

## THE UGLINESS OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE: BILL C-26

Some individuals are extraordinary. They give unstintingly of their love, care and service to others. Examples include Mother Teresa, with her compassion for the neglected and forgotten, and Jean Vanier, with his love and devotion for the developmentally disabled. It's reassuring to know that there are such good people in our midst.

There are others, however, who live out their lives hurting or destroying those who have the misfortune to fall in their path. Examples of these, the lowest of human beings, are those individuals who sexually abuse helpless children in order to feed their personal fantasies and for sexual gratification. These predators leave in ruin the lives of innocent children whose childhoods are destroyed. This, however, is irrelevant to the predators in pursuit of their own pleasure.

The internet has exacerbated the availability of disgusting photographs of sexual acts with children. Police around the world constantly play catch-up, trying to seek out and stop this terrible harm to children.

Unfortunately, when these perverts are caught, far too many judges in Canada have handed down sentences for such heinous crimes that are mere slaps on the wrist, dismissing these crimes as though they are simply a matter only of "boys will be boys". This occurred, for example in 1999, when Mr. Justice Duncan Shaw of the BC Supreme Court concluded that the 67 year old accused, Robin Sharpe, was not guilty of child pornography in regard to his written works because the child pornography law infringed on Mr. Sharpe's freedom of expression and conscience. Judge Shaw went on to state that a person's right to explore material depicting children as vehicles of sexual gratification was an essential part of that person's intimate and private life, which should be given considerable weight.

And, even though Mr. Sharpe had in his possession over 500 photographs of child pornography, which he had taken himself while visiting in Asia, Mr. Justice Shaw sentenced Mr. Sharpe to a minimal sentence of four months house arrest for violating the child pornography law. The house arrest consisted of Mr. Sharpe remaining in his apartment for four months, under electronic monitoring between 4:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. He was ordered not to contact anyone under 18 years of age and was denied access to the Internet, except with the

permission of his parole officer. The Crown prosecutor had argued for at least 10 to 12 months imprisonment.

Some judges, such as Duncan Shaw, cannot be trusted to give sentences in keeping with the crime. Such judges are more concerned about the accused than the victim. They seem to believe that the accused can be rehabilitated if provided with counselling, compassion and a minimum sentence. Such liberal judges live in a world of unreality.

### BILL C-26: TOUGHER PENALTIES FOR CHILD PREDATORS ACT

The Conservative government has introduced Bill C-26 in order to address the problem of lenient judges in regard to sexual offences against children. The proposed bill provides for the following:

- (a) increase mandatory minimum penalties and maximum penalties for certain sexual offences against children;
- (b) increase maximum penalties for violations of prohibition orders, probation orders and peace bonds for child predators;
- (c) require courts to impose, in certain cases, consecutive sentences on offenders who commit a number of sexual offences against children, rather than allowing these sentences for many charges to run concurrently;

## CONTENTS

THE UGLINESS OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE: BILL C-26 .....	PAGE 1
PROTECTION RACKET BY HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVISTS .....	PAGE 2
A WELCOME TWIST ON THE TWISTED TRANSGENDER BILL .....	PAGE 3
THE EMPTYING OUT OF CANADA .....	PAGE 4
ONTARIO SEX EDUCATION BLASTED ON ALL SIDES .....	PAGE 5

- (d) ensure that a judge who imposes a sentence considers evidence that the offence was committed while the offender violated the terms of his release from prison;
- (e) amend the Canada Evidence Act to ensure that spouses of the accused can be a witness against his/her spouse in child pornography cases.
- (f) provide that there be reporting obligations of sex offenders who travel outside Canada, and provide for a High Risk Child Sex Offender Database to establish an accessible database that contains information for the public that had only previously been available to the police. This database is to include the names of those who are found guilty of sexual offences against children and who are at high risk of repeating sexual crimes against children.

This is all well and good since these provisions will provide more protection for children.

### **DEFENCE LAWYER CLAYTON RUBY OPPOSES BILL C-26**

It is interesting, however, that one of the leading defence lawyers in Canada, Clayton Ruby, was referenced by NDP opponents of Bill C-26 in the House of Commons. Mr. Ruby is currently defending the former Ontario Deputy Minister of Education, Benjamin Levin, who was responsible for the controversial and age inappropriate sex education curriculum in Ontario. Mr. Ruby claimed the consecutive

minimum sentences required under the Tougher Penalties for Child Predators Act did not leave room for considering the individual offender and “the circumstances” surrounding the offence for which he is charged. He described Bill C-26 as “shallow symbolism”. It’s hardly symbolism when a sexual offender can be sent to jail to serve sentences for each sexual offence he has perpetrated. Mr. Ruby’s real problem, however, is that Bill C-26 will make it harder for defence lawyers, such as himself, to avoid conviction for such offences by his clients. That is, under Bill C-26, Mr. Ruby and other defence lawyers will no longer be able to use the court system to plea bargain for their clients, as Mr. Ruby did in the Benjamin Levin case. Levin was charged with seven offences, but under Ruby’s plea bargain, four of the charges were dropped in return for Mr. Levin pleading guilty for just three of the offences.

Once Bill C-26 is passed into law, the good old days of extensive plea bargaining by lawyers will be avoided. Mandatory minimum sentences imposed under this bill will prevent lenient sentencing, which has been so generously provided by liberal judges in the past, i.e., a suspended sentence, probation or a “house arrest” sentence will no longer be handed down to child predators. That is, no longer will child predators, such as Mr. Levin, be given a lenient sentence because of the supportive letters he has requested from his friends in high places to tell the judge what a fine fellow he is, apart from the “minor” problem of his sex abuse of minors. The lawyers retained by accused child abusers will no longer be able to keep their clients out of jail, and society will be much safer. ‡

## **A PROTECTION RACKET BY HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVISTS**

There is something deeply puzzling about businesses and well-known corporations jumping on the homosexual bandwagon, giving their vocal approval and generous financial support to the homosexual organizations and their campaigns.

The mainstream media of course totally accepts the homosexual agenda, as being only reasonable and just. No exceptions allowed, no independent views or religious or conscientious rights allowed to interfere with the promotion of and acceptance of homosexuality.

There may be more involved with this phenomenon than meets the eye. As the homosexual campaigns have achieved more success, the activists have become markedly more aggressive and demanding. They insist not only that their agenda be tolerated, but that it must be totally accepted as normal behaviour. In fact, homosexual activists are now insisting on full control of thought, word and action in society on all matters concerning homosexuals. This is the new form of totalitarian control.

There seems to be little pull back by others to these outrageous demands, except by some churches and pro-family organizations, which have, despite harassment and legal sanctions, remained resolute under relentless pressure to conform.

What is going on that so many have capitulated to the demands of this tiny minority? Why are businesses supporting the homosexual agenda?

In some instances, it may be based on a fundamental belief in the homosexual cause.

That is, some executives in corporations are “true believers” in the homosexual agenda, e.g., some billionaire Republicans, who had previously donated to the Republican 2012 Presidential campaign are now giving huge donations to the venomous Washington based homosexual Human Rights Campaign because they now believe in so-called “gay equality”. But this doesn’t explain why Starbucks or McDonald’s, for example, endorse homosexual rights. Why do businesses, who, after all, are in existence to make money for their shareholders, take sides favouring homosexuality? What is in it for them? Why do they risk alienating those who are offended by the homosexual agenda? The latter’s money is after all, just as important and more abundant than the minority homosexuals’ money.

It is quite possible that corporations are paying “protection money” to homosexual groups in order to protect their businesses from harassment, bad publicity and legal charges against them for some trumped-up discriminatory practices. In short, they are being

blackmailed by aggressive homosexual activists. In order to be allowed to be left in peace to operate their businesses, it seems they may be buying protection from hostile homosexual activists.

On the other hand, some corporations may have just signed up with the sexual left. Christian employees in these corporations should be on their guard. The sexual leftists in the company will do what they can to get rid of them.

### THE BANK OF MONTREAL (BMO)

One of the corporations in Canada that has been taken over by the sexual left is the BMO. On October 9, 2014 BMO announced a policy of requiring law firms with which it does business to henceforth disclose the diversity statistics of their associates, partners and management committee, or the BMO will drop legal vendors who are not supportive to BMO's commitment to diversity and inclusion.

### THE DELUSION OF BMO

BMO also wrote a letter, dated March 23, 2014, to the Federation of Law Societies and the Law Society of Upper Canada encouraging them to refuse to accredit the future law graduates of Trinity Western University, a Christian university located in Langley B. C. BMO states that "the core values of Canadians" support its position [on homosexuality]. Why does this financial institution think it is able to determine just what are core Canadian values? Why does BMO think it can promote such harsh discriminatory policies against Christians in the name of alleged diversity? Doesn't BMO realize that Christians, too, form a large and important part of Canada's diversity? BMO, however, claims that the corporation is "more than just a financial institution, but instead as people and partners who understand and reflect their [customers'] values, priorities and goals" of Canadians. What nonsense. BMO has taken leave of its senses. What gives BMO the authority to adjudicate Canadian values? By trying to do so it has exposed itself as a bigoted and intolerant institution.

BMO is not alone in their mischief. Seventy-two major Canadian corporations, led by BMO, have established a group called Legal Leaders for Diversity (LLD) to promote diversity in the workplace and create a more inclusive profession for LGBT lawyers and staff. These corporations include Sobey's, Ford, MNP, Kellogg's, Deloitte, RBC, UPS, and many others

who have agreed to 17 ways of promoting this radical, secular agenda which shows little tolerance for Christians and others who do not support the homosexual agenda.

This absurd policy lacks business sense. Businesses operate in order to make a profit: business is business. Undoubtedly, there are homosexual networks in many companies forcing their policies on businesses. But common sense indicates that businesses keep away from controversial issues and just keep their shareholders content, hopefully increasing the value of their investment.

Considering that BMO has missed three of its four goals or financial targets this year, it should stick with its financial concerns. This failure hasn't stopped BMO from increasing the salary of its CEO, William Downe, from a mere \$9.48 million in 2013 to \$9.94 million in 2014. What kind of business is BMO anyway?

Well, it's a large opportunistic institution trying to tie its brand to the highly controversial social issue of homosexuality. It is inappropriate for a financial institution to insert itself in such issues as homosexuality. With its concern to provide a politically correct voice in the national conversation, BMO is alienating some of its customers. It can't be to increase business. Exxon Mobile, scores absolute lowest in the annual ranking of homosexual friendly corporations, listed by the anti-Christian US Human Rights Campaign. Exxon Mobile is one of the most profitable corporations the world has known, making profits north of \$45 billion a year: that's profits, not sales.

Please write to BMO objecting to its obnoxious campaign against Christians and others who do not agree with the homosexual agenda.

### Contact:

BMO Financial Group  
Corporate Communications  
100 King Street West, 28th Floor  
Toronto, ON M5X 1A1  
Tel: (416) 867-6785

Mr. William Downe  
BMO President & CEO,  
[corp.secretary@bmo.com](mailto:corp.secretary@bmo.com)

BMO Board of Directors  
[board.directors@bmo.com](mailto:board.directors@bmo.com) †

## A WELCOME TWIST TO THE TWISTED TRANSGENDER BILL

The controversial transgender bill (Bill C-279) met sensible resistance in the Senate when Senator Donald Plett, a member of the Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, brought forward amendments to the bill which were passed by the Committee.

His amendments removed the definition of "gender identity" which provided that "gender identity" meant a

person's deeply felt internal or individual experience of gender. That is, one need only "feel" what his/her gender is in order to assume that gender. Another of his amendments was to prohibit a transgender from using "segregated" facilities, such as washrooms, change rooms, crisis centres, women's shelters, shower facilities, change rooms, etc. The purpose of this amendment was to protect women and

children from sexual predators having access to women's premises by pretending they belonged to the female gender. It also applies to transgender women wishing to use male premises. Supporters of the transgender bill claim that sexual predators don't take advantage of this provision. They are either seriously uninformed or they are just denying the truth. Predatory behaviour has, in fact, occurred in many of the jurisdictions which have passed a transgender law. That is, women and children have been harassed, sexually assaulted and physically intimidated by sex abusers because of the provision allowing their access to such facilities.

Homosexual NDP MP Randall Garrison, who introduced the Transgender Bill (C-279), was infuriated by Senator Plett's amendments. He claims that these amendments mean that

he and his supporters can no longer support the bill which he states is now discriminatory legislation. That is unfortunate.

Any amendments made by the Senate will have to be returned to the House of Commons for debate and approval and, if passed there, will be returned to the Senate for final approval.

Parliament, however, will recess by the middle of June and, since an election is expected to take place on October 19, it will not sit again until after the election. Consequently, with only a few Parliamentary weeks left before the June recess, it is thought unlikely that this bill will be passed. Rather, it will simply die on the Order Paper.

One hopes so, as this will prevent harm to women and children. †

## THE EMPTYING OUT OF CANADA

### It is time that Canada comes to grips with the problem of a rapidly declining population, and implements some of the worthwhile initiatives....

Canada is facing a dark future with its decreasing birth rate. Our fertility rate is far below the replacement level of 2.1 children per woman of reproductive age. Instead, the fertility rate in the last census in 2011 was 1.61 children per woman. Every single province in Canada has a birth rate well below replacement level. The only exception is Nunavut which has a birth rate of 2.97 children per woman of reproductive age. Good for them!

The government is doing what it can by increasing the immigration rate this year in order to counteract population decline caused by our dismal birth rate. However, this is not a permanent solution, as immigrant families in the second generation take on the practices of native born Canadians in that they reduce their family to one or, perhaps, two children only.

No one can put their finger on exactly why Canadian, American and European women are reluctant to have children. It could be that in the last few years a larger number of women have been entering professional high-paying positions and as a result have delayed child bearing. Also, the vast majority of women who are in the paid workforce cannot cope with managing larger families as well as their paid work. Further, some women are making the choice to live an affluent lifestyle, and become accustomed to it, unencumbered by the responsibilities of motherhood. They prefer a tranquil life with tangible, physical comforts, without the responsibilities of parenting and childrearing.

Whatever the reasons, the declining birth rate in Canada is already affecting our social benefits programs.

For example, the Old Age Security Benefit (OAS) now

costs more than \$46 billion each year and is one of the largest and most expensive of our federal programs. This is because everyone over the age of 65 is entitled to the monthly OAS cheque of \$563.74 indexed to inflation, with low income seniors entitled to additional support from the Guaranteed Income Supplement starting at age sixty. Some of this pension is clawed back for higher income retirees. This small monthly payment is not much help for lower income retirees who have inadequate savings to supplement it.

Although Canada has an aging population, there are fewer taxpayers to support the OAS payments. In the 1970's, there were seven workers for each old age pensioner. Today, there are roughly four taxpayers for each old age pensioner. In 15 years, the ratio is expected to fall to just 2:1.

This decline in taxpayers available to pay for our social programs has been exacerbated by unrestricted abortion which destroys future taxpayers at a rate of over 100,000 each year. They are destroyed mostly for no reason other than that they are inconvenient to the lives of their parents. The number of plumbers, carpenters, nurses, lawyers and physicians in the future who will be paying taxes can no longer be relied on. They decrease in number each year.

The scale of the problem is so enormous that the Conservative Government has needed to deal with at least part of the problem. Its solution was spelled out in the 2012 budget, when it introduced a new policy to take effect between the years 2023 and 2029, to the effect that the age of OAS eligibility will increase from 65 to age 67.

This is a helpful policy, but it is also a discouraging policy for low income Canadians with limited income from other sources, as they will not be able to receive OAS when they had anticipated.

Other solutions must be found to this problem of a declining population. It may be that France has found some answers to the problem. It has aggressively enacted policies to support women who want to have children, but who still wish



to keep their paid employment. The French policies have led to an astonishing increase in the French birth rate so that France now has the second highest birth rate in Europe, after Ireland.

What are these pro-family policies that have turned the situation around in France? One of the most important policies is providing flexibility for women who want to continue working while still having children. For example, the length of paid maternity leave increases with the more children one has. The government has also been extremely generous in providing a large number of child care options for parents, such as covering the cost of part-time nannies, and

providing subsidized private day care and company day care, as well as increasing public day care. The French Government also provides special advantages for large families (3 or more children) by providing free train and subway service, free access to museums and other government facilities.

The French Government has shrewdly provided families with both more time and more money. These incentives have proven successful. It is time that Canada comes to grips with the problem of a rapidly declining population, and implements some of the worthwhile initiatives undertaken in France. †

## ONTARIO SEX EDUCATION BLASTED ON ALL SIDES

Ontario's Premier, Kathleen Wynne, thought that with her majority government, she could bring in her cherished sex education curriculum without difficulty. She was mistaken.

At first, she dismissed objections to her programme by shouting "homophobes" at the objectors (she is an acknowledged lesbian). The Deputy Minister of Education, Benjamin Levin, who was responsible in 2010 for the development of the highly controversial sex education programme, which is much the same as the 2015 curriculum, pleaded guilty on March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2015 to charges of sex abuse of children. His sex education programme includes age inappropriate information such as gender identity, homosexuality and same sex marriage in grade III. In grade VI children are taught about anal and oral sex, and the joys and the satisfaction of masturbation. Such topics imposed on innocent children may satisfy Premier Wynne's and Benjamin Levin's own distorted views on sexuality, but not that of many parents who are not in agreement with this promotion of and grooming of children for sex at such young ages.

When parental concerns about Levin's involvement with the curriculum was raised, Ms. Wynne and her current Education Minister, Liz Sandals, maintained that the former Deputy Minister of Education and convicted child predator, Benjamin Levin, was not involved in developing the controversial sex education curriculum. Documentation indicates otherwise. Further, despite Wynne and Sandals' denials, further documents obtained under the Access to Information Act have disclosed that Levin remained closely involved with the Ontario Ministry of Education, right up until the charges were laid against him in 2013. Lies and more lies by these untrustworthy politicians.

Parents from ethnic backgrounds, Chinese, Sikh and Arab Canadians, among others, have raised strong objections to the Ontario curriculum. This is undermining Wynne's political support in these communities. The ethnic newspapers have written continuously about the programme as being offensive to their ethnic groups. Members of Ms. Wynne's own Liberal caucus in the Legislature, Harinder Malhi, and Harinder Takhar have raised objections to the curriculum.

What is happening is that Canadians from a wide variety

of ethnic groups, among others, have joined together with social conservatives to reject the curriculum.

Rejection of a sex education curriculum, however, is not just an Ontario phenomenon, but it is occurring worldwide. Millions of people see sex education programmes as an attack on their culture which they believe serves as protection for their children against permissive sex. Further, there is little or no evidence that these programmes actually reduce teen pregnancy or sexually transmitted diseases,—so what is to be actually gained by these programmes in the first place, parents are asking?

On the subject of sex, parents have their own values which they wish to convey to their own children. This is a fundamental matter for them. Schools are not qualified to set the standards for society and religions on sexuality. When they try to do so, the schools learn the hard way, it is a mistake to foist the programmes on a diverse public.

Premier Kathleen Wynne has had a well-deserved rude awakening in this regard.

Demonstrations and many petitions are keeping up the pressure on Ms. Wynne to withdraw the offensive curriculum. †



Birds and Bees by Steve Nease Posted online at York Region Media Group.

# NOTICE OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

**When:** Friday, June 5, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.  
**Where:** North York Central Library  
5120 Yonge St Toronto Ontario M2N 5N9  
ROOM 2/3

**Topic:** The Crushing of Religious Freedoms in Canada  
**Speaker:** Damian Goddard

Recently appearing as a news anchor on Sun News Network, Goddard has spent much of his career covering sports for Rogers Sportnet, Leafs TV, Raptors NBA TV, The Score, and the CBC. He now has a spot as a talk show host on NewsTalk 1010(CFRB).

In 2011, Damian tweeted his support of the "traditional and true meaning of marriage" from his home computer. The following day was fired from Rogers Sportsnet for voicing his view on marriage, despite his being one of the network's lead sports anchors.

Please write down the date and plan to attend REAL Women's Annual Meeting and Mr. Goddard's talk.

Refreshments will be provided.

## ANNUAL MEETING

1. To receive the financial statements of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2014, together with the reports of the directors and auditors thereon;

Members may obtain a copy of the Financial Statement available at  
REAL Women of Canada's Ottawa Office.

2. Appointment of Auditor;
3. To elect a Board of Directors;  
Only those who subscribe to our objectives and have been members in good standing of the Corporation for at least 60 days prior to this meeting shall have the right to vote and/or run for office.
4. To hear and vote on resolutions from voting members;  
Resolutions must be submitted in writing prior to the Annual Meeting by May 25, 2015 and approved by the Resolutions Committee.  
Please send such resolutions to:  
**REAL Women of Canada,  
Resolutions Committee,  
BOX 8813 Station T,  
Ottawa ON K1G 3J1 by mail or  
fax: 613-236-7203 or  
email: realwcna@rogers.com**
5. To transact such further or other business as may properly come before the meeting or any adjournment or adjournments thereof.

*Pauline Guzik*

Pauline Guzik  
National President

## MESSAGE BOARD

- Action Item: Write letter to BMO. See article "Protection Racket by Homosexual Activists"
- Action Item: Write to your MP and Prime Minister Stephen Harper to offer your support of Bill C-26: "Tougher Penalties for Child Protection Act". See article: "The Ugliness of Child Sexual Abuse"
- Action Item: Write to your MP and Prime Minister Stephen Harper to encourage them to introduce legislation to encourage larger families, as has been done in France. See Article: "The Emptying Out of Canada".
- Feel free to use any of the information contained in REALity when writing letters to elected officials, or letters to the Editor. We want the information to get out there. You do not need permission from REAL Women to use anything you read in REALity. Thank you for spreading the word.

## SUPPORT REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

PLEASE MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO JOIN OUR WORK  
TO DEFEND & PROTECT LIFE & THE FAMILY

Membership \$30/year • Groups \$50/year • Donation \_\_\_\_\_  
*Contributions, unfortunately, are not tax deductible.*

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

Province \_\_\_\_\_ Postal Code \_\_\_\_\_

Tel \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

Send online at [www.realwomenofcanada.ca](http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca) or by mail. Thank you.

**REALity** is a publication of **REAL Women of Canada**

PO Box 8813 Station T Ottawa ON K1G 3J1 • Tel 613-236-4001 Fax 613-236-7203  
[www.realwomenofcanada.ca](http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca) • [info@realwomenofcanada.ca](mailto:info@realwomenofcanada.ca)