# REALity January/February 2009 Volume XXVII Issue No. 1

#### FEMINISTS FUNDED BY THE CANADIAN TAXPAYERS STILL SOW DISSENT

By C. Gwendolyn Landolt, National Vice President, REAL Women of Canada

The Conservative Federal government changed funding criteria in September, 2006 so that core funding for feminist groups would cease, as well as funding for their research and advocacy by way of Status of Women Canada. Nonetheless, in 2006-2007, this department did receive \$11,592,766, according to Public Accounts Transfer Payments records http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/201/301/public\_accounts\_can/index.html. This generous sum was increased to \$15,217,326 for 2007-2008, http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/recgen/pdf/44.pdf. This money was now to be used only to cover grants to women's groups to provide financial assistance from them to carry out "projects" which would directly affect women. According to the Status of Women web site, their total department spending estimate for 2007 – 2008 was \$30.8 million which included the above grant money.((In short, feminists continually whine about funding cuts, but their very own Status of Women's annual funding for grants was increased by the Conservatives last year by \$3.6 million.

Even with cuts to Status of Women feminist research, this research is continuing undiminished in other government-funded circles, despite the difficult economic times. That is, other organizations continue to crank out left-wing "research" which the feminist groups continue to use. These other organizations providing research receive federal funding which is a part of the federal government's annual \$26 billion hand-out to special interest groups.

Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA)

FAFIA is a coalition of over 75 "equality seeking" (feminist) groups. FAFIA has received funding from Status of Women since its formation in 2000. FAFIA advocates an increase of the Status of Women budget to \$50 million from the present \$30 million (no doubt to increase its share of the take) and further recommends gender budgeting, which would address every government budgetary and fiscal measure by way of a feminist lens, under the pretense that this would advance women's equality. Sure!

FAFIA has received the following recent funding from the Status of Women:

2006 – 2007: \$330,000 2007 – 2008: \$180,470

The current year funding of FAFIA was scheduled to end in September, 2008. It is not known as yet whether it received further funding for the 2008-2009 fiscal year. REAL Women will be following up on this to see if this is the case. Altogether, FAFIA has received \$1,522,311 from the Status of Women since 2000, supposedly to carry out its "projects" on behalf of women. One of its "projects", apparently, is to use the UN as a tool to promote the feminist cause at the UN and in Canada.

FAFIA's Feminist Activities at the UN

One of FAFIA's major activities is to use the United Nations as a tool to pressure the Canadian government to further so-called feminist "equality" rights of women in Canada.

This is carried out by FAFIA appearing before select UN monitoring committees to report to them on the Canadian government's many alleged failures in regard to women. FAFIA claims that Canada is in violation of women's rights as set out in the UN Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

# How the UN Serves FAFIA's Objectives

Pushing the feminist cause with these UN Committees is made easy for FAFIA due to the fact that, in December 1996, in Deep Cove, New York, feminist groups met with representatives from all of the UN agencies, e.g., The World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Family Planning (UNFPD), etc. and decided that the way to impose feminist policies at the UN was by "re-interpreting" the six UN human rights treaties to make them accommodate the feminist agenda. This was to be done by way of the so called "Monitoring Committees", which are set up under the six human rights treaties to receive reports every few years from ratifying countries in order to determine whether these countries have complied with the provisions of the treaties. These monitoring committees, however, are comprised of NGO representatives – mostly feminist individuals or employees of international feminist organizations, who re-interpret or read into these treaties provisions in accordance with their own agenda, to attempt to force the implementation of feminist policies around the world. That is, even though feminist policies are not written into the treaties at all, they are interpreted as such by the committees.

Whenever a reporting country is scheduled to appear before a monitoring committee (as Canada most recently reported to the CEDAW monitoring committee, in October 2008) feminist groups submit reports (called "Shadow Reports") to the monitoring committee explaining how their government has failed in its obligations under the treaty. These feminist monitoring committees then issue criticisms of that country, based on these feminist reports. As a result of this process, for example, over 65 countries have been pressured by the CEDAW Committee to liberalize their abortion laws, even though the CEDAW treaty does not mention abortion.

# **UN Committee Decisions Are Not Binding**

The criticisms of a government by the treaty monitoring committees are not legally binding on a country, but are used for propaganda or political purposes by the feminist groups, to embarrass and pressure the government to implement the feminist agenda. For example, FAFIA appeared before CEDAW's monitoring committee in 2003 and again in 2008, when Canada presented its reports on the Convention. In its 121-page report to the CEDAW Committee in October 2008 http://www.fafia-afai.org/files/FAFIA\_Canada\_Cedaw\_2008.pdt), FAFIA included 34 recommendations. To present this report, FAFIA sent no less than four representatives to Geneva to "expose" the federal Conservative government's many failures. The expenses of these four representatives were, of course, paid for by the Canadian taxpayer out of FAFIA's grant from the Status of Women. FAFIA's report included the usual feminist demands.

Opposition Parties Attack the Conservative Government Based on Committee's Response

The CEDAW Monitoring Committee issued its report on Canada on November 19, 2008 and, not surprisingly, the opposition parties quickly and delightedly used the CEDAW Committee's report to attack the Conservative government for its alleged failure to promote the equality of women in Canada. For example:

November 25, 2008:

Ms Johanne Deschampes (Laurentides-Labelle, BQ) referred to the UN report's criticism of the government for its lack of shelters for battered women, etc. (Hansard pg. 242).

Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib) referred to the UN report's "shocking" criticism of the government ignoring calls for an enquiry into the establishment of a national violence prevention program for women (Hansard pg. 249). Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP) referred to the UN Committee's criticism of Canada regarding Canada's 510 Aboriginal women who have disappeared or have been murdered since 1980 (Hansard pg. 250).

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes (Brossard-La Prairie, Lib) referred to the UN Committee's criticism of the Federal government's failure to stop violence against women and its serious cuts to the Court Challenges Program (Hansard pg. 250).

## November 28, 2008:

MP Carol Hughes (Algoma-Manitoulin-Kapuskasing, NDP) referred to the CEDAW's UN Committee report, citing its criticism of the Canadian government's record on women's rights (Hansard, pg. 278). Ms. Hughes stated:

The committee was also concerned about women's insufficient access to legal aid, affordable housing, childcare spaces, and shelters. The committee was concerned as well about the poor representation of women in public life, inequality in the labour market for visible minorities, mistreatment of women prisoners, the cancellation of the Court Challenges Program, and the elimination of funding for advocacy for women's organizations.

Canada has an international obligation to address women's human rights in Canada, as well as an obligation to women in Canada to address the concerns of the committee.

The government needs to take immediate action to advance women's rights in Canada.

In a response on November 25, 2008 to these criticisms, Helena Guergis, (Simcoe-Grey, Ontario), the recently appointed Minister of State (Status of Women) stated (Hansard, pg. 250) that a commitment had been made in the 2008 budget to develop an action plan that will include further work on violence against women, including aboriginal communities. Ms Guergis further stated, on November 26, 2008 (Hansard pg. 288),

I am also very proud that our government recently joined the UNIFEM campaign to say no to violence. Canada joins 159 ministers and heads of state from 60 governments in supporting UNIFEM's call to see an end to violence against women.

### Conservative Government Weak-Kneed Under Criticism

It seems that the Conservative government has obligingly fallen into the trap set by the feminist group FAFIA to further feminist goals and aspirations by using the UN as its tool. Has the Conservative government no backbone, or is it just not aware of the game that is being played by the feminists? If it is the latter, the Conservative government is pretty gullible.

## FAFIA Receives Governor General's Award

Chair of FAFIA's Human Rights Committee is Shelagh Day, a feminist – lawyer activist who has spent her entire career being supported financially by the taxpayer. She was once Vice President of the NAC (National Action Committee on the Status of Women), one of the founders of the feminist movement's legal arm LEAF (Women's Legal Education Action Fund). She also chaired the Equality Panel of the Court Challenges Program (see REALity January/February 2008, "Dishonesty and Duplicity by the Standing Committee on the Status of Women"). She was also on the Canadian delegation at the UN Conference of Women in Beijing where she headed the lesbian caucus. In these various positions she has been paid a salary, attended conferences, all expenses paid, supposedly representing "women" when in fact she represented only a special interest group of feminists – all paid for by the taxpayer. Obviously, she views her life work on behalf of feminists as an entitlement.

# Governor General's Persons Award Given to FAFIA's Shelagh Day

On November 27, 2008 (Hansard pg. 355), MP Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway NDP) proudly announced that Shelagh Day, Chair of FAFIA's Human Rights Committee, had just received the Governor General's Persons Award for her "lifetime of work on equality, social and economic rights for all Canadian women". Mr. Davies stated "because she [Ms Day] has devoted her life to improving respect for women, it is particularly apt to applaud her efforts when we are remembering that we still have a long way to go."

REAL Women made inquiries on what basis the Governor General's award is made. We learned that an "independent selection committee" was appointed by the Status of Women to review the nominations for the awards. The selection committee was made up of five individuals reflective of the "diversity" of Canadian society (make that left-wing only) but the names of the selection committee and information on its deliberations "are not made public".

We were also advised that the award is traditionally presented to the recipient on a date close to Persons Day (October 18).

In short, the Governor General's award is just another ploy by the Status of Women to promote feminist activists in Canada.

#### Conclusion

The Conservative government would serve the Canadian public well by shutting down the entire Status of Women apparatus. It does not serve the cause of women at all, only that of radical feminists, all paid for by the taxpayer.

Please write to the following, requesting that the Status of Women be shut down and that the feminist Governor General's Award be abolished.

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper Office of the Prime Minister 80 Wellington Street Ottawa, ON K1A 0A2

Fax: 613-941-6900

The Honourable Jim Flaherty Minister of Finance **House of Commons** Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6 Fax: 613 996-9880

Your MP **House of Commons** Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

#### PRO-LIFE GRANDMOTHER IN JAIL – AGAIN

By Kathie Hogan, REAL Women Member, Parry Sound, Ontario

There are many ways to be pro-life. Some pray, donate time and money, write letters, volunteer at Right-to-Life offices, or attend annual Life Chains. Linda Gibbons' commitment to the pro-life cause goes back almost fifteen years.

On August 30, 1994, the Ontario NDP government of the day, under Premier Bob Rae, passed an injunction, prohibiting counselling and any other pro-life outreach, within sixty feet of two Toronto abortuaries, and within thirty feet of another. That same week, Linda Gibbons, along with two friends, was arrested for breaking that injunction. The three stood silently and prayerfully within the "bubble zone", and were arrested and charged with "obstructing a police officer." Linda was found guilty, and spent three months in jail. Released on December 17, 1994, she was re-arrested two days later, as she prayed outside another Toronto abortuary.

This pattern continued, off and on, for the next fourteen or so years. Many times, Linda was alone when arrested. She has also been arrested in conjunction with others. In some instances, others have also done time in jail. In total, Linda has spent six years of interrupted time in prison, including the Christmas of 2008. In 1994, Linda Gibbons' name was far from a household word - the media ignored the situation entirely. However, internet advances have allowed pro-lifers to circumvent mainstream media sources and Linda's story is much more widely known today, thanks to the many articles about her published in Campaign Life News and LifeSite News.com

Perhaps this "increased recognition factor" led to the interesting development at Linda's court appearance this past fall. After fourteen years of being charged with "obstructing a police officer", on September 30, 2008, Mr. Justice Ford Clements of the Ontario Court of Justice ruled that the diminutive grandmother's peaceful and silent conduct could in no way be interpreted to mean she was making any peace officer's job more difficult and, therefore, did not constitute obstruction. Linda, as always, remained silent during her court appearance, in "solidarity with the unborn child who has no voice." As always, she did not acknowledge her pro-life supporters in the courtroom that day.

At her October 23rd court appearance to determine bail, a Justice of the Peace, unfamiliar with Linda's decision to stay silent during her court appearances, sent her for a mental health assessment, which, not surprisingly, she passed. Linda was back in court the next day, with her (case remanded to January 12, 2009, when she was to stand trial on the charge of "disrupting a court order." She was held in prison from October 8th, the date of her arrest, until the January 12, 2009 hearing.

There are many interesting facets to this case. To begin with, the NDP injunction was a "temporary injunction", and yet still stands on the books, despite the passage of merely fifteen years. This is unprecedented. The decision to charge Linda with "obstructing justice" is laughable - one only has to look at the tiny grandmother to know the absurdity of the charge. The Ontario Criminal Code was recently changed to allow for the prosecution of "disobeying a court order" on a summary offence, meaning that Linda would not be allowed trial by jury under the new charge. (A jury trial would bring unwanted media attention.) Furthermore, the injunction itself is suspect - why doesn't the Ontario government want a prayerful pro-life witness in front of these abortion clinics, offering women and their unborn babies an alternative to abortion? Surely, the government is not trying to stifle freedom of speech in Ontario?

At the January 12, 2009 hearing in a Toronto criminal court, the charges against Linda were dismissed on the grounds that the "court order" of which she was charged of violating was a civil injunction imposed by a civil court. That is, it was not a matter over which a criminal court had jurisdiction. The judge stated:

There are rules for civil matters and there are rules for criminal matters. They're separate and apart ... The rules are clear and mutually exclusive.

The latest development presents an interesting conundrum for those who have prosecuted Gibbons over many years. With judges having successfully thrown out charges of obstructing a peace officer and disobeying a court order, the province and Crown Attorney's office appear to be left with little option but to launch a civil proceeding against her, if they wish to pursue the matter at all. They have two years from the date of the alleged transgression to do so.

If a civil proceeding is now launched against Linda, then the validity of the "temporary" injunction itself will become an issue before the court. Quite a problem for the Attorney General, since the "temporary" injunction has now been in effect for going on to 15 years.

Linda Gibbons is a quiet woman, a woman of deep faith, for which we are all deeply grateful. She is a genuine heroine.

### PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

It is interesting to look back on articles which I have set aside as background material for my messages to you. I'd like to write today about heroes. David Warren awarded his "Man of the Year" title to Sarah Palin, in his last article in the Ottawa Citizen in 2008 (you can read his article on his website, www.davidwarrenonline.com/index.php?id=955.

Sarah Palin is an American heroine, and the American media's mistreatment of her and the values for which she stands are rousing rank and file "hockey moms" (and others) from around the United States to stand shoulder to shoulder in solidarity with her values. They've even formed an internet-based association, complete with membership and interactive chat space and blogs.

As for Canadian heroines, you'll read the article about Linda Gibbons elsewhere in this issue of REALity. Linda is a real Ontario-based heroine.

But closer to home — my home at least — I'd like to talk about an unsung Canadian heroine from Vancouver whom I have always admired: she is Sissy von Dehn, a nurse and long-time member of REAL Women.

In November, 1996 Sissy attended a meeting of the Vancouver Status of Women which was advertised as "open to all women". However, when she and another REAL Women member, Peggy Holland, arrived at the meeting, they were barred from entering the meeting and the door was shut on them. With presence of mind, Sissy and Peggy had brought a camera and photographed the closed door. Five feminists emerged from behind the door and attacked the REAL Women members in the hallway, throwing Sissy to the floor and piling on top of her while trying (unsuccessfully) to get hold of her camera. When Peggy tried to assist Sissy, two of the feminists grabbed her by the arms and she also fell to the floor. They both suffered bruises and a broken camera as a result of the attack. (See REALity Jan/Feb. 1997, p. 11, "Zero Tolerance – Feminist Style, Beat Up the Opposition").

In March 1997, Sissy and other members of the REAL Women chapter joined the International Women's Day (IWD) Parade in Vancouver, which again was advertised as being "open to all women". In view of their past experience, Sissy and the others took the precaution of advising the Vancouver police of their intention to march in the parade. The police showed up in droves, giving fine protection to our stalwart pro-life/pro-family women who carried signs which read:

Abortion: A Violence Women Can Stop Families Are Women's Most Precious Asset IWD 97 Celebrates Pro-Life Nurses Moving Forward Together

Violence Begins in the Womb IWD IS Against Women

**IWD Discriminates Against Women** 

These were messages that the IWD Committee didn't quite have in mind! (See REALity March/April, 1997, p. 12, "International Women's Day – Vancouver Style".)

Sissy also purchased a house next to Vancouver's abortion clinic called "Everywoman's Health Centre". Sissy covered her house with pro-life messages to inform the women entering the abortion clinic, much to the alarm of the abortionists. The house also served as a rest spot for the picketers outside the abortion clinic prior to the imposing of the Bubble Zone law by the B.C. government.

More recently, Sissy handed out brochures explaining about the BC Bubble Zone Legislation inside the Bubble Zone itself around an abortion "clinic". Workers at the abortuary had called police to complain that someone was in their precious Bubble Zone distributing copies of the very legislation which created the zone.

Sissy was merely handing the information to passersby inside the zone informing them they risked arrest under the legislation if they even so much as discussed the subject of abortion. Many took her handout and expressed dismay at the situation. One person, obviously a clinic staff member, took a handout and went into the facility. Shortly thereafter two plain clothes Vancouver police officers arrived and went directly into the building, emerging 45 minutes later to speak with Sissy. They informed her that she was not breaking the Bubble Zone. They added that the clinic workers were upset she was handing out the brochures on the Bubble Zone.

This is ironic because these are the very people who insisted on the draconian legislation in the first place and now they're upset when someone informs the general public of its existence!

In early September, BC's Court of Appeal upheld the Bubble Zone law as being minimally invasive of someone's freedom of speech and freedom of expression. Now the clinic workers themselves are upset when pro-life volunteers like Sissy inform the public of this law.

Truth be told, the legislation is actually supposed to be posted on all entrances to the abortion facility but has never been posted despite a court ruling to the effect. Perhaps the workers are embarrassed by having to publicly identify their location and business? Perhaps they prefer to continue carrying on their morbid work away from public scrutiny?

Vancouver police have assured Sissy that she can indeed inform people when they are inside the 50-meter bubble zones without fear of being arrested. She promises to continue to do so – and she will!

Sissy and the others are Canadian heroines. May their stalwart, resolute witness inspire another generation of Canadians to stand up for what they (and we) believe in.

Until next time! Laurie Geschke

#### SILENCING THE PROBLEMS OF CHILDREN RAISED IN SAME-SEX HOUSEHOLDS

By Dawn Stefanowicz, Author, "Out from Under", The Impact of Homosexual Parenting

Quoting propagandist Joseph Goebbels, "If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it..." For a long time, powerful media have been complicit with those trying to keep people in ignorance about same-sex parenting by silencing debate, and smothering freedom of speech. The impact on children who grow up with same-sex parents is being silenced.

Before my book, Out From Under: The Impact of Homosexual Parenting, was published (see Book Review), Canada was in the midst of debating hate crime legislation and same-sex "marriage," I had testified in 2004 at the Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs and was concerned that the inclusion of "sexual orientation" as a protected category under hate crime legislation would silence freedom of speech. I felt the public was being duped into believing that there were terrible crimes being committed against "gays" and "lesbians" by heterosexuals. There are no solid statistics to support this. In addition, the media refuses to mention the significant number of same-sex domestic emotional and physical assaults within their subculture. As well, using the undefined term "hate" eludes the real issue: certain people wanting the sexual license and "human right" to do what they please without detraction or constraint.

By the way, the term "sexual orientation" includes sexual attractions or sexual practices involving a person, group of persons, animals, natural or inanimate objects, and legal or illegal sexual practices which are privately or publicly demonstrated. There are no restrictions based on age, blood relation, or gender. Therefore, pedophilia, incest, bestiality, sadomasochism, bondage, public nudity, and group sex can be protected under the expression "sexual orientation". These are sexual behaviours I was exposed to growing up with a homosexual father.

After my book was published, I contacted CBC, telling them I was available for interviews. I received no queries from them or from other mainstream Canadian media which I had also notified. Instead, the CBC and other Canadian mainstream media continued with their unbalanced content, failing to mention the problems caused to children by alternative homosexual households.

A few brave Canadian independent television shows, however, did interview me. It was not long before the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) was contacted with complaints of alleged hate and

homophobia in connection with my interviews. When the CRTC couldn't find anything wrong with my tone or my comments, it then advised these family friendly media outlets that they must henceforth provide "balance" on their programming on the issue, i.e., include the other side's perspective on same-sex parenting, or else have their broadcasting licenses revoked. This was outrageous since the mainstream media are pro same-sex parenting and are not required to provide so-called "balance" in their programming on the issue. The CBC, for example, uses our tax dollars to spew forth propaganda supporting same-sex parenting. However, small independent media which rely on sponsors and advertisers are required to provide programs providing both perspectives of the same-sex parenting issue.

As a result of the CRTC ruling, the media outlets which originally aired my story have not contacted me for further interviews. I laud the courage of these pro-life/pro-family stations which interviewed me initially on the truth about "alternative" parenting and subcultures which have opened a Pandora's box of sorrows for children. However, because they want to stay in operation with their licenses intact, they must now comply with the discriminatory hand dealt them by the CRTC.

## Media Interviews Outside Canada

In contrast to the disgraceful media censorship in Canada, I was in Ireland in October and spoke before good-sized audiences there, and had a dozen mainstream interviews. By the end of my tour, I was heard by over half of the population of Ireland. In addition, the Washington Times, Michael Medved Show, 30 Days (Fox), Janet Parshall's America and many other U.S. media have covered my book with vigor. Australia and Hong Kong's print media also have interviewed me. But Canadian media continue to perpetuate the lie that there is no difference between children raised by homosexual and heterosexual parents. Consequently, innocent vulnerable children in Canada are being adopted by same-sex parents despite the fact that this is detrimental to them.

It is not that my story about homosexual parenting is unsupported. Dr. Steven Nock, research methodologist, at the request of the Attorney General of Canada, submitted an affidavit opposed to same-sex marriage in the Halpern vs AG case in 2000 in which he reported over 200 same-sex parenting studies which "contained at least one fatal flaw of design or execution; and not a single one of those studies was conducted according to general accepted standards of scientific research." When clinical psychologists, Dr. Mark Lerner and Dr. Althea Nagai reviewed 49 same-sex parenting studies, all were found unreliable and the sample sizes too small for relevance. When Sharon Quick, M.D., a paediatric anesthesiologist, and pediatric critical care physician and former assistant Professor in the Department of Anesthesiology at the University of Washington School of Medicine, reviewed 63 same-sex parenting studies, she found major design flaws, interpretive errors, and unsupported conclusions. Interestingly, no heterosexual married couples were ever included in any of these studies so you cannot say homosexual parenting is equal or better. In almost every study, "lesbian" single mothers and "heterosexual" single mothers were compared. The participants were cherry-picked by biased researchers, including "lesbian" participants with higher education and income levels while removing those with mental health issues or criminal records. In most cases, the parent spoke for the dependent child, and in a few cases where children were asked general questions, their responses were qualified.

Dr. Quick reviewed the Technical Report (TR), published in 2002 in Pediatrics, the journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), which was also used as evidence for the American Medical Association's policy statement supporting the practice of same-sex co-parent adoptions. In the TR, Dr. Quick found that 57 percent of the references were inaccurately quoted. Unfortunately, some of these TR quotation errors have been carried on in the article, "The effects of marriage, civil union, and domestic partnership laws on the health and well-being of children," published in the July 2006 issue of Pediatrics.

The important life-long benefits for children raised in married father-mother home environments cannot be ignored. After Dr. G. Rekers, Professor of Neuropsychiatry and Behavioral Science, Research Director for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, and Chairman of Faculty in Psychology at the University of South Carolina School of Medicine in Columbia, S.C. reviewed over two hundred cases of children from homosexual households; he found they faced numerous stressors including growing up with a homosexual parent. The children experienced changing living arrangements,

varied cultural values, premature exposure to expressed sexuality, addictions by parents and partners, physical health issues, lower life expectancy, multiple partners, varied gender identity expressions and role models. These traumatized the children.

Consequently, many children from alternative households seek therapy to deal with stress, depression, anxiety, sexual confusion, and suicidal tendencies.

Though I loved my father and cared for his partners, by nine years of age, two of my father's partners had committed suicide after breakups with my father. My father later died of AIDS in 1991. None of my father's partners/ex-partners are alive today.

#### Editor's Notes

To invite Dawn as a guest speaker or book her for an interview, please contact her at Commissioners Court Plaza, 509 Commissioners Road West, Suite #335, London, Ontario, Canada N6J 1Y5 or e-mail at dawnstefano@sympatico.ca.

Due to space limitations, footnotes for this article were not included, but are available upon request.

# **BOOK REVIEW: "Out From Under" The Impact of Homosexual Parenting**

Author: Dawn Stefanowicz, Publisher: Annotation Press, \$14.95

If ever a book has pointed out the need for a strong, protective male figure in a family, this book is it. This book is not for everyone, however, since it portrays human degradation and sordid behaviour that is difficult to read at times.

That is because Dawn Stefanowicz writes of her horrendous experience growing up with a homosexual father. The latter failed utterly in protecting and affirming her both as a person, and as a woman. Instead, her father, who was himself the product of a drunken abusive father and who was sexually and physically abused many times as a child, spent his entire life looking for a father figure himself who would love, affirm and attend to him. That is, he longed for and sought to obtain male companionship and love through his gay lifestyle to meet his own emotional needs. In so doing, he failed to provide attention and affection for his wife and children who were left to cope alone. Unfortunately, Dawn's mother was an ineffective and submissive person who was overwhelmed with her own neediness, and did little to help her children in their agony.

Dawn's father brought a succession of lovers into the home where his sexual acts were often carried out, and which Dawn sometimes witnessed. Her father used Dawn to lure and attract men when he cruised, since homosexual men also apparently like to have attractive women around them even though they are not sexually attracted to them. Dawn was forced by her father to watch sexually perverse and violent TV. His succession of lovers in and out of the home over her childhood taught her the bitter lesson which was to trust no one or never allow herself to become attached to another human being as they will only betray and abandon her in the end.

The book does show, however, that through a deep faith and the genuine love of a good husband, healing and forgiveness can take place as occurred to Dawn, who forgave her father by the time he died of AIDS in 1991.

The lesson learned from the book is that homosexuals who demand the "right" to adopt children or bring them into their same-sex relationship by way of medical technology, on the basis that they are supposedly equally good parents as heterosexuals, is a fraud. Vulnerable children need both a father and a mother to love and protect them. They should not be used as instruments of social experimentation by narcissistic needy individuals who seek their sexual gratifications and their identities outside the traditional family. The promiscuous lifestyle of most homosexuals should be a warning sign to common sense Canadians that society must prevent children from experiencing the corruption caused by same-sex attraction and behaviour.

Dawn Stefanowicz's book does a tremendous service by telling a terrible tale in its stark reality, and not according to the picture that homosexual activists would like a gullible public to believe.

# CANADIAN CONSERVATIVE PARTY CONVENTION November 13 – 15, 2008

By Cecilia Forsyth, Western Vice President, REAL Women of Canada

REAL Women of Canada is a non-partisan organization. However, it is within our mandate to encourage individual members to be active in the political party of their choice, particularly a party that has family friendly policies.

As a result, many of our members attended the Conservative Party Convention, held from November 13th – 15th in Winnipeg. We participated as individuals representing our local EDA's (electoral district association) and as REAL Women supporting family friendly policies. Although this Convention had fewer identified pro-life/pro-family delegates than past conventions, we accomplished our goals by working with other delegates, Members of Parliament and the 4MY CANADA group.

As REAL Women coordinator for the Convention, I was ably assisted by another REAL Women member of Saskatchewan, Marcy Millette, who is a prominent leader in the pro-life movement. In fact it was the two of us, unknown to each other, who proposed the resolution Protecting Pregnant Women (Policy 207), which was submitted to the National Policy Committee by our respective EDA's. Other REAL Women members who worked tirelessly before and during the Convention included Jeannine Lebel (Powassan, Ontario), Lorraine McNamara (Oshawa, Ontario) and Joanne and John Carroll (Thunder Bay, Ontario).

Having actively participated in five policy Conventions since 2000, I can honestly say that every Convention has its challenges, and the Winnipeg Convention was not different. For starters, the fall election brought the Conservative Party policy development process to a grinding halt. Instead of EDA's ranking resolutions to go to the National Convention, this final process was performed by the Party's National Policy Committee. Consequently, delegates did not know which policy proposals would be debated until about 10 days prior to the Convention. Most of the Convention delegates received the policy resolutions documents by e-mail. However, some of us, myself included, never did, but other people quickly forwarded the documents as needed.

The week prior to the Convention was short and busy. A chain letter type of communication process was implemented to contact individuals and groups across Canada soliciting support for Policy Resolution 207 (protecting pregnant women). Two Convention handouts were prepared and distributed under the name of "Conservatives for REAL Conservative Values" to reflect the wide range of people who supported our efforts.

Various MP's were also contacted. Former Albert MP and sponsor of the Private Members Bill C-484 Unborn Victims of Violent Act, Ken Epp, agreed to be the second speaker in support of the Protecting Pregnant Women resolution. Each resolution was allowed two speakers for and two speakers against. The Convention guidelines further stated that the EDA, which submitted the resolution, would be the first speaker to introduce it, so I was the first speaker at the workshop and at the Plenary session.

Another bonus came by way of Winnipeg MP Rod Bruinooge (now the chairman of the all party Parliamentary Pro-Life Caucus), who notified me three days before the Convention that the 4MY CANADA group would prepare and distribute flyers in support of Policy 207. This was great news and we were grateful to have the assistance of the lovely young women from 4MY CANADA.

The Convention registration package contained four policy documents and two Constitution documents. Three of the policy packs contained resolutions for delegates to discuss and vote on during the Friday breakout sessions. The fourth package included 56 resolutions for handout ballot voting (i.e. no discussion). To add further interest to the handout ballot, resolution P-56 was an omnibus resolution which would either add or delete wording to 78 different

policies. The instructions stated that this resolution was prepared by the National Policy Committee to ensure the 2005 Policy Declaration is sufficiently updated to reflect our years in Government. It was a trick way, however, to add or delete certain issues. The second Constitution package contained 16 resolutions for handout ballot voting.

The three policy workshops were: Canada's Economy; Canada's Social and Democratic Framework; and Protecting Canada's Health & Safety.

These workshops ran concurrently with the Constitution workshop. It was next to impossible to attend more than one workshop because at the conclusion of each session delegates in the room would choose their top five resolutions passed at that workshop. The top five resolutions from each workshop would go to the Saturday Plenary for final debate and voting.

Our focus was "Canada's Social and Democratic Framework". Our handout-voting guide for this workshop recommended delegates support five particular resolutions and oppose three. To pass the breakout session, a resolution had to receive more than 50% of the vote. The five policy resolutions we supported passed the workshop vote and the Plenary vote. The three we opposed were defeated in workshop.

The Policies REAL Women Supported and Opposed

Policy 202 – Affirm Charter – Passed Workshop and Plenary Vote

We supported P 202 which added a new clause to existing policy by stating that the Conservative Party re-affirms the legitimacy of the entire Charter of Rights and Freedoms, including Section 33 (Notwithstanding Clause) which allows Parliament or the legislature to "override" a decision of the courts for a five-year period, and which override can be renewed.

Policy 203 Human Rights Commission Jurisdiction – Passed Workshop and Plenary Vote

We supported P 203 which added a new clause to existing policy. The policy supports removing authority from the Canadian Human Rights Commission and Tribunals to receive, investigate or adjudicate complaints related to Section 13 of the Canadian Human Rights Act. (S. 13 allows the Commission to determine whether "hate crimes" have taken place on the internet).

Policy 207 Protecting Pregnant Women – Passed Workshop and Plenary Vote

A curious thing happened immediately prior to the workshop discussion on Policy 207. The National Policy Chair entered the room to give his (unscheduled) Committee report which took 10-15 minutes. As he was speaking many delegates rushed into the back of the room. Clearly this manoeuvre was to give other Convention delegates time to enter the workshop room so they could vote against the resolution P 207. Fortunately, the Party robots did not achieve their goal. P 207 readily passed with a large majority of the workshop vote. The extra, on-the-spot voting delegates then left the workshop. Some would return at the end of the workshop when delegates voted for their top five resolutions. Apparently, this type of chicanery took place in other workshops as well.

Policy 210 Family and Marriage - Defeated in Workshop Vote

We opposed P 210 since it would have deleted two basic principles which we believe should be retained as Party Policy:

The Conservative Party believes that Parliament, through a free vote, and not the courts, should determine the definition of marriage; and

A Conservative Government will support legislation defining marriage as the union of one man and one woman.

I spoke against P 210 not only because it would have deleted these two major basic principles but also it was further flawed in that it only referred to the freedom of religious organizations to maintain the traditional definition of marriage, instead of respecting the freedom of all individuals to have this right.

Policy 211 Polygamy – Defeated in Workshop Vote

This proposal was similar to P 210 in that parts of existing policy would be deleted and new clauses would be added. It would have deleted the existing clauses which provided that a Conservative Government would support the freedom of religious organizations to determine their own practices with respect to marriage and would support legislation defining marriage as the union of one man and one woman.

P 210 or P 211 would have been supported by REAL Women if either resolution had just added new clauses to current policy instead of deleting major portions of the existing policy. We later learned that the National Policy Committee intended to put the entire section on Marriage on the handout ballot recommending that it be deleted from party policy. However, since P 210 and P 211 would have essentially done the job for them, the policy on Marriage was left off the handout ballot.

Policy 212 Child Care – Defeated at the Workshop Vote

We opposed P 212, as it would have deleted the entire existing Policy section 66 on Child Care. In summary, section 66 provides that parents are in the best position to determine the education and care of their children, and that they should be able to do so in an environment that encourages as many options as possible and in a manner that does not discriminate against those who opt to raise their children in family, social, linguistic and religious environments. Jeannine Lebel spoke effectively against this resolution. The National Policy chair supported deleting Section 66 claiming it was the same as S. 64. What he failed to tell us was that the omnibus handout resolution would delete S. 64. Fortunately, P 212 was defeated.

Policy 213 Women – Passed at Workshop and Plenary Vote

We supported P 213 which removed feminist language from the existing policy. Gender equality was changed to "the full participation of women in the social, economic and cultural life of Canada". Equal pay for work of equal value was changed to "equal pay for equal work".

Policy 218 Diversity Principles – Passed at Workshop and Plenary

We supported P 218 as it improved the language of the existing policy supporting Canadian common values such as equality, democracy and the rule of law.

Policy 305 Income Splitting – Passed in Workshop and Plenary

P 305 was in the workshop on Canada's Economy. It amended a clause under existing Policy, Section 20 on Family Tax Fairness by calling for income splitting for couples with children.

Policy 119 Human Trafficking – Passed in Workshop and Plenary

P 119 was debated in the workshop on "Protecting Canada's Health & Safety". It added new policy stating that the Conservative Party takes strong action to combat human trafficking and take a lead in developing international agreements and protocols against human trafficking.

### **Resolution Process**

Resolutions at the Plenary session had to pass the double majority rule with the majority of delegates as well as the majority of provinces in support of the resolution. If the hand vote were close, an electronic vote would be taken to confirm the results.

The Plenary Session was supposed to have only two speakers for and two speakers against a resolution. However, all the resolutions prior to P 207 had three to four speakers on each side of the discussion. Beginning with Policy 207, only two speakers for and two against were allowed. It passed with 58% of the delegate vote and with the support of the majority of the provinces. The Human Trafficking resolution, P 119, passed the plenary with an unanimous vote.

# Purpose of a Policy Convention

The main purpose at the Policy Convention is to support or oppose particular policy, but there are other added benefits of attending as well. A Convention offers a great opportunity to speak to many Members of Parliament and to expand our network of pro-family supporters. For example, at one MP information session, REAL Women member Corry Morcos from Edmonton, was able to question the new Health Minister about the HPV vaccine, Gardasil.

Leaving the Winnipeg Convention was a satisfying experience, knowing the pro-family, pro-life delegates passed all the resolutions that we wanted to pass! Of course, that does not mean our work is finished. We must continue being active within the local ridings of the Conservative Party of Canada (or the party of your choice) until Canada becomes a nation that respects the right to life of all human beings and recognizes and supports the traditional values of family and marriage. Even if it takes us the rest of our lives, we must continue working and praying to accomplish these goals.

## THE DECLINE OF THE HUMAN FAMILY: SOMETHING MUST BE DONE

One of the most ominous events of modern history is quietly unfolding. Social scientists and economists agree – we are headed toward a demographic count down caused by a rapidly decreasing population world wide. This will have catastrophic social and economic consequences to us all. Its effects are already being seen in Europe. This global decline in human birthrates is the single most powerful force affecting the fate of nations and the future of society in the 21st century.

Much of the collapse in population has been due to social engineering policies and programs which have led to high divorce rates, the rise of cohabitation, the normalization of homosexuality, families putting off procreation to pursue careers, an anti-family culture and voluntary childlessness.

Who will operate our factories and farms in the future? Who will guard the frontiers? With a graying population (a declining birthrate combined with growing longevity), who will provide support systems and otherwise care for the elderly?

The fact is, the world is in a head long rush toward economic and social chaos. The world wide fall of birth rates is one of the most pressing problems confronting humanity today.

We can no longer shrug it off and look the other way, while we focus on our everyday problems, which expend our energies, while ignoring the disaster that will inevitably descend on our children and grandchildren. They will be left only with the detritus of our civilization. We must, therefore, come to grips with the problem and find solutions now.

The first step in doing so is to acknowledge the looming crisis. The problem has been competently explored in a DVD entitled, "The Demographic Winter: The Decline of the Human Family." In this DVD, world-wide scholars, economists and sociologists discuss the problem that de-population is creating for our world and make some suggestions what to

do about it. This DVD should be widely distributed among our churches, service groups and our friends.

To order a copy of "Demographic Winter: Decline of the Human Family" or to view a trailer for the documentary, go to http://www.demographicwinter.com. Cost US \$19.95.

Please email them with any questions, enquiries and comments at: http://www.demographicwinter.com

Email to: support@demographicwinter.com

Tel: 508 405-1337