REALity January/February 2006 Volume XXV Issue No. 1

ELECTION 2006 AND ITS AFTERMATH

The federal election was quite a journey. When it began, on November 29, 2005, the Liberals were in the lead by 8 points. The Liberals were confident, even smug, believing that the Conservatives would stumble and self-destruct during the election campaign. The Liberals predicted all would go well for them, as Canada's natural ruling party which would win yet another (their fifth) straight election. Most agreed with this analysis by Liberal officials. In effect, the Liberal plan was to campaign on the same strategy as they had used in the June 2004 election just 18 months previously. Not a good idea.

REAL Women was one of the few organizations in Canada which predicted last spring that there would be a Liberal defeat in 2006. We were well aware that the political situation had changed dramatically between the 2004 and 2006 elections. We predicted, in fact, a Liberal defeat in 2006 in a press release dated last June 29, 2005. In that press release, we stated:

REAL Women predicts that the Martin Liberals will meet defeat within the year during the next federal election as history repeats itself:

Liberal arrogance in 1957 over the pipeline led to Liberal defeat
Liberal arrogance and intensive pork barreling in 1983 led to Liberal defeat
Liberal arrogance over Bill C-38 and its imposing of the Bill which is unacceptable to the majority of Canadians, and by compelling the Cabinet and pressuring the Liberal backbenchers to vote for the Bill, plus the Liberals' overt corruption, will lead to its defeat in the early 2006 federal election

The Liberal government has outlived its usefulness. It will not recover from Bill C-38. Corruption, imposing on Canadians third world politics by way of arrogant top-down government, open bribery to obtain votes, and the manipulation of the Parliamentary process will bring down this despotic Prime Minister and his cronies.

The Liberal government will linger on for a few more months, but its time has run out.

Wait and see.

The many missteps by the Liberals during the campaign, plus the RCMP investigation of possible wrong doing in the Finance Department confirmed one very critical fact - namely that Canadians understood during May and June 2005, when the non-confidence votes and the vote on same-sex marriage were taking place, that there were no moral or ethical considerations that would stop the Liberals in their efforts to hold onto power - power to be held for the benefit of the party and its elites. To pursue this power, the Liberals used every trick, misrepresentation, bribery and other devices at their disposal.

The public knew then that the Liberals genuinely believed that they were entitled to govern as a right. All the bumps in the Liberal road that occurred since then, were not the defining moments but rather, the moments to confirm what Canadians knew about the Liberals and their leader Mr. Martin. In contrast, at the time of the June 2004 election, Mr. Martin had been Prime Minister for only six months. Few at that time had an understanding of Mr. Martin or his policies. By January 2006, they did, and they did not like what they saw. They saw a political leader who would do whatever it took to stay in power. The preservation of power was all that mattered to him.

Liberal MP Belinda Stronach

What is so interesting in retrospect is that the crossing of the floor by MP Belinda Stronach (Newmarket - Aurora) last May from the Conservative to the Liberal party, which saved the Liberals from defeat in a non-confidence vote at that time, was ironically a decision which saved the Conservative party and led it to its victory in the 2006 election. That is, if the non-confidence vote had been successful in May, the Conservatives would not at that time, have developed their extensive platform which did so much to dispel the alleged "scary" perception of Mr. Harper and the Conservatives. Without this platform on which to campaign in May, Mr. Harper would have been restricted to campaigning only on the issue of Liberal corruption - not enough to turn the voters away from the Liberals, and to demand the change in government that finally occurred in this January's election.

The Road Ahead

The Conservative win of 124 seats means that Canadians will not have to struggle with the projected Liberal policies such as the decriminalization of both prostitution and marijuana and the easing of legal access to the non-medical use of drugs. A Conservative government will also not bring in a euthanasia bill, planned by former Minister of Justice, Irwin Cotler. We must be watchful, however, for anti-life and anti-family private members bills that may gain support from a united opposition of Bloc (51 seats), NDP (29 seats), and Liberals (103 seats).

Another advantage of the Conservative Party win is that the Canadian presence at the UN will change. No longer will Canada work with its former ally, the rabidly anti-Christian left-wing European Union. Instead, hopefully, Canada will, for the most part, be supporting the US government's pro-life / family positions at the UN. Also the Canadian Ambassador to the UN, Allan Rock, will soon be recalled and replaced by an individual more amenable to Conservative policies.

A Conservative government will also begin the difficult work of dismantling the Liberal infrastructure that has served the Liberals so well over the years in perpetuating its left wing policies. These include the funding of feminist only and homosexual organizations, multicultural organizations, and the Court Challenges Programme. The Status of Women and the Law Commission must also be dissolved. The Conservatives must also devise a transparent and honourable method of choosing judges for the courts - there is already one vacancy on the Supreme Court that must be filled immediately.

The road ahead for change will not be easy for the Conservatives. They will have to move very slowly so as not to alarm the electorate. They will also be harangued by the propaganda of the hostile mainstream media.

Further, Mr. Harper spoke the absolute truth on January 18, 2006 when he stated that his government would have to deal with a Liberal-dominated Senate, a liberal judiciary and the civil service.

The 105-seat Senate has 67 Liberals and only 23 Tories - the remaining senators are either Independent or old-time Progressive Conservatives who never approved of the merging of the Alliance Party with the former Conservative Party. The senators are patronage appointments who owe their position for their hard work for their respective parties. Unfortunately, they see their job in the Senate not as being a quiet reflective voice of sober thought, but rather as cheerleaders for their party. Conservative legislation passing through these raucous Liberal senators will not be easy.

Similarly, many in the civil service will not be willing to be neutral despite their claims to the contrary. This is especially true in regard to the Departments of Justice and Foreign Affairs, where feminist/lesbian/homosexuals have dominated the policy decision-making positions for several years. Many of these latter see their role in government as promoting the "progressive" agenda of the left in government policy. They will not quietly depart, but will remain on, if at all possible, to fight any changes in a conservative direction. We can expect their attempting to undermine the Conservatives by such actions, for example, as arranging significant leaks to the media, which will be ready and willing to raise controversy over any changes in the left agenda.

Finally, the Liberal appointed judges will be ready with pens poised to block any affront to their personal philosophies and ideologies by a conservative government. They have no problem, as evidenced by some of the articles in this issue of Reality, in making up so-called "constitutional" reasons to block legislation not to their liking.

Despite these real problems, however, the Conservatives will have to show they can govern and govern well. It will not be easy having regard to the triple obstacles mentioned above. However, the entrenched liberalism in the government and our courts must be shown up for what it is - sheer opportunism and manipulation to promote an agenda for self-serving reasons, not for the benefit of the public.

In this regard, one of the first obligations of the Conservative government will be to reform Parliament so as to return to us once again a truly democratic government - not one controlled by a handful of paid advisors in the Prime Minister's Office.

Although the Conservative Party is forming a minority government, its election marks the beginning of renewal for Canada. The government must judicially and reasonably carry out its responsibilities. If so, a conservative government will be in power for many years to come.

Please let the new Prime Minister know that Canadians want a pro-life/ family Ambassador appointed to the UN. It will mean a great deal to Canadians as well as to the world internationally, if he does so.

Please write to:
The Right Honourable Stephen Harper
Office of the Prime Minister
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A2

Minister of Foreign Affairs
Department of Foreign Affairs
Lester B. Pearson Building, Tower A, 10th Floor
125 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

THE SUPREME COURT SWINGS AND KNOCKS OUT DECENCY

Christmas is always a dangerous time for Canadians because it's usually just before then that Chief Justice McLachlin and her revolutionary crew of judges sitting on the Supreme Court choose to hand down their blockbuster decisions to change the established law and instead, impose their own personal revisions. The activist judges assume that no one is paying attention at that time, so their decisions will not get too much attention and be forgotten by January. The judges did this in December 2002, when Chief Justice McLachlin wrote the majority decision in Chamberlain vs Surrey School Board in which the BC School Act was rewritten by the court to state that all schools must teach homosexual "tolerance"; the court also instructed School Boards to ignore the religious views of parents who object to such a program. The BC School Act did not provide that tolerance of homosexuality be taught, but this new requirement was provided on the sole inspiration of the majority of the Supreme Court of Canada. Chief Justice McLachlin, re-wrote another law on December 22, 2005 in Jean Paul Labaye vs the Queen, the "swingers" case where she and her colleagues concluded that nothing is indecent unless it "causes a substantial risk of harm incompatible with the proper functioning of society".

This conclusion opens the gates to all sorts of public behavior (or more accurately misbehavior) and material that most Canadians would find intolerable. This is because the Court's new definition of indecency is difficult, if not impossible, to prove and is frankly unworkable. Possibly, this was the main objective of choosing such a standard, i.e., to make Canada a very liberal country with no restraints on sexual behaviour or material. At least the two dissenting judges Mr. Justice LeBel (Quebec) and Mr. Justice Bastarache (New Brusnwick) stated in their judgment at paragraph 105 that the philosophical underpinning of the majority's harmed-based approach was found in the liberal theories of John Stuart Mill's book "On Liberty and Considerations on Representative Governments" in which he argued that the only purpose for which state power can be rightfully exercised over the community is to prevent harm to others. Whoever said that judges ignore the law and impose their own philosophical views in their legal opinions was absolutely right.

The Facts

This case arose when a swingers' sex club in Montreal was charged, under Section 210 of the Criminal Code, with operating a common bawdy house, i.e., a place where alleged "indecent acts" occurred. The club was located in a commercial building. Advertisements encouraging the public to become members appeared regularly, the owners granted interviews to magazines and TV hosts to attract new members, and brochures were distributed to the general public. The first floor was occupied by a bar where dancing took place, the second, was a salon with private rooms for sexual activity but with cameras installed for the participants and others to observe the sexual acts. The apartment on the third floor of the building was not to be lived in, but was a large loft-style room with no private spaces. There was no kitchen, plumbing, cupboards or electric outlets. Eight mattresses were strewn about on the floor for the purpose of public sex acts. There was a constant movement of people from one level of the establishment to the other.

Any adult person interested in the group sexual activities promoted by this sex club could become a member, unless, according to the evidence, he or she was "disrespectful" or did not share the philosophy of the club and its members. Few applicants were refused membership. Over 800 people had access to this swingers' club, including its third level, where the sexual acts at issue took place. Interviews with prospective members consisted primarily in answering the questions of those wishing to enter the club. It was a mere formality that could not reasonably be intended to limit the public's access to the club. Moreover, every member had the right to bring guests, who did not have to be interviewed.

The type of partner swapping that occurred in the establishment involved the widest range of practices, including acts of penetration, fellatio and masturbation performed simultaneously or in turn by several men with a single woman. Since consent to this sexual activity was given by the individuals, such acts could be performed by anyone 14 years and over (14 years is the age of consent to sexual activity in Canada). Therefore by this decision, the Court has sent a strong open invitation to international sex traders and pedophiles to come to Canada to participate in unrestricted sex with those 14 years of age and older.

In reaching her conclusion that the determination of indecency must depend upon "harm" being proved beyond a reasonable doubt, Madame Justice McLachlin dismissed concerns that promiscuous sex can lead to an increase in sexually transmitted diseases (STDs and AIDS). She airily declared that this was not a concern as there is no link between promiscuous sex and these medical problems. One wonders in what dream world these judges exist.

This new approach to determine indecency completely swept away the former test for its determination which was that the community standard of tolerance, reflecting the values of the entire community, should be applied. That is, the test for indecency that has always been applied before this bombshell decision of the Supreme Court was based on a social consensus among Canadians as to what is acceptable in terms of sexual practices.

The lower courts in Quebec had applied this former test to this case and found social harm in the fact that sexual exchanges took place in the presence of others and that the actions were degrading and dehumanizing, calculated to induce anti-social behaviour in its disregard for moral values and raised the risk of sexually transmitted diseases.

This decision, to legalize group sex clubs by the majority of the judges on the Supreme Court of Canada, clearly shook and deeply upset, the two dissenting judges, Mr. Justice LeBel and Mr. Justice Bastarache. They wrote a powerful dissent to the majority's new approach to determining indecency.

The dissenting judges accurately stated in paragraph 98 of the judgment:

> In principle, we consider the change to the legal order proposed by the majority of the courts, to be inappropriate, particularly because no valid justification is given for departing from the existing test. We are convinced that this new approach strips off all relevance the social values that the Canadian community as a whole believes should be protected. (Emphasis ours)

The two dissenting judges went on to state, in paragraph 103:

> In our opinion, the test adopted by the majority introduces a concept of tolerance that does not seem to be justifiable according to any principle whatsoever … Social morality, which is inherent in indecency offences and is expressed through the application of the standard of tolerance, must still be allowed to play a role in all situations where it is relevant. Otherwise, the social values that the Canadian community as a whole considers worth protecting would be stripped of any relevance. (Emphasis ours)

In short, the rewriting of the indecency law has opened up a Pandora's box of problems for Canada and has resulted in the views of ordinary Canadians on this sensitive issue of indecency being no longer considered of consequence.

Judges' Decisions Have No Legal Basis

What is also very clear, as a result of this decision and the decision in the Surrey School Board case, is that Madame Justice McLachlin and her colleagues need no legal basis on which to base their decisions. They just make up propositions as they go along. For example, in the Surrey School Board case, the BC School Act specifically gives jurisdiction to the School Board to make decisions about which books are to be used in the classroom. However, Madame Justice McLachlin obviously did not like this and instead stated that her court was entitled to interfere in the School Board's decision because the issue was a human rights matter in which the court had "particular expertise", and that even though it was never stated anywhere in the BC statute, the legislators "intended" a "relatively robust level of court supervision over the issue." That's a revelation and a brand new concept that came from nowhere. It seems that this radical interpretation of this Act comes solely from McLachlin's head.

Similarly, in the sex swingers' club case, the re-defining by McLachlin and colleagues of the indecency law was based on nothing more than the judges' personal desire to make the law more to their liking. As stated by dissenting Justice LeBel at paragraph 103, the Court's new standard or test for indecency was "not justifiable by any principle whatsoever".

The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that this court can and will do anything it feels like and it simply doesn't care what the public thinks. They are the "Supremes", after all.

No one is happier about this decision, by the way, than the homosexual activists because it means that their bathhouses, where promiscuous sexual behaviour is constantly carried out without restraint, are no longer illegal in Canada. The activists had been planning to bring a legal challenge of the prosecution of their bathhouses, but they no longer have to do so as the Supreme Court of Canada has conveniently changed the law for them in this regard.

The only positive point that can be said about this incredible decision is that it does not involve any Charter rights, i.e. constitutional rights, so that Parliament can, if it so wishes, overturn the decision by a vote in Parliament in order to return the test for indecency to community standards of tolerance.

Prime Minister Harper Will Re-visit Decision

It is significant during the leaders debate on January 9, 2006 that Conservative leader, Stephen Harper, was the only party leader to comment on the Supreme Court's "swingers" decision even though the moderator had opened up the topic for discussion. Mr. Harper stated that he recognized that many Canadians were unhappy with the ruling and stated that his government would revisit the issue.

We can only hope that a Conservative government will make this change as one of its first orders of business. An amendment to the Criminal Code to change the libertine approach to indecency imposed on us by a very liberal court must take place.

Canadians must make it absolutely clear that they will not tolerate the law of indecency as re-written by the absurd Supreme Court of Canada.

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

Minister of Justice
Department of Justice
East Memorial Building
4th Floor, 284 Wellington St.
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H8

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

CHIEF JUSTICE MAKES A GRAB FOR MORE POWER

Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin of the Supreme Court of Canada was in Wellington, New Zealand at the end of November, when she gave an astonishing speech to the law students at the University of Wellington. According to this speech, the Chief Justice is of the belief that judges, upon their appointment to the Bench, acquire such wisdom and knowledge that they are able to determine with certainty what is best for all Canadians.

This conclusion is based on the fact that Judge McLachlin asserted in her speech that judges can render their opinions based on "unwritten" Constitutional norms, even in the face of clearly enacted laws or hostile public opinion. She defined her unwritten norms as those "essential to a nation's history, identity, values and legal systems". Such norms, according to Judge McLachlin, can only be properly understood and interpreted by appointed judges.

She bases this claim on the premise that there exist fundamental norms of justice so basic that they form part of the legal structure that must be upheld by the courts, even though they are not written into the law. She cited, as an example, the need to protect people from a government which believes in torture or denies citizens a fair trial. No one disputes that these policies are not acceptable and should not be implemented. That is, there is a consensus among reasonable people that a civilized society must provide citizens with basic protections. However, the Chief Justice went on to say in her speech that the courts must also support the "dignity of human beings" and honour rights to prevent "discrimination" on the basis of gender, race, and religion. "Human dignity", however, is a vague term that means different things to different people, as does the word "discrimination". These are concepts in fact, on which there are no necessarily established consensus or "norms".

However, Judge McLachlin believes that only judges know how to accurately interpret these unwritten concepts. She skirts around the problem that these concepts have a wide variety of interpretations by stating that judges can look to guidelines provided by international treaties and commitments for direction in interpreting them. This ignores however, the profoundly significant fact that Canada's international commitments i.e. treaties, are determined solely at the discretion and whim of the Prime Minister. They are not debated or approved by Parliament, and in no way can they be recognized as a reflection of Canadian "values". These are the values of the government in power - yes - but not necessarily those of its citizens. A court, appointed by the government looking to these treaties for guidance is merely making an arbitrary decision, based on policies determined by that elitist government that has by-passed the democratic process. What a cozy arrangement.

Justice McLachlin also claims that judges have a legitimate role to play in determining "unwritten" laws because she argues that judges have a "judicial conscience" which is founded on the judges' "sworn commitment to uphold the rule of law". We beg to differ. This argument overlooks the fact that most Canadian judges are sitting on the Bench because of their politics, not because of any specific legal merit on their part. Moreover, they are using their appointment to change society, according to their own personal perspective. (See "Supreme Court Swings and Knocks Out Decency p.4).

The Truth About Judicial Appointments

Judges in Canada are appointed because they or their law firms have paid large sums of money to the party in power, or, alternately, these judges have personally worked diligently to service the party. This was made clear in the Gomery hearings, which disclosed that lawyers in Quebec were handsomely rewarded with judicial appointments for supporting the Liberal party. This practice, however, is not limited to appointments in Quebec, but occurs right across the Canada. (See Reality July/August, 2005 "The Squalor of Our Judicial Appointments", p.5).

For those who believe that this analysis is too critical of the judicial appointment process, it should be noted that, in the two years that Paul Martin and his Minister of Justice, Irwin Cotler were in power, the following individuals were appointed to the Bench:

Michael Brown, Mr. Cotler's executive assistant and policy advisor;
Yves de Montigny, Mr. Cotler's Chief of Staff;
Randall Echlin, the Legal Counsel to the Ontario Liberal Party;
Rosalie Abella, appointed to the Supreme Court of Canada. She is wife of Mr. Cotler's friend, Irving Abella. Both Mr. Cotler and Mr. Abella are former Presidents of the Canadian Jewish Congress;
Marsha Erb, Alberta Liberal fundraiser, a close personal friend of Cotler's Cabinet colleague, Anne McLellan;
John J. Gill, Co-chair of the 2004 Alberta federal Liberal campaign;
Vital Ouellette, an unsuccessful Alberta provincial Liberal candidate in 1997 and 2000 elections;
Bryan Mahoney, Liberal candidate who lost twice to federal Conservative MP Myron Thompson;
Edmond Blanchard, former Liberal New Brunswick Minister of Finance.

To put it simply, judges in Canada lack legitimacy because they are merely political appointees, selected at the personal discretion of the Prime Minister, based on political considerations rather than on any consideration of merit. As such, judges do not have "legitimacy". Moreover, the judges' decisions in many cases make it all too obvious that they are not "upholding the rule of law" in any way.

Supreme Court has Seized Power

It is no secret that Justice McLachlin and her court have seized every opportunity to extend their grasp of power. The assertions made in her New Zealand speech is another attempt by her and her colleagues to further their control. For example, in the same-sex marriage reference case, handed down December 9, 2004, the Supreme Court of Canada declared our Constitution was not "frozen" but was a "living tree". In practical terms, the "living tree" philosophy hands the courts a large and liberal or progressive opportunity to interpret the cases as broadly as they wish, based

not on the law, but rather on their own ideology or philosophy. That is, the "living tree" concept of our constitution places judges squarely in charge of determining cases by way of adapting the law according to their own personal perspectives rather than by way of legal principles and precedents. These judges will continue to do so unless or until they are forcibly stopped.

Judges Want No Restraints on their Power

Judge McLachlin's speech makes it clear that she and her judicial colleagues want no restraints placed on them, politically, legally or morally. Quite frankly, they enjoy their power. They deliberately ignore the fact that our system of government requires a clear separation of the legislative, executive and judicial branches, each acting within its own sphere of influence. Instead, we are now experiencing a judicial leap-frog over the legislative and executive branches of government by judges to make them the unquestionable final authority in this country. Judge McLachlin's specious arguments to justify this grab for power, as set out in her November speech in New Zealand, only serves to make this objective patently obvious..
In this context, Mr. Martin's recent enthusiasm for removing the Notwithstanding Clause (s.33) from the Charter was deeply disturbing. Section 33 stands as one small finger in the dike against the deluge of judicial power grabbing.

House of Justice Committee Reviews Appointment Process

Recently retired from the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal, Madam Justice, Constance Glube, appeared before the House of Commons Justice Committee, which was reviewing judicial appointments, on November 15, 2005. She stated in her testimony, that the judicial appointment system must be changed because these appointments are based not on merit, but rather on political considerations. This marked the first time that a chief justice in Canada has publicly challenged the appointment system of judges. She gave, as an example of an inappropriate appointment, a "very serious incident" in 1998 which related to the Liberal Justice Minister of the day, Anne McLellan, appointing Liberal party organizer and fundraiser Heather Robertson to the Nova Scotia Supreme Court. Madam Justice Glube put the situation very politely, but, she has publicly acknowledged the problem. Madam Justice Glube, by the way, was one of Canada's more competent judges, as she has consistently based her decisions on the rule of law and legal precedent, rather than on her own personal ideology. Her retirement is a loss to Canada's judicial system.

Madam Justice Roberston, by the way was enraged that the political strings she had pulled for her appointment had been publicly exposed. She demanded a public apology for "this unforgivable attack on a sitting judge." No apology was given. (Lawyers Weekly, January 20, 2006)

Recommendations of the Justice Committee

The House of Commons Committee, which conducted the groundbreaking brainstorming for reforms to the federal judicial appointment process, announced on November 28, 2005 (three hours before the Liberal government fell on a vote of non-confidence), that it had arrived at a "consensus" for reform. Representatives of the four parties sitting on this committee recommended that judicial vacancies be advertised, and that judicial candidates be interviewed and that some form of short list be provided in order to prevent the ruling party from so blatantly favouring its own partisans for the bench.

The interim report of the Committee also recommended that MPs resume study of judicial appointment reform as a priority in the new 39th Parliament, to be formed after the January 23, 2006 federal election.

Reform to our system of judicial appointments can't come soon enough.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The tumult and the shouting dies,
The captains and the kings depart…

Today, the day after the election in Canada of a Conservative minority government, these words of Rudyard Kipling came to mind. Certainly this has been, in many ways, a "tumultuous" election campaign. The negative ads, dirty tricks and fear mongering did have some effect, but not enough to quell the desire for change.

Congratulations to those of you who worked so hard to elect good Members of Parliament! For many volunteers, however, there is often a bit of a letdown after the election, even when one's candidate has won his or her seat in the House of Commons. The temptation, after so much effort, is to forget about politics for a while, at least until the next election. However, as Kipling also wrote:

Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget.

We must not forget that the government reflects the will of the people, and we must remain vigilant to ensure that solid family values are protected and promoted. The Conservatives have gained strength, but this does not necessarily mean that their new members are socially conservative. (Incidentally, I find it most insulting that the term "socially conservative" has been used almost as an epithet by many Liberal, NDP and Bloc candidates.)

We must also not forget that while we are subject to the "laws of Caesar", our real sovereign is the "Lord God of Hosts". We need to keep praying!

How can we continue to make a difference to our country? Certainly we should keep in touch with our Members of Parliament by writing or telephoning them on issues of concern or to show appreciation for their efforts. It is also a good idea to volunteer one's services at a constituency office. Sometimes simple jobs such as folding mail-outs and placing them in envelopes can be of enormous assistance. Also, make sure to invite friendly MP's (or possible future MP candidates) to community events in order to provide them with as much exposure as possible. Keep in mind, of course, that much of your MP's time must be spent in Ottawa, and of course not all invitations can be accepted.

My local Member of Parliament, a wonderful young man, managed to retain his seat despite a very strong challenge from a high-profile union leader. I do believe his success was due to his willingness to stand up for traditional values - and also due to the prayers of so many supporters in this riding.

On a more personal note, as mentioned elsewhere in this issue of the REALity, we will be holding our annual Conference in British Columbia this June. If you are able to attend, please do so. I am looking forward to visiting this beautiful province again, and to meeting many of you.

God bless!
Laurie

POLYGAMY AROUND THE CORNER

Conservative leader, Stephen Harper, and Liberal MP, Tom Wappel, were ridiculed during the same-sex marriage debate last spring when they claimed that the same-sex marriage bill would lead to demands for the legalization of polygamous unions. It turns out, however, that they were right on the mark.

Same-sex marriage in Canada has only been legal for about six months, but already the demands for polygamy have been creeping out from the dark shadows and are gradually moving onto centre stage. The issue will soon be before the courts in BC.

This court case will result from a situation in the community of Bountiful, situated near Creston, BC, in the interior of the province, that has been the home of a renegade branch of the Church of Latter Day Saints (Mormons). This

community's beliefs include polygamy as one of its tenets. It argues that polygamy is a legitimate way of life and marriage. The leader of the community and his assortment of wives have boldly appeared on TV, radio and in print, unabashedly discussing their joy and happiness about being in polygamous relationships and all the supposed advantages, (obviously for the male at least!) The Attorney General of BC, Wally Oppal, has merely blushed and looked the other way, and has not prosecuted the leader of the polygamous community. Why? Because he knows that with the passing of the same-sex marriage legislation, and the protection of religion in the Charter, there has been created serious legal problems for the Crown in prosecuting such a case. That is, to lay a charge of polygamy will be dangerous, since the courts could then follow the identical arguments heard once in the trumped up, same-sex marriage court challenges in 2003

Provincial Attorney General, Oppal, would have happily continued to ignore the polygamous business in Bountiful except for the fact that the Attorney General of Utah, Mark Shurtleff, came calling on him in late November demanding that something be done, as girls as young as 13 years of age have been crossing the border from Utah into Bountiful to be married off to much older men. Another troublesome issue is that some of the polygamous wives in Bountiful have begun to complain about their treatment and their lack of consent to their "marriage" arrangements. Also, young men have been ejected from the Community in order to avoid a competition for young wives with the older leaders in the community.

As a result of these problems, the RCMP has recently undertaken an investigation of Bountiful. Based on the RCMP's findings, the Provincial Attorney General may then be obliged to lay charges against the leaders of the polygamous sect in Bountiful.

New Debate on Polygamy

If so, a new debate on marriage, to legalize polygamous marriages will hit the public eye. The exact same arguments, that were used to recognize same-sex partnerships as legal marriages, will be heard again. One of these arguments will be that the failure to approve polygamous marriage is due to the stereotypical treatment causing historical disadvantages against people who love each other. Another argument will be that since the courts have conceded that procreation no longer provides sufficient reason to restrict marriage to heterosexuals, then there is no reason to restrict marriage to other sexual arrangements as well.

And why not? Take marriage away from its historically recognized essence of one man and one woman, and there is no logical reason to restrict other marital arrangements, such as those who love two women, or bisexuals who have a sexual desire for both sexes. The fact that these arrangements are currently prohibited under the Criminal Code is no argument because homosexual conduct was also illegal until relatively recently. The laws against polygamy can also be similarly changed.

What a mess the courts have created! In their zeal to be liberal and progressive and to make the world aware of their trailblazing spirit, the Canadian judges have made fools of themselves and us. They are also tearing down the foundations of society, while establishing a dangerous precipice on which the institution of marriage is now tilting.

Polygamy Established Elsewhere

Canada, however, isn't the only nation facing the problem of polygamous marriages. For example, Norway's Directorate of Immigration has reported that, despite the illegality of polygamy in Norway, it is becoming increasingly prevalent, since Norway liberalized the "marriage" laws by allowing legal civil unions for same-sex couples. Now Norwegian men travel abroad to meet and marry women, where polygamy is legal. Then they bring their new "wives" to Norway to live together under legal civil unions, in one, happy, polygamous harem.

The Netherlands

The Netherlands is experiencing this problem in a very big way. In September 2005, the government approved a

polygamous union when a Dutch man and two women were given a license for their three-way legal union. The male in the union claims that, since both of his "wives" are bi-sexual, there is no jealousy between them - they're all just happily loving one another.

Ill Effects of Same-sex Marriage

The common theme when same-sex marriage was argued last spring in Canada was that the Netherlands had experienced no ill effects from same-sex marriage and that the issue was no longer contentious there.

Had the actual situation in the Netherlands been disclosed, however, the story would have been much different. It would have disclosed that there has been a substantial increase in out-of-wedlock births and parental cohabitation as a result of the legalizing of same-sex marriages in that country.

That is, the broad Dutch acceptance of same-sex marriage, which detached marriage as an institution from parenthood in the public mind, has led to substantial changes in Dutch society. In addition same-sex marriages have also now started the Netherlands down the slippery slope to group marriage. The Dutch Minister of Justice, Piet Hein Donner, recently refused to ban group marriages as he states that multi-partner marriage contracts serves a "useful regulating function". In short, it is difficult to withhold equal standing for another organized sexual minority once same-sex marriage is accepted.

Polygamy in the US

The pressure for group marriage has also started in the US. The Unitarian Church, headquartered in Boston, played a key role in the legalization of gay marriage in Massachusetts. That church has now begun to promote public acceptance of polygamy and polyamory, (which refers to open stable relationships among more than two people, blending heterosexuality, homosexuality and bisexuality). Unitarian ministers in the US are already are performing "joining ceremonies" for polyamorous families.

Status on Polygamy in Canada

With the overlapping of same-sex marriage rights and the co-habitation contracts such as occurs in Holland, it was understandable that the Canadian Department of Justice and the Status of Women a year ago at a cost of $150,000 commissioned four separate studies on polygamy. The attention grabber paper on these studies was released in the middle of January this year. It was written by three feminist / lesbians, law professors at Queens University. These same individuals were among consultants retained by the Law Commission in its report "Beyond Conjugality" tabled in the House of Commons on December 2001. That Commission's report recommended that all close relationships should be recognized by law, not just the relationship of a man and woman in marriage. The Commission recommended also, of course, that same-sex marriage be legalized. In their study of polygamy, the three consultants advocated decriminalization of polygamy and urged that Canada, allow immigration by polygamous families. They also argued that Canada's current prohibition against polygamy in the Criminal Code may well be unconstitutional. Their study unfortunately, gave little attention to the children of such polygamous unions and the fact that polygamous families are plagued by spouse abuse, poverty and fathers not involved in the care of their children - apparently, not issues for these feminist / lesbians.

Justice Minister Cotler Misinforms Committee on May 12, 2005

In view of his department commissioning several studies on polygamy, it was disingenuous of the Liberal Minister of Justice, Irwin Cotler, to argue in his testimony before the House of Commons Committee studying the same-sex marriage legalization, on May 12, 2005 that polygamy, incest, etc. will not result from the passage of Bill C-38, since "bigamy and incest are criminal offences in Canada. That is the law of the land. That will not change." Perhaps Mr. Cotler believes Canadians were easily confused by his statements. Common sense tells us that if the government could make the revolutionary change in the definition of marriage, by opening it up to two "persons," regardless of

their sex, then it is perfectly capable of making further amendments to the legislation at a later date for polygamy. That is, the courts may well find polygamous or group marriage an equality right on the grounds of the criteria for "equality" chosen by the Supreme Court of Canada in Law v. Canada [1999] I.S.C.R. 497. That is, when a person "feels" demeaned, by his or her exclusion from a law then the law is discriminatory. Why cannot that same criterion be applied to polygamy, incest, etc.?

Perhaps, also, Mr. Cotler was not aware that advocates of polyamory (group marriage) are taking their cue from the movement for gay marriage which is now the favourite cause of scholars of family law (see The New York University Review of Law and Social Change: "Monogamy's Law: Compulsory Monogamy and Polyamorous Existence 2004," Volume 29. Number 2). Polyamorists have long treated their inclination toward multi-partner sex as analogous to homosexuality. In short, the arguments for the logic of gay marriage extend to state sanctioned polyamory as well.

The truth is, by keeping the label and the legal status of marriage, but changing its meaning and concept, in the legalizing of same-sex marriages, this necessarily involves rejection of what marriage actually means and has meant for millennia. Marriage then means everything and includes anything and this means nothing.

Polygamy can and will become a serious problem for Canadians in the future.

CONTROLLING THE INTERNET - THE NEXT CHAPTER

The UN, filled with excess numbers of pilfering, incompetent bureaucrats, is always short of money. It hates the fact that it has to rely for its income on the dues paid by its member nations - a source of income that is not always reliable. It also resents the fact that 22% of its income is donated by the US with whom UN bureaucrats are frequently at odds.

As a result, the UN has been looking for an alternative source of income. It thought it had found it. The idea was to acquire control of the Internet. This would give it a thousand ways to raise money. For example, Internet users could be required to pay a tax merely to find an Internet provider. Then the provider would tax every transaction. Purchasing an appliance via the Internet could require a Value Added Tax (VAT) awarded to the UN. When one asks driving directions or a weather forecast for a city to which one plans to fly, or when one helps grandchildren with their homework, taxes could be required to be paid to the UN and its work. Secretary General Kofi Annan and France's President, Jacques Chirac, have long dreamt of a global "solidarity" tax online such as this. The plan, however, had one complication in that the Internet was created in the United States initially as a Pentagon project in the late 1960's and early 1970's for military intelligence purposes. Since the US Department of Defense has funded much of the Internet's early development, it therefore is, technically, the property of the US. which controls the dispensation of IP addresses and domain names and 10 of the Internet's 13 root servers.

Internet Still in its Infancy

Initially, as stated above, the Internet was developed by the US Department of Defense for military purposes only. In the late 1980's, it began to be used for higher education purposes. By 1990, the general public began to use the Internet. Not a day goes by when the Internet somehow is not improved. For example, the invention of search engines alone was a monumental achievement. The potential for the Internet is merely beginning. It is at the stage now that television was in 1956. There is no question either that the Internet has enormous significance for the global economy.

It's not that the US completely controls the Internet. Rather this is done through the California based, impossibly named, Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), formed in 1998 by the US to handle the Internet's daily operations under an advisory committee, which has representatives from more than 100 countries.

The US nonetheless retains veto power over ICANN's decisions although there are just 3 Americans on ICANN's 15 member Board of Directors. The US government set up the non-profit ICANN specifically to keep government out of the Internet, on the basis that a more responsive, and private sector is better suited to operate the Internet. ICANN, however, explicitly does not oversee the content of the Internet - a job that the UN would be only too happy to assume. ICANN administers the "root zone file" the master list of all Web addresses world-wide, which the US has kept since the creation of the Internet. Its job then is to keep track of which Web sites are assigned to which electronic addresses. Ensuring that any given Web address or domain name is assigned to only one Web site is a key reason why the Internet has become such a powerful tool.

Canada, Japan and Australia support this approach. Undaunted, however, the UN has established a forty-nation committee to encourage the US to hand ownership of the Internet over to the UN.
The argument used to urge the US to relinquish control of the Internet is that no country ought to be the ultimate authority over such a vital part of the global economy. Also there is some indication that some nations feel discomfort that the US, as the world's only superpower, has the power to take unilateral action over the Internet. This fear intensified in August when the US government asked ICANN to table or put off an initiative to add a new domain name for pornography in Web sites. ICANN had tentatively approved the new domain name, called .xxx, but at the last minute, the Department of Commerce removed its support, based on thousands of letters of complaint it had received from conservative Christian groups and others.

Rethinking about the Internet has also arisen in part because of its global growth and growing importance in many areas. Widely available to the public and for commercial purposes in the past decade, the Internet now has close to a billion users. It has become a critical means for conducting business, as well as for receiving services, such as video and phoning so that its importance cannot be underestimated.

The economic and social strength of the Internet today, however, derives from its open and decentralized structure, which enables access to users anywhere in the world. If governments began to create their own distinct Internets, this would undermine the essence of what makes the Internet so powerful.

US Showdown Over the Internet

The showdown between the UN and the US over the Internet took place at the UN 's World Summit on the Information Society held in Tunisia November 15 - 16, 2005.

There was also something else at stake at this meeting than merely money for the UN. What was at stake was the chilling impact on the use of the Internet for the free flow of information. Not surprisingly, some of the loudest opponents to the American control of the Internet have been China, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Cuba. In fact China now intentionally blocks Internet free speech from its people. It is a crime in China to download information from free-speech web sites. The Chinese government employs 40,000 full time technicians to monitor and block out free-speech web sites and certain other media.

The UN had argued that it would respect freedom of expression if it controlled the Internet. It claimed that one of its key principles would be to "respect the cultural and linguistic diversity as well as tradition [and] religion" and would provide "multilingual, diverse and culturally appropriate content." But who will decide whether content is culturally or otherwise "appropriate"? Today, no one. But tomorrow the UN! We already know that the UN does not respect culture and religion since it has attempted to establish policies at conference after conference to subvert religion and culture so that they are secondary to other "prior" rights such as "the right to abortion" and "homosexual rights." Control over the Internet will only enable the UN to impose control of these "rights" with no opposing voices allowed.

US Retains Control Over the Internet

It was a relief that the US won its bid at the UN conference in Tunisia, in November 2005, to retain control over the Internet. This means ICANN will remain in charge of the computer systems that control the free flow of information.

Unfortunately, Washington doesn't hold all the cards here. Countries can create parallel Internets. The same Web address might take users in China and the US to different Web sites. This would be a nightmare outcome for online business as well as the vibrant marketplace of ideas that the Internet has fostered. For now, at least, the matter is still under control, but for how long?

Maurice Strong Moving on the Internet

Maurice Strong is a Canadian who is a global gadfly - especially at the UN. He was Secretary General of the UN Conference on the Environment in 1992 in Rio de Janeiro. He and his associate Mikhail Gorbachev among others developed the Earth Charter, which they hope will replace the 1948 Declaration of Human Rights. This Charter includes reproductive (abortion) rights for women and human rights including homosexual rights and special protection for the environment etc. Mr. Strong is a powerful advocate of the left wing and dreams about imposing on the whole world all the policies set out in his Earth Charter.

Consequently, Mr. Strong and other left wing activists have recently decided to move in on the Internet by establishing "ManyOne" Networks for a new, whiz-bang 3-D platform for the "digital Universe". The technology for it however is still in development. The guiding document for the proposed network is Strong's Earth Charter. According to his plans, the technology for "ManyOne" will allow one to soar over the Earth or through the solar system and then click on the topic one wishes to know more about. Sounds great, except when you get down to who provides the information.

"ManyOne", according to the company's blurb, sent out in January, "has been carefully designed with socially responsible ownership, governance and advisory architecture to ensure that it can play a pivotal role in the ethical revolution of the Internet and the World Wide Web".

This is alarming coming from Mr. Strong. "ManyOne" plans to access myriad portals put out by NGO and government organizations that are working for "positive social and environmental change". That is, the left wing ideological zealots will be doing the writing and editing of the new technology.

The "ethical" claims of "ManyOne" are somewhat undermined by Mr. Strong's involvement in Iraq's Oil for Food affair. He has lately disappeared into China but will certainly return in order to pursue his vision of a new world order by way of the Internet.

CONFUSION OVER AGE OF CONSENT

It is not surprising that there is confusion over the age of consent in Canada, as it varies in different areas of the law. That is, the age of consent for sexual intercourse is set out in the Criminal Code, but it is different from the age of consent required for entering into marriage which is set out in the individual marriage statutes for each province.

Age of Consent for Heterosexual Intercourse in the Criminal Code

The Criminal Code provides that the age of consent for sexual intercourse is 14 years of age - one of the lowest in the western world. That is, the Criminal Code provides that it is a criminal offence to have sexual intercourse with anyone under 14 years of age on the basis that adolescents under that age are not capable of giving a valid consent to the sexual act.

The age of consent for sexual intercourse at 14 years of age was first set out in the 1892 Canadian Criminal Code. This provision was based on the British law at that time, except that the age of consent in Britain was a year younger, at 13 years of age.

Setting the age of consent for sexual intercourse at 14 years of age may have been acceptable 114 years ago, when life expectancy was much shorter, but it is no longer acceptable today because present-day 14 year old adolescents, who are still in school, today do not have the maturity to make responsible decisions in regard to their sexual activity with adults. Sex between young persons and adults can lead to long-range problems that will affect the adolescents for the rest of their lives. Such activity can and does lead to sexually transmitted diseases (STDS and AIDS), unexpected pregnancies, the lowering of self-esteem and the curtailment of education, among other problems.

The provincial attorneys-general have tried to convince the federal Liberal government over the past several years to raise the age of consent. At the federal-provincial meetings of Attorneys General in 1998, 1999 and 2003, the proposal to raise the age of consent was put to the Liberals to act. To no avail. For example, when the Liberal government brought in child protection legislation in 2005, the age of consent was not included in the bill. The Conservative Party, on the other hand, has tried to raise the age of consent to at least 16 years of age, on at least two occasions by way of private members bills. In April 2002, it put forward such legislation and again in September, 2005, but the Liberals each time refused to go along with the proposal and the bills failed to pass.

According to a Pollara poll, released in May, 2002, 80% of Canadians support increasing the age of consent from 14 years of age to at least 16 years of age.

Homosexual (Anal) Sex

Up until 1967, all homosexual acts, which were referred to at that time in the Criminal Code as, "buggery", were prohibited by law. In 1967, then Justice Minister Pierre Trudeau brought in extensive amendments to the Criminal Code. Included in these amendments was the provision that acts of buggery (anal sex) were permissible between consenting individuals 21 years of age or older.

In 1986-87, the Criminal Code was again under review, and at a meeting of the House of Commons Committee on February 17, 1987, homosexual, NDP MP Svend Robinson, made a motion in Committee that the word "buggery" in the Criminal Code be changed to the expression "anal intercourse". This was agreed to by the Committee and the Criminal Code was subsequently amended to refer to homosexual acts henceforth, as "anal intercourse" rather than acts of buggery.

Mr. Robinson then moved at that same Committee meeting, that the age of consent for buggery (anal intercourse) be lowered to 14 years of age from the then 21 years of age, on equality grounds in the Charter of Rights. That is, he argued that since the age of consent for heterosexual sex was set at 14 years of age, then the age of consent for homosexual sex should also be set at 14 years of age. This motion was defeated, although the Committee subsequently did decide to reduce the age of consent for homosexual acts from 21 years of age to 18 years of age and this latter amendment passed into law in June, 1987.

The reason the Committee decided not to reduce the age of consent to 14 years of age, as recommended by Mr. Robinson, was due to the differences in the sexual acts between heterosexuals and homosexuals as explained by the then Minister of Justice, Raymond Hnatyshyn, who testified before the Committee in this regard, as follows: (17 - 2 - 1987: 1:30)

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that both the Badgley and Fraser reports recommended the reduction to the age of 18, which is the basis of the present legislation, from 21. They did not recommend the provisions that Mr. Robinson and the NDP are now putting forward.

Mr. Robinson, the fact is that this is a reduction from 21 to 18 which is the age of consent.

There are, I think, a couple of factors that we should take into an account to make our judgment with respect to taking any further steps. 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 the heightened danger of contracting Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome or other sexually transmitted disease from penetration.

So for a variety of reasons, quite unrelated to any question of discrimination at all, I think there are a number of bases upon which we have proposed that this provision should satisfy the recommendations of the two commissions which spent a lot of time considering appropriateness of changes in the law with respect to the whole area of child sexual relations. So we have brought forward legislation which is based on the recommendations of Badgley and Fraser. This is the reason why, Mr. Robinson.

Court Steps in to Lower Age of Consent for Homosexual Acts

What the legislators refused to do in reducing the age of consent for anal sex, the courts did for them. Two female judges, in two different courts in 1995, arbitrarily decided that the age of consent for anal intercourse should be reduced from 18 years of age to 14 years of age on the basis of equality rights. That is, on the grounds that setting a higher age of consent for anal intercourse from that of other sexual intercourse was discriminatory under the equality provision of the Charter of Rights, Madame Justice Barbara Reed, in the Federal Court of Canada in February, 1995 (see Reality, March/April 1995, "Reducing the Age of Consent for Homosexual acts", p. 14), and Madame Justice Rosalie Abella in the Ontario Court of Appeal in May, 1995 (see Reality, July/August, 1995, "Court Lowers Age for Homosexual Sex", p. 7) struck down the age of consent for anal intercourse from the age of 18 years to 14 years. The judges claimed it was discriminatory to provide age of consent for one type (heterosexual) of sexual intercourse at 14 years but another higher age of consent for anal intercourse. In her judgment, Madame Justice Rosalie Abella specifically stated that anal sex was "a basic form of sexual expression for gay men" and stated that the difference in the age of consent for anal sex "…perpetuates the gap for a historically disadvantaged group - gay men".

In reaching their conclusions, both these judges ignored the medical facts surrounding anal intercourse and instead endorsed the politically correct position, regardless of its medical implications. Neither of these decisions was appealed by Justice Minister Allan Rock. Consequently, adult homosexuals now have legal access to 14 year old male youths for anal intercourse. This is the reason why the Liberals refused to raise the age of consent. That is, homosexuals want access to 14 year old youths and successfully pressured the Liberal government against raising the age of consent for homosexual acts (anal intercourse).

Age of Consent to Marry

Under the 1867 Constitution Act, the Federal Government has jurisdiction to determine who has the capacity to marry, but the provinces have jurisdiction over all marriage procedures. These procedures include the determination of at what age (age of consent) an individual may enter into marriage. The age of consent for marriage differs somewhat across the country, as follows:

Province	Age of Consent	Province	Age of Consent
British Columbia	19	Quebec	18
Alberta	18	New Brunswick	18
Saskatchewan	18	P.E.I.	18
Manitoba	18	Nova Scotia	19
Ontario	18	Newfoundland and Labrador	19

Those under the age of consent, who are seeking to marry, must, according to the respective provincial legislation, obtain consent to marry from their parents before a license to marry can be issued. If parents are not available, the provincial statutes usually make provision for consent to be obtained from other sources such as a judge etc.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S PERSONS AWARDS - A FEMINIST'S DAY TO SHINE

The Governor General's Awards in Commemoration of the Persons Case were presented on November 15 at Rideau Hall. Since 1979, five awards, plus a youth award, have been given every year to Canadian women who are recognized as promoters of equality. The recipients are chosen by Status of Women Canada and rewarded for continuing in the tradition of the "Famous Five" feminists who brought the legal case to the Privy Council, arguing that women should be eligible to be appointed to the Senate.

Eugenics Movement

While some praise the Famous Five as feminist pioneers who established women's rights in Canada, others consider them the Infamous Five for their involvement in the eugenics movement of the early 20th century. The Hon. Irene Parlby advocated forced sterilization as the "great and only solution to the problem" of the propagation of the "simple minded". Liberal MLA and suffragette Nellie McClung promoted the benefits of sterilization for "young simple-minded girls". Emily Murphy proclaimed "Insane people are not entitled to progeny". She was also a racist who wrote scurrilous attacks on immigrants who she claimed had weak morals.

Deliberate Subversion of Parliamentary Rules

The process used by former Liberal MP Jean Augustine to obtain parliamentary consent to erect the Famous Five statue on Parliament Hill was labeled a "deliberate subversion of parliamentary rules" by the Ottawa Citizen (See Reality Jan/Feb 1998, Jan/Feb 2001). An attempt by the supporters of the recognition of the "Famous Five" to change the national anthem to suit feminist prejudices against male pronouns, mercifully failed (see REALity Sept/Oct 2001).

Award Winners

Yet Canadian feminism marches on at taxpayers' expense, as feminists give each other Persons Awards every year with great fanfare at Rideau Hall. In 2002 a Persons Award was given to pro-abortionist, pro-homosexual lesbian, Nancy Riche of the Canadian Labour Congress, who has appeared before Parliamentary Committees on the same panel as REAL Women. CLC advocated the inclusion of "sexual orientation" in the Canadian Human Rights Act. A 2000 Persons Award recipient was Cherry Kingsley of the Canadian National Coalition of Experiential Women (prostitutes), who appeared on the same panel as REAL Women before the House of Commons Sub-Committee on Solicitation (prostitution) Laws. Ms Kingsley advocated the full legalization of prostitution and empowerment for "sex workers." In 2004, lesbian Allison Brewer was awarded for 30 years of gay rights activism (Capital Xtra Sept 9, 2004). Persons Award recipients are a who's who of feminist lesbian socialist and abortion advocacy in Canada.

Governor General Michaelle Jean Presents Awards

Every year, REAL Women has received an invitation to this feminist love-in at Rideau Hall on "Person's Day". We have never bothered to attend as we believe we have more important work to do. This year however, we decided to attend in order to gain some insight into the thinking of the new Governor General, Michaelle Jean, who was appointed by former Liberal Prime Minister Paul Martin. She stated in her speech, prior to making the awards, that "denying more than half the world's population the most basic human rights is one of the biggest scandals of our time". In the opulent Ballroom at Rideau Hall, she painted a rather grim picture of women for the affluent audience. Recalling the 1995 World March of Women, she stated that as a journalist she had wanted to ensure that the voice of women was heard: their fear of violence, rape, murder, poverty, starvation, being sold as commodities, their solitude and despair. The Governor General echoed the inaccurate feminist accusation that, "In Canada, women are still paid less than men for equal work, even when they have higher levels of education". This is patently untrue. "It is women who still work more unpaid hours" she said. "It is women who are still at greatest risk of being attacked in the street or at home, or disappearing", ignoring the higher rates of violence against men and male injury in the workplace. She spoke of an "epidemic" of family violence and the need to eradicate the "discrimination and misogyny that are still felt all too often". She noted that "more and more women are daring to rise up and put a human face on humanity".

Non-feminists, such as REAL Women, who appreciate the great contribution that the majority of husbands, fathers, brothers and sons make to the well-being and fulfillment of Canadian women, and women around the world, could not help but question this lopsided vision. The expensively dressed, coiffed and bejeweled feminist audience did not appear oppressed in the least.

More Inaccuracies Abounded

Senator Shirley Maheu stated that before the Persons Case "only a man could be legally interpreted a person". This is erroneous since women could own property, obtain an education, vote, engage in business transactions and accumulate wealth just like men before the "persons" case was ever decided. The persons case only dealt with women being appointed to the Senate. Nothing more.

Award Recipients Grateful

The 2005 Persons Award recipients were grateful for the honours. They thanked their husbands for being understanding when they weren't home on time to join them for dinner because they were "busy helping other women". They thanked their children for accepting that they were "always away". They thanked the government for funding their causes and hoped more financial support would be forthcoming. They thanked their husbands for being feminists too. Poverty is a form of violence, we were told. Genital mutilation occurs in this land of liberty and Canadian girls must be protected, one of the recipients said, as she called for more funding. In reference to 500 missing women, one recipient announced "our women are dying in this country of violence and indifference". In fact, Canadians have long lived under the rule of law where murder is illegal and murderers are prosecuted.

On the brighter side, the aboriginal recipient of the Youth Award, speaking with a lovely Irish-Newfoundland accent, thanked her mother and her belief in God. A recipient of Philippine origin thanked her parents for being "ordinary God-fearing people".

After the awards were presented, refreshments were served in the grand Reception Room where Canada's hard-core feminists and friends gathered to munch on canapes of caviar, smoked salmon, buffalo terrine and wild duck pate.

Among the guests were the feminist Senators Shirley Maheu, Joyce Fairbairn, Lucie Pepin and Lorna Milne; Liberal feminist MP's Anita Neville and Paddy Torsney (defeated in the recent election); "Sex with Sue" broadcaster, Sue McGarvie; and David MacDonald, former Conservative Cabinet Minister responsible for the Status of Women under Joe Clark and a former NDP candidate, and now, partner of NDP MP Alexa McDonough.

After the reception, guests went home, content that equality for all (sic) had been celebrated and that the myth of female victimhood had once again been duly brought to the fore at the expense of the Canadian taxpayer.

Father Raymond J. De Souza - National Post

Tuesday, January 24, 20062006 Federal Election© National Post 2006

Editor's Note: The following article published January 24, 2006, in the National Post by its regular columnist, Father Raymond J. De Souza, explains what occurred when former Prime Minister, Paul Martin, sought to retain political office. It is an accurate assessment of Mr. Martin's tragedy.

CALGARY - The election campaign was the final step in the corruption of Paul Martin.

Since his "Mad as Hell" post-Adscam tour two years ago, Martin spent his time in the Prime Minister's Office insisting that he was the one who had cleaned up the corruption left by his predecessor. His exoneration by Judge Gomery was trumpeted as the independent confirmation of his argument: Paul Martin was not corrupt, even if some Liberals on some occasions in some ways had been somewhat corrupt.

And yet the charge maddeningly stuck. During a CBC town hall broadcast during the Liberals' worst week of the campaign, Peter Mansbridge addressed the stench of corruption around Martin directly: "I understand [your claims of exoneration], but the fact is that you still wear it. It's not about responsibility, but you're sort of still dragging it around."

He wore it to the end. Perversely, even as Judge Gomery said Martin wasn't responsible, the PM's own conduct led voters to become more convinced that he may well have been. It wasn't his suit, but it fit well. And if it does fit, you can't acquit.

Martin and his advisors failed to grasp that there are two types of corruption in politics. They were so busy distancing themselves from the first type that they did not realize that they were immersed in the second.

The first type of corruption is exemplified by the sponsorship scandal -- the use of public offices and money for private benefit. Political scandals are generally of this vulgar kind -- jobs given as favours, contracts given to friends, illegal payments, inflated invoices, fraudulent accounts, kickbacks. The Adscam envelopes stuffed with cash just put the finishing touches on a scandal as brazen as they come -- the governing party helping itself to government money.

It was on that point that Martin was exonerated. The Gomery inquiry did not accuse him of taking a penny of public money, nor of knowing that his colleagues in the Liberal party were doing so.

There is, though, another type of corruption. It's not so vulgar, but more subtle and more soul-destroying. It is not about using political office for one's own gain. It is about compromising oneself to grasp and retain political office. It is about power for power's sake. And it is this corruption which consumed Paul Martin.

If getting power meant undermining his predecessor, he would do it. If heading off Adscam meant throwing his predecessor's allies overboard, he would do it. If winning the 2004 election meant trashing Stephen Harper in hysterical terms, he would do it. If keeping power meant allowing the NDP to rewrite the budget, he would do it.

If it meant embarrassing himself with petty outbursts against the Americans, even after promising to improve Canada-U.S. relations, he would do it. If it meant allowing his chief of staff to negotiate tawdry deals to induce opposition MPs to cross the floor, he would do it. If it meant trafficking Cabinet seats to win a non-confidence vote, he would do it. If it meant engaging in a pre-election spending spree completely contrary to his well-earned reputation as a fiscal manager, he would do it. And finally, if it meant conducting a near-maniacal election campaign -- disgorging smears, proposing constitutional amendments on the fly, playing fast and loose with national unity, and descending into a caricature of the man who will say anything to win a vote -- then he would do it in spades, and have the chutzpah to declare that this election was about his values.

Vulgar corruption asks at what price a man can be bought, or at what price an office can be sold. The more pernicious corruption born of the lust for power acknowledges no price as too great to stay in office. As Martin descended from the noble heir apparent to the unprincipled king, Canadians began to see a man whose corruption was so deep that they lost their trust in him.

The pre-Martin Liberal party, having achieved office, was not above using it for a little private gain here and there. For the new "Paul Martin Liberals" there was no level to which they were unwilling to sink to hold onto office itself. As that became evident over the past 18 months, voters decided that the distinction between the two types of corruption was without a meaningful difference in this election.

The unspoken rationale for Martin's long assault on the leadership of the Liberal party was that he deserved Jean Chrétien's job because he was the superior man -- the urbane businessman rather than the grubby political hack. The tragedy of Martin is that his long grasp for power turned him into a man who knew only, in the end, how to grasp for power. And when that transformation was made manifestly evident in this campaign, and his corruption was complete, he lost the job for which he had paid a very heavy price -- his integrity.

AN EPIDEMIC OF SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASES

The conclusions of the Supreme Court of Canada that promiscuous "swinging" sex was not harmful to society were exposed as being prejudicial and irrational by the recent release of a report by the Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Canada (SOGC).

How little the judges on the Supreme Court of Canada know. How little they understand.

The report of the SOGC disclosed that great harm is caused by promiscuous sex. The SOGC report states that since 1997 there has been an 80% increase in gonorrhea and a 70% increase in chlamydia and a staggering 908% increase in syphilis cases in Canada. The association called this an "epidemic:" The majority of the 598 cases of syphilis diagnosed in 2004 were in homosexual men, while 15 - 24 years old women accounted for the great majority of the 30,000 chlamydia cases in 2004. Men aged 20 to 29 accounted for the majority of the 4,023 cases of gonorrhea in 2004.

Tragically, teens (who can give a legal consent to sex at 14 years of age) are participating more and more in oral sex, believing it is "safe" i.e. won't cause pregnancy. They are totally unaware that oral sex can lead to sexually transmitted diseases such as chlamydia, which does not show symptoms until later stages of the disease, but is a major cause of the increasing prevalence of infertility in women.

Young teens are also participating in oral sex more frequently because of the demise of teen social dating. Instead, they "hook-up" with boys with whom they have no emotional ties but are just acquaintances. They agree to have oral sex with them on a "friendly" basis in order to please them and to show their sexual "empowerment". Instead of empowerment such behaviour means humiliation and debasement, yet teens continue to do it on the strength that such actions are permissible in today's society.

Why is such casual promiscuity happening? We can blame our sex obsessed society. Movies, and TV portray casual sex as commonplace and acceptable with no consequences, physical or emotional.

But we can also blame our Supreme Court of Canada, which naively believes that promiscuous sex causes no harm. By its decision, it has sent a distinct message to everyone - especially our impressionable adolescents, that all consensual sex is permissible, any time, any way with anybody.

The cruel irony is that, for the most part, the principal agents in the sponsorship scandal kept their jobs and the money. Paul Martin lost both his job and his principles. His corruption was total.