

PROSPEROUS CANADA IS DYING

There is a huge elephant in the livingrooms of our nation. We talk around it, and over it, but seldom acknowledge its presence. The huge elephant we are reluctant to talk about is our rapidly declining population.

Although we are ignoring the problem today, we can't do so forever. Our population decline is sending out only tiny insignificant waves now, but it is going to eventually swamp us like a tsunami wave, as early as 2015.

The current birth rate in Canada is about 1.5 children per woman. According to a Statistics Canada report, released in December 2005, the number of seniors in Canada will outnumber children by 2031. That is, according to Statistics Canada, seniors will, in 2031, account for about 25% of the population (8-9 million) while the number of children under 15 years of age in 2031 will only range from 4.8 million and 6 million. Quite a startling difference. We are destined to become a nation of oldsters. By 2031, there will be more deaths than births in Canada. By 2040 social benefits to the elderly alone (including our highly prized [by some] medical health system) will comprise 22.9% of our Gross National Product (GNP). This will be an unwieldy and ever mounting expense.

These mind-numbing statistics are screaming a message to us. Watch out! If we don't start working on the problem now, almost every area of our society, health care, pension benefits, social programmes, education, investments, immigration and our standard of living is going to have to be fundamentally changed to adjust to the fact that we just won't have enough workers to provide the money necessary to sustain Canadians at their present level of comfort.

Why the Rapid Decline in Population?

Before we can arrive at any solutions to this question, we first have to determine why families are having so few children today. Our economy is at a 50 year high, thanks to the exporting of our natural resources, especially oil and gas, and we have the lowest unemployment rate (6%) in thirty years. So why are Canadians unwilling to have children in these good times?

What are the factors that have caused us to go from a baby boom high of four children per mother in 1960 to our dismal 1.5 children today? Demographers have obligingly given us a number of explanations as to why Canadian women have collectively decided to give motherhood a pass. The explanations they provide are many.

- * The introduction of the birth control pill in 1961 permitted an almost infallible method of controlling births for the first time in history.
- * Increased education of women encourages women to first focus on their careers before giving birth. This delay in motherhood provides less time to have children.
- * Increased education of women provides women with career opportunities, which gives them economic independence and an alternative to motherhood.
- * Less advantaged women delay pregnancies because they can't afford to support children and must work, even though they don't necessarily want or have a "career". According to Statistics Canada, the average full-time wage for women in 2004 was \$25,000, most of whom work in mainly clerical, retail or call centre work.
- * Massive migration of the population over the last century from rural to urban areas has changed the perspective of Canadians in regard to children. Rural populations everywhere in the world encourage births because they view children as an economic advantage in providing a future labour supply and also a retirement package for support in old age. In urban areas, children have little opportunity for work and are more likely to be an economic drain on parents.
- * Increased use of pension plans, insurance policies and financial markets has provided financial security in old age, rather than having to rely on one's children for support.

* Increased divorce and co-habitation without marriage have caused less security in relationships and have created less reason for having children.

* Unrestricted access to abortion has led to the death of well over a million Canadian babies since the abortion law was initially widened in 1969.

All these explanations are valid. Globe & Mail columnist, Margaret Wentz (who by the way, with her common sense, practicality and good humour would have made an excellent mother if she hadn't, according to her own admission, decided against it) discussed in a recent column (May 13, 2006) why she and her female friends don't have motherhood in their resumes. She listed a number of explanations.

Why didn't we have children? We're not really sure. We had interesting jobs. We liked our independence. We never did see ourselves as happy-housewife types. It was never the right time. It seemed like too big a sacrifice. Children are expensive, and they need a huge investment of parental energy. Couldn't find dad material that we liked. And so on.

Ms. Wentz went on to say that she doesn't believe the decreased births are related to our loss of values in our secular, postmodern culture because fertility rates have also plunged below replacement levels throughout South America and East Asia, including poor nations, such as Vietnam and Burma (now called Myanmar), Algeria, Lebanon, Tunisia and Iran, which all have below replacement level birth rates. Even the teeming cities of Calcutta, New Delhi and Bombay (now called Mumbai) have below replacement birth rates. In fact, more than half the countries in the world have a below replacement level birth rate. What's going on?

Pope Benedict XVI addressing Canadian Catholic Bishops in May 2006 warned that, contrary to Ms Wentz's assessment, Canada's plummeting birth rate is due to the pervasive effects of secularism. No longer, he says, is there trust in God's providence and care which helps couples to see the good in one another and human society and to trust in and hope for the future.

Instead, there is uncertainty and fear and moral ambiguity that follow in the wake of a secularist ideology, which makes couples uneasy. To many, it's safer and easier living for the moment, for the here and now, and to ignore a future that includes children and the responsibility and costs involved in raising them.

What Should Canada Do?

First and foremost, we should put this difficult problem out on the table for discussion. We must come to grips with the problem. This means not dismissing it as did Globe columnist John Ibbotson (Globe May 11 – 2006), who claims that all our population problems can be "fixed" by a wide open immigration policy. We all realize that Canada needs immigrants. We always have and always will. Last year, Canada took in 260,000 immigrants. We also took in more refugees than any other country in the world (35,768). Wide open immigration policies raise many other issues, however, such as national security, as well as the problem of family immigration that makes little economic contribution to Canada, while straining our social services and especially, our health care system. Further, high immigration creates assimilation problems, especially in the major cities of Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver to which immigrants migrate and where in 20 years' time, Europeans will become a visible minority.

Government Must Take Immediate Steps

When considering the problem of our declining population, it is essential that the government take at least some tentative steps now to ease the situation. Special, innovative benefits for large families have proven a success story in France. (See Reality May / June 2006). Russia and Italy are embarking on such programmes. Financial pressures and society's condescending attitude toward those who stay at home to raise large families have contributed to our declining population. It is good social policy then to address this by generous financial incentives to large families. This would also show respect for the career of motherhood. Columnist Randall Denley stated in the Ottawa Citizen (May 14, 2006) that \$25,600 annually is a reasonable sum to compensate a stay at home parent for sacrificing a career and a regular income. Restricting abortions, to at least prevent them from being used as an expensive state funded

method of birth control, as is the situation now, would be a worthwhile start on curtailing this human destruction of our future citizens.

Legislation to allow a flexible retirement age is also needed. Almost unnoticed, the Senate Banking Committee, chaired by Senator Gerry Grafstein, submitted a report in June with the alarming title "The Demographic Time Bomb". It urged the government to immediately reduce financial inducements to early retirement and to substitute inducements for later retirement.

The report recommends that older workers stay on the job past 65, collecting some pension income, if they wish, along with some employment income, without undue financial penalty. It also recommends the elimination of the Canada Pension Plan (CPP) requirement that individuals cease employment before receiving benefits. It also recommends that individuals be allowed to accumulate pension credits on the basis of employment after 65 years of age. These are good ideas that can easily be implemented.

Please write to the following to request the enactment immediately of government policies to address the enormous problem of our rapidly declining population.

Please write to:

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper
Prime Minister of Canada
80 Wellington St.
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A2

The Honourable Diane Finley, P.C., M.P.
Minister of Human Resources and Social Development
Place du Portage, Phase IV, 14th Floor
140 Promenade du Portage
Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0J9

Your M.P.
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

PRO-FAMILY ADVOCATE WINS IN COURT

Kari Simpson, founder and spokesperson for the B.C. based pro family organization Citizens Research Institute was the subject of commentary by well-known Vancouver broadcaster Rafe Mair. In October, 1999, Mr. Mair described Kari as "a mean-spirited power mad, rabble rousing and yes, dangerous bigot". He stated that there is no distinction between condemning the rights of blacks or Jews and condemning the civil rights of homosexuals. He then went on to say that Kari's actions placed her alongside skinheads and the Klu Klux Klan "in regard to the philosophical parallels to...intolerance". He also stated she was hostile to homosexuals in the manner of Adolf Hitler and racist U.S. governors such as George Wallace who condoned violence. Quite an indictment.

Kari brought an action of defamation against Rafe Mair and the Vancouver radio station WIC Ltd. on which Mr. Mair broadcasts. She claimed that his comments had caused her irreparable harm and damage to her reputation, bringing to her public scandal, odium and contempt. The lower court, the Supreme Court of British Columbia held that although Mr. Mair's statements were capable of a defamatory meaning, since they were honestly held beliefs, they were therefore "fair comment" and not defamatory.

However, the British Columbia Court of Appeal in its decision handed down on June 13, 2006, held that there was no foundation for a finding that Kari would condone violence as espoused by Hitler, KKK and skinheads etc. The Court

then found that Mr. Mair had, in fact, defamed Kari and ordered that damages be awarded her (the amount to be subsequently determined) and that she be awarded her court costs.

Mr. Mair and the WIC radio station have until September 12, 2006 to appeal. Most lawyers involved in the case believe that such an appeal would not be successful.

How the Court of Appeal Reached Its Decision

One might well ask why the B.C. Court of Appeal reached a conclusion that is counter to the customary support for gay rights, which the courts in Canada, all at levels, have unequivocally given over the past few years.

The answer to this lies in the very first sentence of the judgement, in which Madam Justice Southin, who wrote the decision, approved by the two other judges, stated:

When there is a sea change in the accepted wisdom of a society, those who have adhered to the attitudes of the past, what I call the 'old wisdom', in a very short space of time may find themselves denigrated by adherents of the "new wisdom".

She then went on to explain the two views of homosexuality. On the one side i.e. the "old wisdom", homosexuality was wrong both on religious and legal grounds as provided in the provisions of the Criminal Code and case law up until 1980.

On the other hand, the Court described the "new wisdom" about homosexuality, which is based on the belief that there should be no distinction in any aspect of society between homosexual and heterosexual relationships and conduct. The Court then stated tellingly:

There are reasonable arguments, by which I mean arguments founded in reason, on both sides. Which side is right (if, in such a contention, there is a right side) is a judgement best left to history.

That is, the Court did not take sides in the current public debate raging in Canada on homosexuality. Instead, it remained above the debate and simply looked to the law of defamation as set out in English and Canadian legal precedents and reached its conclusions based on the law, not on politics. It was a refreshing, and proper approach to take.

This approach is significantly different from most court decisions, in which homosexual "rights" collide with other rights whether religious or otherwise. "Progressive" judges use their position in the Court as an opportunity to push the political debate in support of the pro-homosexual side – regardless of the law.

STATUS OF WOMEN OPENS ITS DOORS

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

On April 4, 2006, REAL Women wrote to the MPs and especially to the Minister for the Status of Women, Bev Oda, raising our documented objections about the discriminatory practices of the Status of Women, as well as those of the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women. Both these organizations support feminist only groups. (See REALity May / June, 2006, p. 12.)

We had expected a reasonable response from a Minister representing a conservative government. Imagine our surprise, therefore, when we received a letter dated June 2, 2006 signed by Bev Oda, in which she stated:

This government is committed to promoting women's human rights and eliminating barriers for women. Canada has made some progress in advancing equality for women through our constitution and laws. However, there is still work

to do to make sure women can enjoy full equality in their day to day lives.

As Minister of Canadian Heritage and Status of Women, I will continue to work with organizations to attain concrete results in achieving full equality for women.

We were furious. We wrote to Ms Oda on June 8, 2006 stating that her letter was deeply offensive to our organization in that she had either ignored and/or dismissed the main points of our letter of April 4, 2006. We went on to state:

Your statement in your letter that your department “will continue to work with organizations to attain concrete results in achieving full equality” clearly implies that your department will continue with its reprehensible policies of consulting with, promoting and funding only feminist organizations and continue to discriminate against all other women’s grass root organizations.

Surely, it is reasonable that the Status of Women cease its discriminatory practices and policies and represent all women in Canada from their various perspectives, not just that of the special interest group of feminists. This was the main point of our letter which you have failed to address.

On June 15, 2006, we wrote to Prime Minister Stephen Harper, stating:

Ms Oda’s response to our concerns was deeply offensive to us. It is apparent that Ms Oda has ignored our concerns about the apparent bias of the Status of Women. The implication is clear that the Status of Women will continue with the policy established under the Liberal government which is to consult and fund feminist organizations exclusively, in the search for “concrete results” in achieving equality.

One would conclude from her correspondence that the change in government on January 23rd has not in any way altered the policies of the Status of Women and that the policies of the Liberal party are to continue on their feminist trajectory.

We had a prompt response to our letters to Ms Oda and Prime Minister Harper. On Friday, June 30, 2006, a phone call was received by REAL Women President, Laurie Geschke, followed by a letter inviting her to attend a meeting on July 5th, 2006 with Ms Oda, together with representatives from 15 other women’s groups to discuss the issue of economic independence for women. Travel expenses, hotel and meals were to be covered by the Status of Women.

Representatives from some of the other women’s groups in attendance at that meeting included the National Council of Women, Alliance des Femmes Françaises Hors de Quebec, Canadian Women in Communications and Media; Canadian Business Professional Women’s Club; Canadian Women’s Foundation; National Organization of Visible Minority Women, Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Standing Committee in Increasing Women in Politics.

The demands of these feminist groups were as expected, such as more gender based analyses (GBA) [read: feminist analysis] for government bureaucrats, court staffs, judges and lawyers, etc: more employment equity to place more women on corporate boards, more government funding of women’s groups, more government funded child care, improved maternity leave, including for self-employed women, gender specific English as a Second Language (ESL) etc.

In her presentation to the group, REAL Women National President, Laurie Geschke, provided some background on REAL Women and mentioned that enforcing quotas in business and government was not acceptable. She also mentioned the importance of raising the personal exemptions for a spouse at home, which should be claimed on the working spouse’s income tax return. This would provide the family, of which women are a major part, with economic independence, i.e. more disposable income. Minister Bev Oda then inquired whether our organization supported income splitting to which, of course, Laurie responded in the affirmative.

Minister Oda did ask at least three of the organizations present “for the results of their studies for which they’d received grant monies” from the Status of Women. None of them had documented their “results”.

Minister Oda then requested a letter from us, if we had further comments to make. REAL Women will follow up on this.

CONSERVATIVES TO RAISE THE AGE OF CONSENT FOR SEXUAL ACTIVITY

The Conservative Party has long sought to raise the age of consent for sexual relations from the present 14 years to 16 years of age. It brought this issue forward on Opposition Day back in April 2002. Since then, several Conservative MPs have put forward private members' bills to raise the age of consent. These bills have been overwhelmingly supported by their Conservative colleagues, but the Liberal party has resolutely refused to support raising of the age of consent because of political pressure from homosexuals. The latter want access to adolescent males, claiming that such teenagers should have "choice" as to their sexual activity to discover themselves and fulfill their sexual desires.

Conservative Justice Minister Vic Toews introduced Bill C-22 in the House of Commons on June 22, 2006. This bill includes an exception to allow young teenagers, who are within five years of age of each other, to be exempt from the age of consent provision. Mr. Toews explained that this five year gap for teenagers was included because the Conservatives didn't want to criminalize consenting sexual conduct between youths, but "wanted to protect young people from adult predators..."

Sexual predators, who use the Internet to lure Canadian children for sexual purposes, have made the raising of the age of consent a critical issue, as Canada has one of the lowest ages of consent in the western world. This has resulted in pedophiles around the world focusing on Canadian children to lure them over the Internet. For example, in March 2003, a 32 year old Texas man came to Ottawa and had sex with a 14 year old boy he had met on the internet. When police raided the predator's hotel room, they seized his computer, which had 288 pictures and movies of child pornography. Although the predator was charged with possession of child pornography, the police could not charge him with having sex with a minor, since the boy was 14 years of age and had "consented" to the act.

Opposition to Raising the Age of Consent

Homosexual activists, such as the lobby organization EGALE, the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario, the homosexual Sex Laws Committee, the Canadian AIDS Society and Planned Parenthood (recently re-named the Canadian Federation for Sexual Health), have all come out swinging against this proposed legislation, arguing that the Criminal Code already includes a provision which came into effect last July, that makes it illegal for people in positions of authority or trust to "exploit" young people by having sex with them if that person is under 18 years of age. Unfortunately, "sexual exploitation" is not defined in the Criminal Code and it is difficult, if not impossible, to prove that exploitation has occurred when a young victim claims that the sex act was consensual. Another problem with the provision is that it leaves it up to the judge to determine whether exploitation has occurred and this means that young persons, once in court, frequently suffer at the hands of defence lawyers, who aggressively cross-examine them, dispute their relationships with the older sexual partners. This leaves them emotionally exposed and vulnerable.

The groups opposing the raising of the age of consent also argue that it will cause adolescents to go "underground", i.e. not receive assistance if they become pregnant or if their partner is an older man, whom they may want to protect. Nor, they claim, will adolescents seek sexual health information if they are below the age of 16 years.

It is also significant that homosexual activists are complaining that the Conservative bill to raise the age of consent discriminates against gay men, since the bill does not reduce the legal age for anal sex, which is currently set at 18 years in the Criminal Code. The activists demand that the age for anal sex should be the same as heterosexual or vaginal sex. EGALE claims that "one sexual act should not be treated any differently than any other sexual act". There are, however, very cogent medical reasons for prohibiting anal sex to those under 18 years of age. This is because anal sex is the most dangerous for the transmission of HIV/AIDS and other STDs. Anal sex causes tiny tears in the anal tissue, which, according to the website of the University of California, "are like giant highways for the HIV and STD viruses to get into the blood system."

Surprisingly, the supposedly conservative National Post, in an editorial on February 11, 2006, stated that the difference in age for anal sex was “plainly discriminatory”. It said that it will “stigmatize homosexual and bisexual teenagers” and impose “moral judgments on the nature of the intimacy between young adults...” If only it were that simple! However, the National Post in its editorial of June 26, 2006, did go on record as supporting the raising of the age of consent to 16 years of age.

The real question to be addressed is whether society should bury its head, pretending that adolescents under 16 years of age are capable of giving their consent, or whether vulnerable young persons should be protected by the law. Fortunately, it seems that most believe it's a protection issue.

The bill is supported by the Provincial Attorneys General, and, surprisingly, most of the NDP caucus and a few Liberal MPs. As a result, fortunately, the proposed bill is likely to be passed even without Liberal or the Bloc Quebecois Party support.

Please write to your MP and urge him/her to vote in favour of the Age of Consent Bill – Bill C-22.

Your MP

House of Commons

Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

BOOK REVIEW: AGAINST JUDICIAL ACTIVISM

By Rory Leishman, McGill – Queen's University Press 2006
(Available from Amazon Canada and Chapters/Indigo - \$44.95)

Journalist Rory Leishman has done a great service to Canadians by bringing together and analyzing the major judicial and human rights tribunal decisions, which have transformed Canadian society since the Charter of Rights was passed in 1982. If you want to know what changed our country from its traditional way of life and values in the last few bewildering years, this book makes it all clear. Case by case, he relates the outrageous decisions of these appointed courts and tribunals. It makes for chilling reading as it exposes in clear and unambiguous language how judges and human rights panelists have stifled the historic rights and freedoms of Canadians on little or no evidence. Mr. Leishman states at page 120,

The rule of law has, to an alarming extent, given way to the arbitrary rule of human rights adjudicators and judges.

Human Rights Tribunals

According to Mr. Leishman, not only are the decisions of the tribunals not based on any rules of procedure and evidence, the tribunals themselves have been given the widest latitude to interpret human rights by supportive, liberal courts who share the same ideology as the tribunal panelists. Worse, even if the disputed words are the truth, this is no defence before the Mad Hatters Tea Party, which constitutes a tribunal hearing.

This is why tribunals in B.C., Quebec and Ontario reached the absurd conclusion that even though neither the provincial Human Rights Codes nor the Charter mention transsexualism, transsexuals are protected by the law by merely representing themselves as women because they believe they are women, even though they physically remain men. That is, all that is necessary now to qualify as a woman in law, is to self-identify as a woman, although in all biological respects that person is and always has been a man. This “enlightened” interpretation has led to such bizarre situations as a night club in Victoria being fined because a club bouncer refused a cross-dressing man, still one of the boys under his frock, from using the women's washroom. A rape relief centre was forced to accept a transsexual to counsel rape victims, and a man, a convicted murderer, who self identified as a woman, was incarcerated in a woman's prison (where he subsequently entered into a relationship with “another” woman). Under orders of the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal, Correctional Service Canada ended up paying for his six sex reassignment surgeries

at taxpayers' expense.

Zealous human rights tribunals regularly stamp on the religious beliefs of Christians such as mayors of numerous cities who, for religious reasons, do not wish to declare gay pride days, or Scott Brockie, a Toronto printer who was forced by the Ontario Tribunal to print homosexual material contrary to his religious beliefs.

Supreme Court of Canada

Mr. Leishman states at page 92:

To an alarming extent, unelected, activist judges on the Supreme Court of Canada have become a law unto themselves. While purporting to uphold the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, they routinely rewrite or ignore the common law, statute laws, and constitutional laws of Canada.

Time and again the Supreme Court of Canada has intruded into the legislative process because, as Mr. Leishman states at page 15:

One can do whatever one wants with a charter. Indeed, a charter can mask the subversion of the very human rights and fundamental freedoms it is supposed to affirm.

Since the Charter of Rights came into effect in 1982, the Supreme Court of Canada has presumed to change the law and dictate national policies on abortion, euthanasia, homosexual and lesbian rights, aboriginal land claims and fishing rights, and the admission of refugees and immigrants to Canada, to name only a few of the many judicial intrusions and remaking of the laws which had been passed by the legislatures. The arrogance of the Courts knows no bounds.

The reason judges should not be making law is just common sense as expressed by Mr. Leishman at page 151:

Judges lack both the skills and information necessary to determine sound public policies. Few judges have experience in crafting the political compromises that are often necessary to mobilize popular support for effective public policies. Besides, judges cannot pretend to uphold the rule of law while making major alterations in the law in quick response to changing social and political circumstances.

Moreover, judges have few means of assessing the potential impact of their changes since they do not, unlike Parliament, have the benefit of expert witnesses, nor do they hold public hearings. Judges typically devote no more than a day or so to hear oral arguments and, in addition to this, read a customary 20 pages of written legal arguments, received from legal counsel, even though the cases may be vastly complicated ones.

Mr. Leishman states at page 133:

Canada's Supreme Court judges and human rights commissioners are no angels, yet they have taken to changing the laws and governing the rest of us. Is this appropriate? In conformity with the principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, should we, in Canada, not insist that our elected legislators curb the law-making powers assumed by our unelected and unaccountable judges?

Mr. Leishman is perfectly correct in his careful analysis of the arbitrary and monstrous tribunal and judicial decisions that have transformed Canada in recent years.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

I am pleased to serve REAL Women of Canada as its National President and I would like to take this opportunity to introduce myself to you.

My name is Laurie Geschke. I have been a member of REAL Women of Canada since 1984. I have also been active in our provincial Chapter, REAL Women of BC, since that time. I have been married for 28 ½ years to Rob. We are the parents of four children, ages 23, 21, 18, and 13. I worked full time before having children. Since then, I have been a full time mother by choice, except for several years working to supplement our family income when Rob was unemployed. Fortunately, we've come through those lean years and life is easier for us now.

I have been educating our children at home for the past 18 years, and now am only left with the "baby" who is going into Grade 8 in September. Several of my interests — books, learning styles, autism, education, history, and languages — are related to what I do everyday. Other interests include policy making, and business development and cycles. These passions were kindled by my work experience, which included serving three 3-year terms as an elected director on a corporate board of a private corporation with assets of almost \$125 million in a government-regulated industry. My other love and passion, which I hope to use as extensively as possible as President of REAL Women, is my ability to speak French. Je suis francophile, et si vous voudriez m'écrire en français, vous êtes les bienvenues! Malgré que je vis en Colombie Britannique, j'espère pouvoir mettre au courant de notre organisme toutes les femmes qui pensent comme nous à travers le Canada.

I was talking to a friend the other day, a woman I hadn't seen for several years and who is a mother of six and has been married to the same man for over 25 years. We were comparing notes on how rude complete strangers have been to us for our choice to deliberately have more than one child and then to dare to bring them all out into public places at the same time! What stories she had to tell! I was touched greatly when she said that she appreciates REAL Women very much (even though she is not a member), because she knows that we are there working so that ALL women's choices will be treated equally under the law and for income tax purposes. She knows that we are working toward a day when every woman will be free to choose to remain at home to bear, nurture and raise her children without impugning her reputation! As I said on a radio interview several years ago, if that is her choice, what is wrong with her making that choice?

Until next time.
Laurie Geschke

SAME-SEX MARRIAGE VOTE THIS FALL

Prime Minister Harper reiterated on June 2, 2006 that he would call the vote on same-sex marriage this fall. Parliament returns after the summer recess on September 18th but it is unlikely that the vote will take place immediately.

Making an educated guess, it is likely the vote will probably occur some time after the middle of October.

It is therefore crucial that we contact our MPs. No MP, no matter from which party, should be able to say that this issue was not raised by his/her constituents. It must be raised and now is the time to do so.

However, not all communications with your MP are equal. An e-mail is of almost no help, nor is a postcard.

The order of effective communication by a constituent then is as follows:

- 1.a personal visit with your MP,
- 2.a hand written letter,
- 3.a phone call leaving your name, address and phone number.

DO'S AND DON'T'S ABOUT SPEAKING TO YOUR MPS THIS SUMMER

DO's

DO express your appreciation for your MP. If there's something you particularly like, offer the MP your thanks (a card?).

DO attend events where your MP will be present: parades, fairs, barbecues, Chamber of Commerce / Board of Trade meetings.

DO make an appointment to speak to your MP about marriage, notify how many will attend, and take no more than three or four people – stay only a ½ hr. If you want him to read something, send it ahead.

Do invite your Member of Parliament to speak to your organization, service club, a meeting hosted by your church, etc. He is your MP and you are entitled to hear him between elections.

DO express your point of view in two or three sentences ending with how you want your Member of Parliament to vote in the House of Commons when the marriage vote comes before it.

DO give the Member of Parliament your contact information, including phone number, address, and e-mail address, either on a business card or BLOCK PRINTED on a 3" x 5" card.

DO be prepared to counter "equality arguments" about so called "gay marriage": "Marriage is an INSTITUTION – not a right – that is limited to one man and woman. This institution is intended for the procreation of children and raising the next generation. As such, marriage is foundational to families and society." Or, "What about the rights of children to have both a father and a mother?"

DO write a letter to your MP, in your own words, in your own handwriting (if legible):

(Name), MP

House of Commons

Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

DO encourage your family, friends, and neighbours who are like-minded on marriage to use these "DO'S AND DON'TS".

DON'TS

DON'T berate or harass our Members of Parliament, their spouses, their families, or their staff.

DON'T be afraid to express your point of view on marriage – clearly and succinctly.

DON'T permit your Members of Parliament or their staff to bully you into silence.

DON'T use a form letter. They tend to end up in "the round file" when they arrive in Members' offices.

DON'T flood your MP's fax machine. Put your letter in the mail, instead.

DON'T forget to "be polite," to thank your Member of Parliament, and to express your point of view clearly and succinctly on how you want the Member to vote when marriage comes before the House of Commons.

If you don't know who your Member of Parliament is, please go to:
www.canada.gc.ca/directories-repertoires/direct-eng.html
and click on the link: "Find your Member of Parliament" Using your postal code

OR, contact: REAL Women of Canada National Office, Telephone: (613) 236-4001, Fax: (613) 236-7203

Making the Case for Marriage

Some Facts and Arguments About Marriage

1. Marriage is, and always has been, a unique relationship which is fundamentally and exclusively heterosexual in nature. This fact has been recognized by all the great religions of the world since time immemorial and even by atheistic states like communist China and the former USSR. Why? Because marriage as the union of a man and a woman:
 - * Constitutes a unique good for society;
 - * Has a fundamental and irreplaceable role;
 - * Is the stabilizing force for the family which is the basic unit of every society throughout all human history;
 - * Forms the basis of society through the binding love of the husband and wife, their inherent ability to bear children, and their ensuing responsibility for their children as a mother and a father.
2. It is not discriminatory to treat different realities differently. Same-sex relationships are fundamentally different than heterosexual relationships. Non-discrimination does not require uniformity – it requires respect for diversity and differences.
3. The Supreme Court of Canada has never ruled that the heterosexual definition of marriage must be changed to include same-sex relationships.
4. Not a single federal court, not a single federal human rights tribunal, nor the United Nations has ever ruled that calling same-sex relationships marriage is a question of human rights. Some lower courts have so ruled, while others have not. Even the legal community in Canada is divided on this question.
5. Marriage has evolved over time, but never before in a way that contravenes its fundamental heterosexual nature.

On Marriage and "The Rights of Children"

1. A child has a natural right to know and be raised by his father and his mother, a right that is recognized in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989 (UNCRC, Section 7). Canada is a signatory to this convention.
2. In all decisions concerning children taken by courts of law and legislative bodies, "the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration" (UNCRC, Sec. 3).
3. So-called same-sex marriage violates the right of a child to have both a father and a mother, to know who they are, and to be raised by them. Marriage by two same-gender partners places children's rights and interests behind those of adults.
4. The laws of Canada should protect children and not be complicit in creating fatherless or motherless children.
5. Adults can represent themselves, but children cannot promote or defend their own interests. They need legal protection. Man-woman marriage protects their rights.

SOME COMMON OBJECTIONS AND POSSIBLE RESPONSES

OBJECTION: “But isn’t marriage an equality right?”

RESPONSE: Marriage is not a bundle of rights and benefits. Marriage is an institution intended at its core for the procreation of children and for raising the next generation of people. As such marriage is INSTITUTED as the union of one man and one woman, excluding all others. It is the foundation of families and, therefore, of human society.

OBJECTION: “Why should heterosexual couples be given privileges and benefits that homosexual couples don’t get?”

RESPONSE: Marriage entails responsibilities, and comes with certain privileges and benefits to assist a husband and a wife bear and rear children, and to assist them in creating a stable environment.

OBJECTION: “What about heterosexual couples who don’t want children? Why do they get the privileges and benefits?”

RESPONSE: This is known as the “free rider” problem. That is, some people get a “free ride” on benefits and privileges without the responsibility of rearing children. Many heterosexual couples who marry without any intention of having children, later do have them. It would be impossible to predict that people won’t have children, except if they’re past childbearing age. And most who do remarry later in life after their childbearing years have already raised children. We have decided to tolerate free riders to male-female marriage. But gay activists want to expand the number of “free riders” even further.

OBJECTION: “Isn’t it better to have loving gay parents than unloving, uncaring parents who are heterosexual?”

RESPONSE: Research shows again and again that the best family environment for the raising of children includes a mother and a father present in the home, not two mothers or two fathers. Male children need male role models, and female children need female role models – in their parents. And male and female children need an opposite-sex parent in the home to learn how to relate to the opposite sex.

OBJECTION: “You would be fine with the whole thing if they just called it something other than marriage because you don’t think you should be in the same category.”

RESPONSE: No. It’s not just a matter of terminology. A relationship between two friends living together platonically is qualitatively different from two people living together and engaging in sexual intercourse. In a similar way, the relationship between a man and a woman in a married relationship is qualitatively different from two men or two women living together and engaging in a sexual relationship. Marriage – one man and one woman, excluding all others – is intended at its core for the bearing and rearing of children. That makes it quite different! Taking away a business enterprise’s ability to make a profit means it ceases to be a business. Require a charity to make a profit and it’s no longer a charity. In a similar way, taking away the heterosexual character of marriage causes it to cease being marriage.

Editor’s Note:

It has recently become fashionable to claim that same-sex marriage has not caused any negative consequences to Canadian society. This is not true.

The article below outlines the problems that have taken place in regard to same-sex marriage, as well as in regard to homosexuality in general.

This article was sent to the major Canadian dailies for publication in July. Some newspapers did not accept the article for publication probably because of its content, which the editors did not wish to publicize, believing it preferable to keep the public in the dark about the consequences of same-sex marriage.

SAME-SEX MARRIAGE HAS CHANGED CANADA

By C. Gwendolyn Landolt, National Vice President, REAL Women of Canada, July 4, 2006

Two views of homosexuality are creating tensions in Canada. Some believe, on the basis of equality, that there should be no distinction drawn in any way by society between homosexual and heterosexual relationships. Others are opposed to homosexuality for practical, medical, moral and/or religious reasons.

The “no distinction” approach has dominated primarily because of the decisions of appointed judges and human rights panelists. It was on this basis that the legalization of same-sex marriages was made. Even within the Parliamentary process, the decision was made by a very few individuals. The 19 NDP MPs and the 39 Liberal Cabinet members were ordered by their leaders to vote in support of the proposed same-sex marriage legislation in June, 2005. This deprived their constituents of any representation. The Liberals rammed through the legislation by disallowing any amendments and imposing closure to cut off debate.

Same-sex marriage is now public policy, and has triggered some significant changes.

This new definition of marriage has a profound impact on the welfare of children. A large body of social science research indicates that children thrive best with a mother and father who teach them gender identity and sex role expectations. This was the conclusion of a Committee of the French National Assembly, which recommended, in January 2006, that France not accept same-sex marriage due to its detrimental effect on children. The French Committee criticized studies on same-sex parenting that claimed it had no ill effects on children, on the basis that these studies lacked scientific rigor, included inadequate sampling, and showed a lack of objectivity.

Some Canadians point to the fact that same-sex marriages are not functionally equivalent to opposite-sex marriages, but are different in structure, values, and practice. It is widely acknowledged that these differences include the fact that sexual faithfulness is not usually regarded as a requirement in same-sex relationships, but is of vital importance in a heterosexual marriage. Same-sex partners tend to experience a higher incidence of health problems resulting in shorter life spans. The duration of same-sex marriages is shorter than that of opposite-sex relationships: on average, the former last only two to three years. These factors are detrimental to children who require stability in their lives.

A trend resulting from same-sex marriage is evident in the Netherlands, which has allowed homosexual couples to register their partnerships since 1997 and which legalized same-sex marriages in 2000. Statistics show that the out-of-wedlock birthrate there has increased by an average of 2% a year -- more than in any other country in Western Europe. This indicates a marked decrease in a desire for legal marriage and increase in cohabitation. According to Statistics Canada, cohabiting relationships are much less stable than legal marriages.

The legalization of same-sex marriage in Canada has caused law and religion to embark on a collision course. The Catholic organization, the Knights of Columbus, in Port Coquitlam, BC, was required to pay a fine for causing “hurt feelings” when it denied the use of the organization’s hall to a lesbian couple to celebrate their “wedding”. A Mennonite-owned summer camp in Manitoba was found guilty of discrimination by the Manitoba Human Rights Commission because it refused to rent its premises to a homosexual choir.

Religion based social services, such as counselling and adoption services are now required to conform to the same-sex marriage law. The tax-exempt status of churches has become the subject of intimidation and harassment. Bishop Fred Henry of Calgary was threatened by the Canada Revenue Agency with removal of the Roman Catholic churches’ tax-exempt status if he persisted in speaking against same-sex marriage during a federal election. A complaint was also laid against Bishop Henry before the Alberta Human Rights Commission because he issued a pastoral letter opposing same-sex marriage, although subsequently withdrawn, (for the time being), by homosexual activists. Another pastor in Alberta, Stephen Boisson, who published letters in a local newspaper opposing homosexual practices and same-sex marriage, was the subject of a complaint before the same Tribunal.

Those who favour same-sex marriages are free to speak their views, but those opposed to them are being harassed and coerced into refraining from doing so. This was evident at Toronto's Ryerson University in June, 2006, when a respected Professor of Ethics from McGill University, Dr. Margaret Somerville, who opposes same-sex marriage, was subjected to public attack, including picketing. Furthermore she was insulted by some of the professors of that institution, who turned their backs on her while she was being presented with an honorary degree.

Within school boards, teachers and other individuals are being forced to deny their religious beliefs and freedom of speech by being required to promote same-sex marriage, and publicly refraining from expressing any opposition to it. A teacher and school counselor in British Columbia, Dr. Chris Kempling published a letter in his local newspaper objecting to homosexuality. This resulted in his suspension for one month without pay by the BC College of Teachers, which alleged that Mr. Kempling's letters "poisoned the school environment." There was no evidence to support this, nor was there any complaint made against him by any student, parent or supervisor. Subsequently, Dr. Kempling was a candidate for the Christian Heritage Party in the 2006 federal election, and, in that capacity, published a letter in his local newspaper opposing same-sex marriage. He received a further suspension of three months without pay.

Because of a complaint made before the British Columbia Human Rights Tribunal, the government of British Columbia announced in early June that the school curriculum from kindergarten to Grade 12 would be revised to integrate positive homosexual instruction. In a Kafkaesque form of events, the revised curriculum is to be subject to the approval of the homosexual activists who laid the complaint! School Boards such as those in Quebec and Ontario, especially in Toronto, Hamilton and London, now require homosexual "education" in their school systems. Such programs do not provide balanced instruction on the issue, and the medical, psychological and legal impacts of homosexuality are not mentioned. There is no opportunity for parents to withdraw their children if they disagree with this indoctrination.

As these examples show, these are monumental consequences of same-sex marriage. Are these the changes that Canadians want? Who knows? We've never been given the opportunity to express our views.

B.C. GOVERNMENT AGREES TO COMPULSORY HOMOSEXUAL INDOCTRINATION IN THE SCHOOLS

In 1999, a homosexual teacher in Coquitlam B.C., Murray Corren, and his partner laid a complaint before the B.C. Human Rights Tribunal alleging that the B.C. school curriculum did not adequately address sexual orientation. They argued that this failure was systemic discrimination, even though they acknowledged that the curriculum was not in any way anti-homosexual. An especially disturbing aspect of their complaint was that it included a demand that future positive homosexual instruction be made a mandatory subject for all students, including those attending private schools, if the latter are in receipt of government funding.

On June 2, 2006, the B.C. government announced that the Attorney General, Wally Oppal, and the Minister of Education, Shirley Bond, had negotiated a 6 page agreement with the homosexual activists. (Mr. Corren has a long history of homosexual activism, most recently pushing for same-sex marriage). The agreement reached was in two parts.

1. A new course on "social justice" is to be offered to interested students in Grade 12, which would incorporate the homosexual issue as well as race, ethnicity, family structure and gender equality. The course would address legal, political, ethical and economic perspectives that supposedly provide Canadian concepts of justice, equality and equity.

The course will be piloted in schools in the 2007-08 school year, with full implementation to follow in the next year.

This course will be optional for school districts, which will be required to provide the course only if there is enough interest expressed in it. It is uncertain whether the 37 independent high schools in the province, representing 9,300 students, will be required to include this course in their curriculum.

2. The entire B.C. school curriculum is to be reviewed to ensure that it reflects positive homosexual “inclusion”, i.e., that homosexual and gender identity be included in all discussions, such as those involving racial inequality and women’s rights, ethnicity, etc.

At the present time, the province permits parents and students to opt out of some classes, such as those on sex education, health and career courses. This agreement, however, will force students to remain in classes dealing with sexual orientation, since it will be integrated throughout the entire curriculum from kindergarten to grade 12.

As part of the settlement, the B.C. government has agreed to provide the complainants with a draft of the revised curriculum to allow them to make further revisions before it is finalized. This gives the two homosexual complainants significant authority to rewrite the curriculum at all levels. In effect, the agreement has given a special interest group a free hand to propagandize in the public schools without any opportunity for rebuttal or for the provision of a balanced account of homosexuality, including its negative medical, moral and physiological outcomes. One wonders what the reaction would have been if REAL Women, instead of homosexuals, had been granted authority to revise the school curriculum in a similar manner.

Why This Agreement?

By signing this agreement, the B.C. government avoided a long, costly battle before the kangaroo court known as the B.C. Human Rights Tribunal. The homosexual complaint placed the government in a financial bind, as the government was required, in addition to its own legal costs, to pay all legal costs of the complainants. That is, after laying their complaint, all the complainants had to do was sit back and watch the members of the Tribunal run with their ball to score the inevitable goal in their favour – no stress, no costs – the burden lying solely on the defending government. The outcome of the Tribunal hearing was a foregone conclusion. Therefore, the B.C. government capitulated to the demands of the homosexual activists.

By this agreement, the B.C. government has undermined freedom of belief, religion, and opinion in the B.C. schools. It has failed to provide information, instead it is providing indoctrination on a heated political issue now gripping this country. The government has shown itself to be cowardly and totally lacking in integrity by deciding to take the expedient route. An editorial in the National Post (June 17, 2006) on this planned curriculum change stated:

Parents do not give, by placing their children in the school system’s care, consent to have them subjected to either sexual propaganda from special interest advocates ...

But the B.C. government has done just that.

LEGAL ACADEMY TO HOLD TRAINING SESSION

Saturday, September 30, 2006, Delta Bow Valley Hotel, Calgary

REAL Women of Canada is part of a legal organization formed to give special training to lawyers involved in pro-life / pro-family issues. The members of this organization, called the Christian Legal Intervention Academy (CLIA), includes Focus on the Family, the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada (EFC), the Catholic Civil Rights League, and the Home School Legal Defense Association, in addition to REAL Women.

The training academy features some of the nation’s top legal experts, who instruct on Canadian constitutional matters in the area of pro-life, family advocacy and various Charter and Human Rights issues. Not only do attendees learn from the best, they also leave knowing a network of lawyers who will be glad to assist them in the future.

This year’s training session, which is open to Christian lawyers and upper year law students, consists of an intensive one-day event to take place on Saturday, September 30, in Calgary at the Delta Bow Valley Hotel, in conjunction with

the Christian Legal Fellowship Conference (September 29 – October 1).

Space is limited and applications will be processed in the order and priority received. Therefore, we encourage lawyers to apply as quickly as possible. Please pass this vital information along to any lawyer of your acquaintance who may be interested in participating in this training session.

For information, please contact:

Christian Legal Intervention Academy

Attention: Ruth A.M. Ross

1673 Richmond Street, Suite # 140

London, Ontario N6G 2N3

Tel: 519 641-8850 Fax: 519 641-8866 Ross.clf@primus.ca

REAL Women of Canada 2006 National Conference Summaries

REAL WOMEN ON THE GO: OUR FUTURE WORK

A Talk by C. Gwendolyn Landolt, National Vice President, REAL Women of Canada
Summary by Lorraine McNamara, Past President, REAL Women of Canada

In her talk on the role of REAL Women of Canada, Gwen Landolt provided insight into the difficulties REAL Women faced in the past, and how the situation has changed in recent years. She stressed the importance of continuing to fight for the family in Canada.

Nobody asked me for my opinion!

By 1983 radical feminist groups were receiving significant government funding, based on their claim to speak for “all Canadian women”. They would declare, “The women of Canada demand...” and the government would respond. Gwen’s indignant response was, “Who are these women daring to represent all Canadian women? Nobody asked me for my opinion!” There had to be an alternative voice.

With Gwen at the helm, REAL Women was started by just seven concerned women in Toronto. Our organization has since grown to be a national women’s organization, with provincial chapters as well as several local city chapters. It is the alternative voice of women, spearheading the battle for the promotion and protection of family life.

We knew the radical feminists were heavily funded by the Women’s Program, Secretary of State, and although in principle we did not agree with funding for special interest groups, we believed that in order to participate in the political arena, we must also apply for government funding. However, back in 1983 – 1984 REAL Women could not even get an application form, from the Status of Women! It was not until we phoned the Women’s Program, Secretary of State, and identified ourselves as a new group of women called, the “National Association of Lesbian Mothers”, that an application form immediately was sent to us – together with a welcoming note! (We’ve preserved the note for posterity)

After numerous complaints to the Status of Women and friendly MPs, the Conservative government at that time did grudgingly give some very small grants – nothing in comparison to that which was doled out to the feminist organizations. All grants to REAL Women were suspended by the Status of Women in 1996.

REAL Women is not for turning!

REAL Women of Canada for several years was treated with disdain and barely tolerated by successive Liberal governments, its officials, and the media. We were described as “women who were against” women’s issues, never

described as an alternative voice for women. Fortunately, we are not easily intimidated or pushed around. As former British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher once famously said, "This lady is not for turning". Nor is REAL Women!

We have always been steadfast in our beliefs and positions. Because of our firm stance we have gained respect and acknowledgment over time from the government (even Liberal ones!) and the media. Now, when we write letters, put out press releases and make presentations to government committees, we are taken seriously. Nearly every day the Toronto or Ottawa offices are contacted by the media for interviews. It is now recognized that REAL Women is the voice of conservative pro-family women in Canada and that our positions are well researched and articulate – so it is difficult to ignore us.

We cannot expect miracles.

The new Conservative government is planning to put forward some good legislation. Since 2002 the Conservatives have been making it a priority to raise the age of consent from 14 to 16 (Canada's age of consent is the lowest in the western world). It has already introduced a bill to this effect (See Conservatives To Raise Age of Consent). The child pornography law will be changed to remove the excuse of "artistic merit" as a defence. (Why should an artist be protected from responsibility for the harm he or she has caused?). Criminal sentences will be strengthened, and marijuana and prostitution will not be de-criminalized, as had been planned by the former Liberal government.

Gwen warned, however, that we probably cannot expect that there will be any drastic changes in funding for special interest groups, despite the blatantly unfair situation. In a minority situation, there is only so much this Conservative government can do and we do not want the media to jump all over the government at this time on highly controversial issues. We must be rational and try to assist this government to reach a majority in the next election. There is no guarantee that this will happen, despite the favourable polls, so it is crucial that pro-family Canadians become involved in politics to ensure our candidates get nominated and elected.

Same-sex marriage legislation must be properly analyzed!

Presently, the major concern to be addressed is the same-sex marriage issue which will be before Parliament this fall. Gwen reminded the conference participants how the same-sex marriage legislation was rammed through Parliament last June in a shockingly undemocratic manner. The 39 Liberal cabinet ministers and the 19 members of the NDP Caucus were ordered to vote for the bill, thus denying their constituents any say on the issue. No amendments were permitted and closure was imposed to shut down the debate. No consideration was made of the effects of the legislation on children. In this regard, it is significant that the National Assembly in France on January 26, 2006 tabled a report which rejected same-sex marriage because it was not in the best interest of children.

REAL Women is still in the forefront!

Although the times are still difficult, they are somewhat easier than in the past as the Canadian public has become generally more conservative to-day. The present Conservative government at least listens, even if it cannot do as much as it would like to do. REAL Women continues to analyze legislation and lobby the government. It is important however, that others do so as well. We must let our pro-family Members of Parliament know of our concerns, and we must become involved in the next federal election campaign. It is important also that local newspapers receive letters supporting pro-family issues, because they often receive a great many letters from well-organized groups, such as day-care lobbyists or homosexual rights activists, who spring into action whenever their issues are raised. E-mail communications and petitions are not nearly as effective as letters. Best of all, make a personal visit to your Member of Parliament. REAL Women will do everything it can to provide you with any background information you may require.

In conclusion, Gwen confirmed that REAL Women of Canada has always been in the forefront in the political and legal battles of the day. She vowed that we will continue to carry on the battle for the family for many years to come. REAL Women never give up!

EFFECTIVE POLITICAL ACTIVISM AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

A Talk by Heather Stilwell, Trustee Surrey School Board
Summary by Laurie Geschke, National President, REAL Women of Canada B.C.

Heather Stilwell spoke about becoming actively involved in the political process at the local level, either as an elected representative or in assisting the election of a candidate of choice. She encouraged this, by stating, it is easy if you start when your children are small by being involved in the school's PAC (Parent Advisory Committee) and the DPAC (District Parent Advisory Committee).

Our involvement on Parent Advisory Committees at our children's school is critical for the health of public education and society at large. Elected school trustees and boards can and do offer parents real opportunities for meaningful input. Too often, however, parents don't see their involvement as necessary when it conflicts with scarce family time or other activities. Don't be mistaken: getting involved this September in your child's or children's PAC could be one of the most important things you ever do! You'll never become aware of the opportunities to make a difference if you are not on the PAC first and attending their monthly meetings.

Local politics (City Councils and School boards) are the next easy step. They are also very important as they hire and set policy. Heather did caution however, that politics is a family affair and that a spouse must be supportive of any such efforts.

While it does take some money to run for public office, the candidate should not have to depend on it coming from his or her own pocket. Networks are critical. Other people who are not willing to run can donate toward the costs of a like-minded candidate. If the candidate is not able to raise campaign funds before the election, then it may be best to expand personal networks and wait until the next election to run. Candidates must understand their own strengths and weaknesses. For example does the candidate like big crowds? Or prefer small groups? Does the candidate have the funds to take potential supporters out for coffee to a restaurant? Does the candidate need supporters to host in-home coffee klatches where he/she can be given an opportunity to speak? Before the election is called, a professional photograph should be taken for signs, brochures, website, and any media requests. Make sure that the signs are always at eye level to the passing traffic, as signs are critical. If a candidate doesn't have signs how will people know that he/she is running?

The candidate should pick concerns for his platform that the public shares, and shouldn't be afraid to express his genuine concerns. Politics is not for others: it is for us!

Candidates can be helped in the election in many ways, such as writing a letter to the Editor on an issue that the candidate is concerned about, or paying for a professional photograph for the candidate for his or her brochures/campaign signs. Paying for all or part of the literature printing costs or postage expenses is quite a help, as well as volunteering to hand deliver literature house by house on behalf of the candidate. Another help for the candidate is to participate on a telephone committee to identify the vote and, on election day, to transport the candidate's supporters to the polling stations. Assistance can also be given by expanding the candidate's personal networks (to meet voters) by hosting small groups of your friends and associates in your home. Volunteering to be on a sign crew is also entirely helpful.

Individuals and/or small groups of two or three can make a huge difference, if they are willing to work long and hard. In this regard, Heather personally acknowledged two local women, Hilda Krieg and Deanna Fernandes, whose individual efforts to elect pro-life candidates have become legendary in B.C.

We end up with the government we deserve! Have you ever said "somebody should do this"? Well, Heather said, You are that somebody! "You can make a politician out of a pro-lifer much easier than you turn a politician into a pro-lifer!"

REAL WOMEN WORKING AT THE UN

A talk by Ginger Malacko, UN Lobbyist for REAL Women of Canada
Summary by Jill Cahoon, Alberta Board Member, REAL Women of Canada

At the age of 23, Ginger agreed to accompany her mother to a United Nations meeting, only because a trip to New York appealed to her! She did not realize just how much the trip would influence her life. The trip began her long affair with lobbying at the United Nations on behalf of REAL Women of Canada, an NGO with consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.

The United Nations consists of representatives from 191 countries. Also present are a variety of non-government organizations (NGO), most of which push a radical agenda. Although the UN has six official languages, most of the actual negotiations are carried out in English. Unfortunately, some of the delegates are not familiar enough with the English language or UN expressions and therefore do not always grasp the implications of some of the expressions entered in the documents. That is, some of the delegates are not aware of the implications of some of their proposed text and agree to it even though it is opposed to their country's values and beliefs. This is why it is important for pro-family NGOs to be present at these meetings, to alert the delegates to the tricks being played on them by the anti-life anti-family drafters of the documents as well as NGOs and other delegates, such as those from the European Union and Canada, who are using the UN as a tool to promote a destructive agenda world-wide.

A document is always presented to the delegates at the start of the negotiations. Ginger's work at the UN begins with checking the wording of the text for anti-life anti family expressions such as "women's reproductive rights" or "responsible sexual relations", which, at the UN level, refer to a woman's right to abortion or ready access to contraception by adolescents without their parents' knowledge or consent. After Ginger has identified the problem areas in the document, she researches the issue and then informs the voting delegates by any means she can of the potential pitfalls of the wording. Sometimes this is done by way of flyers documenting the problems and sometimes by speaking directly to delegates, and offering assistance to them. Ginger always works in co-operation with representatives from other pro-family NGOs at the UN.

Political trends at the United Nations include a never-ending push for abortion on demand, gender identity (there are 48 different gender combinations, all of which radicals demand be protected), children's rights (which also includes their sexual rights, to the detriment of the family), prostitution and sexual freedom. Feminist ideology is also pushed at the UN, such as demanding quotas for females working in the government, implementing a national child care plan, forcing women out of the home into the paid work force, providing contraception to curtail population, promoting homosexual rights and same-sex marriage and always frequent attempts to curtail the influence of religion both at the UN specifically, and world-wide.

Early in Ginger's life she was influenced by the expression, "Stand for something or fall for anything". She feels that her work at the United Nations gives her an opportunity to do something worthwhile. Her work there has changed her life forever. It has become her cause and she is very grateful for the financial assistance from REAL Women of Canada and for the privilege of representing our organization at the UN.

The work at the UN is difficult, it takes time and patience, but it is a life-changing experience. Ginger especially encourages young people to commit to this work and stated that she would be happy to assist anyone who may be interested in doing so.

THE POSITIVE CONSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE COURTS and THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA

A Talk by Senator Anne Cools, Senate of Canada

Summary by: Sharen Frewing, Past President, BC Chapter, REAL Women of Canada

Our beloved, stalwart Senator Anne Cools delivered on her promise to come out to BC anytime we asked, coming for one day to be one of the speakers at our national conference. She had such a wealth of information to impart that the forty-five minute time-slot only allowed us a glimpse of the depth of this woman's knowledge and passion for the family in Canada. The material deserved at least a half day or full day seminar.

Senator Cools is a constitutional expert. She has been tireless in fighting for the dignity and protection of the family in Canada, and for Parliament and the Courts to maintain their proper mandates and boundaries. Thus, she and former Liberal MP Roger Gallaway became interveners in the definition of marriage issue at the Supreme Court, asking the Court not to touch what was properly a parliamentary issue. Senator Cools outlined in her talk the development in law and practice which led to the separation of the judiciary from Parliament – boundaries that are now becoming blurred.

The Senator is very concerned about the courts improperly taking over the responsibility of Parliament to make laws. The checks and balances of the Constitution have gone by the wayside and there are now no constitutional checks on the power of the Prime Minister. Unfortunately, Parliamentarians rarely consult the Senators, who are supposed to be the Parliamentary experts. Nor do the MPs do their job in monitoring the spending of the higher level civil servants (mandarins) in their departments. Thus, we have fiascos like the Firearm Bill with its massive, out-of-control spending on the Gun Registry. This was a bill that the public didn't want in the first place, but which the Liberal government was determined to implement. The budget for it went from \$65 million to the present \$2 billion! The Treasury Board was warned by the Senate about the escalating expenditures of the firearm registry when its costs were a "mere" \$900 million.

Senator Anne noted that we no longer even have a common language with which to speak to Parliament. We are now into "messaging", the hallmark of which is the misuse of words and terms of speech. Thus we can no longer even debate important issues, or any issues, as the language used is meant to obscure meaning, rather than make meaning clear.

Senator Cools is a staunch supporter and admirer of REAL Women. Her advice to us is:

Knock on friendly MPs' doors;
Know the laws and be there speaking in an informed way;
Take the abuse when it comes, as it inevitably will;
Write letters to the editor. Develop this skill and use it;
Find a way to get government to focus on the issues that are important to us.

The Senator warned that the battle is getting harder. The same-sex marriage issue will return and we must use the time wisely.

Senator Cools is a wonderful role model: She works hard, educates herself on the issues, is not afraid to speak her mind, is not cowed or side-tracked by abuse, uses clear speech to debate issues and stands immovable on principles. May her tribe increase!

PASSING OUR VALUES ON TO OUR CHILDREN

A Talk by Doris Darvasi, President, BC Chapter, REAL Women of Canada
Summary by Corry Morcos, President, Alberta Chapter of REAL Women

Doris Darvasi, President of the BC Chapter of REAL Women gave a passionate plea to all of us to walk the talk for the moral values we want to instill in our children. "If we are leaders, and nobody is following, we are just taking a walk". We have to acquire knowledge and understanding ourselves to be able to pass them on to our children, not as pals, but as parents.

Society is bombarding our families with negative stereotyping and politically correct propaganda, mainly through TV, movies and the Internet. As parents, we can take steps to help our children stay grounded in the faith and morality by living the life ourselves. We take back our children's minds in this cultural fight. First of all, we minimize programs coming into our home by removing cable, and we watch programs together, and talk about what we hear and see. Computers should never be in an isolated room, like a bedroom, but visible to all. Books that speak truth about dangers of lifestyle choices should be available readily to our children.

Doris shared her views on the disturbing trend of luring teens into a world of distorted, self-focused, relativistic views, with muddled sexual boundaries. This is done by desensitization and suggesting that straights are gay, which, in fact, they are not. This has been part of a systematic strategy of homosexual activists that began 30 years ago. In supposedly promoting tolerance and acceptance, activists demand the celebration of homosexuality.

Doris quoted Harry B Thayer: "As are families, so is society. If well ordered, well instructed, and well governed, they are the springs from which go forth the stream of national greatness and prosperity – of civil order and public happiness".

Doris finished by stressing again that as parents, we must set an example for our children to spend time with them, eat and read together, and when issues arise, share freely our own values. So let us not just take a walk, but lead the way for the next generation for the future of our children.