



# REALity

REALISTIC | EQUAL | ACTIVE | for LIFE

## UPDATE ON THE POLITICAL SCENE

***“In just over a year since being elected Prime Minister, Trudeau has apparently grown tired of the drudgery of democracy, and is using his majority to nonchalantly ram through a bill without providing adequate explanation, evidence or data to support it.”***

REAL Women of Canada has been working on several issues in the last few months which are of great concern to all Canadians. We have written to the MP’s and Senators raising our objections to the following:

### **1. AN APOLOGY AND COMPENSATION FOR HOMOSEXUALS DEMANDED BY THE LGBT COMMUNITY?**

Reasonable people dislike discrimination, and want to eliminate it. In doing so, however, it is prudent to examine the history of the issue in order to reach conclusions that are based on facts, rather than hype.

A rational approach to discrimination should be applied to all issues, no matter how contentious the subject matter.

Currently LGBT activists are requesting an apology for alleged past discrimination in their dismissal from the public service and the military. They are also seeking financial compensation.

It is true that previous governments have apologized for historical acts of discrimination. To cite some examples: the Chinese Head Tax in 1885; the 1914 refusal to allow landing of the Kamagata Maru with Sikhs and Hindus on board; the turning away of the St. Louis with 900 German Jews escaping the Nazi regime; the evacuation of persons of Japanese origin to internment camps during World War II.

Are these discriminatory acts similar to past acts taken by the government against homosexuals? It seems that the treatment of homosexuals by the government is not similar to those other acts by the government.

Homosexuality was prohibited under the Criminal Code until Trudeau Sr. decriminalized it in 1969 for consenting adults over 21 years of age, (later reduced to 18 years). The practice of homosexuality was a crime, formerly referred to in the Code as buggery or sodomy, and later as anal intercourse. This prohibition was in accordance with the social

and cultural values of the time.

The Criminal Code prohibition against homosexuality was based on the moral law as expressed in Judeo-Christian faiths and principles. Society in general believed religion provided good guidance which protected people from harm. For example, bacterial infections and death by venereal disease were the consequences of promiscuity before antibiotics. Thus the laws served to protect vulnerable people from these and other negative consequences.

The reason for the dismissal of homosexuals in the military and public service was that they were subject to blackmail if their sexual orientation, then a criminal offence, was publicly disclosed. This blackmail could result in not only forcing homosexuals to pay money in return for silence, but also requiring them to divulge national security secrets to which they were privy because of their employment. Homosexuals in the military had led to problems in operational effectiveness because of the impact on the cohesion and morale of the unit.

The law that prohibited homosexuality in the Criminal Code may not be acceptable to everyone, but it was not unjust discrimination. Such action by the government was distinguishable from the outright discrimination that occurred when groups were refused entry into Canada and denied full citizenship rights. By contrast, this was not the situation with homosexuals who were, in fact, accepted as citizens.

### **2. TRUDEAU BLINDSIDES DEMOCRACY WITH HIS TRANSGENDER BILL C-16**

During the 2015 election, Trudeau famously assured the public that transparency and public accountability would be

## CONTENTS

UPDATE ON THE POLITICAL SCENE.....	PAGE 1
SOMETHING VERY PECULIAR ABOUT THE ASSISTED SUICIDE BILL.....	PAGE 3
THE GREAT SENATE HOAX.....	PAGE 4
THE UN UNDER NEW MANAGEMENT.....	PAGE 5
SEX EDUCATION IS WASTED ON THE YOUNG.....	PAGE 6
MESSAGE BOARD.....	PAGE 6

the order of the day if he became Prime Minister.

In just over a year since being elected Prime Minister, Trudeau has apparently grown tired of the drudgery of democracy, and is using his majority to nonchalantly ram through a bill without providing adequate explanation, evidence or data to support it.

On October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016, second reading took place on Bill C-16 which amends the Canadian Human Rights Act to provide special protection for transsexuals and to include them in the list of identifiable groups that are protected from hate propaganda in the *Criminal Code*.

The debate commenced at 10:10 a.m. and in just 4 hours at 2:00 p.m. the majority Liberals pushed the bill to the Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

That Committee did not bother to invite witnesses from the public to appear before it. Further, Minister of Justice, Jody Wilson-Raybould, admitted at the committee hearing that she had no actual evidence or data on whether transsexuals were actually experiencing discrimination or hate, but was only relying on information provided to her from partisan transgender and LGBT activists.

Also, during discussions at the committee, it was clear that no one understood the meaning of the expressions “gender identity” and “gender expression” which were supposed to be protected by these amendments. Ms. Jody Wilson-Raybould, in explaining the bill admitted that transpersons could already complain of discrimination on the grounds of sex under the Human Rights Act. This bill, therefore, lifts the transgendered to an explicit category in law. This has not been done for any other group such as First Nations people or other vulnerable individuals who also experience discrimination.

When the issue was raised as to how this legislation will affect immigration, travel procedures for transsexuals, their passports and their placement in federal correctional facilities, Minister of Justice Jody Wilson-Raybould admitted that these issues had not yet been dealt with and that there would be “ongoing discussions” about them.

It is noteworthy that new medical evidence has been disclosed in *The Journal – The New Atlantis*, (August 23, 2016) [www.thenewatlantis.com](http://www.thenewatlantis.com) that there is no scientific evidence supporting the transgender identity. The report specifically stated that:

- The belief that gender identity is an innate, fixed human property independent of biological sex—so that a person might be a ‘man trapped in a woman’s body’ or ‘a woman trapped in a man’s body’—is **not supported by scientific evidence**.

And

- Transgender people have higher rates of mental health problems (anxiety, depression, suicide), as well as behavioral and social problems (substance abuse, intimate partner violence), than the general population. Discrimination alone **does not account for the entire disparity**.

Bill C-16 will have wide ranging impact. It applies to the federal government in its role as employer and service provider and to the federally regulated private sector, including crown corporations, inter-provincial and international transportation companies, telecommunications, the postal service and chartered banks. This bill is a political statement which will be followed with programs of employment equity and amelioration.

This significant bill is an embarrassment to Canada. It is based purely on politically correct ideology, not facts or evidence and is being rammed through Parliament in a highly undemocratic manner.

It is completely unacceptable, both in regard to the procedural process applied, as well as to its content. This bill passed the House of Commons on November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016 and is now before the Senate.

### 3. LOWERING THE AGE OF CONSENT FOR HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVITY (BILL C-32)

The Trudeau government has introduced legislation to lower the age of consent from 18 years of age to 16 years of age, for homosexuals. This amendment supposedly is to “ensure respect for equality rights” according to Justice Minister Jody Wilson-Raybould, since the age of consent for heterosexual sex is set at 16 years of age.

It is not the issue of “equality” that should be a concern, but rather, the fact that the amendment will be harmful to adolescents. This is because anal penetration carries different risks than vaginal sex and can leave adolescent males unprotected from exploitation and medical risks.

This “equality” is not a new issue. It has been argued before in the courts by defence lawyers for older males having sex with under-age boys. In a number of cases some judges have enthusiastically jumped on the equality bandwagon stating that the discrepancy in the age of consent between homosexual and vaginal sex infringes the guarantee of equality of adolescents. However, the intent of the law has always been to protect children from exploitation by prosecuting the adults involved, which took priority over concerns about equality.

Anal intercourse is one of the riskiest behaviours associated with the transmission of AIDS and sexually transmitted diseases. Given the interest of some adults in having sex with youngsters, which is well documented, why then are those who should be protecting them, compromising children’s physical and emotional health?

In 1986-87 NDP MP Svend Robinson proposed that this age of consent for anal intercourse be reduced. The Attorney General, The Honourable Raymon Hnatyshyn, the Minister of Justice at that time, stated that there were factors that should be taken into account before lowering the age of consent. In particular, he stated:

“Medical evidence does indicate different kinds of psychological or physical harm may attach to different types of intercourse for young persons. Medical experts are not certain at what age sexual preference is established, and many argue that the age is fixed only in the later

teen years. Also the question here is that heightened danger of contracting Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome or other sexually transmitted disease from anal intercourse since the tissues are more susceptible to physical damage from penetration.”

Despite the court rulings, it is significant that in the intervening years, no government, either Liberal or Conservative, amended the *Criminal Code* to lower the age of

consent because of the risks to adolescents.

Under pressure from the LGBT community, Justin Trudeau ignores these risks, and has automatically assumed the politically correct position on the issue.

Please write to your MP to object to this bill:

**Your MP's Name**  
**c/o House of Commons**  
**Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6 †**

## **SOMETHING VERY PECULIAR ABOUT THE ASSISTED SUICIDE BILL**

***“It is all too easy for judges sitting on the Supreme Court in isolation and solitude, removed from the public, to decide what the law should be. ...They, like the senators, are accountable only to themselves and can and do act according to their own individual biases and whims.”***

The Liberals' Bill C-14 permitting assisted suicide by physicians, nurses as well as “third parties” under medical supervision, is very peculiar in a number of ways. Certainly, there are many complaints from both sides of the issue about the bill itself, which is the most devastating bill to impact on the dignity of human life in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

Besides this, there is something else very peculiar about this bill.

It is peculiar because it was created and revised by unelected elites without consideration of the public's views on this critical issue.

On February 6, 2015, the nine unelected Supreme Court of Canada judges decided on the narrow facts and arguments placed before them, in *Carter v. Attorney General*, that assisted suicide should be legalized in Canada. This decision by the court ignored legal precedent, which prohibited assisted suicide in the *Rodriguez v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, [1993] 3 S.C.R. 519, case. As well, the Judgment ordered Parliament to formulate the new law within a deadline of one year—namely, February 6, 2016. Subsequently, the court extended the deadline by four months to June 6, 2016 due to the intervening election of a new federal government.

Because of this deadline, the Liberal government fell all over itself in its haste to pass the bill. In the race against the clock to bring in a radically new precept for medicine and law, the government refused to accept any amendments to the bill by MP's. It also cut off debate on the bill despite the fact that there were many MPs anxious to speak to the issue.

It is significant that the Supreme Court in the *Carter* case also set out precisely the actual contents of new legislation that would be acceptable. In effect, the court wrote the as-

sisted suicide law. However, it did state the following:

It is for Parliament and the provincial legislatures to respond, should they so choose, by enacting legislation consistent with the constitutional parameters set out in these reasons. (emphasis ours)

The reality then is that if the Liberals' bill didn't match the criteria set by the Court, i.e. that it was not “consistent with the constitutional parameters set out”, then the court could and would strike it down. By May 2016, two courts, the Alberta Court of Appeal, and the Ontario Superior Court, proclaimed that Bill C-14 was a “no-no” because it didn't comply with the court's criteria i.e. constitutional parameters. Both these courts declared that the bill was “unconstitutional” even though it had not yet been passed into law! However, despite these two court decisions, Bill C-14 was pushed through the House of Commons by the majority Liberals. The Senators, however, decided to ignore the deadline, and proposed amendments that broadened the bill to change the eligibility criteria for physician assisted suicide to match the exact language of the Supreme Court of Canada decision. Specifically, the Senate voted an amendment to Bill C-14, which would have eliminated the requirement that the patient be terminally ill before seeking physician assisted suicide. This amendment knocked out the central pillar of Bill C-14 in that the person's death was to be “reasonably foreseeable” i.e. terminal.

In effect, the unelected Senate, consisting at that time of 86 Senators, ignored the court's timeline and chose, instead, to take their own time to review the bill and make their own amendments. The Senate did exactly what it chose to do, regardless of the public or the elected House of Commons. The Senators represent no one but themselves and were indifferent to the Canadian public in overriding the elected representatives of millions of citizens.

However, when the Senate returned the amended bill to the House of Commons, the latter stood firm and rejected the Senate's terminal illness amendment. The bill was then returned to the Senate and, as a consequence, it was faced with a dilemma. The Senators were obviously intoxicated with new power brought about by Trudeau, who in 2014 ordered them to become independent and cease to be “Liberal” Senators accountable to the party. With this new indepen-



dence, the Senators could kill the bill by stonewalling the bill until the House of Commons tailored the legislation to its will, or it could bow to the will of the elected House of Commons and pass the bill. In the end, reluctantly, the Senate passed the bill 48-22 and it was then passed by the House of Commons, breaking the legislative log jam.

Will the Senate, even though it chose to give the House of Commons the benefit of the doubt this time, do so in the future? Was this whole episode a warning signal? Perhaps.

Does the appointed Senate have the right to be a chamber of, not second thought, but rather of final thought? In short, is it the Senate's role to develop and create social policy by overriding the will of the elected House of Commons?

We will have to wait and see whether we will eventually live under an unappointed Senate living in its paradise of unaccountability, and generous remuneration, standing up on its hind legs and telling us what to do.

It seems, however, that Trudeau has solved this problem for now with his recent appointments to the Senate (see article: *The Great Senate Hoax* on page 4).

While the tangled Bill C-14 process was taking place,

it was being closely watched by the judges of the Supreme Court. The latter will not hesitate to pounce on the bill, and reject the finished product i.e. the law on life and death of vulnerable human beings, if it doesn't suit their own individual perceptions of what they think the law should say. A few weeks after the bill was passed the BC Civil Liberties Association launched a court case to strike down the provision in the law of "reasonably foreseeable" death to give the court the opportunity to strike the bill down.

It is all too easy for judges sitting on the Supreme Court in isolation and solitude, removed from the public, to decide what the law should be. Judges do not have to deal with the irksome, messy process of democracy. They, like the senators, are accountable only to themselves and can and do act according to their own individual biases and whims. Not for them, the untidy business of public debate. The latter would only confuse them!

What a mess we have created in Canada. The views of the public are excluded from proceedings, ignored by unelected, well-paid elites, sitting in splendid isolation from the public. This is a terrible violation of democracy. †

## THE GREAT SENATE HOAX

Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has no difficulty controlling the House of Commons with his solid majority of seats. His Liberal MP's are meekly doing his bidding, voting for bills that defy logic, common sense and evidence. These controversial bills include Bill C-16, to provide special rights for transgendered, lowering the age of consent for homosexuals (Bill C-32) and amending the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act to allow the spread of harmful drug injection sites in Canada.

However, in 2015, when he was elected, this smooth sailing of his bills in the House of Commons could have been stalled in the Senate, which had 40 Conservative senators and 21 so-called "independent" senators, with 21 vacancies. The previous year, in 2014, Trudeau had arbitrarily kicked out of his caucus the Liberal appointed senators who were, as a result, supposedly to become "independent" senators. They, however, promptly identified themselves as "Senate Liberals".

This created a serious problem for Trudeau as his untenable bills could be permanently stalled in the Senate unless he took action to revise this situation.

### CON-JOB COMMITTEE

To remedy this problem, Trudeau carried out a con-job. He appointed a committee of Liberals, headed by a well-known Liberal supporter, former public servant and former University of Ottawa Chancellor, Huguette Labelle, to sift through the 2,700 applications from Canadians who had volunteered their names for appointments to the Senate. Why wouldn't people apply for such a job? It pays \$145,000 base salary plus living expenses, job security to age 75, a gold-plated pension, with no elections to fight and no accountability. A dream job. The best gig in the country. There was no requirement that Trudeau actually had to choose the names of those recommended by his Committee, but who knows since the Committee's recommendations remain a secret.

Trudeau made 25 new appointments to the Senate in October, claiming that they were all "independent". This was clear nonsense. The newly appointed senators were all liberal leaning elites, and their appointments in no way changed the politics of the Senate as Trudeau was pretending. The



Moudakis Cartoon (Theo Moudakis / Toronto Star) | Mon., Oct. 31, 2016

only difference was that the Senate is now dominated by Liberal senators not Conservative senators. For example, one appointment was that of Patricia Bovey of Winnipeg, formerly involved with the Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation, a widow of a former Liberal MP. Most had worked for government or organizations supported by government, or were university professors, etc. That is, elites and bureaucrats were appointed rather than individuals with whom ordinary people can relate. As stated by National Post Columnist, Christie Blatchford (November 2, 2016):

“Where are the ordinary Joes? The steelworkers, teachers, the guys on the line at Ford, the out-of-work oil patch folks, the cashiers at Metro? Where is there anywhere some-

one who isn't from the conventionally approved swaths of Canadian society?”

The reality is that Trudeau has created a Liberal dominated Senate while pretending it is independent. There are now 40 so-called “non-affiliated” senators, 41 Conservatives, as well as the 21 “Liberal Senators” previously appointed, who are supposed to be independent. Now Trudeau should have no problem pushing his bills through the Senate. This was the objective of his scheme of appointments in the first place.

How naive does Trudeau think the Canadian public is? It's not hard to recognize that his appointments to the Senate are nothing more than the customary patronage, clothed with his usual hot air. †

## THE UN UNDER NEW MANAGEMENT

***President Trump has appointed as his UN Ambassador, Nikki Haley. She was the pro-life Governor of South Carolina.... The new Secretary-General is António Guterres, the former Prime Minister of Portugal. He is a devout Catholic and a man of deep faith and serious convictions***

One of the benefits of Donald Trump's election as President of the US is that the former Obama Ambassador to the United Nations, Samantha Power, an ardent feminist, will no longer be manipulating the UN on behalf of President Obama. The US provides 22% of the UN's regular budget and makes large voluntary contributions to its numerous agencies. As a result of this financial support, Obama, together with the European Union and some Latin American countries, have been able to relentlessly push a pro-homosexual, anti-family agenda at the UN.

President Trump has appointed as his UN Ambassador, Nikki Haley. She was the pro-life Governor of South Carolina. She has a strong pro-life record, and, in 2013, defended South Carolina's constitutional amendment upholding marriage as between one man and one woman. She also signed the *Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act*, which protects babies from painful late-term abortions.

### **A NEW SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UN**

The former Secretary-General of the UN, Ban Ki-moon, was an obedient servant to Obama and the EU during his term of office. He never failed to promote the anti-life, anti-family agenda promoted by the West.

The new Secretary-General is António Guterres, the former Prime Minister of Portugal. He is a devout Catholic and a man of deep faith and serious convictions. While Prime Minister, his socialist party presented a draft law to legalize abortion on demand up to 12 weeks of pregnancy. Mr. Guterres made his opposition to this law clear and voted against it.

Mr. Guterres has his work cut out for him with the UN agencies determined to impose homosexual and abortion rights into UN documents. However, Mr. Guterres stated:

“As Secretary-General, having been chosen by all Member States, I must be at the service of them all equally and with no agenda but the one enshrined in the UN Charter.”

Mr. Guterres has also held the top UN job as a forceful

## **Need help?**

### **TO AVOID PHYSICIAN ASSISTED SUICIDE**

**COMPASSIONATE COMMUNITY CARE is an organization that provides advice, help and support regarding euthanasia, assisted suicide and/or end-of-life treatment issues.**

- Do you need help understanding the medical advice you have been given?
- Do you need help navigating our complex healthcare system?
- Were you denied basic medical or personal care?
- Do you have questions related to life support measures?
- Do you need support through a chronic care or end-of-life journey?
- Are you concerned about the care your loved one is receiving?

**For assistance call [1-855-675-8749](tel:1-855-675-8749)  
or email [info@epcc.ca](mailto:info@epcc.ca) .**

***It is confidential and free.***

and passionate UN Commissioner for Refugees. In that job he cut headquarters costs by some 20%, arguing the money should be spent on refugees. He managed to raise funds while criticising the major donors—both the United States and the Europeans—over the failings of refugee policies.

For the moment, there is a space at the top of the diplomatic pyramid for an experienced mediator, and Mr. Guterres looks like the man to fill the job. Clearly, Mr. Guterres as Secretary-General has the potential to work within the UN to improve its dismal history. †

## SEX EDUCATION IS WASTED ON THE YOUNG

***“A comprehensive and rigorous study reviewing school-based interventions on sex education, ... has found that sex education programs for youth are useless because they have no effect on the incidence of pregnancies, sexually transmitted diseases or HIV.”***

The hooting and hollering by health policy officials that children must be provided with school-based sex education programs in order to properly manage their sexuality has unravelled.

A comprehensive and rigorous study reviewing school-based interventions on sex education, combining peer-reviewed data from more than 55,000 young people from around the world, has found that sex education programs for youth are useless because they have no effect on the incidence of pregnancies, sexually transmitted diseases (STD's) or HIV.

The review, released in April, 2016, was conducted by [The Cochrane Library](http://www.cochrane.org), which is internationally recognized as the highest standard in evidence based health

care research. [http://www.cochrane.org/CD006417/INFECTN\\_school-based-interventions-preventing-hiv-sexually-transmitted-infections-and-pregnancy-adolescents](http://www.cochrane.org/CD006417/INFECTN_school-based-interventions-preventing-hiv-sexually-transmitted-infections-and-pregnancy-adolescents).

The Cochrane review of sex education programs used only randomly controlled trials from Europe, Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa.

The findings of this review were different from other studies on sex education because previous studies had been based on the self-reported behaviours of young people, which are prone to bias and are notoriously unreliable. In contrast, the Cochrane review only included studies featuring objective, measurable, biological outcomes from records or tests of pregnancy, STD and HIV.

Further, the Cochrane review discovered the startling effect that education or training has as an effective measure for improving adolescent sexual outcomes—especially for girls. That is, staying in school is an effective contraceptive!

Health policy officials who promote sex education programs as a way to change attitudes, behaviour and social norms, however, may have another objective in mind about sexuality, which they are not disclosing when insisting on these programs. The programs are providing pornography to children and teaching abnormal sex practices. Health officials want to normalize homosexuality, transgenderism and sexual promiscuity to change our children's values. Another study should be conducted to determine how successful they are in this regard. †

### MESSAGE BOARD

- ACTION ITEM: As requested in the topic “Lowering the Age of Consent for homosexual Activity (Bill C-32),” please write your MP to urge that the age for homosexual activity NOT be lowered to 16 yrs old. In your letter, feel free to use any information from the article. No need to reference REALity in your letter.
- Have you renewed your annual membership for REAL Women of Canada? It is due every January. We do not mail out reminders due to cost considerations <http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca/about-us/become-a-member/>. You may also mail in the renewal form found in this issue.
- Action Item: Please write the Senators in your province, <http://www.parl.gc.ca/SenatorsBio/>, to request that they reject Trudeau's Transgender Bill C-16. You will find talking points in this issue's article: Trudeau Blindsides Democracy with his Transgender Bill C-16. †

### 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)