believe the clergy should have the right to refuse to marry a same sex couple;
- 57% believed officials (marriage commissioners) conducting secular weddings be permitted to decline to do so;
- 68% believed that teachers should be allowed to write letters to newspapers opposing same-sex marriage and printers should have the right to refuse to print homosexual materials;
- six of seven Canadians want a review of the same sex marriage legislation "to make sure that freedom of speech and religion" are fully protected.

Unfortunately, Prime Minister Harper seems to have backed down, for now, on the possibility of DORA legislation. He stated in the House of Commons on October 3, 2006 after a barrage of questions from the opposition, that his government has "no plans" to draw up such legislation. In view of the reality of the homosexual tyranny Canadians are experiencing, he should reconsider.

Please write to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and your MP and urge them to enact DORA legislation. Their addresses are as follows:

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper  
Prime Minister of Canada  
Office of the Prime Minister  
80 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax: (613) 941-6900

The Honourable Victor Toews  
Minister of Justice  
House of Commons  
Parliament Buildings  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax: (613) 995-1049

Your MP  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

## **FINANCIAL HELP GRANTED TO SENIORS - PENSION SPLITTING**

REAL Women joined a coalition of organizations, which lobbied the federal government to allow pension income splitting for Canadians. Canadian Activists for Pension Splitting (CAPS) is comprised of 23 organizations with 2.6 million collective memberships. It includes Retired Teachers of Ontario, Bell Pensioners' Group, Alliance of Seniors, Air Canada Pensioners, Canada's Association for the Fifty Plus, CBC Pensioners National Association, General Motors Salaried Retirees Association, Royal Canadian Legion of Canada, and others. More information on CAPS can be found at [www.pensionsplitting.ca](http://www.pensionsplitting.ca)

Because Canadians are now taxed as individuals rather than within a more comprehensive system based on family income, seniors living on one pension have been taxed at a higher rate than if they had been living on two pensions of equal value. Today's seniors raised their families when society functioned on the basis of a single family wage so that the mother was free to care for children and home, and the father provided for them. In other words, the father helped build Canada's economic structure while the mother helped build Canada's social structure. The penalty on the single income lifestyle assumes that the role of mother at home is of little value and that the nonearner is not 'working', and is only a dependent of the earner.

Therefore the issue about the single income tax penalty is closely linked to advocacy to recognize unpaid labour as a vital part of an economy and to recognize that caregiving work at home, a historical female role, has always had great value to the nation. This division of labour should be recognized under our tax system.

On October 31, 2006, however, Minister of Finance Jim Flaherty did just that when he announced that splitting of a pension between the husband and wife (or common law partners) was to be available for 2007 and subsequent tax years. This is a major change to our income tax system which generally has required each individual taxpayer to report and pay tax on all of the income he/she receives. This was the case even if the individual, like many Canadians, actually supported his/her family members such as his wife and children on his single income. Under this new plan, he can now allocate to his spouse up to one-half of his pension, which will reduce the tax to be paid on that pension income.

For individuals aged 65 years and over, eligible pension income includes lifetime annuity payments under a registered pension plan, a registered retirement savings plan or a deferred profit-sharing plan and payments out of or under a registered retirement income fund. For individuals under 65 years of age, eligible pension income includes lifetime annuity payments under a registered pension plan and certain other payments received as a result of the death of the

individual's spouse or common-law partner.

There still is the problem remaining, nonetheless, whereby a one-income family still pays more taxes than the two-income family earning the same amount. However, this now seems to be under examination by the Conservative government.

Parliamentary research estimates that pension splitting or pension sharing, as some prefer to call it, will involve a shift of \$310 million dollars a year. In order to implement income splitting for families with children under 18 years of age, however, the estimate is a shift of \$1.6 billion a year, which is quite a difference. Income splitting for families with children under 12 only, would amount to \$1 billion a year. With surpluses in the range of \$13 billion a year and with \$26 billion a year being transferred to special interest groups and companies in grants and contributions, surely some of these grants can be eliminated in order to provide for all the families who are being taxed unfairly.

The concept of income-splitting for tax purposes, it should be noted, is not a new idea. It has been discussed for decades but has always been put aside because of feminist concerns that joint filing would force wives to reveal their full incomes to their husbands and thereby threaten the "economic autonomy of married women."

Conservative economists are suggesting however, that a more family oriented tax system could be structured gradually; starting with pension splitting, and then to income splitting for families with children, then total inclusion of all families. The family is already recognized as a unit in taxation with regard to the Canada Pension Plan, child tax benefits, GST credit and Guaranteed Income Supplement. Other countries such as the United States, Germany and France formally recognize families as a single unit for tax purposes.

The Conservative Party of Canada's policy on family tax fairness is very promising. "Policy Statement", September 8, 2004 states at #15. Family Tax Fairness: A Conservative government will create tax fairness for families by eliminating inequities between single and dual income families and introducing a deduction for dependent children." The introductory Message from leader Stephen Harper to the CPC "Policy Document", March 19, 2005, stated: "We will provide continuous tax relief so that all Canadians - including families, seniors, and new Canadians - can prosper."

A very successful National Conference on Pension Splitting, sponsored by CAPS, was held on October 3, 2006 on Parliament Hill, with excellent speakers explaining unfair taxation in detail and suggesting remedies. The future looks brighter now that so many groups are advocating improvements supportive of families, long endorsed by REAL Women.

## **PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE**

Now that fall has passed and we begin to get our homes ready for Christmas, I'm wondering whether there has been a positive change in your life recently.

There has been a change in mine as a wonderful thing happened to me. I have always been very sensitive to criticism. I'm a people pleaser who wants everyone to like me. (My dermatologist told me once that I should not go into politics because my skin was too thin!) ?

The Settlement Agreement between the BC Ministry of Education and two homosexual men, which gives these two men and their recommendations access to BC school curriculum from K-12, was especially distressing since their stated goal is to make BC curriculum homosexual-positive, with no reference to the real social and health problems of the homosexual lifestyle.

I decided I needed to do something about this. I have never spoken to the School Board and have actually not written much to the local newspapers for three or four years now, mostly due to family commitments. But I decided that I needed to go to the School Trustees to talk to them about how they need to ensure that parents continue to exercise

their fundamental freedoms, according to the Charter, to determine their children's education. The trustees also needed to affirm that parents continue to exercise their parental responsibilities regarding the education of their children, in accordance with United Nations documents, such as Section 26 of the UN Declaration on Human Rights and Principle 7 of the UN Rights of the Child. The school trustees have the legislative power to enforce these parental rights if they choose to do so.

So off I went last week. Eight of the nine Trustees had no comments or questions after my presentation. However, the ninth Trustee made insinuating comments, which, fortunately, I was able to show were not true.

The wonderful thing that happened was that I had perfect peace during my presentation (though I did have to remember to breathe occasionally!) and the negative comments did not pierce my heart and destroy my confidence one little bit. I was just pleased that I could do something tangible about the dreadful situation here in BC about the take-over of the school curriculum by homosexual activists.

I have to follow up to make sure that the Trustees respond to my concerns, as to-date they have not done so. I'll get back to you on this in the new year and let you know what is happening here with regard to the BC curriculum.

In the meantime, May God richly bless you and your family this Christmas with peace that passes understanding, joy like a river, and the love of Christ!

Laurie

## **CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT CUTS LEFT-WING AGENCIES**

On September 25, 2006, the federal Conservative government announced a \$2 billion cut in government spending over a two-year period. The monies saved from these programs are to go towards reducing the nation's debt, currently at \$481.5 billion. This debt was largely built up by the previous Liberal governments.

Three particularly objectionable programs were affected by these budget cuts. They were the Status of Women, the Court Challenges Program and the Law Commission. These three agencies were all the inspiration of former Prime Minister Trudeau, and were designed to ensure that Canada would continue on its left wing trajectory long after Mr. Trudeau and his colleagues left the political scene.

### **1. Status of Women (SOW)**

#### **Change in Criteria for Funding**

The Status of Women with an annual budget of \$23 million, lost \$5 million by budget cuts. This reduction was to be applied to the administrative side of the programme, but the \$10.8 million in its appropriation allotted for grants to women's groups across the country was left in place and not affected by the cuts. As a result, feminist groups gave a huge sigh of relief, believing they had missed the bullet and would be able to continue on undisturbed with their abuse of the taxpayers' money to promote feminism across the country. They were wrong. They did not realize that the day following the announcement of the budget cuts, the Conservative government had changed the criteria for groups eligible to receive these grants. Under the new criteria, lobby or advocacy groups were no longer to be funded and money for "research" (inevitably feminist research) would no longer be funded. Further, funding for so called "capacity" building, i.e. the promotion or publicity for special interest groups to increase their membership and influence, were also prohibited under the new funding criteria. Instead, funding was restricted to organizations that provided actual services to women within their communities and which could show measurable results for their activities. That is, groups that directly assist women, such as assisting seniors, or increasing women in upper management roles in Canadian businesses or integrating immigrant women into Canadian society or reducing violence against women, would be funded. It is significant, however, that Statistics Canada released a report in early October,

2006 on a study it carried out in 2004, which showed that 7% of women and 6% of men were victims of spousal violence at least once during the previous five years. More women were beaten (i.e. 14% : 124,000) compared to 8% of men. These latter figures, however, means that 44,000 Canadian men received beatings by their female partners during the relevant five year period but that this considerable violence against men is not addressed by any SOW grants.

### Change in Objectives

The objective of the Status of Women now is to support women in their economic, social, and cultural life, but conspicuously deleted from the previous criteria was the objective of achieving so-called "equality" for women which had been one of the prominent goals of the programme since its inception back in 1973. The Minister for the Status of Women, Bev Oda, explained, however, that since women already had equality under the Charter of Rights, it was no longer necessary to fund special programmes that promote "equality" for women. It is noted by the way, that the criteria on "equality" was used by SOW as a method of excluding organizations, such as REAL Women, from funding because we didn't support the feminist definition of "equality".

### Feminist Fury

The feminists were enraged when they finally learned of the changes in the criteria for funding about a week after its implementation. During debate on the cuts to the Status of Women REAL Woman was viciously attacked by the raging feminists MPs including Liberal MP Judy Sgro, chairperson of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. The attacks were so relentless that the Conservative MP Mark Warawa (Langley, BC) felt compelled to come to our defence reminding the feminists:

... when we have the chairperson of a committee publicly ridiculing a delegation that is about to come, like REAL Women, I have real concerns that democracy may be under attack. We hear rhetoric now and heckling. Is that a good approach for a delegation coming? ...

The Liberal critic for Women's Issues, Belinda Stronach (Newmarket - Aurora), was particularly incensed that the Conservatives may have actually consulted with REAL Women of Canada about the funding issue. In her limited mind, this was an unspeakable crime. On September 26, 2006 during Question Period, Ms Stronach rose up to state:

The Prime Minister's Chief of Staff, Ian Brodie, has said that the organization, REAL Women, raises interesting points that warrant close inspection. This is a group that is anti-choice, anti-gay, does not support equality for women and wants to obliterate the Department on the Status of Women. This group's website even has links to sites that suggest that day cares do not care and homosexuality is a psychological disorder.

With budget cuts on the horizon, whom is the minister listening to, Ian Brodie, the right-wing organization, REAL Women, or will she stand up and defend the rights of Canadian women?

On October 5th, Minister Bev Oda met with the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women and Ms Stronach took this opportunity to attack REAL Women once again. She stated:

I'd like to know who [sic] the minister consulted with, because once upon a time, back in May, this minister stood for equality for women and backed equality for women, and in fact said it needs more work. So after pressure from the Prime Minister to meet with REAL Women, this has changed. Why? What's happened? I'd like to know, will this minister, after listening to other women's groups across the country, listening to this committee, have the guts to go to the Prime Minister to fight for the 25% increase, minimum, for this department?

Ms Stronach continued on:

I am not very satisfied with this answer because let's go back to May 19. It was this committee, not previous

governments, that recommended the increase to the budget and now we see a decrease after, and is it after pressure from other organizations like REAL Women, because you were for equal rights for women and you said you'd back that. You said it needed more work.

Then that organization put pressure on the Prime Minister. You met with that organization and suddenly we see a change in the funding criteria.

### Ms Stronach's Obsession With REAL Women

Ms Stronach seems to be obsessed with REAL Women, which has dared to defy her with our independent views. Ms Stronach has a superficial understanding of the issues of abortion, child care, marriage, equality etc. which is apparent by her arguments which amount to trendy clichés. REAL Women, at least, approaches these issues with thoughtful, well-reasoned arguments. When asked by the media about her latest love affair, Ms Stronach famously replied (Globe and Mail, October 7, 2006) that she didn't sit at home on Friday nights knitting! Indeed not. Her lifestyle of designer clothes, a personal trainer, a regular turnover of lovers and celebrity partying does not leave much time for knitting or any other home based pursuits! Ms Stronach obviously finds it difficult to believe and definitely cannot relate, to those many, many women in Canada who quite happily look after their own children, love their husbands, and are content to stay home Friday night, doing whatever! Ms Stronach would be further shocked to learn that such women are intelligent, capable, and not too impressed by empty clichés and a libertine lifestyle. It must be said, however, that independent thought and in-depth analysis are not and have never been Ms Stronach's strong point.

We hope the budget cuts and changes in criteria for the Status of Women are just the beginning of the end of the Status of Women and that the budget in the February, 2007 will bring us even more good news about the fate of the Status of Women.

## 2. Court Challenges Program (CCP)

The Court Challenges Program (CCP) was initially established in 1978 to fund individuals and groups to bring test cases to the courts on language rights.

In 1985, the federal government expanded the program to include the financing of equality rights issues. The CCP was supposed to help "disadvantaged" groups and individuals to bring the court challenges under the Charter of Rights. In pursuit of this, over the years, millions of dollars have been transferred to the CCP from the federal Heritage Department to cover the cost of these challenges. Unfortunately, it was not the so-called "disadvantaged" groups, which reaped most of the benefits from this program, but rather an interlocking assortment of homosexual and feminist groups, who had privileged and private access to this CCP fund. The chair of the "equality" panel, for many years, was the well-known lesbian Shelagh Day, former vice president of NAC (National Action Committee on the Status of Women) and one of the founders of the legal arm of the feminist movement, LEAF (Women's Legal Education Action Fund). Representatives of LEAF currently sit on both the Advisory Board and on the Board of Directors of the CCP. Ms Day was replaced as chair of the Equality panel by another member of LEAF. Guess which organization is the recipient of many of the grants from the CCP?

### REAL Women's Applications for Funding Rejected

REAL Women applied to the CCP on three occasions to request assistance in our court interventions, only to be rejected each time. Yet, LEAF and the homosexual organization EGALE that opposed us in many of these court cases were funded by the CCP. Another so-called "disadvantaged" group that received funding from the CCP was the wealthy (by way of compulsory union dues) Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE). The latter received funding from CCP to oppose REAL Women in the Ontario Court of Appeal in the Rosenberg case, which granted marriage benefits to same-sex couples, thanks to the decision of trendy Madame Justice Rosalie Abella, who, presently sits on the Supreme Court of Canada. CUPE also intervened against REAL Women's affiliate Alberta Federation of Women United for Families (AFWUF) in the Vriend homosexual case, in which the Supreme Court of Canada forced the



province of Alberta to provide protection for sexual orientation in its human rights legislation. CUPE, by the way, is now funding a campaign to "save" the CCP and has set up a website to further this campaign. According to the website, the Court Challenges Programme's reinstatement is supported by left-wing organizations in Canada especially feminists and homosexual ones.

#### EGALE is Distraught

The homosexual organization EGALE is apparently distraught over the closing down of CCP. In an article in the homosexual newspaper Capital Xtra (October 19, 2006) on the CPP, it stated as follows:

No group has benefited more from Court Challenges funding than the queer community. Thanks to clever interventions from groups like Egale Canada we have achieved equal relationship recognition, and with the Charter of Rights as a backbone, we've fought homophobia and discrimination in classrooms and workplaces. Now the program is gone.

In another article published in the same issue, it stated:

Money from the Court Challenges Program helped Egale win equal marriage rights through the courts in BC, Ontario, and Quebec. When government sent questions to the Supreme Court in 2004, Egale was there to help make the legal case that gays and lesbian marriage was a charter issue - with the help of the Court Challenges Program money.

'This will have a devastating effect on our ability to pursue legal cases' says Gilles Marchildon, executive director of Egale.

#### Summary of CCP

The CCP rarely advanced the rights of minorities: With very few exceptions, it has been used to subvert the democratic process and advance the cause of left-wing special interest groups to change the social values of this country by judicial fiat. The CCP funding allowed the courts rather than Parliament to decide controversial social issues. Parliament, at least, hears both sides of an issue, makes compromises, and has access to extensive research, as well as to the social facts involved in an issue. The courts hear, on the other hand, only the arguments of those who can afford to appear before it. Thus the CCP funding has allowed only one side to be heard since those holding other views usually do not have the deep pockets to appear before the court. The final insult to the taxpayer about the CCP, is that although it is completely funded by the taxpayer, it is not answerable to Parliament, nor is it subject to the Access to Information Act and as a result, could do whatever it liked with the taxpayer's money without fear of any interference with its decisions.

Finally, recipients of the CCP grants had its representatives sitting on the CCP Board of Directors and its Advisory Committee, which enabled it to make grants to their own organizations. The CCP was profoundly undemocratic and an insult to the taxpayers. The disbanding of the CCP was long overdue.

#### 3. The Law Commission

The Law Commission is no more acceptable than the CCP. It was established in 1971 by the Trudeau government supposedly to review federal laws and make recommendations for their modernization. Its recommendations were never rooted in legal principle, but reflected only the ideological views of the appointed commissioners and was used as a method of providing a platform for the liberalization of the laws. The Commission reported to the Minister of Justice, not Parliament, and even though its recommendations were non-binding, the Commission's recommendations were avidly quoted by the Supreme Court of Canada to support changes in the laws. Over the years, the Law Commission has recommended abortion on demand, fetal experimentation, decriminalization of prostitution, elimination of incest and bestiality as crimes among other provocative recommendations.

An example of the politically correct trendy mindset of the Law Commission was apparent a number of years ago, when REAL Women was invited to a consultation organized by the Law Commission to discuss women and criminal law. REAL Women's Gwen Landolt was the only non-feminist lawyer present among the fifteen or twenty female lawyers invited to the consultation. The Commission took it for granted that feminists were the only acceptable representatives of all Canadian women - and REAL Women's invitation was merely a token for the "others".

At that meeting by the way, the issue of removing bestiality (sex with animals) was discussed. When Gwen inquired why this change was indicated, the Chairman of the Commission told her that bestiality need no longer be a criminal offence because animals were now sufficiently protected under provincial legislation!

Although Gwen was greatly outnumbered at that meeting, she never allowed the feminist lawyers to get away with any of their nonsensical arguments. Consequently, it's not surprising that REAL Women was never asked to attend another of the agency's so called "consultations"!

#### The Law Commission and Same Sex Marriage

The most recent example of the failings of the Law Commission was its report "Beyond Conjuality" released in 2001. This report not only recommended that same-sex marriage be legalized but also recommended that marriage be eliminated altogether. The report listed in the acknowledgements the names of those on the study panels and the background researchers who had prepared the report. These individuals were almost solely homosexual or lesbian activists, as were the drafters of the final report. Hardly an objective analysis.

This lack of objectivity of the Commission on the same sex marriage issue was exemplified by the fact that its Chairperson, Nathalie DesRosiers, held a press conference on January 30, 2001 jointly with Rev. Brent Hawkes of Toronto's homosexual church the Metropolitan Community Church to announce its report in support of same sex marriage.

Obviously, the elimination of the Law Commission and the Court Challenges Program was long overdue and their elimination will contribute to a more balanced and objective public dialogue in Canada - something that Prime Minister Trudeau and his left-wing colleagues had tried to prevent.

Please write to Prime Minister Harper, and your MP letting them know you heartily agree with these budget cuts. Certainly, the media is doing everything possible to undermine the conservatives in this regard.

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper  
Office of the Prime Minister  
80 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax: (613) 941-6900

Your MP  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

#### **FURTHER CONSERVATIVE PLANS ON CHILD CARE**

During the last election, when the Conservative government rejected Paul Martin's grand (and expensive) scheme to establish a national child care program, Mr. Harper promised \$1,200 per year to be paid to parents with children younger than 6 years of age. This plan was implemented on July 1st of this year.

The second part of the Conservatives' plan on child care is to create 125,000 more child care spaces at a cost of \$250 million annually over a five-year period, beginning in the fiscal year 2007-2008. These spaces are to be created by way of tax credits and other financial incentives, such as capital grants and loans to corporations and other organizations in order to encourage the development of more spaces.

Over the last few months, officials from the Department of Human Resources and Social Development Canada (HRSDC) met with employers, stakeholders and providers in each province and territory to discuss this initiative.

REAL Women was contacted by officials at HRSDC and asked to meet with Barbara Moran, Director, and Maureen Edgar, Policy Analyst of the Child and Youth Policy Division of HRSDC, to obtain our input on creating the child care spaces.

On September 14, 2006, three members of REAL Women met these officials from HRSDC. They were National President, Laurie Geschke, National Vice President, Gwen Landolt, and Cecilia Forsyth, Saskatchewan Chapter President. Prior to our meeting with these officials in Ottawa, Cecilia had conducted an informal survey on behalf of REAL Women on the child care requirements of rural women. (Cecilia and her husband, George, operate a farm in rural Saskatchewan.)

REAL Women believes that the ideal situation is for every family to look after its own children in its own home, if they so choose. However, we know that because of economic necessity, illness, and other family circumstances substitute child care is often an essential and valuable service to families. The child care choices, however, must be made by the family, not the state.

Thus, at our meeting, REAL Women emphasized that the creation of child care spaces must give priority to parental preference, which usually means informal arrangements with relatives, friends, or community care provided by religious or cultural organizations. We discussed the advantages and disadvantages of on-site child care at business sites, as well as the development of child care centres in schools. (The school site child care centres provide care before and after school hours, which allows the child to remain in one place during the course of the day, i.e., provides continuity of care for the child during the day.)

We also discussed child care for rural parents and single parents, as well as parents operating home-based businesses and small family businesses, which often require child care for only short periods of time, rather than on a regular, consistent basis.

We recommended a voucher system or tax credits for parents, so as to allow them to make their own choices to accommodate these different child care needs.

#### Informal Child Care Providers Don't Give Receipts

Informal child care arrangements are by far the preferred choice of parents, but unfortunately, such child care providers do not usually provide receipts because informal child care providers do not want this income to be taxable. Rather, they regard these earnings as a small contribution to their family income, as well as, often, an effort to help out their family, neighbours, and friends. REAL Women believes that neither the parents nor the informal care givers should be financially penalized for these informal arrangements. Consequently, we suggested that a mechanism be developed whereby taxes would not be payable by the informal child care providers up to a specific sum, for example, \$3,000 per annum, after which the earnings would then become taxable.

Consultations on this child care initiative by HRSDC were carried out until the end of September. In early October, the results of these consultations were submitted to a nine-member Child Care Advocacy Committee, headed by Dr. Gordon Chong (a Toronto dentist and former Toronto Council member). This Committee was appointed by the Conservative government to provide final advice on the approach and mechanisms required to implement the child care initiatives. The Advisory Committee's recommendations are to be submitted to the HRSDC before Christmas, to enable the government to put the plan in place for the 2007-2008 budget.

## **CANADA'S NO-FAULT DIVORCE: CREATING HEARTACHE AND HARDSHIP**

### Previous Divorce Law

Prior to 1968, the divorce rate was relatively low in Canada, since the grounds for divorce were limited to adultery. As a result, individuals entering into marriage at that time regarded marriage as a permanent commitment for life and were obliged to work hard at making their marriage succeed, since extricating themselves from the marriage was extremely difficult. This was verified by a fascinating article in the National Post (November 5, 2006) in which three couples married over 60 years, were interviewed as to why their marriages had lasted. All the partners stated that their commitment to the marriage was the glue that kept them together despite the difficulties that had occurred which are inevitable in every marriage.

However, the 1960's in Canada and elsewhere was a time of sexual revolution, coupled with a disregard for all the old rules and understandings that had previously bonded society together. Marriage was not exempt from this new attitude. As a result, marriages based on commitment, duty, responsibility and sacrifice were regarded as outdated. It was argued that commitment should give way to the individual's right to self-fulfillment and happiness, regardless of the fact that separation and divorce may cause harm to others. Because of this new attitude towards marriage, political pressure to widen the Divorce Act began to build.

### Divorce Amendment Act 1968

This political pressure finally resulted in an amendment to the Divorce Act in 1968, which permitted divorce on the grounds, not only of adultery, but also on the grounds of physical and/or mental cruelty or "marriage breakdown", indicated by the couple living apart for a three-year period. Even these grounds, however, proved too restrictive for many, since they required proof of "fault" by one of the partners, and proving "fault" in a court was not always easy.

### Divorce Amendment Act 1986

The demand arose for still easier divorce laws, i.e., divorce to be granted on no grounds at all, but merely on the fact that the couple lived apart for a short period of time. Consequently, another amendment to the Divorce Act took place in 1986, which allowed divorce after only one year of separation. The new attitude towards marriage, that is, to casually walk away from it if one was "unhappy" in the marriage, was an important cultural shift that ignored the reality that breakdown of marriage creates severe and troubling problems, not just to the individuals themselves and their children, but also to society.

### No-Fault Divorce is no Solution

It is significant that much of this pressure for the "no-fault" divorce amendment in 1986 came from feminist organizations which argued that no-fault divorce would easily free women from abusive husbands, ease the pain and suffering of the partners, as well as reduce the financial costs of the divorce. The reality, however, was that the pain and suffering caused by marital breakdown continued unabated under the amendment; only the lawyers and accountants actually benefited from the change in the divorce law because of their increased incomes that resulted from it. That is, the same old problems involved in marriage breakup continued: namely, conflict over custody and access and support payments, for which no-fault divorce provided no cure.

The divorce rate in Canada is as follows and indicates the large jump in numbers each time the divorce law was loosened:

Years	# of Divorces	Rates per 100,000 Pop.
1921	558	6.4
1941	2,462	21.4
1961	6,563	36.0
1968	11,343	54.8
1969	26,093	124.2
1981	67,671	271.8
1985	61,980	253.6
1986	78,304	298.8
1987	96,200	362.3
1990	80,998	295.8
1994	78,880	269.7
1995	77,636	262.2
1996	71,528	241.1
1997	67,408	222.6
1998	69,088	225
1999	70,910	232.5
2000	71,144	231.2
2001	71,110	236.9
2002	70,155	223.7
2003	70,828	223.7

In this regard, it is interesting to note that studies indicate that if couples in struggling marriages hang in and remain faithful to their spouses, more than 80% say that they have a good marriage five years later. That is, marriage like all human relationships rarely remains static, but changes according to circumstances and the various pressures experienced by the partners during the course of the marriage. Marriage frequently improves with time and perseverance on the part of both partners.

This is not to imply that there are never circumstances in which couples should separate. Severe personality defects, emotional and/or physical abuse, promiscuity, alcoholism, drug abuse etc., frequently make it impossible to sustain a marriage, no matter how committed the other partner may be to the relationship.

#### Detrimental Effects of Divorce on Society

##### 1. Mother and Child Poverty

We frequently hear concerns about the large number of Canadian children living in poverty. Nobody mentions, however, the reason for this. Childhood poverty is largely the result of out of wedlock births, divorce and separations, which leave lone parents to raise the children. According to Statistics Canada 1996 (Statistics Canada Catalogue 13-207), the incidence of low income among families with children in 1996 was as follows:

Husband and Wife Families	11.8%
Lone Parent Families-Female	60.8%
Lone Parent - Male	31.2%

Children in lone-parent families headed by women were almost five times more likely to be in a low-income situation than children in two-parent families. This pattern continued in 1997, when 56.0% of children in female, lone-parent families were in low income environments, compared with 12% of children in two parent families. The low-income rate for female lone-parent families has been consistently above 50% since the early 1980s. The answer to the

problem of child poverty then is to strengthen marriage and keep families together. This will also increase a child's chances to succeed in life and make his/her growing years healthier and happier ones.

## Fathers

Fathers suffer from no-fault divorce, not only because of the personal devastation experienced by the marriage falling apart, but also by the fact that custody, in most cases, is awarded to the mother. According to Statistic Canada, in 2002, custody was awarded to the wife in 49.5% of cases while fathers were awarded custody only in 8.5% of cases; in 41.8% of the cases, custody was awarded to the mother and father jointly. Under a joint custody arrangement, however, children do not necessarily spend equal amounts of their time with each parent, but the parents do at least supposedly have equal say over the children's upbringing.

The financial support guidelines, enforced by the courts, do not make a father's life any easier. Access by the father to his children, even court-ordered access, is all too frequently not honoured by the mother if she decides she wants the father out of her children's lives. Court ordered access is seldom enforced, often leaving the father to pay for support of children he seldom, if ever, sees. Sadly, the lack of a father's constant presence and influence is one of the reasons why many children in broken families fail to thrive on nearly every scale, educationally, emotionally and socially.

## Detrimental Effect of No-Fault Divorce on Society

### 1. Marriages Weakened by No-fault Divorce

No-fault divorce has dramatically changed society's attitude toward the importance of marriage, which has led to the destabilization of society. That is, because the marital bond can now so easily be broken at the discretion of one partner, marriage is no longer regarded as a permanent commitment, but is allowed to continue only so long as the partners find it convenient. This results in the destabilization of society because marriage is the bedrock on which families are built and is the best environment for raising children to be stable and responsible citizens.

### 2. Trial Marriages Rise Due to Easy Divorce Laws

In the early part of the 20th century, very few couples lived together before marriage. But today a large number of people embark on a "trial marriage", to see if they are compatible. That is, it has become perfectly acceptable, indeed almost expected, that couples will live together before they marry. In fact, many couples today do not even bother with marriage at all: instead they move in together and have children without any true commitment to each other. It is a matter of indifference to them whether they have the "piece of paper" i.e., a formal marriage certificate, as the partners basically regard their relationships as transitory, shifting and changing.

According to a study in 1986 by William Axinn of the University of Chicago and Arland Thornton of the University of Michigan, couples who live together are less committed to the institution of marriage, and "cohabiting experiences significantly increase young peoples' acceptance of divorce." Axinn and Thornton cited studies that found couples who live together before marriage have divorce rates 50 to 100% higher than those who do not live together prior to marriage. "Living together," they stated, "may reinforce the idea that intimate relationships are fragile and temporary" and this might "reduce the expectation that marriage is a lifetime relationship."

In fact, legal marriage is the most stable of all co-habiting relationships. According to Statistics Canada, by the time children are 10 years old, 63% of children with parents living in a common-law union will have seen their parents separate, compared with only 14% of children whose parents were married and had not previously lived common-law.

Moreover, according to Statistics Canada's Survey on Violence Against Women released in November 1993, a woman living in a common-law relationship is four times more likely to be the subject of domestic violence from their partner than legally married women. In a study released in October 2006, Statistics Canada found that a woman living

common-law is now five times more likely to suffer abuse than a woman who is married. Indeed, violence by a live-in boyfriend or girlfriend is the only category of abuse that has grown over the past few years.

### 3. Divorce Detrimental To Children

It is now beyond dispute that children thrive best when raised in a home with their biological parents because married mothers and fathers living under the same roof are much more likely to provide stable and secure environments in which their children can flourish.

It has been documented that the natural family structure of mother, father and children benefits nearly every aspect of children's well-being, including greater educational opportunities, better emotional and physical health, less substance abuse, lower incidences of early sexual activity for girls, and less delinquency for boys. This was made clear in a study by Judith Wallerstein, which commenced in 1971 and continued for nearly 15 years, and remains the most enduring study of long-term effects on children of divorce, where severe forms of economic or emotional deprivation were not a factor. For example, five years after divorce, this study found that more than a third of the children experienced moderate to severe depression. Young adults from disrupted families were nearly twice as likely as those from intact families to receive psychological help. Family disruptions also affected school achievement. This has led to one of the great tragedies of our times, which are children failing in school, not because of a lack of intellectual capacity, but rather, a lack of emotional capacity. Much of the increased crime rate can also be attributed to the rise in the number of disrupted families. Boys from fatherless homes are significantly more likely to wind up in the juvenile justice system. Moreover, one of the long-term effects of divorce apparently emerges years later when young adults are trying to make their own decisions about marriage. According to the Wallerstein study, divorce makes it more difficult for young adults to make and commit themselves to new relationships. This may well be a contributing factor in the recent rise of common-law marriages to 14% of co-habiting arrangements, according to the 2003 census.

### 4. No-Fault Divorce Sets Stage for Same-sex Marriage

Pro-family researchers argue that those who support no-fault divorce must share some of the blame for today's debate over same-sex marriage.

For example, Dr. Stephen Baskerville, a professor of political science at Howard University in Washington, D.C. claims that the controversy over same-sex marriage has not arisen suddenly, but gradually over decades because of changes that have been going on regarding the family for at least 40 years, and in particular, no-fault divorce. He claims that no-fault divorce has debased the institution of marriage because it has led to increasingly casual attitudes toward marriage, which no longer serve as a barrier to promiscuity. This makes marriage more attractive to those who engage in the promiscuous homosexual lifestyle. Increasingly casual attitudes about unwed pregnancy, unmarried cohabitation, marital infidelity, and other sex outside marriage have helped to undermine the integrity of traditional marriage and family.

#### Society's Responsibilities

It is the business of society to protect vulnerable children and their families from harm. Divorce, when readily available, permits marriage partners to step away during the rough patches, which are inevitable in all marriages. Society must stress not so much Perfect Love, but Perfect Determination to stick the marriage out and make it work. In this regard, the state cannot persuade husbands and wives to accept the high obligation of marital chastity and commitment. But, it can exact a price from those who break the marriage contract by failing to meet lawful marital obligations. The state can, not from malice, but rather to protect children, enforce restraint on partners by making the marriage contract more difficult to break, by adopting stricter divorce laws.

Further, under the present Divorce Act, the Court cannot look to "fault" when determining the division of property and the setting of spousal support. This leaves the aggrieved, innocent party without a sense of closure or recognition of their commitment to the marriage, which was lacking in the other partner. Thus, it is perhaps time to consider the

reinstatement of fault in divorce.

There are positive steps that can assist couples in their marriage journey. These include:

Ending no-fault divorce and making divorce more difficult to obtain by re-establishing the concept of "fault" in divorce actions;

Establishing a national goal of reducing divorce, in particular, for couples with children, by embarking on a public campaign, informing the public of the risks of divorce and demonstrating the long-term benefits of marriage;

Establishing community-based marriage counseling courses with low-cost fees;

Making marriage counseling a tax deductible item, thereby making it more "respectable" and affordable;

Required mandatory counseling for divorcing couples with children; such as is available now in the province of Alberta, to ensure the children are given full protection and that their parents are aware of what their children's needs will be because of the divorce.

The tragedy is not so much that marriages fail, but rather, that so little is done to help make marriages work in Canada.

## **GOVERNMENT GRANTS OUT OF CONTROL**

Past Liberal governments burdened Canada with a corrupt system whereby the government collected hard earned tax dollars from Canadians and then re-distributed this money to its own liberal causes and supporters to further the government's own agenda. The Liberals gave \$26 billion per year on grants and contributions to individuals, companies and non-governmental organizations. Canadians are generous taxpayers but they have been abused by this over-taxation by the Liberals and excessive government spending - money spent not so much to assist the welfare of the public but rather to promote the Liberal party and keep it in power.

According to a poll of business leaders carried out by COMPAS polling company "business leaders say grants and subsidies to support research and development are inherently unfair and favour politically connected companies." 90% of respondents believe that tax credits available to all are better than grants "because they involve no politics." They concluded that "low taxes across the board are the only fair and efficient way of stimulating the economy." (Financial Post, October 16, 2006).

### **Auditor General's Role**

The Conservative government had wanted to authorize the Auditor General to "follow the money" by auditing any entity receiving grants, contributions or transfer payments of over one million dollars over five years. Auditor General Sheila Fraser however, has rejected this because she stated that it is up to the individual government departments, not the Auditor General, to monitor this spending.

Therefore, the Conservatives have put forward the Federal Accountability Act, which would make ongoing department reviews of granting programs, enshrined in law, to reassure Canadian taxpayers that their tax dollars are used wisely. The plan includes rooting out non-performing or irrelevant programs and establishing a panel to identify barriers to accessing government grants and contributions programs. Unfortunately, at this time, Bill C-2 the government's Accountability Act has been put on hold by the Senate. (See article "Conservative Government Cuts Left-Wing Agencies.")



Public Accounts Canada lists the billions of dollars given to thousands of recipients across Canada. Anyone with a strong stomach who wishes to peruse the tax dollars doled out in 2004 - 2005 to influence every aspect of Canadian society can now review them at the following website, which is only the tip of the iceberg. The website is [www.pwgsc.gc.ca/recgen/pdf/transfer05.pdf](http://www.pwgsc.gc.ca/recgen/pdf/transfer05.pdf) This site lists in 251 pages the grants over \$100,000 a year, made in that fiscal year. This, therefore, does not include the many thousands of grants, which were handed out for less than this amount. It must take quite a bureaucracy to keep track of all the groups receiving this generous funding!

Although it is true that some of this tax money went to some good causes such as disaster relief and helping the disadvantaged, bilingual services, immigration, sports, religious institutions, the arts, music, media, communications, exchanges between citizens, youth, museums of all kinds, all of which are an important part of Canada's society, unfortunately, much of the funding also went to special interest groups promoting the Liberal government's left wing causes. As a result, Canadians have less money in their pockets because of the government's generosity to its favourite groups. Many of these recipients receive grants from other departments as well and most of these grants are given automatically year after year once a precedent is set. It's a great set-up for the government and its supporters, but certainly unfair to the taxpayer.

Listed below are just a few of the happy recipients of Liberal largesse for 2004-2005, soon to become Conservative largesse if the new government does not tackle this serious problem.

From Canadian Heritage - Total transfers	\$ 1,012,170,746
Grants to eligible publishers of Canadian periodicals to defray a portion for mailing costs	49,192, 576
Canadian Unity Council Ottawa - Canadians in Europe Project	1,705,900
Canadian Unity Council Ottawa - Information & research on Canada	4,300,000
Canadian Unity Council Ottawa - Exchanges Canada Initiative	8,796,176

Grants to non-profit organizations, universities, institutions and individuals for promoting multiculturalism - total \$ 11,329,461

Canadian Council of Muslim Women Gananoque	128,625
Egale Canada Inc. Ottawa (homosexual lobby group)	112,800

Contributions in support of the Community partnerships program: Total:	\$ 8,034,814
Canadian Centre for Philanthropy	1,449,749
Volunteer Canada Ottawa	6,472,100

Contributions in support of Exchanges Canada Initiative: Total:	\$ 19,810,646
Society for Educational Visits and Exchange in Canada	4,500,000
YMCA of Greater Toronto	3,080,000

Katimavik\* (a program instituted by former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau's Friend, Senator Jacques Hebert in 1975. It is a national program for youth between 17 & 21 years of age to work as volunteers in projects in different communities in three regions of Canada.

\*This organization is currently under review because of serious concerns about financial irregularities. The organization was directed in November, 2006 to cease any further recruitment activities until further notice.

19,776,000

Contribution for the Sport Support Program: Total:	\$ 82,256,198
Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sports	4,320,000
Association for the Advancement of Women in Sports	396,000

Some of the sports associations which received over one million dollars in 2004-2005, were: Bobsleigh, basketball, diving, wrestling, canoe, curling, cycling, hockey, soccer, yachting, coaching, judo, rowing, skating, swimming, and tennis.

Not so lucky in the draw were sports associations receiving only a few hundred thousand dollars: bowling, wheelchair sports, ringette, rugby, shooting, squash, snowboarding, and Sport Dispute Resolution Centre.

Contributions to support the development of official-languages communities program

100 associations and governments listed                    204,715,357

Status of Women Canada: Total:                    \$ 10,840,000

Coalition of Women in Engineering, Science and Technology                    135,000

Canadian Council of Muslim Women - Gananoque, Ont. (second grant as it also received another grant for 2004-05 from the Heritage Department)                    156,038

Canadian National Coalition of Experiential Women (Prostitutes who promote the decriminalization of prostitution)                    252,305

Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (feminist research organization)                    304,481

Feminist Alliance for International Action (promoting feminism in third world countries)                    299,687

Power Camp National (a national programme that combines "social Justice" education for girls with a feminist analysis to provide an "anti-racist, feminist, queer-positive, ability-inclusive, youth" program for the empowerment of young women).                    151,300

Foreign Affairs - Total transfers \$ 3,458,628,074

22 pages of grants given to institutions, agencies and NGO's OECD (a Paris based organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (see REALity, Mothering is crucial Nov/Dec 2004). This organization criticized Canada in 2004 for it's failure to provide a national day care plan 22 pages of grants given to institutions, agencies and NGO's OECD (a Paris based organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (see REALity, Mothering is crucial Nov/Dec 2004). This organization criticized Canada in 2004 for it's failure to provide a national day care plan 10,703,550

Planned Parenthood Federation Canada (three separate grants)

\$548,914, + \$163,310, \$344,992                    1,057,216

Aga Khan Foundation                    2,404,695

Canadian Baha'i International, Almonte Ont.                    450,669

Canadian Labour Congress                    1,697,640

Jeunesse Canada Monde Montrea                    1 7,975,000

Kairos (a left wing human rights and environmental organization working for "corporate responsibility" internationally.

It is opposed to the war in Iraq and the Canadian military contribution in Afghanistan                    1,082,228

Catholic Development and Peace (a very left wing organization working internationally)                    7,512,720

Sound fiscal policy is essential to our survival as a nation. Liberal social engineering was a heavy burden on the taxpayer. The whining and groaning from left-lib beneficiaries of this excessive government funding both nationally and internationally, must not deter a level-headed Conservative government from cutting many of these extravagant grants. Billions can be re-directed to more worthwhile endeavours such as broad based personal tax cuts and tax fairness (see Finance Committee Pre-Budget Consultation Highlights, REALity Nov/Dec 2005).

## **FINANCE COMMITTEE PRE-BUDGET CONSULTATION HIGHLIGHTS**

REAL Women of Canada was invited this year to appear before the House of Commons Finance Committee Pre-Budget Consultation. About 400 groups and individuals have made similar presentations to the committee in cities across Canada. REAL Women was placed on a panel with five other groups at our September 26 presentation in Ottawa. In our presentation, we emphasized that the future prosperity of our country depends on the strength of our families. Consequently, the family, which is the foundation of a nation, we said, must be central to the formation of all public policy. Government decisions, especially tax and social policy, must be fair and equally beneficial to all Canadians.

We recommended the following:

1. End tax discrimination against the single-income family.
2. Convert the child care expense deduction (CCED) into a refundable child tax credit for all children.
3. Make the spousal deduction equal to an increased personal exemption.
4. Provide over-all tax relief for families.
5. Any government funding of day care must go directly to parents.
6. Eliminate funding to special interest groups.

See REALity Nov/Dec 2005 on REAL Women's presentation in 2005 for a detailed explanation of each recommendation.

This year, we answered questions from the MPs on the Committee on such issues as child poverty, low income families, the Quebec day care plan, women in the workforce, income splitting, and the freedom to care for one's own children at home. To our surprise, the NDP questions centered around abortion! Judy Wasylycia-Leis (NDP, Winnipeg North Centre) also took exception to our description of feminism. In fact, we did not describe feminism, but merely asked that feminist funding be cut because no one group or department can speak for all women, just as no one group could speak for all men. Without allowing us the opportunity to respond to her comments, Ms Wasylycia-Leis then turned to another panelist representing the Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Canada, to help defend her concept of feminism:

It was at this point that REAL Woman intervened in her discussion with the medical association in order to correct the record, which now reads as follows:

Mrs. Diane Watts (REAL Women of Canada): I'd like to correct an assumption that has been made about our organization..... We have no problem with feminists or for that matter anyone in a democratic society, expressing themselves, expressing views, and promoting whatever they want to promote for women and their views of equality, and dignity, etc. But we object to the government funding an organization that claims to speak for all women but speaks only for feminists. This is what we object to, because the feminist perspective does not represent the views of all women. This is why young women have rejected feminism. Yet we have a department that claims to represent and continues to claim to represent all women.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis: I think women's organizations try to ensure that there are choices for women and that obstacles facing women are dealt with so they're not harmful to our health and well-being. That's why I would like Mr. Lalonde... to explain to you why it is important to have funding for women's organizations that look at things through a gender lens.

Dr. Andre Lalonde. (Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Canada): We obviously have a very strong policy on sexual reproductive rights. If you don't believe this, then there is no use in having poverty reduction. We know that the poorest of the poor is the single mom who is pregnant. We are paying dearly for this because we then have to repair "le pot casse" [the broken jar] in later years, with child abandonment, child problems, youth problems, etc... We need to be all-inclusive in Canada. We need to include mothers, and we need to include people who have not had a chance to have stable relations for whatever reason. We're not looking to be judgmental. We're looking to provide them with support because this is the quality of the Canadian life. Everybody has an equal chance, but we're there to help them attain that equal chance.

This narrow understanding of problems that the medical association believes can be solved by the application of sexual reproductive rights (abortion and birth control), indicates clearly why women who do not hold these superficial notions about well-being, choices, poverty reduction, all-inclusiveness and quality of Canadian life need to join in the public debate.

It seems, however, that times are now changing and the family friendly tax policy is finally a possibility for Canadians, judging from the comments by the other Committee members and by the Conservatives' recent decision to allow pension splitting (see "Financial Help Granted to Seniors - Pension Splitting").

### **RECENT AMERICAN ELECTION HAS A SILVER LINING**

We have all been told by the mainstream media what "happened" in the American election in November - namely that anti-life/anti-family Democrats gained control of the U.S. Congress.

But, what was not publicized was the fact that pro-life/pro-family candidates had an advantage over other candidates in that election.

Pro-abortion political action groups such as the feminist "Emily's List" had \$30 million to spend to get out their vote and it ran splashy ads, as did other U.S. pro-abortion organizations.

The National Right to Life political action group, on the other hand, had much less money to work with, but despite this, over one-fifth of the electorate (22%) heard or saw their pro-life message according to a national poll.

But what was really significant was that a whopping 36% of the total sample said that the abortion issue influenced their vote. Almost exactly two-thirds of that figure (23%) voted for candidates opposing abortion, as compared to only 13% who voted for candidates favouring abortion. The pro-life advantage saved a number of candidates. Other issues, the importance of which overrode or neutralized the advantage enjoyed on the abortion issue by the pro-life candidate, felled those who lost. "Emily's List" and the National Right to Life Political Action Committee went head-to-head in 18 contests, and the National Right to Life prevailed in 14 of the 18 contests or won 78% of the contests.

Moreover, some of the newly elected and younger Democrats are deeply pro-family/pro-life and will not be obediently following orders from the older left-wing pro-abortion elites who now run that party and Congress. Internal wars among the Democrats over policy and strategy are expected.

The November U.S. election reflects the cultural change that is gradually developing in the U.S. on the abortion issue. This augurs well for the next U.S. presidential election to be held in 2008.

### **ACTION CANADA FOR POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT**

On May 26, 2004 REAL Women received an e-mail from a pro-life NGO (non-government organization) working in Latin America. The e-mail asked for background information on the Canadian NGO called Action Canada for Population and Development (ACPD) an NGO, which, according to the e-mail, was "giving a lot of help and funding to the pro-abortion movement in Latin America."

Background to ACPD

REAL Women was well acquainted with ACPD.

It was established by Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada (PPFC) in 1997 and was federally incorporated in 1998. It shared premises with PPFC for some time until it moved to its own separate office.

Its purpose or mission statement is to mobilize support both within Canada and internationally for population control, abortion (sexual and reproductive rights) and the homosexual agenda, including same-sex marriage.

At its inception in September, 1997 ACPD appointed lesbian activist and lawyer, Katherine McDonald, as its executive director, who still holds that position today. Ms. McDonald was formerly a member of the Board of International Planned Parenthood and served for a time as Chairwoman of the Nova Scotia Advisory Council of Women, a position from which she was subsequently dismissed.

#### ACPD Activities

It is obvious that ACPD does not lack for funds. Its executive director, Ms. McDonald, flits from one side of the world to the other pushing abortion and homosexual rights at international conferences. She has also been a member of the Canadian delegation at several conferences, which means that all her expenses are paid, courtesy of the Canadian taxpayer.

For example, Ms. McDonald was a member of the Canadian delegation to the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva in 2003 and 2004, where she lobbied extensively for a resolution in support of homosexual rights. In July 2004, Ms. McDonald was in Puerto Rico as a member of the Canadian delegation pushing abortion rights for women.

She also attended a UN meeting in New York in 2000, as a member of the Canadian delegation. The purpose of the meeting was to review the implementation of the population control provisions of the UN Population and Development Conference (ICPD), held in Cairo in 1994.

In between these official jaunts, Ms. McDonald has kept busy organizing conferences, such as its meeting in 2003 in Ottawa of the Asian and Pacific Alliance to advocate ICPD's international agenda. She co-chaired a press conference in October 2005 at Toronto's Sutton Place Hotel along with the UN Family Planning Fund for Population activities (UNFPA), promoting its annual "State of the World Population Report". This press conference also featured the launch of the 3rd edition of the ACPD publication on UN treaties called, "The Application of Human Rights to Reproductive and Sexual Health Law." This publication was nothing more than a lobbying guide for pro-abortion/homosexual NGOs to get abortion and homosexual rights included in UN reports and treaties.

During the 2004 federal election, on June 4, 2004, just two weeks before that vote, Katherine McDonald, together with Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada, the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League (CARAL) and Catholics for a Free Choice (CFFC) [so called] held a press conference in Ottawa to warn voters against casting a ballot for a Conservative Party candidate. These pro-abortion organizations expressed their concern about the "hidden agenda" of the Conservative Party, which was supposed to strip away abortion rights in Canada. In its press release, Katherine McDonald is quoted as saying:

We believe that this issue will be a deciding factor for many women, especially those who were considering support for the Conservative Party.

Subsequent to the 2006 federal election, ACPD completed a post election analysis of MPs' attitudes towards abortion and same-sex marriage. ACPD, of course, is one of the left-wing NGOs seeking to restore the Court Challenges Program (see article "Conservative Government Cuts Left-Wing Agencies".)

#### Where Does ACPD Receive its Funding?

Even when it acquired a separate office from Planned Parenthood, ACPD continued its relationship with that organization. According to ACPD's 2000 - 2001 annual report, it stated:

During the year, our office moved to new quarters separate from the premises hitherto shared with Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada (PPFC). We at ACPD owe a great debt of gratitude to the PPFC for its encouragement and support since our inception, and we have continued a cooperative relationship with it.

The "co-operative relationship" between Planned Parenthood and ACPD is due to the fact that ACPD, because it is a

lobby group, does not have a charitable tax status and cannot issue receipts for tax purposes. Thus, it is linked with Planned Parenthood of Canada in regard to donors who request a tax receipt. In effect, ACPD acts as an agent of Planned Parenthood which receives donations requiring a charitable status.

This was confirmed by a letter from APCD to a donor which stated:

Regarding the information I gave you about a donation receipt, I have asked others about attaining the charitable status and apparently we will not be eligible as we act mainly as an advocacy organization. However, Planned Parenthood would issue you a receipt and forward your donation on to us if you would prefer to handle it that way.

This would appear to be illegal.

Initial funding for ACPD came from Planned Parenthood Canada, and US population organizations such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Hewlett Foundation, the David and Lucille Packard Foundation, and the U.S. Population Action Council. According to the 2005 financial report of the notorious U.S. Ford Foundation (See Reality Sept/Oct 2006), it gave ACPD \$100,000 in 2005. It is probable that ACPD has received other grants from the Ford Foundation in previous years as well - but only the 2005 financial report is available on the Internet. The only financial statement ACPD has posted on its website was in 1999 when, in just after one year of operation, it recorded revenue of \$416,032 of which \$214,999 came from the Canadian government.

REAL Women was curious as to which federal departments were handing over grants to such an organization. Accordingly, we applied, under the Access to Information Act to a number of federal government departments. From this, we learned the following:

#### Funding to the ACPD

Citizenship and Immigration (2001-2002)	\$25,900.00		
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)	2001 \$15,700.00	2002	\$49,866.00
Foreign Affairs	1998 \$37,025,00	1999	\$19,327.41

It was our request, under the Access to Information Act, to Foreign Affairs that interested us the most, as Foreign Affairs supports and promotes the activities of ACPD. This is reflected in ACPD's appointment to Canadian delegations and also the pride of place given ACPD at all the Foreign Affairs consultations, as witnessed by REAL Women. We knew that Foreign Affairs had at least given ACPD funds to organize a series of regional forums across Canada in 1999 in connection with the UN's five-year review of the UN Conference of Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo. Yet, in its reply of October 29, 2004, Foreign Affairs claimed that it did not provide any funds to ACPD. REAL Women appealed this inaccuracy to John Reid, the then Information Commissioner of Canada. On November 28, 2005, Foreign Affairs finally acknowledged that it had, in fact, awarded ACPD funding as listed above.

#### ACPD Funded by U.S. Population Control Agencies

It also seems that in addition to funding from the federal government that the U.S. population control agencies are generously funding ACPD in order for it to allow it to work in third world countries to promote abortion and homosexuality. This generous U.S. funding is undoubtedly prompted by the fact that Canadian NGOs can achieve better results than American NGOs because the latter are viewed with suspicion in developing nations which fear so-called "American Imperialism." Canadian NGOs are not nearly as formidable to developing nations and this is the realistic reason why U.S. population control agencies are so generously funding ACPD to carry out its various works abroad.

In short, through organizations such as ACPD as its front, U.S. population control foundations and the Canadian federal government are able to introduce a political agenda in a foreign country and to manage political changes there that U.S. NGOs could not achieve. This deceptive activity amounts to political interference (it is nothing less) in foreign countries, using the Canadian NGO, ACPD, as its front.

