

FUNDING CUTS TO FORMER LIBERAL GOVERNMENT'S NETWORK

Canadians may not realize the extent to which successive Liberal governments have developed a vast network of left-wing government dependent organizations to promote liberal causes. When their funding is cut, these special interest groups discover that average Canadians don't even know they exist and couldn't care less that their funding has been eliminated.

However, these left leaning groups are shocked when their feelings of entitlement are bruised by the Conservative government's funding cuts. They proclaim that if the money doesn't keep flowing their way, democracy is undermined, the voices of Canadians have been silenced, and their right to freedom of speech has been denied. They object when told they should obtain funding from independent sources. In their view, unless leftist advocacy is funded by the federal government, with billions of tax dollars, there are no other legitimate voices in Canada, no valuable opinions exist beyond theirs, and democracy is under serious threat. On the contrary, an end to preferential funding for left-wing ideologies, such as feminism and "social justice", will expose Canadians to more representative public discourse.

The Left Mobilizes

Liberal MP caucus members, Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre) and Ken Dryden (York Centre), have organized a series of forums on Parliament Hill, where liberal left groups can "tell their stories" about their powerlessness and fears, as a result of government funding cuts. Michael Ignatieff called government cuts the "chilling of NGOs" and compared the situation in Canada to Cuba and Bulgaria. Ken Dryden claimed that it is "unhealthy and undemocratic" for governments to refuse funding to groups which disagree with government policy. The groups represented at the first forum on June 14, 2010 were LEAF (Women's Legal Education Action Fund), the legal arm of the feminist movement, Match International (whose purpose is to spread feminism abroad), Canadian Council for International Cooperation (an umbrella advocacy group for 90 organizations whose purpose is to reduce global poverty), Canadian Society for International Health, Assembly of First Nations, Action Canada for Population and Development (political arm of Planned Parenthood), Canadian Council of Learning (received \$8.5 million in 2004 over five years), Canadian Council on Social Development, Oxfam, Native Women's Shelter (Montreal), New Brunswick Coalition for Pay Equity, Ontario AIDS Network, Womenspace, and Conseil d'intervention pour l'accès des femmes au travail. It was claimed that other groups did not attend for fear of losing their funding.

In fact, all these organizations have created an industry for themselves, with more tax money supporting the activists, their salaries and offices, than is being used for the disadvantaged whom they are supposed to be assisting.

Petition Organized

Seeing themselves as "civil society organizations", which have been "shut down", some funding recipients have organized a petition objecting to funding cuts. They claim the government has "weakened crucial international human rights initiatives", including the rights of indigenous people, gays and lesbians, and women. Funding recipients claim a "loss of democratic space." Among the first to sign the petition were Judy Rebick (former president of the feminist National Action Committee on the Status of Women), Keith Spicer (former Commissioner of Official Languages and CRTC Chairman under the Liberals) and writer Margaret Atwood. Among the 46 groups which endorsed the petition are the Abortion Rights Coalition of Canada, Action Canada for Population and Development (ACPD), Amnesty International, BC Civil Liberties Association, Canadian Arab Federation, Canadian Labour Congress, Canadian Voice of Women for Peace, Childcare Resource and Research Unit, The Council of Canadians, Match International, Oxfam Canada, Vegans and Vegetarians of Alberta Association. It should be noted that an Arab-Israeli research group called "Mada" received an \$800,000 grant in 2009 from a crown agency International Development Research Centre (IDRC)

to study the marginalization of women in Arab-Israeli society and also the low level of political participation by Israeli Arabs. The grant was to be distributed over a three-year period. In March 2010 IDRC terminated the grant and the Mada organization has brought a legal action in the federal court again IDRC for terminating the grant for “lack of cause”.

A letter has been sent to the Prime Minister by 10 religious leaders, asking for clarification of CIDA funding cuts to KAIROS, an umbrella group representing the left leaning elements in Canadian churches. Many church goes object to government funding of leftist influences in their churches and were grateful for funding cuts to Kairos.

The Canadian Council for International Cooperation has not had its 2009 \$1.7 million funding renewed this year. It represents 90 organizations, many of which are left leaning. Some of the 90 groups already receive federal funding totaling \$407 million annually. Among the groups under the CCIC umbrella are abortion activists, such as ACPD, Amnesty International, Canadian Federation for Sexual Health (the new name for Planned Parenthood); several union social justice funds; some legitimate foreign aid organizations; feminist organizations, such as Match, and some left leaning religious groups.

Conservative Government Seeks Accountability

Funding cuts are necessary and are welcomed by most Canadians, who object to their tax dollars being used to promote costly left leaning policies, when we already have a democratic system in place to represent the views of Canadians. Some international advocacy groups have been receiving operational funding since the 1960's. Feminist groups started receiving funding in the 1970's. Some of the hardly mainstream groups, whose funding from CIDA and Heritage Canada (Status of Women) has been cut, are listed below (all data from Public Accounts Canada).

Organization	2009 Funding (Canadian Funds)	2008 Funding (Canadian Funds)	Average Annual Funding 2000-2007
MATCH International	347,662	418,244	-
KAIROS	1,676,671	1,177,758	-
Canadian Arab Federation	1,039,504	498,087	-
Alternatives	1,587,298	986,995	-
Canadian Society for International Health	4,071,116	1,116,225	-
International Planned Parenthood Federation	6,000,000	6,000,000	-
Canadian Council for International Cooperation	1,692,745	2,038,244	-
National Association of Women and the Law	-	-	270,000
Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association	-	-	140,000
Women's Legal Education and Action Fund (LEAF)	-	-	240,000
Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAW)	-	-	280,000

Thankfully, the Conservative government has not been detracted from systematically reviewing all government handouts and program accountability. This is long overdue.

THE TRUTH ABOUT MATERNAL HEALTH

Like most Canadians, REAL Women is heartily sick of being told that any program to reduce maternal mortality must include abortion.

The Liberal Opposition party, feminists, and most of the media have been relentless in demanding this. However, they are wrong!

The demand that abortion be included in programs to reduce maternal mortality stems from the UN, which has stated repeatedly that there has been no reduction in maternal mortality in the past 20 years, and that these statistics can

only be changed if women are provided with safe, legal abortions. This is not true.

A comprehensive study of maternal mortality was carried out at the University of Washington from 1980 – 2008, and its results were published in April 2010 in the prestigious British Medical Journal, Lancet. This study determined that the UN figures on maternal mortality by the UN are wrong and that maternal mortality has decreased by 35% in 20 years. This revelation sent the UN into disarray, as the new study did not even mention abortion. Instead, it stated that the remarkable decrease in maternal mortality was due to:

lower pregnancy rates in some countries;
higher income, which improves nutrition and access to health care;
more education for women; and
the increasing availability of a “skilled attendant”, people with some medical training to help women give birth.

This study appears to be confirmed by the Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Canada (SOGC), which stated, in a press release dated June 2, 2010, that 80% of maternal deaths in low resource countries take place during delivery, caused by post-partum hemorrhage, eclampsia, dystocia (prolonged childbirth) and sepsis (infection). The press release stated:

... complications during labour and birth are the main reason mothers are dying, it seems clear that this should be the primary focus of any Maternal and Child Health Initiative.

The press release went on to say:

Low-resource countries also suffer from a severe shortage of trained health professionals who are able to address pregnancy complications and to appropriately use available resources to save a mother and her baby. More health-care professionals and community workers must be trained and be provided with the tools they need to address the main causes of maternal mortality.

Dr. Dorothy Shaw, past president of SOGC was quoted in the press release as stating:

To ensure the health of a child, you must save the mother. To save the mother, you must have skilled attendants able to provide emergency obstetric care during childbirth.

Dr. Richard Horton, editor of Lancet, disclosed in his editorial in April 2010, that he had been requested to “delay” or “hold” publication in order to avoid “potential political damage” to maternal advocacy campaigns by the UN. This attempt to silence the true facts on this issue also occurred at a meeting on maternal and child health research, hosted by the University of Washington Institute for Health Metrics in June 2010. At that meeting, UN staff and abortion advocates told scientists that they should “harmonize” their findings with the UN so as to have a consensus on the numbers. Dr. Horton, however, stated that “consensus” or “harmonizing” was not acceptable. Rather, there should be a scientific summary of the totality of available evidence referenced. Further, he stated:

Unless we subject numbers to that peer-review process, I think we are accepting second-class data, and that applies wherever the numbers come from.

This was a major embarrassment and set back for UN officials. The incorrect figures repeatedly provided by the UN on maternal mortality also created problems for over 3000 delegates at an expensive conference on maternal health, called “Women Deliver”, held in Washington in early June 2010. This conference drew international UN staff and political leaders for a three-day marathon on topics, which included a reduction of maternal mortality, the promotion of contraception, and the dismantling of pro-life laws around the world.

The conference, however, was forced to down play its pro-abortion slant because it could no longer give credible claim that abortion would reduce maternal mortality. Instead, the conference proposed that a new strategy be

applied on the choice of abortion: it was to pretend that abortion was actually “value-neutral”, and that it was by ending “unsafe” abortions, by means of changing the social and political climate in favour of abortion that maternal health would be improved. This “harm reduction” strategy, was copied directly from the drug strategy used by those wishing to liberalize drug laws. These advocates claim that providing drug injections sites, free needle exchanges, free drugs, etc. will “reduce the harm” caused by drug addiction. That is, the women’s conference on abortion argued that to effect legal change on abortion and reduce resistance to it, it should be stated that no one should be judgmental about the “behaviour” of having an abortion. So, the strategy is to promote only the reduction of harm to such women by ensuring that abortions are “safely” carried out. In short, harm reduction is only a façade to accomplish the goal of pro-abortion changes in the law.

UN Refuses to Accept the Truth

The black eye the UN received on its figures on maternal health, unfortunately, hasn’t led to its acceptance of the facts. Instead, in the middle of June the following occurred:

UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon released the UN’s plan on maternal health, which included access to safe abortion services.

The executive director of the Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria, which controls billions in development aid from hundreds of countries, including a \$130 million-a-year donation from Canada, made a pilgrimage to Ottawa at the same time as the UN Report was released, to pressure Prime Minister Harper to include safe abortions in maternal and child health.

Significantly, former NDP MP Svend Robinson, a self-acknowledged homosexual, is employed by the Global Fund in Geneva. His job is to coordinate the fund’s outreach to Parliamentarians worldwide.

The UN Council on Human Rights in Geneva stage-managed a debate in June 2010 on maternal health, by limiting the time available for debate, preventing both the Holy See and the pro-life UK organization, Society for the Protection of Unborn Children (SPUC), from speaking on the issue. Two pro abortion NGO’s, Amnesty International, and the New York based Centre for Reproductive Rights, the latter representing a large group of pro-abortion organizations, including International Planned Parenthood (IPPF), were permitted to speak. The High Commissioner’s report supported the proposition of UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon on maternal health care: that abortion is a proposed solution to the improvement of maternal health.

These events form a part of the UN political maneuvers to declare abortion a human right, something that has eluded the pro-abortion lobby at the UN for 16 years.

Fortunately, however, the UN’s last-ditch attempt to influence Mr. Harper failed.

The UN continues to be ruthless, left wing and anti-life. Yet, Canada continues to support it.

Listed below are examples of just a few of the grants Canada gives to UN agencies through CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency which distributes 80% of Canada’s foreign aid).

1. UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)

2007 - \$250,000 for integrating gender and human rights in Nigeria and a further \$2,500,000 for institutional support;

2008 - \$475,000 for gender mainstreaming in Pakistan;

2009 - \$2,200,000 for “Women as Decision Makers”;

2010 - \$2,950,000 to establish the Association of Southeastern Asian Nations (ASEAN) Commission on Women and Children;

2010 - \$2,500,000 for institutional support;

2010 - \$1,000,000 for the Legal Empowerment of Women in the Context of HIV/AIDS.

2. The UN Development Program (UNDP)

2007 - \$1,200,000 for the empowerment of Palestinian women; and

2009 - \$150,000,000 for institutional support.

3. UN Population Fund (UNFPA)

2007 - \$113,000,000 for institutional support

2008 - \$18,984,000 to improve "Reproductive Health" (which includes abortion);

2009 - \$17,350,000 for Institutional Support.

In the year 2008-2009, Canada contributed \$499.4 million to the UN through the Department of Foreign Affairs and Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). This sum does not include the Canadian contribution to the Global Peace initiative, which promotes gender rights (\$16 million), nor does it include the Canadian contribution to the UN Peacekeeping Operation (\$203.3 million), or the \$16.3 million contribution to the UN office on drugs.

Our money can be put to better use.

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO COMMON SENSE?

Pets

We know that pets are usually loved as members of a family. They bring comfort and love to most, but especially the lonely, the home bound and the elderly. Pets can improve the quality of life and longevity of family members. In short, pets are an important part of many of our lives.

Yet, something is happening about pets. Today, people spend \$49 billion (US) worldwide on pet food every year, while, at the same time, 8.8 million children die annually before they reach the age of five, because of malnutrition and a lack of basic medical care. This discrepancy is heart-breaking.

Animal health product sales in the US reached nearly \$7 billion (US) in 2008. Many of the drugs for animals are "lifestyle" drugs, such as slenderizing drugs for dogs (just what are the owners feeding their dogs?), motion sickness medication and anti-anxiety and anti-depressant drugs for dogs. There is also a growing arsenal of diagnostic instruments, and surgery available for pets. The list includes joint replacement surgery, cataract surgery, allergy testing and treatment, mechanical ventilation, around-the-clock critical care, dialysis, MRI and CT scans, nuclear scans, neurosurgery, laparoscopy and minimally invasive surgery.

There are now funeral home directors for pets who arrange a casket, visitation, full funeral procession, and grief counseling and cremation with special urns to hold the pets' ashes. The pet's picture and life story can be published in the obituary section of the local paper. Already online pet memorials are a booming business.

We know our pets are important, but do we love them more than innocent, helpless children who need our care, concern and financial assistance? Where is the balance? Where is the common sense? .

Gun Registry

In 1994, the then Liberal Justice Minister Allan Rock, stated that the total cost of the long gun registry would be \$2 million.

In 2002, the Auditor General Sheila Fraser condemned the long gun registry for cost overruns, financial inaccuracies, system failures and delays in implementation.

In 2004, Canadians had spent over \$1 billion on the long gun registry.

There are nearly seven million registered long guns in Canada, yet, of 2,441 homicides recorded in Canada, since mandatory long-gun registration was introduced in 2003, fewer than two percent (47) were committed with rifles and shotguns known to have been registered (Canadian Centre of Justice Statistics).

Manitoba Conservative MP Candice Hoepfner (Portage-Lisgar) introduced a private members Bill C-391 to dismantle the long gun registry. This bill is at third reading at the House of Commons and, if and when it passes, - likely with the support of some rural Liberal and NDP MPs - it must go to the Senate for final approval. In the meantime, the existing suspension of registering long guns has been extended for another 12 months. Unfortunately, the original legislation, with regard to the required registration of handguns etc. is still in effect.

Illegal smuggling by organized crime is by far the principal source of firearms on our streets. Indeed, the Vancouver police report that 97 percent of firearms seized were illegal guns smuggled in from the United States, usually by organized crime (Vancouver Police, Strategic Plan 2004-08).

According to Statistics Canada, in 2008 there were nearly 23,500 victims of violent crime, committed with a knife. Homicides and attempted murders had the highest proportion of knife related incidents, at about one-third of such incidents (Lawyers Weekly, May 21, 2010).

Another death trap for Canadians, according to Transport Canada's report in 2006, is automobile collisions. There were 2,889 road deaths that year. In addition, 374 pedestrians, 218 motorcyclists and 73 bicyclists were killed. A survey of 1,500 drivers, conducted by the Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse in June 2008, found that, while 8.1 per cent of nighttime drivers tested positive for alcohol, 10.4 per cent showed evidence of drug use. In total, 16.9 per cent of drivers tested positive for drugs, alcohol or both.

With the above death statistics in mind, why, then, is there such a fierce determination to ban and/or register guns? Where is the common sense in all this? It is individuals who wield the weapons that cause the harm, whether it be knives, guns or automobiles. Where is the common sense in paying out the billions of taxpayers' money for the gun registry?

Sex Before Marriage

A survey of 1,241 women was conducted by Noora Online Inc. between February 18 and March 12, 2010 on whether Canadian brides believed in abstaining from sex before their wedding night. The results, published in June by Canada's Weddingbells, magazine found that only 8 percent of engaged women believe sex before marriage is unacceptable.

However, according to a study conducted by the US National Center for Health Statistics in June 2010, couples who have sex before marriage are less likely to remain married. That is, couples who live together before marriage are 6% less likely to make the marriage work. Young couples who chose to have sex before marriage often for the sake of convenience, therefore, may find that such a strategy will not result in an increase in a stable long-term marriage. "Getting to know you" sexually before marriage doesn't seem to work.

Unfortunately, an attitude that separates sex from marriage leads to a dissolute society, one without order, without self-restraint, without self-control. That is, in our sex-dominated society, casual sex is regarded both as an enjoyable entitlement, and a pastime without consequences. In such a society, anything can and does happen. Self-indulgence, as opposed to self-sacrifice, responsibility, and lack of commitment to marriage is now de rigeur. It is little wonder we have such a high divorce rate, alienation of youth and increased substance abuse within all age groups. Without faithfulness and commitment to each other in marriage, we cannot have a solid society or solid family life. Yet, sexual

opportunities, that are available and are casually indulged in, have become acceptable in today's society. Where is the common sense?

Stacking the Euthanasia Panel

In December 2009, an Expert Panel on End-of-Life Decision Making was appointed by the Royal Society of Canada, an educational association of academics and scientists, to study the possible benefits and problems of legalized euthanasia. Four of its six members are known supporters of euthanasia and physician assisted suicide. The panel is scheduled to report its findings in a year. Will the panel act objectively, intelligently and perceptively? No, it will just act out its bias.

For example, the panel is chaired by Dr. Udo Schuklenk, Professor of Philosophy and Ontario Research chair in bioethics at Queens University in Kingston, Ontario. Dr. Schuklenk is well known for his promotion of euthanasia and atheistic philosophy.

Why bother spending money on this panel? We already know what its recommendations will be. The panel is merely a political tool to reach a predetermined conclusion in support of euthanasia and physician assisted suicide, in order to push the euthanasia agenda.

When the panel announces its conclusions, the media, predictably, will trip all over themselves in order to breathlessly tell us what this "thoughtful" "intellectual" panel has concluded. Who cares? An objective, analytical panel would have been a welcome addition to the debate, not this group of extremists. Where is common sense in the establishment of such a ridiculous panel?

THE SCANDAL OF THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

The UN Human Rights Council in Geneva is a total scandal. The situation with the Council (formerly the UN Human Rights Commission) is so bad that one is inclined to dismiss it as merely a dance conducted by loonies. One cannot do so, however, because the Council is damaging to world democracies. The Council, in fact, has become as removed from genuine human rights matters as Stalin was from human compassion.

The Council consists of a mish-mash of 47 countries dominated by undemocratic China, Russia, Cuba and Libya, the latter led by Moammar Gadhafi. Gadhafi, for example, assassinated his rivals wherever they were, sponsored terrorists, supported the IRA with arms, backed Black September (the Munich Olympics assassinations), hired Carlos the Jackal, financed the destruction of Pan Am Flight 103 over Scotland, that killed 270 (and for which Gadhafi eventually paid \$2 billion compensation).

U.S. President Reagan referred to Gadhafi as the "Mad Dog of the Middle East", (Gadhafi prefers the title, "King of Kings of Africa"). After September 11, 2001 Gadhafi renounced terrorism but he is still unhinged. He gave an incoherent, rambling speech at the UN last year, from which we learned that Israel's agents assassinated US President John Kennedy and that swine flu was developed in military labs. When Mr. Gadhafi travels to foreign countries, he doesn't stay in a hotel. Instead he pitches a large tent in a local park where he is protected by a contingent of remarkably statuesque and handsome female bodyguards. Despite this, Libya was elected President of the Human Rights Council in January 2003. The current President is from Thailand, which, at present, is experiencing violent pro-democracy riots – of no apparent concern to the Council.

The Human Rights Council has persistently condemned Israel for its alleged human rights violations. In fact, the very existence of Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, is regarded by the Human Rights Council as an affront to human rights. Clearly, the inmates are running the UN's Human Rights asylum!

In 2001, the Human Rights Council sponsored a UN World Conference on racism in Durban, South Africa. The conference turned out to be a scandalous attack on Israel and Jews. The U.S. delegation left this conference in disgust, but the Canadian delegation, headed by Liberal MP Hedy Fry, then Secretary of State for Multiculturalism, remained at the Conference. (Ms Fry is the MP who erroneously proclaimed that crosses were burning in Canada, “as we speak”. See REALity, March/April 2001, p.11). Yet she chose to ignore the blatant racism right under her nose at the Durban conference.

A follow-up Durban Conference, chaired by Libya, held in April 2009, reaffirmed the 2001 Declaration that effectively labeled Israel a racist state. To Canada’s credit, the Conservatives took the lead, with eight other western countries, by refusing to attend Durban II. Prime Minister Harper said Canada would not attend because Canada refused to lend legitimacy to the event by its presence.

On October 23, 2006 the Council sent a letter to the Nicaraguan government, which had had the effrontery to include full protection for the unborn in its constitution. The Council claimed that Nicaragua was acting contrary to UN treaties by doing so, although no UN treaty includes any provision for abortion. Not surprisingly, Canada was one of the co-signatories of this letter.

On March 25, 2010, the Council again placed intense and concentrated pressure on Nicaragua over its position on abortion. To our surprise, Canada was not one of the countries endorsing the resolution criticizing Nicaragua this time on abortion. What a refreshing change.

In November 2009, the UN Human Rights Council appointed radical rapporteur, Paul Hunt, to determine whether there were gender based human rights abuses in counter-terrorism measures. Mr. Hunt took this opportunity to stray from his assigned topic, by including in his report a redefinition of the word “gender”, which he concluded was not determined at birth, but was constructed by social convention. He also tried to advance extremely controversial sexual rights, such as a right of individuals to receive government paid sex change operations. Further, the rapporteur falsely claimed that all countries were under legal obligation, because of the human rights treaties, to promote and protect homosexual and transgendered rights. The rapporteur’s radical sexual ideologies were supported by many European countries, some Latin American countries and also by the United States, Canada, Japan and Australia, which all attempted, with intense pressure, to have the report accepted by the Council. Fortunately, their attempt failed – this time.

Finally, never to miss an opportunity to make mischief, the Human Right Council in early June 2010, stage-managed a “debate” on maternal health care to include abortion. During the debate, no pro-life person was allowed to speak (see article “The Truth About Maternal Health Care”, p._____).

The world needs to be protected from the bizarre manipulations of this mad UN agency.

PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE

DID YOU KNOW.....

THAT, REAL Women of Canada has wonderful, loyal members and supporters! The National Board of Directors is very grateful for each and every member. Your support encourages us and keeps our determination strong and focused. Thank you all for your financial and moral support!

THAT, the costs of producing REALity, our bi-monthly newsletter, have doubled in recent years.

THAT, the Board approved plans to produce an e-newsletter by the end of the year (a newsletter that is sent to members by email, instead of post office mail).

THAT, in order to prepare for this change in operations, our national office needs the email addresses of all our members who have email. Please send your email address to: realwcna@on.aibn.com.

THAT, members who do not have an email address will continue to receive a printed copy of the REALity newsletter by regular mail, although it may have a less colourful appearance than our current newsletter.

THAT, REAL Women of Canada has a fan page on Facebook. We invite you to become a fan. Go to our website, www.realwomensca.com and click on the blue Find Us on Facebook sign. It will open the Facebook fan page. Become a fan by clicking on the “like” sign at the top of the page next to our name.

THAT, the administrator of the Facebook Fan page (Cecilia Forsyth) would appreciate your comments and notice of newsworthy articles. I am also seeking assistance from a person who has the time and computer knowledge to compile a file of generic type photos that could be used with the fan page articles to focus attention on each item. If you can help, please contact Cecilia at: cjf4342001@yahoo.ca.

THAT, it is summertime and the living is easy... or so I hope it is, as we all take a break to spend time with family and friends and renew our determination to speak out for traditional family values.

THAT, the 2011 national conference will be held in Saskatoon, SK, probably at the end of April. Mark your calendar now. If you have speaker requests or other comments, contact Cecilia.

God bless and have a great summer!
Cecilia Forsyth

GOVERNMENT CLAMPS DOWN FURTHER ON FEMINIST FUNDING

Opposition MPs were outraged that the Conservative government has clamped down even further on funding feminist groups. The opposition was incredulous that these recent cut backs are occurring to some twelve feminist organizations that have been funded for decades. It was, in fact, the first time in their history that these groups were being denied “essential funding” for their work. For example, they listed feminist groups, such as Match International, which promotes feminism internationally, which has been funded for 34 years by CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency) (\$400,000 annually). The following groups have also lost funding: Womanspace Lethbridge, for 25 years (\$155,428 in 2007 – 2008), Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women, for 25 years (\$83,700 in 2007 – 2008) but averaging \$280,000 annually for 10 years, and the New Brunswick Pay Equity Coalition, (\$200,000 in 2009) – the latter three groups funded by the Status of Women. This denial of funding was described by the opposition as a shocking denial of these groups’ “entitlement” to government funding.

It obviously has not occurred to the opposition parties or to these feminist groups that, just maybe, after decades of funding from the taxpayer, they should look elsewhere for financial support. Instead, the opposition parties claim that without government resources for gender “equality” initiatives, women’s rights will be eroded both here and abroad: a remarkable exaggeration.

The Minister of International Cooperation, Bev Oda, made it clear that these feminist groups do not have any “entitlement” to taxpayers’ dollars. For example, Ms Oda stated that MATCH had been evaluated, and was found to have serious financial accountability problems, as well as being inefficient, ineffective and with “unidentifiable” priorities (Hansard, May 5, 2010, pg. 2391 and Hansard May 6, 2010, pg. 2461).

The truth is that these feminist groups, so long supported by the taxpayers, actually consist of only a small circle of feminist activists whose supporters dwindle each day, since these groups have no members. They don’t deserve to be bankrolled by the government for their outdated policies. Just because their government funding has been cut off,

doesn't mean they are rendered "voiceless" as they and the opposition MPs claim. REAL Women of Canada has thrived for 27 years on membership dues and donations, without government funding, and is by no means "voiceless".

Yet, since 1973, feminist groups have complacently sat back, greedily taking taxpayers' money to promote their left-wing agenda. They expected this entitlement to continue indefinitely.

Access to Information on Feminist Funding

From information obtained from government Access to Information, and feminist websites, REAL Women has established that the feminist funding in Canada and abroad has handed out to gender focused groups between \$1.3 billion and \$1.5 billion in the last decade alone.

Feminist Funding Continues

Unfortunately, however, this feminist funding has not been entirely stopped. The Status of Women has received an increased appropriation for funding under the Conservatives. In fact, it is now receiving the highest funding in its history (Rona Ambrose, Minister for the Status of Women, Hansard May 5, 2010, p. 2396). Generous grants are, therefore, still being made to feminist organizations, such as the following:

\$1.2 million in 2009 to the feminist organization Equal Voice to work toward more (feminist) women being elected to Parliament.

\$480,000 in the 2008 – 2009 calendar year to Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA). It has received a total of \$1.8 million from the Women's Program since 1999.

\$407,202 grant in March 2010 to the Girls Action Foundation for a 36-month project to promote the participation in leadership and decision-making roles for young, marginalized women by way of building their leadership skills.

Among its activities, the Foundation provides workshops on sexual health "to offset unrealistic social and gender normal assumption that everyone is straight". The educators in these workshops are required:

- to talk to young girls about different sexual orientations, social locations, gender identification, and sexual acts;
- encourage a socially positive approach to sexual health and sexuality, including offering non-judgmental support of sexuality and sexual choices;

- empower and support all sexualities, including lesbian, bisexual, queer, two-spirit, questioning and straight; and
- offer honest ways to reduce risk for all sexual acts and across orientations, including the use of condoms, dental dams, and gloves, or to choose less risky activities over high risk ones.

The workshops are also to present "peer-led, non-abstinence-based and empowering lesbian, bi-sexual, queer and straight perceptions on sexual health".

This nonsense apparently is perfectly acceptable to the feminists in control at the Status of Women and who recommended the grants to the then Minister Responsible for the Status of Women, Helena Guergis. According to the Status of Women website, June 30, 2009 all funding decisions are made by the Minister.

Women's Centres Still Receiving Funds from the Status of Women – Why?

2007-2008

Name of Organization	Amount
St. John's Status of Women Council (St. John's, Nfld)	\$148,820.00
Tri-County Women's Centre Society (Yarmouth, N.S.)	83,260.00

Women's Network PEI Inc. (Charlottetown, PEI)	90,383.00
Federation des femmes du Quebec FFQ (Montreal, Quebec)	770,000.00
Downtown Eastside Women's Centre (Vancouver, BC)	252,000.00
Vancouver Status of Women (Vancouver, BC)	221,100.00

2008 – 2009

Name of Organization	Amount
Corner Brook Status of Women Council (Corner Brook, Nfld)	\$34,710.00
LEA Place Women's Resource Centre Society (Sheet Harbour, NS)	114,740.00
Women's Centre of Grand – Portage (Riviere-du-Loup, Quebec)	81,940.00
Kelowna Women's Resource Centre Society (Kelowna, BC)	40,900.00
Kitimat Community Services Society (Kitimat, BC)	25,431.00
Women's Resource Society of the Fraser Valley (Mission, BC)	281,721.00
Golden Women's Centre Society (Golden, BC)	94,314.00
Vernon and District Women's Centre Society (Vernon, BC)	88,800.00
The Avenue Community Centre for Gender and Sexual Diversity Inc., Saskatoon, SK	90,980.00
Terrace Women's Resource Centre Society (Terrace, BC)	99,384.00
Women's Place Kenora (Kenora, Ontario)	64,322.00
West Central Women's Resource Centre (Winnipeg, Man)	9,520.00

Although the Conservative government has rejected a universal child care program, that hasn't stopped the Status of Women from funding groups still lobbying for a national child care program.

2007 - 2008

Child Care Coalition of Manitoba (Winnipeg)	\$115,035.00
---	--------------

2008 - 2009

New Brunswick Child Care Coalition (Moncton, NB)	\$169,700.00
--	--------------

Even some of the national feminist organizations, which are supposed to have had their funding cut off, are still enjoying the comfort of federal tax payers' money.

2007 – 2008

West Coast LEAF (Women's Legal Education Action Fund Association) (Vancouver, BC)	\$124,000.00
--	--------------

Your money, your taxes at work.

Please write to the following, thanking them for the cuts they have made to feminist groups, but asking them to completely halt all funding, and to shut down the Status of Women, as an obsolete agency.

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

The Hon. Stockwell Day
President of Treasury Board
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Phone: 613-995-1702 Fax: 613-995-1154

The Hon. Rona Ambrose
Minister Responsible for the Status of Women
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Phone: 613-996-9778
Fax: 613-996-0785

The Hon. Bev Oda
Minister Responsible for International Cooperation
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Phone: 613-992-2792
Fax: 613-992-2794

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

REAL WOMEN AWARD 2010 TO LIFESITE NEWS

REAL Women was very pleased to honour LifeSite News (LifeSiteNews.com) with its REAL Women annual award in 2010. The award was presented at REAL Women's annual conference in North Bay in April, 2010 to John-Henry Westen, editor and co-founder of LifeSite News on behalf of our organization.

LifeSite plays a unique role in the culture wars, both in Canada and internationally.

LifeSite News is courageous and forthright in its investigative work and reports. No matter how powerful or influential the organization or individuals about whom it reports, it sets out the facts, obtained by painstaking research, and then fearlessly explains in clear, concise language.

LifeSite's honesty and integrity have resulted in powerful figures attacking it, trying to discredit it. But LifeSite has remained stalwart and unflinching in carrying out its responsibilities to report the truth, no matter how unpalatable it might be to some.

LifeSite is making a major impact in advancing the pro-life, pro-family cause world-wide. Those of us who are actively involved with this movement rely heavily on LifeSiteNews to provide us with vital, accurate information. We cannot recommend the web site more highly.

LifeSite needs our support in order to continue its remarkable work. It operates free of charge because it wants its news reports to reach as far and wide as possible in order to have the maximum impact in preserving our culture.

LifeSite needs our support, both financially and morally. Donate securely online, by mail, or by phone (866) 787-9947. (All other calls 888-678-6008.) Its offices are open from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time.

U.S. Mailing Address
LifeSiteNews Inc.
4 Family Life Lane
Front Royal, VA 22630
USA

Canadian Mailing Address

LifeSiteNews
104 Bond St, Third Floor
Toronto ON M5B 1X9
Canada

May God bless and guide LifeSite News for its great contribution to the pro-life, pro-family cause.

THE TRANSGENDERED HAVE THEIR DAY

NDP MP Bill Siksay (Burnaby-Douglas) was, at one time, the legislative assistant to former NDP (and fellow homosexual) MP Svend Robinson. The latter was forced to resign his parliamentary seat because he stole a \$64,500 ring on display at a public auction, (See REALity March/April, 2005 "Svend Robinson Staging His Comeback").

It seems Mr. Siksay learned a thing or two about political strategy and game playing while at Mr. Robinson's side. This conclusion is based on the fact that Mr. Siksay replayed exactly the strategy Mr. Robinson used in pushing through his controversial private member's Bill C-250 in 2002, which provided that sexual orientation be included in the hate crime provisions of the Criminal Code S. 319. This controversial Bill C-250 was passed by devious means and Mr. Siksay's private members Bill C-389 on the transgendered seems to be following exactly the same path.

For example, Mr. Robinson brought his bill forward for second reading close to the House of Commons adjourning for summer recess on May 29, 2002. There were only 15 MPs in the House at the time - only two members of the then Canadian Alliance party were present, the rest being Liberals and NDP MPs. Mr. Cauchon, the Liberal Minister of Justice, backed Mr. Robinson's private member's bill and, through agreement with Mr. Robinson, the Liberal MPs present joined the NDP MPs to pass Mr. Robinson's bill at second reading, as well as to push it to, and through, the Justice Committee. (See REALity Sept/Oct 2003, p.1.)

MP Siksay's Bill on the Transgendered

The purpose of Mr. Siksay's private member's bill on the transgendered, Bill C-389, is to amend the federal Human Rights Act and the hate provisions in the Criminal Code, to give specific protection for "gender identity" and "gender expression", as prohibited grounds of discrimination. That is, this bill would provide transgendered, transsexuals and gender non-conforming individuals with protection as their human right. Significantly, the expression "gender identity" and "gender expression" are not defined in the bill.

(Transsexuals are individuals, who believe they were born the wrong sex. Transgendered, is an umbrella term to cover a variety of behaviour, including that of drag queens and cross-dressers, etc.)

MP Siksay's Bill C-389 Rushed Through House of Commons

The first hour of debate on Bill C-389 was on May 10, 2010. It was the fourth time in six years, that MP Siksay had introduced the bill. The bill was, as is customary, placed at the bottom of the list of private member's bill, but miraculously reappeared for second reading less than a month later on June 8, 2010. MP Siksay had apparently done some serious trading with other MPs on the timing of his private member's bill. Like MP Robinson's Bill C-250, the debate on MP Siksay's Bill C-389 occurred immediately before the House rose for summer recess. Consequently, scarcely any MPs were sitting in the Commons during the debate on second reading – NDP and Bloc Quebecois MPs were there, and happily supported the bill. Only one Conservative MP, Daniel Petit (Charlesbourg, Haute-Saint-Charles), Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, spoke against the bill on June 8, 2010, arguing that the vague language in the bill was unacceptable. He stated:

... guaranteeing additional protection for one minority group can have unwanted social and legal consequences for another group. We must know the exact repercussions of legislative amendments and we were not given this

information by the member who sponsored the bill.

He went on to say:

... the amendments proposed by Bill C-389 are vague and undefined.

... it is important to note that the term “expression” is nowhere to be found in the list of protected rights [in the Canadian Human Rights Act.]

... when we look at the changes proposed in Bill C-389, none of these terms are defined. As a result, we cannot be sure of the meaning of “gender expression” and how it might be interpreted by the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal and the courts.

Despite these concerns, the bill passed second reading, with few if any Conservatives in attendance. (Where was the Conservative House Leader that day, that he didn't get the troops out for the vote?) The Bill has now been sent to the Justice Committee for review. The Justice Committee, like all other Committees, is dominated by opposition MPs due to a minority Parliament, so the bill's destiny is uncertain.

That is, everything hinges on whether Liberal opposition leader Michael Ignatieff orders a “whipped” vote on the bill, i.e. that he require all Liberal MPs to vote for the bill as a matter of party policy. Certainly, the NDP and Bloc Quebecois will all vote for the bill. Although it is unusual for a party leader to order a “whipped” vote on a private member's bill, this occurred with the Liberals on Mr. Robinson's Bill C-250 in 2002. Therefore, such an action is not unprecedented by any means.

Since the terms “gender identity” and “gender expression”, are not defined in Mr. Siksay's bill, one can justifiably be concerned as to how the human rights tribunals and the courts will interpret them. It is quite possible that the term “gender expression” will be interpreted to protect anyone who may “think” he/she is another sex, whether or not he/she had hormonal treatment or surgery or not.

Transgendered and Transsexuals Have a Psychological Problem

Johns Hopkins hospital in Baltimore, Maryland at one time was the leading authority on transsexual surgery. It carried out the requested surgeries, even though such surgery merely changed the external sexual parts, such as providing an artificial vagina or penis, neither of which functioned as such since the internal reproductive structure remained the same, as does the person's DNA and chromosomes. Johns Hopkins conducted follow-up studies and found that these surgically altered individuals were no happier or well adjusted after all the hormone and surgical treatment than before. These people had much the same problems with relationships, work and emotions as before. Clearly, the hope that, after their treatments, they would emerge from their emotional difficulties to flourish psychologically was not fulfilled. In addition, unfortunate post-surgical male subjects were, in fact, caricatures of women with their large hands, prominent Adam's apples and thick facial features, which become more pronounced with age. High heels, copious makeup and flamboyant clothes do not deny the obvious. Therefore, authorities at Johns Hopkins Hospital concluded that to assist with surgery and hormone treatment was to fundamentally cooperate with these individuals' mental illness. Johns Hopkins hospital ceased providing such treatment. (See REALity July/August 2004 “Homosexuals' New Agenda – Transsexualism”.)

Transsexuals and Transgendered Need Help

We should not pretend that changing gender identity is an answer to transgendered and transsexuals' problems. Instead, these people need our compassion and concern and also treatment in the form of counselling in order to deal with their delusions.

What Will be the Effect if Bill C-389 Passes?

The major effect of this bill is that transgendered, transsexual and sexually confused individuals will be given full protection re employment, services, housing, etc. in public institutions under federal jurisdiction. That is, their obvious oddities will be “normalized”, and accepted and protected under the law. Even without surgery, an individual who “thinks” he/she is another gender may be entitled to use the washroom of his/her “perceived” gender. Medical health plans will be required to pay the costs of surgery and hormone treatment (approximately \$20-\$30,000 at a minimum). Even federal penitentiary inmates will be provided with treatment at their request. After the treatment, a few problems will arise as to whether he or she should be in a male or female penitentiary.

If this bill becomes law, we can expect the provinces to be heavily pressured to rapidly follow the federal lead, and as a result, school children will be taught in school that even “thinking” you are another gender is normal, acceptable and reasonable.

In summary, some of the consequences of this bill if passed into law are as follows:

Federal institutions, such as banks, the military, penitentiaries, the RCMP, ships under federal jurisdiction etc. will be forced to hire or retain a male who dresses as a female or vice versa.

Children will be allowed to be taught, to their confusion, by a woman who has had sex change surgery and has become a man.

Governments will be required to rent property to “drag queens”, cross dressers, etc.

Restrooms within government buildings will be used by members of the opposite sex just because that person “believes” he/she has a newly discovered “right” to belong to the opposite sex. What about the rights of others?

What about women who don’t wish to share the restroom with a disturbed male?

Children will be exposed to child predators, who use cross-dressing as a pre-text to gain access to children, via restrooms and employment venues involving children, etc.

It will be a strange new era if Bill C-389 is passed into law.

Please write to the Prime Minister and your MP to ensure Bill C-389 does not become law.

Prime Minister Stephen Harper
Office of the Prime Minister
80 Wellington St
Ottawa ON K1A 0A2
Fax 613-941-6900

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6