

THE POLITICAL AND JUDICIAL WHO'S WHO OF HOMOSEXUALITY

The Politicians

REAL Women has carefully documented, over the past few years, as reported in REALity, the relentless effort by the federal Liberal Party of Canada to push the homosexual agenda. Prominent Liberal Cabinet Ministers, especially a long line of Liberal Justice Ministers, starting with Allan Rock in 1996, working in tandem with the party hacks appointed to the Bench by a series of Liberal Prime Ministers, have brought about a homosexual revolution in Canada. Anything homosexual activists demanded was handed to them on a silver platter by the Liberals – sexual orientation protection in the Human Rights Act, same-sex benefits, same-sex marriage, immigration privileges, the subverting of religious rights, etc. During these monumental changes, the public's views were disregarded by the arrogant Liberals. After all, the Liberals were the party of power, in perpetuity they thought, and they knew what was good for us. The democratic process of consulting the public was irrelevant to the Liberal elites.

Have the Liberals learned their lesson by their defeat in 2006? Apparently not – judging by the new generation of Liberal elites, post Prime Minister Jean Chretien – who are also keen on pushing the homosexual agenda on the road to society's destruction. This was made apparent by their unabashedly marching in the so-called "Gay Pride" parade in Toronto on June 29, 2008. They marched alongside drag queens, gyrating exhibitionists, nudes with their genitals totally exposed (but wearing sandals to avoid indecent exposure charges), sado-masochism specialists, "leather-men" etc. No doubt believing they were liberated forward-thinkers, these supporters of the Parade in fact, revealed themselves to be mindless followers of politically correct thought. The politicians in the parade included the following:

Former Leadership Candidate MP Bob Rae (Toronto Centre);
Former Leadership Candidate and Liberal Deputy Leader Michael Ignatieff (Etobicoke – Lakeshore);
Toronto Liberal MP Mario Silva (Davenport), a self-acknowledged homosexual;
Toronto Liberal MP Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul – Trinity) happily escorted by transsexuals during the parade;
Former Liberal Leadership Candidate Gerard Kennedy;
Liberal MP Belinda Stronach (Aurora-Newmarket);
Toronto Liberal MP Borys Wrzesnewskyi (Etobicoke Centre). The latter attended a morning church service conducted by the homosexual Metropolitan Community Church minister, the Rev. Brent Hawkes, who broke the law by officiating at an unlawful same-sex marriage ceremony in 2002; and
Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty and his homosexual cabinet minister George Smitherman, Minister of Energy and Infrastructure.

It should be mentioned that NDP leader Jack Layton and his wife MP Olivia Chow were also in attendance, together with Elizabeth May, leader of the Green Party. It seems the left-wing in Canada marches together, in solidarity with homosexuals.

The only Conservative of note at the Parade was the not very enlightened Ontario Conservative leader, John Tory. He went down to ignominious defeat in the Ontario 2007 election where he garnered just 26 seats to the Liberals 71 seats (see REALity Nov/Dec 2007, p. 5). His defeat was self-engineered mainly because he is a left of the centre kind of guy. He supports same-sex marriage, has acquired the habit of marching in gay parades, and has hired a homosexual activist as his chief of staff. At the leadership review, held in February 2008, Tory obtained only 66.9% support for his retaining the leadership, and this was achieved only after some dishonest tactics on the part of his organizers. Mr. Tory lost his seat in the 2007 election and none of his caucus is willing to relinquish a seat so he can run in a by-election. As a result, he sits a lonely man outside the legislature, rarely commenting on the passing scene. It is only a matter of time before he resigns from the Ontario Conservative Party leadership. This would free him up to continue his left-wing pursuits, unhindered by the social conservatives who sat at home rather than vote for Mr. Tory on election day. There was a

meager 53% voter turnout in that election – the lowest in history, thanks to Mr. Tory.

The Judges

We are all familiar with the scandal created by former Ontario Chief Justice Roy McMurtry, who involved himself in the court cases on same-sex marriage, even though he had a lesbian daughter living in a same-sex partnership at that time (see REALity Sept/Oct. 2006, p.1). He should have recused himself, due to conflict of interest.

The issue before the court was whether same-sex unions should be recognized with legal rights and privileges. In short, the case dealt directly with the legality of McMurtry's daughter's relationship. After the decision, McMurtry, contrary to acceptable judicial conduct, partied with the homosexual litigants who had brought the legal challenge before his court. Also attending the party was Madame Justice Claire L'Heureux-Dubé formerly of the Supreme Court of Canada. She publicly declared her support for homosexuality in public speeches in 1999 (see REALity March/April 2000, "Speeches by Judge Create Controversy", p. 16). Further, more recently, two former Supreme Court of Canada judges exposed their homosexual bias in July 2008, when they attended the "marriage celebration" of homosexual activist, Toronto lawyer Doug Elliott, who had brought the same-sex marriage legal challenge to the courts. The two judges are former Supreme Court Judge Frank Iacobucci, who reached the Bench in the first place only because of his close friendship with former Justice Minister and later Governor General Ramon Hnatyshyn. Mr. Justice Peter Cory, formerly of the Supreme Court also happily joined the Elliott celebration. Both these judges, in their legal decisions on the Supreme Court wrote major judgments which laid the groundwork for the ultimate same-sex marriage decision.

For example, in the case of Attorney General v. Law (1999), they concluded that a person was discriminated against if they felt they were discriminated against and left a loophole well open for homosexuals to step in. In the case of M. v H. (1999), they agreed that homosexual partners should receive family benefits. This set the next stage which was the same-sex marriage case.

Judge Cory is quoted in the Toronto Star (July 12, 2008) at the homosexual "marriage" celebration:

They were difficult decisions and I hope that they recognize the innate dignity of every human being and the importance of equality and tolerance and understanding.

They could not have been more biased against traditional marriage. Also in attendance at the celebration was Heather Smith who, in her capacity as Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Ontario, had handed down the initial court decision in support of same-sex marriage in 2002. She now sits on the Ontario Court of Appeal, thanks to her husband Senator David Smith, appointed to the Senate in 2002, he being a close friend and advisor to former Prime Minister Jean Chretien. Senator Smith also served as Prime Minister Chretien's campaign manager in three successive elections. All these judges are one happy family, owing their positions to whom they know, not what they know.

However, the "high point" of this "marriage" celebration of Doug Elliott was the kiss on the cheek given to the "bride" ?, or the "groom" ? Doug Elliott, by Ontario Superior Court Judge David Corbett, the first openly homosexual man appointed to the Bench in 2003 by Prime Minister Chretien. Prior to his appointment to the Bench, David Corbett was an activist homosexual lawyer who, among other activities, was a member of the "Foundation for Equal Families" which pushed for homosexual privileges through the courts. He was the pro-bono (free) lawyer in the infamous Marc Hall case: Hall was an Oshawa high school student who filed a charge of discrimination against the Catholic School Board because it refused to allow him to bring his boyfriend to his prom. The court ordered an injunction against the Catholic School Board, preventing it from refusing the homosexual's prom date.

It seems that David Corbett's homosexual activism has not ceased with his appointment to the Bench. In July 22, 2008 he participated in the Gay Parade celebration in Halifax, where he was also interviewed by the media extolling the advances made by homosexuals in recent years. A complaint could be brought before the Canadian Judicial Council against Judge Corbett for bringing the judiciary into disrepute by expressing his political views, which is not in accordance with acceptable judicial standards of conduct. However, since the Chairperson of the Canadian Judicial

Council is Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin, what is the point of laying a complaint, since he will be protected by her and the complaint dismissed?

As mentioned above, these judges are all one happy family. They thumb their noses at the public by promoting their own personal ideology, while enmeshed in political correctness, with their comfortable salaries being paid by the long suffering taxpayer. Justice and integrity are not part of their judicial game plan. Rather, the judiciary appears to be all about doing its own thing, while being thoroughly contemptuous of the public.

AIDS — A HOMOSEXUAL DISEASE

AIDS was recognized in the U.S. as a distinct disease in 1981 when young homosexual men began to die of this mysterious illness.

At the time the disease was recognized, homosexual activists were determined to avoid any stigma associated with the disease, even though it was predominantly an epidemic in the homosexual and a drug addict community. Consequently, homosexual activists commenced an intense propaganda campaign, spending literally billions of dollars on AIDS campaigns, proclaiming that “anyone could get it” and that women were “the new fact of AIDS”. Predictions were made by these activists, as well, that China and Russia would experience a heterosexual epidemic of AIDS. None of this has happened. The number of women with AIDS in Canada, contracted either from bisexual or homosexual men or by use of contaminated needles, make up less than 20% of the AIDS population.

This misguided AIDS campaign has now become a multi-billion dollar industry with many vested interests. Profiteering has trumped prevention.

After twenty-five years of this campaign and billions of dollars spent, however, finally, in June, 2008 at the UN’s high level meetings on AIDS in New York, the truth was finally acknowledged by the World Health Organization (WHO) that there will be no AIDS pandemic among heterosexuals (except in sub-Saharan Africa) because the illness has mostly been contracted by homosexual men and intravenous drug users. It was also acknowledged that AIDS education was wasted on the general population, who were never at great risk.

Even the Canadian AIDS Society now classifies anal sex without condoms as a high-risk activity for HIV transmission since the overwhelming majority of HIV transmissions between two men happen during anal sex without condoms. (Capital Xtra, July 16, 2008)

Tragically, AIDS funds, which should have been directed at the high-risk groups of homosexuals and drug users, were diverted from pressing health needs such as malaria, safe water projects and typhoid etc. from many countries that were deprived of funds for these urgently needed projects in order to support the broad AIDS campaigns. That is, funds, which could cure diseases, were being squandered on the ineffective AIDS campaigns. Robert England (who heads the charity Health Systems Workshop) made this point in a recent British Medical Journal, when he stated that “Although HIV causes 3.7% of [worldwide] mortality, it receives 25% of international health care aid”. (National Post, July 7, 2008)

International AIDS Conference, Mexico City

Concerns were also raised at this UN meeting in New York in June that effective intervention, such as circumcision, which cuts the risk of HIV infection by 60%, and the reduction of the number of sexual partners (heaven forbid that there be only one sexual partner for life!) were not made a part of the misguided AIDS campaigns. Instead, condoms were promoted as “safe” sex, (which they are not) and no mention, of course, was ever made about changing behaviour, ie. that anal intercourse and sharing needles are the real risks that lead to getting AIDS.

Instead of dealing with the reality of HIV transmission, the 17th International AIDS Conference in Mexico City in August 2008 continued on with truly absurd excuses for the failure to stop the infection. It stressed that “aggressive treatment” of AIDS was the answer because it makes sufferers “less infectious” which can slow down the disease. Behaviour changes for homosexuals, which is the only way it can be stopped, never hit the radar at that conference.

No Decline in HIV Cases

Unfortunately, HIV among men who have sex with men is not declining today and, in some cases, is increasing. This is caused by a number of factors (besides the misguided education campaign). One of the main reasons is the growing popularity of “bare-back” (no condom) sex in or among the members of the promiscuous homosexual community, often involving recreational drugs to sustain sexual highs. Also, the development of antiretroviral drugs, that keep AIDS carriers alive for years, has led to the disease being taken far less seriously by homosexual men, who now consider AIDS to be merely a chronic disease, almost a curable one, rather than the deadly infection it actually is.

Rising Number of AIDS Victims

In the U.S., the number of young homosexual men with HIV infections is rising by 12% a year, in the 13 to 24 age group, among men having sex with men. The diagnosis for AIDS was up 8%, between 2001 – 2006, with the steepest upward trend in young black men. In Canada in 2006, there were approximately 58,000 people living with AIDS. Between 2000 and 2004 following a steady decline since 1995, the number of cases reported annually rose from 2112 cases to 2550.

Where AIDS Developed

For years, the public was told that AIDS was imported to North America by a promiscuous, homosexual Canadian flight attendant, dubbed by scientists as “Patient Zero”. However, scientists have now traced the genetic evolution and path of the deadly virus from Africa, to Haiti and then to the U.S. and on to Canada and Europe.

This puzzle of the origins of the AIDS epidemic was explained in a study presented to the US National Academy of Sciences in November 2007. It was disclosed in this study that HIV originally jumped from chimpanzees to humans, possibly when African hunters butchered animals infected with the disease. AIDS has had a long history in Africa, where the virus began to proliferate in 1930. The virus made its jump from Africa to Haiti around 1966 after the Democratic Republic of Congo won its independence in 1960, which resulted in many Haitians seeking work in the Congo. Consequently, the virus entered Haiti and then was transmitted to the U.S. in and around 1969 before traveling to Europe, Canada, Latin America, Australia and Japan among other countries. The U.S., in effect, served as a worldwide hub for the spread of AIDS, which was circulated in the U.S. for years before its formal recognition by U.S. doctors in 1981. “Patient Zero” was undoubtedly an early victim of AIDS and he has been linked to many other early cases of AIDS – but he is no longer considered the original carrier of the disease.

Now that AIDS experts at WHO have admitted that homosexual men and intravenous drug users are mainly responsible for the spread of HIV – can we expect an honest educational campaign on the issue directed at those who are at risk? Will men having sex with men change their sexual practices? One can only hope they do so to prevent them enduring the terror of AIDS.

THE FORMER LIBERAL GOVERNMENT AND PROSTITUTION

Over the years, ever since REAL Women began, the federal Status of Women has recoiled in distaste whenever they have been forced to deal with us.

We are definitely not their kind of women. This has occurred despite the fact we are the backbone of this nation. We are faithful to our families and to our husbands, give birth to and raise the future generation of responsible citizens, pay taxes, volunteer both in schools and in our communities, and in general, serve as the life force of this country.

Nonetheless, at the Status of Women we are viewed as persona non grata, and, at best, ignored. Apparently, however, the Status of Women does not have a similar distaste for women who sell their bodies for sex and who do not in any way contribute to society. Prostitutes appear, along with feminists, to be their favorite kind of people, who receive remarkable care and respect – and loads and loads of money from their agency.

We learned all this when we applied under the Access to Information Act for information about the prostitutes' organization, which operates under the grand name of the Canadian National Coalition of Experiential Women (CNCEW). (Looking in the dictionary, we found the word "experiential" means experienced – and that they are!) The information forwarded to us, under the Act was quite an eye-opener!

The Liberals and CNCEW – 2004 - 2006

The prostitutes' organization, CNCEW, received its initial grant of \$157,305 from the Status of Women in 2003-2004 in order to assist it in developing a network of "experiential" women (prostitutes) across Canada in order to develop and implement a strategic plan of action. Its first "national" meeting (thanks to this government funding) of all of 20 prostitutes (there was a total of 23 women only in this coalition) took place in June 2004. At its second "national" meeting a few months later, in September, the organization presented its recommendations to federal policy makers from five different government departments:

Human Resources and Skills Development;
Canada Border Services Agency;
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA);
Health Canada;
the Status of Women.

Also present was Senator Landon Pearson (now thankfully retired) as well as ministerial staff from the offices of Claudette Bradshaw, Minister Responsible for the Homeless, and Stephen Owen, Minister of Western Economic Diversification. According to the documentation, Senator Pearson was "amazingly impressed by the Coalition's presentation at this meeting".

The five federal representatives then met soon afterwards to determine how the government departments could work together to activate the key priorities identified by the Coalition.

Some of the key priorities of the CNCEW were perfectly valid, such as youth (they recommended the raising of the age of consent), e.g., health (treatment centres for substance abuse), safety, eliminating violence, and "social justice" (whatever that encompasses). The recommendation, however, in which the Liberal government took a particular interest, was the recommendation to decriminalize the prostitution laws, such as those relating to "communicating" for sex, bawdy houses and "living off the avails". The prostitutes thought that eliminating the prostitution laws would end the stigmatization of their "labour force".

The CNCEW further recommended that government officials "... be counseled by experiential women when enacting policy in regard to any aspect of the sex industry".

To achieve these ends, the prostitutes recommended that women in the sex industry "deserve devoted funds for law review because of the increased risk that the current laws pose for them". And did they ever receive funds from the Status of Women to achieve their goals! The funding by the Status of Women, according to its financial statement of September 28, 2007 indicated that a total of \$693,091.00 had been paid out to the CNCEW to carry out their "national strategy" by way of the following grants:

2004	-	\$157,305
2005	-	\$322,646
2007*	-	\$213,140
Total		\$693,091

* Although this grant was paid out in 2007 under the Conservatives, the application and approval had occurred in 2006, before the Conservatives changed the policy on Status of Women funding which occurred in September 2006.

Decriminalizing the Prostitution Law

As stated above, the Liberals took a particularly keen interest in CNCEW's priority to decriminalize the prostitution laws. According to this documentation, CNCEW had private meetings with Justice Minister Cotler and senior justice officials. They also were given amazing access to other government officials such as the Solicitor General and the RCMP. Senator Romeo Dallaire chaired a meeting at which CNCEW made a presentation and at which representatives from 15 federal government departments were in attendance. The Assistant Deputy Minister of Justice formed a committee on prostitution and awarded funding (the amount not specified) for CNCEW to conduct a needs assessment of "indoor sex workers". At the meeting with Mr. Cotler, he assured them that the Liberals would insist that evidence given by CNCEW, at the Sub-committee of Justice reviewing the prostitution law, would be carried forward when a new Justice Sub-Committee is struck to continue the Committee's work (with the special blessing of the Liberals). Normally these committees, under the House of Commons Rules and Procedure are dissolved, when the House of Commons is prorogued. This particular Committee was resurrected time and time again (See REALity January/February 2007 "Political and Judicial Manipulation on the Prostitution Issue", p.8).

Taxpayers may be interested to know that CNCEW's presentation to this Justice Sub-Committee on prostitution cost them a large wad of money. The grant of \$322,646, awarded in 2005, included the sum of \$45,903 designated for just research and writing CNCEW's brief to the Sub-Committee. This sum was broken down as follows:

Research Assistant:	\$350.00 per day x 10 days =	\$3,500.00
Research Assistant:	\$350.00 per day x 40 days =	\$14,000.00
Research Assistant:	\$350.00 per day x 8 days =	\$2,800.00
Research Assistant:	\$350.00 per day x 10 days =	\$3,500.00
Evaluation Consultant:	\$500.00 per day x 6 days =	\$3,000.00
Evaluation Analyst:	\$350.00 per day x 20 days =	\$7,000.00
National Meetings Facilitator:	\$350.00 per day x 4 days x 2 Mtgs. =	\$2,800.00
Communications Consultant:	\$350.00 per month x 18 mos. =	\$6,300.00
Media Monitor:	\$500.00 per month x 18 mos. =	\$9,000.00

And to think that REAL Women's brief to the Subcommittee did not cost the taxpayer a cent!

This huge grant in 2005 also included for example:

items for staff travel \$69,141.00;

salaries and benefits, for project coordination and management \$153,216.00;

"other", for \$24,700.00 which includes child care and out-of-pocket expenses for women and note takers at meetings.

As it happened, REAL Women was asked to testify before the Justice Sub-Committee on February 14, 2005 on the same panel as CNCEW. REAL Women is not overly sensitive (we can't be after all the years we have been politically incorrect!) but it was painfully obvious to us at that hearing that whatever we said would be inconsequential and be instantly ignored by the Committee (with the exception of the only Conservative member, MP Art Hanger, Calgary Northeast). The Committee was on a first name basis with the representatives of CNCEW, while REAL Women was treated with barely concealed hostility. (See REALity March/April 2005 "Legalized Prostitution Next on the Liberal Agenda", p. 9).

We knew from this Committee hearing, with utmost certainty, that the Liberals were intent on overturning the prostitution law using the Committee as the tool to do so. The election of the Conservatives in January 2006, however, interfered with CNCEW's and the Liberal's "plan of action" to decriminalize prostitution.

Thus, we avoided by a hair having unrestricted prostitution in Canada. This documentation on prostitution has also revealed the lack of respect for the public held by the Liberal government. The elites in the party decided the policy, a large number of bureaucrats worked on the issue, the favoured group was heavily funded to push the policy – all without public knowledge or input, or consent.

Moreover, the Liberals would certainly have succeeded in pushing decriminalized prostitution through Parliament as it pushed same-sex marriage, pressuring their MP's to vote for the government policy and requiring the Cabinet to do so. A completely undemocratic process, but this was of no concern to the Liberal elites. These elites determined all policies and whether the public agreed with them did not enter into their consideration.

The Conservatives and the CNCEW – 2007 – 2008

With the election of the Conservative minority government in January 2006, CNCEW met an obstacle in its path towards the decriminalization of the prostitution law. According to CNCEW's application for a grant from the Status of Women, dated February 2, 2006, CNCEW stated:

...with the changes within government there have been obstacles that have arisen, such as REAL Women's attempts to disband the Status of Women and Justice Committee Vic Toews' lack of support regarding proposed decriminalization of the sex industry. CNCEW's response ... [was] the submission of a letter counter-reacting REAL Women's agenda sent by all members to Prime Minister Stephen Harper and MP's within their region.

In September, 2006, the Conservative government announced that the criteria for funding by the Status of Women would no longer be made for lobby and advocacy groups, nor would "research" be funded. Instead, funding would be restricted to organizations that promoted actual services to women within their communities and which could show measurable results for their activities (See REALity, Nov/Dec. 2006, "Conservative Government Cuts Left-Wing Agencies", p. 7).

Therefore, feminists and organizations like CNCEW were, in one stroke, cut off from the public trough.

CNCEW Applies to Status of Women Under the Conservatives

REAL Women next applied under the Access to Information Act for the list of grants made by the Status of Women in 2007-2008 (under the Conservatives). In response we received a relatively thin package, indeed. We will provide an analysis of these grants made under the Conservative government in a future issue of our publication, REALity.

Included in the list of these recent grants, however, was one for \$195,569 given to CNCEW of Victoria B.C. to assist 150 women to exit the sex trade and reintegrate into mainstream employment and the social life of their communities. This is one grant to CNCEW which REAL Women heartily endorses!

Conclusion

In providing a rationale for all the generous grants made to CNCEW in 2004-2007, the Status of Women stated:

One of Status of Women's outcomes is to achieve a strengthened and more equitable public policy, one that will consider the diversity of women's perspectives...

The Government of Canada [has] a commitment to build a society inclusive and respectful of all Canadians ... and the full participation of all women in the economic, social, cultural and political life of the country...

This is outrageous hypocrisy, since REAL Women and other similar thinking women in Canada have never been included in the Status of Women's agenda. Diversity to Status of Women merely means "diversity" among left-wing organizations – never women who hold a traditional or conservative approach to issues.

LIBERAL LEADER STÉPHANE DION CONNECTS WITH FEMINISTS

Opposition leader Stéphane Dion has persistent difficulties in connecting with the Canadian voters. He has also been dodging bullets or knives in his back for months from the ambitious potential leaders-in-waiting, Bob Rae and Michael Ignatieff. He is even experiencing problems with the rank and file members of his caucus who cannot understand him, no doubt doubly hindered by Mr. Dion's imperfect English. However, there is one segment of his caucus with whom Mr. Dion really connects, and that is the special interest group of feminist MPs. They carry remarkable weight with him. Whatever policies they wish to have implemented, regardless of how out-of-date and unacceptable, are included in his platform. To date, Mr. Dion has:

declared that 1/3 of the Liberal candidates are to be female (see REALity May/June, 2008, p. 1);
vowed to block any vote on Bill C-484, a bill which protects pregnant women, by allowing two crimes, when either the mother or unborn child has been killed or assaulted in an attack on the mother during pregnancy;
endorsed the 2006 Liberal women's caucus Pink Book, Volumes I and II, which covers the dogmatic feminist demands of past eras, such as violence against women (studies indicate, however, that women are as violent as men), (see REALity March/April 2008 p. 1);
supported the feminist policies of a national childcare program and pay equity;
agreed to amend the Divorce Act to make it easier for women to exclude men from access to their children; and
enthusiastically supported the Order of Canada Award to Morgentaler because, according to Mr. Dion, Morgentaler "stood up for a woman's right to choose...".

Mr. Dion also pledged, on June 2, 2008, that the Liberal government, if elected, would force compliance with the Federal Plan for Gender Equality first introduced by the Liberal government in 1995 at the time of the UN Beijing Conference on Women. This "gender analysis" requires that all legislation and policies must be evaluated through an "equality" i.e. feminist lens. In practical terms, the objective of this analysis is to ensure that all government actions are subject to feminist overview and approval so that the feminist ideology can be spread throughout Canada.

Gender Analysis Policy

The House of Commons Committee on the Status of Women, under the Liberals, conducted a review in 2003-2004 of the gender analysis policy to determine whether it was being appropriately carried out in the federal government. The Committee members were furious to discover that most of the Ministers and senior bureaucrats at that time were very bad indeed in that they failed, for the most part, to do their duty and serve the feminists' cause by implementing the gender analysis policy in their departments. (See REALity, Nov/December 2005, p. 11, "Imposing Feminism in Canada".)

To circumvent the obstinacy of bureaucrats and insensitive cabinet ministers, feminist Liberal MPs have recently come up with a "never-fail" scheme to force the gender analysis program on all Canadians. These MPs have recommended that a "Commission for Gender Equality" be established to be headed by a Commissioner, appointed with power comparable to that of the Auditor-General, Chief Electoral Officer, or the Official Languages Commissioner to review government policies and actions and report such findings annually, directly to Parliament.

Mr. Dion has taken this recommendation to heart, and has agreed, if elected Prime Minister, to appoint such a Commission. If implemented, Canadians will then have another government agency with a team of highly paid bureaucrats with their requisite number of furnished, carpeted offices, computers, fax machines and pools of secretaries etc. ready to bring full "justice and equality" to women in Canada. These bureaucrats, including the Commissioner, will be exclusively feminists, who will be searching diligently for statistical differences between men and women in areas such as income, employment and representation in elected office etc. In effect, the Commission will be an effective way to pressure, intimidate and implement feminist policies in Canada, whether the majority of women (or men) agree to it or not.

Status of Women Committee Affirms Implementation of Liberal MP's Policy

The opposition-dominated Status of Women Committee in the House of Commons, on June 13, 2008, endorsed the establishment of such a Gender Equality Commissioner and also passed a resolution requiring the Finance Department to publish a separate analysis of future budgets to clarify how they will affect women. It also recommended that the Finance Department develop, within two years, solutions for addressing "gender-based" inequalities in the personal income tax system. Unfortunately, the Conservative female MPs on the Status of Women Committee also supported this latter recommendation. The Conservative MPs on the Status of Women Committee are: Joy Ann Smith (Kildonan – St. Paul, Man.), Patricia Davidson (Sarnia-Lambton), Nina Grewal (Fleetwood-Port Kells, BC), Helena Guergis (Simcoe Grey, ON), and Bruce Stanton (Simcoe North, ON).

Feminist Liberal MPs such as the party's Status of Women critic, Maria Minna (Beaches Toronto), Carolyn Bennett (Toronto St. Paul), Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre), Marlene Jennings (Montreal Notre-Dame-de-Grace, Lachine), Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre), and Sue Barnes (London West), to name just a few of the Liberal MPs in the Liberal caucus, are ecstatic with the co-operation of the Conservative MPs on the recommendation to the Department of Finance. Of course, they are equally ecstatic with Mr. Dion's decision to implement the Gender Equality Commission. Mr. Dion is their friend, indeed. Whether he is a friend of the Canadian taxpayer is altogether another matter.

The female Conservative MPs should have more appropriately directed their concerns about the discrimination experienced by single income families in the income tax system rather than to supposed gender bias in the tax system.

Please write to Prime Minister Stephen Harper and the Conservative MPs on the Status of Women Committee c/o House of Commons, Parliament Bldgs., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6 objecting to their support of "gender-based" inequalities in the personal income tax system and request that Conservative MPs direct their concerns towards the discrimination experienced by the single income family in the income tax system.

Please write to:

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

The Honourable Josée Verner
Minister of Heritage, Status of Women and Official Languages
House of Commons, Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

A very interesting thing happened this summer which I want to write about today to encourage you. Actually, the same thing happened twice, and in two different provinces.

Those of you on our private BC chapter's secure, free, email list heard on July 14th that the BC government had a survey up on the internet (for approximately 2 weeks at that time) seeking public opinion on implementation of full day kindergarten for 3, 4, and 5 year olds in BC. However, they hadn't been seeking public opinion very hard up to that point, as there had been no press release until after the BC based organization, Kids First, asked them where it was, and they didn't release it until after school was out at the end of June. And the closing date for submission of comments was July 15th, one day away from when we sent word to those on our list.

But there was tremendous response from our email Alert directing people to give their opinions on the government's website. There was so much response, in fact, that on the 15th of July, the Minister of Education announced that because of the level of interest, they were postponing the closing deadline for submissions to August 15th.

Our actions and responses made a difference! I was pleased, though part of me wondered if it was just coincidence.

But then it happened again.

In mid August, social conservative groups became aware of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario's request for input to a new draft policy impacting conscience rights for Ontario physicians, the deadline for which being August 15th. The draft policy document, "Physicians and the Ontario Human Rights Code" provides that the Human Rights Tribunal may take action against a physician who refuses to provide — or refer for — procedures that he/she finds morally objectionable. The document also states the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario plans to force objecting physicians to actively assist patients to obtain morally controversial services, despite the fact that a similar call to action in 2006, published in the Canadian Medical Association Journal, generated fierce opposition.

There had been no press release by the College when the draft policy was posted for consultation near the end of June, but the response was so great at the last minute and the call to extend the deadline so universal, that the College extended the deadline to September 12th.

Social conservatives have been likened to a sleeping giant in Canada. Well, it seems that the giant is beginning to stir. God grant that we see more of these small evidences that our voice is beginning to be heard! Keep up the good work, friends, and keep poking the giant that he/she may not return to somnolent oblivion any time soon! And if you have an email address but are not yet on our BC chapter e-mail list, the national, or Toronto e-mail list, please let us know when you next renew your membership or send in a donation.

I hope to meet many of you at the conference and the reception afterward. Please come and introduce yourselves to me! I look forward to it.

Until then!
Laurie

WORLD CONGRESS OF FAMILIES V AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS AUGUST 10-12, 2009

The very successful series of World Congress of Families is continuing in high gear.

At a meeting held in Washington D.C. at the end of July, an international selection committee chose Amsterdam, the Netherlands as the location of the next World Congress of Families, to be held August 10-12, 2009. The Congress will be held at the RAI centre (<http://www.ibc.org/cgi-bin/displaypage.cgi?pageref=1008>) which can accommodate as many as 4000 delegates in one hall, with smaller rooms available for breakout sessions of from anywhere from 100-700 people.

Amsterdam has over 300 hotels and approximately 110 within 20-25 minutes of the RAI – most are four and five star, but there is also a wide range of budget hotels, as well as youth hostels.

Amsterdam is a prime tourist destination, with 40 widely known museums, as well restaurants, shopping and historical sites, like the Anne Frank House.

Why Amsterdam?

Although all the above amenities are very nice (and essential), they are not the real reason that Amsterdam was selected for the next World Congress V. Rather, the selection committee decided that it was now time to go to the very heart of liberal Europe since that country has taken the lead role in the destruction of the family over the years. It has done so by its liberal laws which have legalized drugs, prostitution, and same-sex marriage as a result of the loss of religious faith. The Netherlands is now a tragic nation. However, there is hope. A coalition government has recently been elected in the Netherlands which includes conservative and faith supporters. They are valiantly, slowly but surely, turning the situation around, supported by a budding Dutch pro-family movement.

These courageous individuals want the World Congress of Families to be held in Amsterdam to strengthen their efforts. We are very happy to do so by being there at such a crucial turning point in the history of the Netherlands.

What the World Congress of Families Achieved

There have been four World Congress of Families: Prague, the Czech Republic in 1997; Geneva, Switzerland, 1999; Mexico City in 2004 and Warsaw, Poland in 2007.

These Congresses have made a remarkable impact. They have been like a light shining in a dark night, holding firm to fundamental principles of life and family which, hopefully, is leading the world out of its dark tunnel of self-destruction.

The World Congress of Families has made an impact on nations because:

It is an excellent vehicle for networking and building new alliances;

It has overcome many religious divisions and contributed meaningfully to greater pro-family unity;

It has given rise to a good deal of paranoia among the opposition, anti-family forces!;

It has won greater visibility for the pro-family cause world-wide;

It has articulated a natural family worldview, which is a powerful tool for the future;

It has launched a union of pro-family parliamentarians;

The WCF has established itself as a key "leadership" gathering for pro-family NGO's, scholars and political figures;

It has created a "spirit" that has been infectious (in the right sort of way!); and

The WCF has strengthened pro-family unity in some countries, such as the Czech Republic, Mexico and Poland.

In addition, these World Congresses have directly led several countries, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland, for example, to strengthen their pro-family policies.

Please participate in the World Congress of Families in Amsterdam in August 2009 and help to turn the page of history in both that country and Europe.

As they become available, further details on the Congress will be included in future issues of REALity.

NEITHER THE ORDER OF CANADA NOR MORGENTALER HAS ANY HONOUR

Neither Morgentaler nor the Order of Canada has any honour. They are both political tools used to pursue a specific agenda. The legal challenges to the abortion law over the years by Morgentaler, a humanist, were an opportunity to attack those he especially dislikes, whom he refers to as "religious extremists", notably Catholics and the Catholic Church. This obviously gave him satisfaction. Moreover, the destruction of the abortion law has reportedly given Morgentaler a free hand to make approximately \$11 million annually through the string of abortion clinics he has established across the country. To call him "humane" or "compassionate" is to denigrate these terms.

The Order of Canada, established in 1967, is also a political tool in that it is used to promote a specific agenda. Over the years, the Order of Canada has mainly been awarded to feminists, homosexuals, environmentalists, left-wing broadcasters, writers and others involved in promoting the political left. Seldom has the Order of Canada recognized the services of those who take a conservative approach to issues. For example, there are few, if any, major feminist activists left in Canada who have not received the Order of Canada. Considering the small number of votes the NDP obtains at election time, it is remarkable that so many of its partisans have won recognition over the years by the Order of Canada.

It is a different matter for those receiving recognition as Members of the Order of Canada for accomplishments of local and regional significance. However, for those appointed as Officers or Companions in recognition of their accomplishments on the national and international scene, it is their activism on the left side of the political ledger

rather than their contribution to Canada as a whole that is being recognized. Since it is politics, rather than achievement, that is the operating principle of the Order of Canada, the Order has no honour.

How Nominees to the Order of Canada are Selected

The decision to make someone a member of the Order of Canada is made by an Advisory Council, based on nominations received from the public. Anyone may nominate another person for membership.

Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin

The nine member Advisory Council for the Order of Canada is chaired by the Chief Justice of Canada (currently feminist Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin). One may well wonder why she is the head of such a partisan council. That is, why is she a key member of the committee, let alone sitting as its Chair? A conflict of interest is apparent here since appointees to the Order of Canada, such as Morgentaler, have previously been, are now, or will be in the future, appearing before her court. For example, litigation has been brought in New Brunswick by Morgentaler demanding provincial funding for his abortion clinic. The New Brunswick government last year argued in the New Brunswick Courts that Morgentaler has no legal standing in the case. This argument will, in due course, be appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada. Also, several years ago, a group of pro-life/family organizations, including REAL Women, were denied, by the Supreme Court of Canada, intervenor status in this New Brunswick case. Since Chief Justice McLachlin believes Morgentaler is a hero, how objective is she in his case? Another example of a conflict of interest is the case of the Rev. Brent Hawkes, a Pastor with the homosexual Metropolitan Community Church in Toronto, who broke the law in 2002 by “marrying” two homosexuals. The Rev. Hawkes was a litigant before Chief Justice McLachlin in the highly controversial same-sex marriage case. He was called to the Order of Canada last year when Chief Justice McLachlin again chaired the Advisory Council. What was Chief Justice McLachlin thinking? Does she believe that her appointment to the Supreme Court of Canada has given her special knowledge and insight indispensable to choosing candidates for the Order of Canada?

All this leads us to conclude that Chief Justice McLachlin appears to be less of a judge and more of an activist. She resembles the Anglo-Saxon Queen Boadicea riding into battle on her chariot, with her sword swinging. Only Chief Justice McLachlin is charging at what she obviously believes are the twin dragons of traditional values and conservative thought. She swings her sword at these “dragons” not only in her legal judgments, but also in the other areas of her empire such as in her role of Chairperson of the Canadian Judicial Council (which reviews complaints against judges), and Chairperson of the National Judicial Institute (whose purpose is to provide on-going education for judges).

According to the Globe & Mail (July 3, 2008) Morgentaler’s nomination was “driven” by Chief Justice McLachlin. How could anyone have confidence in her impartiality?

Letter of Complaint to Canadian Judicial Council

Forty-two organizations, including REAL Women, signed a complaint dated August 13, 2008, which was laid with the Canadian Judicial Council against Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin. REAL Women’s press release on the letter of complaint, dated August 14, 2008, stated:

Chief Justice McLachlin knew, or should have known, that her actions as Chairperson of the Advisory Council would compromise the integrity of the judiciary, since legal actions dealing with Morgentaler have in the past, and will again, in the near future, be brought before the Supreme Court. Since the Chief Justice has designated Morgentaler as worthy of distinction, her impartiality and integrity in these legal matters have now been severely compromised.

Chief Justice McLachlin had the duty to uphold the accepted standards of judicial conduct, of impartiality and fairness. She failed to do so. Confidence in her and her court has now been seriously undermined. As a result, the Judicial Council should recommend the removal of Madam Justice McLachlin from the Supreme Court of Canada.

This complaint is laid in the full knowledge that Chief Justice McLachlin also serves as the Chairperson of the

Canadian Judicial Council. Her obvious conflict of interest in this complaint also requires that she immediately step down from her role as Chairperson of the Canadian Judicial Council.

Chief Justice McLachlin was stung by the letter of complaint as she has now publicly denied that she actually voted on the Morgentaler Award and claims that she votes on the Advisory Council only in a tie situation. She further stated, according to the Toronto Star (August 17, 2008):

I'm there to make sure the meeting runs well and fairly and that the vote is taken fairly. ...

If such is the case, then Chief Justice McLachlin has dug an even deeper hole for herself as the award to Morgentaler as discussed below, was not carried out properly or fairly. She can't have it both ways.

Further Appointed Members of the Advisory Council

The other appointed members to the Council include Kevin Lynch, the Clerk of the Privy Council and Secretary to the Cabinet appointed by, and answerable directly to, Prime Minister Harper, and the Deputy Minister of the Department of Canadian Heritage, Judith LaRoque. According to the Globe and Mail (July 3, 2008), both these bureaucrats voted against Morgentaler's nomination. Others appointed to the current Advisory Council include Simon Brault, Acting chairperson of the Canada Arts Council (but apparently he was not present at this particular meeting); and Yvan Guidon, President of the Royal Society of Canada. He is the Director of the Bio-Organic Chemistry Laboratory at the Institut de Recherches Cliniques de Montreal and a member of the Board of Directors of the stem cell network, which was instrumental in the creation and use of human embryo research. Another appointed member of the Council is Thomas Traves, Chairperson of the Association of Universities and Colleges.

Governor General Michaëlle Jean

Governor General Michaëlle Jean, well known for her feminist views, appointed the remaining three members to the Advisory Council, who are required to be previous recipients of the Order of Canada. Since most of the appointees to the Order of Canada are left-wing, Ms. Jean would have had no difficulty in finding members to vote for Morgentaler's nomination.

According to information received from the Director of Information at Rideau Hall, the Governor General need not necessarily accept the final recommendations of her Advisory Council – as she may demand a “clarification” (make objections) of its recommendations. But it is noted that the Advisory Council recommendations are rarely refused by the Governor General, and especially in this case, where the appointee was one whose actions correspond with her personal feminist beliefs. This is not the first time, however, that Ms. Jean has overstepped her role as Governor General. (See REALity May/June 2007, “Our Wayward Governor General Michaëlle Jean”, p. 3). She keeps pushing the envelope, using her appointment as the Queen's representative, to promote her own and her husband's very socialist, left-wing agenda.

REAL Women has had concerns about the Order of Canada for many years. In 2001 we undertook an extensive review of the Order of Canada, at which time we concluded that it is being awarded mainly to politically correct, left-wing activists (see REALity, July/Aug. 2001 p.1). The appointment of Morgentaler to the Order of Canada only confirms this.

Morgentaler's Appointment Breaks Precedent

The Order of Canada, in this case, has been even further cheapened and debased, if possible, because of the dishonest way that Morgentaler was selected. Previous to his nomination, it was the practice of the Advisory Council that once a nominee had been rejected, a file on that person was never re-opened. It is known that Morgentaler had been nominated and rejected several times previously, the most recent rejection occurring in February. Yet, Morgentaler's file was re-opened and his appointment announced on July 1, 2008. Further, in the past, nominees have been rejected because they are “too controversial” such as the eminent McGill ethicist, Margaret Somerville, who has spoken out

against both abortion and same-sex marriage. Her nomination was rejected because she was considered too controversial. Yet who is more controversial than Morgentaler? Finally, previously all decisions on a nomination were made by consensus but this was not the situation with Morgentaler's nomination since the two government bureaucrats opposed it.

The Conservative Government and the Order of Canada

What was the federal Conservative government's role in the decision to appoint Morgentaler to the Order of Canada? One might well ask. The government has taken the position that it had nothing to do with Morgentaler's appointment and has distanced itself from the decision claiming it was the decision of the Advisory Council only. It is generally conceded, however, that a government in power has a thousand different ways, if it had wanted, to stop the nomination. Why didn't it do so? It is known that the government had advance notice of about a month before the announcement was made public.

The reasons the Conservative government may have decided to remain neutral on the appointment could include the following:

It did not want to widen the so-called gender-gap in the forthcoming election whereby fewer women vote Conservative, than Liberal, ie. the Harper government didn't want to raise the ire of the pro-abortion feminists (who are a very small number in any case) and would never back the Conservatives under any circumstances. It did not want to offend Quebec, because feminist Josée Verner, Minister of Heritage, and Lawrence Cannon (Pontiac, Quebec), Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, are both extremely pro-abortion. These members of the Cabinet raised strenuous objections in the Cabinet to the government becoming involved to counter the Morgentaler nomination. It is arguable, however, whether their views accurately reflect Quebecois on this issue. It did not want to get drawn into the abortion debate (which occurred anyway). It did not want to be seen as driven by the social Conservative element in the party – even though it is the foundation of the Conservative party in Canada.

Whatever the reason, it was not a wise decision by the government to remain silent on the Morgentaler appointment to the Order of Canada.

What Should be Done About the Order of Canada

Under the circumstances, this dishonoured award should be abolished. This would be the preferred choice since the Order of Canada represents nothing more than an award to further the goals and specific ideology of the left-wing. That is, because the award has become so discredited and a subject of derision and contempt, it serves no valid purpose. Who today believes it to be a worthy honour? Only those who are left-wing.

Please write to Prime Minister Harper and your MP requesting the Order be abolished.

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

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION INDOCTRINATING TEACHERS TO INDOCTRINATE THE CHILDREN

By Ruth Ann Attia, REAL Women of Canada

I am sure that many of you have heard about the liberal and leftist agenda that has taken over our institutions of higher learning. I would like to share some of what I experienced attending the University of Toronto's Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). It was my first real experience in a Canadian public education institution as I had previously attended a small private high school, followed by attendance at a university in the United States. I can say now that I am very thankful that the time I did spend in the Canadian public education system was not lengthy.

I began my year at OISE with my mind open and ready to learn, with no previously conceived notions about the political atmosphere of teachers college; I had simply heard that, in general, it was often boring and easy. However, my experience at OISE was anything but boring. In fact, it left me feeling angry, deflated and, most of all, deeply saddened about the direction in which Canada is headed. Initially, I was entirely shocked by the blatantly obvious political agenda. On the first day I noticed that my classroom wall had a poster listing the main Canadian political parties. It then listed each party's supposed track record with major Canadian issues, such as health care and education. Unbelievably, the poster went on to proclaim, that, as future teachers, we should be sure to "Vote NDP". I looked around for other posters proclaiming the same for Conservatives and Liberals: I could find none. I was so shocked that I pulled out my cell phone and took a photo of it, as proof of the propaganda! Sadly, this poster was the least of my concerns by the year's end.

Classes began and I was repeatedly baffled by the content of discussions being held in my classrooms. Such issues included why universities and high schools lacked transgendered washrooms, how to not stand for the national anthem, and censoring the celebration of Christmas in schools because it is too "painful of an experience for non-Christians".

After speaking out numerous times and trying to create a more even-keeled discussion about several issues raised in class, I realized that what was most upsetting about this whole situation was that the door to discussion had been closed. Permanently. My classmates and professors at OISE had absolutely no "tolerance" for anyone who opposed their views on tolerance, equity, diversity and social justice. I was fighting a losing battle. It was obvious that my classmates and professors were on a mission. This mission involved indoctrinating each student teacher, and eventually each high school student, with the tenets of their secular religion. The religion's highest objective was to attain "equity, diversity and social justice" in all aspects of education and social life. While it sounded great, when seen through an OISE lens it was actually a very totalitarian policy, with a complex language and some very self-righteous believers. I could not even speak about a possible doubt without being cast out of the group altogether and labeled a diversity-hater and an enemy of social justice.

I desperately tried to fight this belief that I did not care about the issues discussed in class, simply because I approached them from a different angle. I was consistently shut down by shallow arguments and silly comments that implied I simply hadn't developed as far as the rest of the group on the "progressive path". One of my classmates even began crying and told the class she found it very hurtful when people (looking in my direction) did not pay attention to issues she found to be of profound importance (this particular class focused on homosexual education). It was all very demeaning and, by the end of the year, I had mentally and emotionally checked out and no longer spoke in class at all. Fighting against 30 classmates every day took its toll. The last comment I made in class was to let my peers and future colleagues know that it frightened me that they could not deal with my questions or my disbelief in their policies without ostracizing me, for how would they treat the high school students that disagreed with them? As you can imagine, this did not lead to an increase in my popularity.

Needless to say, the year passed by at a dreadfully slow pace. I found myself sitting through classes on how to get hetero-normative language out of the schools, reading countless documents that had been reviewed for "equity", and reading mandatory Marxist and feminist literature. I was urged to attend equity/diversity workshops, and asked to volunteer in Gender Construction workshops that were mandatory for gr. 10 students, where issues like "straight supremacy" would be discussed by curious 15 year olds.

At one point, a classmate asked the professor: "So, are we supposed to be activists, or teachers?" and the professor promptly replied, "Can the two really be separated?" Finally, during a year end meeting with my professor, I boldly mentioned my distaste for the way OISE had over-indulged in the word "equity" and he asked me to write a paper on my thoughts about equity in place of the final paper. I felt overjoyed at finally being able to express myself. However, upon receiving my graded paper back, I realized that my professor had only asked me to write about equity so he could try to persuade me to think more like him! He had written in so many remarks and obviously aggressive responses that in total he had almost written as much as I had! So I realized that while my classroom looked very diverse, everyone thought exactly the same. There was no true diversity at OISE. Instead, it was an educational institution expressing the strictest moral and intellectual uniformity imaginable!

Looking back on my experience now, I realize that, as a student attending OISE, I was subject to what should be described as indoctrination. This indoctrination is of great concern not only to me, but also to all Canadians, no matter what side of the political spectrum. It is institutions such as OISE that educate the educators, who will in turn educate the nation. It is scary and sad to think of the thousands of students who will be indoctrinated in the classrooms of all my like-minded, unquestioning, and intolerant OISE-educated peers.

As parents of future generations, we need to make sure we do everything we can to fight back. We need to be as involved as possible in our local schools, and get to know the teachers and principals. We need to know what our children are learning, ask for curriculum resources, and question them! We need to protest specific aspects of the curriculum, that resemble indoctrination more than learning, and we cannot be shy about it. And of course most importantly, we need to raise our children with good strong moral values. We need to instill in them a love of knowledge and truth that outweighs and outruns the power of leftist indoctrination. This is our greatest hope in the fight against those who are indoctrinating our children and changing our nation.