

WHAT KIND OF HUMAN RIGHTS MUSEUM IS THIS?

Israel (Izzy) Asper, head of CanWest Global Communications Corporation, had a dream. It was to leave as his legacy, not just to his family, or to his country, but to the whole world, a museum on human rights so people all over the world could come for inspiration, education and instruction. This dream is to be realized in 2011.

However, there were a few problems with his dream. In the first place, as wealthy as he was personally, with his media empire, which included ownership of the National Post, the Vancouver Sun, the Ottawa Citizen, the Montreal Gazette etc., and Global TV; access to his well-funded Asper Family Foundation; and access to wealthy donors in the private sector, he still could not begin to raise the funds to cover the approximately \$300 million building costs of the museum. As well, there were the further annual costs of approximately \$22 million for the maintenance and staffing of the museum.

Mr. Asper died in 2003, but his family took on his dream: in particular, his daughter Gail Asper. In short order under Ms. Asper's direction, the proposed human rights centre received the following grants:

Province of Manitoba - \$40 million

City of Winnipeg - \$20 million

Asper Foundation - \$20 million

CIBC, Royal Bank, Bank of Montreal, Bank of Nova Scotia - \$3.5 million

This funding was still not nearly enough to get the project off the ground. Fortunately for the dream, the Liberal government, accurately assessing the museum as reflecting its own liberal values, announced on April 15, 2005, that a grant for the museum, in the amount of \$100 million, would be provided by the government. The sun seemed to be shining on the project - that is, until the January, 2006 federal election, when the Conservative government was elected to power. The Asper family and supporters of the museum held their collective breaths over whether the Conservative government would honour the Liberals' pledge to the museum.

The problem with the museum is that it was mainly a shrine to former Liberal Prime Minister Trudeau and his Charter of Rights. That is, it was supposed to reflect the values set out in the Charter of Rights, which has been interpreted by Liberal-appointed judges to reflect the liberal views or philosophies of the judges and that of the Liberal party, rather than the views of the public.

Patrons of this museum are the feminist Governor-General Michaëlle Jean (See REALity, May June 2007, "Our Wayward Governor-General," page 3) and John Harvard, Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba. In the latter's former life, he was an outspoken left-wing Liberal MP from Winnipeg who traded his seat to allow the former homosexual Winnipeg Mayor, Glen Murray, to run in the June 2004 federal election (Mr. Murray was defeated) in return for his appointment in May 2004 as Lieutenant-Governor.

Further, to ensure that liberal values would prevail, the museum organizers identified, in addition to ethno-cultural and Jewish representatives, so-called "human rights experts", including representatives of homosexual and feminist interests, who were to sit on the museum's National Advisory Council. These representatives included:

Constance Backhouse, hard-line feminist professor from the University of Ottawa, specializing in women's studies. She is currently writing a book on sexual assault in Canada.

Ken Norman, former member of the executive committee of the notoriously biased and discriminatory Court Challenges Program (now, thankfully, disbanded by the Harper government - See REALity November/December 2006, p.7 "Conservative Government Cuts Left-Wing Agencies"), Professor of Law, University of Saskatchewan.

Beth Atcheson, chair of the legal arm of the feminist movement, LEAF (Women's Legal Education and Action Fund).

Lloyd Axworthy, known as "Pink Lloyd", former Liberal Foreign Affairs Cabinet Minister under Prime Minister Chretien.

Stephen Burri, president of the homosexual lobby group EGALE (Equality for Gays and Lesbians Everywhere).

Basil "Buzz" Hargrove, National President of the Canadian Autoworkers Union (CAW).

Senator Mobina Jaffer, feminist lawyer, appointed to the Senate by Prime Minister Chretien. She was a member of the feminist only Canada Panel on Violence Against Women, and a former unsuccessful Liberal candidate, as well as president of the National Women's Liberal Commission.

Madame Justice Claire L'Heureux Dubé, retired feminist judge from the Supreme Court of Canada, founder and former member of the Board of Directors of the feminist organization CRIAW (Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women).

Professor Kathleen Mahoney, hard-line feminist professor of law at the University of Calgary. She has published extensively on women's rights and has served as legal counsel before the Supreme Court of Canada on the issue of hate propaganda and pornography from a feminist perspective.

The Honourable Maurice F. Strong, well known, left-wing UN advisor, currently under investigation for his Oil-For-Food gambit in Iraq. He is also co-sponsor, with former USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, of the so-called "Earth Charter", which includes, in its provisions, a right to abortion, environmentalism, and aboriginal traditions, etc. as basic international human rights.

The Honourable John N. Turner, former Liberal Prime Minister.

Tom Axworthy, political strategist and policy advisor for the Liberal party, former principal Secretary to Prime Minister Trudeau

Alexandre Trudeau, son of the late Prime Minister Trudeau and a left-wing film producer of a laudatory film on President Castro of Cuba and an anti-American film on the Iraq invasion.

Senator Noël Kinsella - Conservative Senator appointed in 1990 by Prime Minister Brian Mulroney - former Chairperson of the New Brunswick Human Rights Commission for 22 years. He tabled a bill in the Senate in 1996 to include sexual orientation in the federal Human Rights Act.

Senator Jeremiah Grafstein, appointed to the Senate by Prime Minister Trudeau in 1984.

Senator Vivienne Poy, appointed to the Senate by Prime Minister Chrétien. She is the sister-in-law of former Governor-General Adrienne Clarkson. Senator Poy tabled a bill in the Senate to change the words of our national anthem to remove the scandalous phrase "all our sons command". Not surprisingly, the bill was not successful. (See REALity, September/October 2001, p. 10.)

Although these left-wing extremists predominate on the museum's Advisory Council, there is a sprinkling of others, such as former red Tory Conservative Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and representatives from each of some Japanese, Ukrainian, Jewish, and francophone organizations.

These latter representatives, however, are all outnumbered by the left-wing, liberal activists who all bring to the Advisory Council their own special interests and agendas.

Many Violations of Human Rights

The museum has two sections: the Hall of Fame and the Hall of Shame.

There are many violations of human rights in Canada to fill the Hall of Shame: these exhibits will, hopefully, serve as a reminder to future generations of past wrongs, never to be repeated. Examples include, the Chinese head tax passed in 1885; exclusion of all Chinese immigrants in 1947; refusal to allow a freighter with Sikh passengers to land in Canada in 1914; internment of Ukrainians, Italians and Japanese as enemy aliens; our treatment of Aborigines; the refusal to allow Jews as immigrants, etc. The list is tragically long. On the other hand, the Hall of Fame will certainly be, according to Prime Minister Trudeau's former principal secretary, Thomas Axworthy, a monument to Pierre Trudeau. Mr. Axworthy described Mr. Trudeau's accomplishments in the Winnipeg Free Press, March 13, 2005, as follows:

[Prime Minister Trudeau] modernized divorce and reformed the Criminal Code in 1967 by removing prohibitions against homosexuality and abortion, passed the Official Languages Act in 1969, and is the father of the 1982 Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms. ...

In an article in the Ottawa Citizen (April 17, 2003), Izzy Asper is quoted as stating that his museum must:

... tell the dirty stories very clearly. And that relates to women, that relates to gays ...

He goes on to say, however:

One is going to have to be very, very careful to prevent it from becoming a propaganda device for a particular political point of view.

Quite so.

The fact is that the museum is shaping up to be quite "a propaganda device". The museum will be used as a powerful tool to champion the left-wing interpretation of human rights, such as abortion rights, feminism, homosexual rights, with some legitimate exhibits sprinkled here and there to give the museum an appearance of legitimacy. Also, if abortion and gay rights activists find themselves in the Hall of Fame, for furthering such so-called human rights advancements as unrestricted abortion and same-sex marriage, then, by default, will those who defend human life from conception to natural death be relegated to the Hall of Shame, since they do not support all the "human rights" defined by liberals?

The museum is also intended to be used as a centre of learning for police, military, political personnel and, above all, children, to combat the "forces of hate and oppression" which include all those who do not support the humanist ideology.

Conservative Prime Minister Harper Backs the Museum

On April 20, 2007 Conservative Prime Minister Harper announced that this left-wing museum would be designated a "national" museum of Canada. He said that it would receive the \$100 million originally promised by the former Liberal government. He also said that the federal government would assume full responsibility for the museum's operating costs - possibly \$22 million a year once it is opened.

With this federal funding, the museum must be transformed into a project that will recognize human rights from other than one left wing political perspective.

The selfless dedication of those protecting the lives of the unborn child, year after year, or those defending the family and traditional marriage, or struggling to protect the rights of the aged and ill against euthanasia must not be

dismissed as "bigots" and "extremists," unworthy of "noble" liberal ideals. In short, this controversial museum must not entrench the dubious values of left-wing interests.

Please write to Prime Minister Harper and to your Conservative MPs to insist that the Board of the Museum and its Advisory Council be changed to reflect the views of all Canadians, and that the human rights exhibited in the museum be those basic human rights on which all Canadians agree.

Please write to:

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

Your MP

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

VANCOUVER'S HARMFUL DRUG INJECTION SITE

While in power, the Liberal government worked quietly to liberalize Canada's drug laws. It knew it had to move very carefully and discretely since the Liberals realized that these changes would not be acceptable to many Canadians.

The Liberals first move was to bring in legislation to liberalize the marijuana law to allow legal possession of up to 15 grams (approximately 20 tokes or joints). Fortunately this legislation died when the Conservatives formed the government after the January 2006 federal election.

Another initiative the Liberals undertook was to establish, in 2003, as a so-called "pilot project", a supervised drug injection site in Vancouver, the first in North America. At this site, addicts could shoot-up in a medically supervised setting run by the government. It was located in Vancouver's tawdry east side where drug dealers freely operate, where alcoholics and prostitutes circulate in abundance, and where assaults and theft, etc., are a regular occurrence.

The Vancouver drug injection site was licensed to operate on a trial basis for a three year period, at the end of which a decision would be made based on its "success" (a false assumption), as well as whether further such sites should be established in other cities across the country.

There was no way that the Vancouver drug injection site would not have been proclaimed a great success, since those supporting liberalized drug policies have already portrayed it as a success in newspaper articles, "studies", letters to the editor etc. This is because the real purpose of the site is to use it as a foothold for the further expansion of drug usage in Canada.

It is significant that demand for such a site did not come about through public pressure or grass roots communities. On the contrary, it was demanded by those who support wide access to drugs and who used it as a planned course of deliberate gradual infiltration to widen access to drugs.

A drug injection site is based on the highly controversial ideology called "harm reduction" which views drug use as not only inevitable, but as a lifestyle option, a pleasure to be pursued, even a human right. This understanding of drug usage, which regards drug use as a choice, and considers the government's role as only helping reduce the consequences of that choice, is based on the perspective that since individuals are going to use drugs anyway, why not enable them to do so in a safe medical environment? Harm reduction supporters have little or no interest in reducing the incidence of drug use or the recovery of the addict from the addiction. This was spelled out in a text,

written by one of Canada's leading harm reduction ideologists who stated:

... Although harm reduction is at odds with the dominant legal-sanction-based policy, the middle range and pragmatic nature of harm reduction measures makes it possible for certain harm reduction strategies to be tolerated, accepted, or even incorporated by legal authorities, without completely dismantling the counter-productive punitive policy. The support and cooperation of the police in needle-exchange programs for injection drug users is one of several examples of the diffusion of genuine harm reduction elements into the existing drug policy, enabling change to occur, and thereby bringing about gradual policy reforms.

That is, a harm-reduction initiative, including the Vancouver drug injection site, requires only an exception to the current drug laws but not an outright change in the laws. However, in order to expand and replicate these initiatives, such measures as drug injection sites ultimately require forms of drug legalization. Legalization and regulation of drugs are central and interwoven into the harm reduction ideology.

It was necessary, therefore, to promote a positive image of the injection site. Thus, sympathetic evaluators, who support open access to drugs, have overstated their positive findings of the site, downplayed or ignored negative findings, or reported meaningless findings in order to give the overall impression that the facility is successful.

The truth about the Vancouver injection site is that since it was established in 2003, there has been little or no reduction in transmission of blood borne diseases (AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases, Hepatitis C), no reduction in public disorder (crimes such as prostitution, break-in, drug dealing), nor has there been a reduction in overdose deaths in the Vancouver area. Moreover, there has been only very sporadic use of the facility by the addicts and little or no movement of the drug users to go into long-term treatment and recovery. In short, the supervised injection facility had led to higher drug use, crime, public disorder and homelessness and has done absolutely nothing to assist the addict, except to cause him/her to fall deeper into addiction.

Conservative Government Policy on Drug Use

The Conservative government apparently does not support using taxpayers' money to facilitate the continuing consumption of illegal substances by way of drug injection sites. This conclusion can be drawn from the March 2007 budget, which allotted \$64 million over two years for police enforcement, treatment of addicts, and drug prevention (education). This allotment was broken down as follows: \$22 million for law enforcement to crack down on marijuana growth operations and to catch and convict drug dealers; \$32 million for drug treatment programs, including money for research aimed at treating crystal methamphetamine addicts. Another \$10 million was allotted for a prevention campaign for young people and their parents. Significantly, no money was allotted for the harm reduction site in Vancouver or elsewhere.

Conservative Government's Specific Response to Vancouver Injection Site

In September 2006, Health Minister Tony Clement extended the license for the Vancouver site to continue in operation for another 18 months only - until December 2007. The Conservative government, therefore, has to make a final decision on the Vancouver site soon. In view of this pending decision, there are already newspaper articles, as well as alleged "scientific" papers (which they are not) promoting the supposed success of the Vancouver site. The pro drug legalization crowd (including Perry Kendall, British Columbia Provincial Health Officer) is pumping out its propaganda, claiming that harm reduction is the only positive response to drug addiction and that Canada's "war on drugs" has failed. The latter is patently false. The current data in Canada shows that use of cannabis by the Canadian public over age 15 is 14%. For all other illegal drugs, prevalence remains from 0.5 to 3%. These rates are very low compared to the 30% range for tobacco use and about 80% range for alcohol use. Clearly, our drug laws hold overall rates of illegal drug use at substantially lower levels than their legal counterparts. It also stands to reason that Canadians benefit from these lower rates of illegal substance use since they lower public health and social costs for the taxpayer.

Moreover, getting off drugs should be the first, not the last step for addicts. Sweden has accomplished significant success with drug use because it employs a programme of compulsory drug treatment for addicts. As a result, Sweden has among Europe's lowest crime, disease, medical and social problems stemming from drug addiction, according to the United Nations office of Drugs and Crime in its 2006 analysis. Canada would be well advised to examine the Swedish drug policy with a view of adapting it here, instead of accepting the false propaganda from the drug legalization movement.

As stated in an editorial in the National Post (May 9, 2007),

... safe injection sites (SIS) don't work. And they send the wrong message, too, promoting disrespect for the rule of law by having government facilitating the consumption of illegal substances.

Too bad most of the proof to back these positive claims come from SIS proponents or the academics who devise harm-reduction theories. Police here, and in Europe (where they have lots of experience with SISs) tell a very different tale.

Currently there are more than three dozen major European cities on record against SISs. Most have had such facilities and closed them because they found that drug problems increased, not decreased.

After an injection site was opened in Rotterdam in the early 1990s, the municipal council reported a doubling of the number of 15- to 19-year-olds addicted to heroine or cocaine. Over the 1990s, the Dutch Criminal Intelligence Service reported a 25% increase in drug-related gun murders and robberies in neighbourhoods housing one of that country's 50 official methadone clinics or addict shelters. Zurich closed its infamous needle park in 1992, after the police and citizenry became fed up with public urination and defecation, prostitution, open sex, panhandling, drug peddling, loud fights and violent crimes.

... drug consumption is the wrong business for government to be in. A government that funds safe havens for injecting illegal drugs on one hand will quickly find it is working against its efforts to reduce drug dealing on the other...

Please write immediately to Prime Minister Stephen Harper and to Minister of Health, Tony Clement and to your MP, requesting that Vancouver's drug injection site permanently shut down and that Canada's drug policy provide only enforcement, prevention and treatment. It is the only effective way of dealing with drug addiction and genuinely helping the individual addicts who need our care and compassion, not encouragement to continue their addiction.

The addresses of the above are as follows:

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper
Office of the Prime Minister
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0A2
Fax: (613) 941-6900

The Honourable Tony Clement
Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic
Development Initiative for Northern Ontario
House of Commons
Ottawa ON K1A 0A6
Fax: (613) 992-5092

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

Erickson PG., Riley DM., Cheung YW, O'Hare P.A. (Eds), Harm Reduction: A New Direction for Drug Policies and Programs. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

British Columbia Provincial Health Officer. Perry Kendall (British Columbia's provincial Health Officer) Responds to INCB's Assertion that Supervised Injection Facilities Are in Breach of International Drug Control Treaties. May 3, 2007

(Supra)

Mangham C. A Critique of Canada's INSITE Injection Site and its Parent Philosophy: Implications and Recommendations for Policy Planning
Journal of Global Drug Policy and Practice, 1, (2), 2007.

Canadian Centre of Substance Abuse. A National Survey of Alcohol and Other Drugs: Prevalence and Related Harms, 2006, Ottawa.

Health Canada, Tobacco Use Monitoring Survey, Ottawa.

United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime, Sweden's Successful Drug Policy: A Review of the Evidence, 2006, Geneva ODC

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

REAL Women's National Board met in Ottawa for 3 busy days in the middle of June. During this meeting we laid out our plans for the year 2007 - 2008. Included in our plans was the preparation of pamphlets on several of the current problems undermining Canadian society. These include pamphlets on the issue of prostitution, use of drugs for non-medical purposes, and on the judiciary. We decided that pamphlets were a good method of distributing the facts about these issues in a succinct manner, as many people do not have the time to read entire articles. These pamphlets will, hopefully, be made available by the fall.

At our board meeting we also made detailed plans for our 25th anniversary celebration, which will take place in Ottawa on Saturday, May 10th, 2008. Board members are now in the process of booking a place as well as contacting our illustrious speakers, who we think will be a very big drawing card for the event. Once we get confirmations from the speakers, we will let you know who they are. In the meantime, don't forget to mark May 10, 2008 on your calendar for a great event!

Another of our decisions at the board meeting was to change REAL Women's motto which we have had since the organization began in 1983. The motto, "Women's Rights Not at the Expense of Human Rights," tended to be somewhat obscure in its meaning. We now agreed to change the motto of REAL Women of Canada to a simpler, more direct motto which is, "Women Building a Better Society." Nothing could be clearer than that!

At the end of our board meeting we held our Annual General Meeting, at which Senator Anne Cools was our guest speaker. As always, she presented us with thoughtful insights into the current legal and political situation in Canada. Our thanks to Senator Cools for taking the time to share with us at our meeting, her well thought-out views.

Our Board meeting left us all excited and enthusiastic to carry on with our work in our next busy year. We are ready for anything!

Until next time,
Laurie

PARLIAMENT IS STALLED

The three opposition parties in the House of Commons are deathly afraid of a federal election. The NDP, for example, is nervous that the Green Party is encroaching on its support. Never higher in the polls in the past few years than 18%, the NDP's support has fallen as low as 13% in the past few months with the Green Party picking up the difference. The Bloc Québécois (BQ) was devastated by the Quebec provincial election in March when its provincial counterpart, the Parti Québécois (PQ) fell to third place while the Conservative Action Démocratique du Québec ran a close second to the minority provincial Liberals. This raised considerable doubts about the future of a sovereignty issue in Quebec and hence the future of the BQ. The Liberals, on the other hand, are still reeling from the 2006 election when they lost power to the Conservatives. Their leader, Stéphane Dion, has not won over the hearts and minds of Canadians, especially those in Ontario and in the western provinces where voter support is essential for an election victory. Canadians generally are not impressed by Mr. Dion's lack of English skills as well as his practice of never responding to questions in neat sound bites, but instead ponderously responding in complicated paragraphs as though addressing a university class. Mr. Dion, in short, has not, to date, been a success as Liberal leader.

Therefore, in order to avoid a surprise election, the opposition parties, have been scrupulously careful to pass the government's bills if their defeat could lead to the dissolution of Parliament and a new election. Consequently, the Conservatives' Accountability Act and its budget (March 2007) have been grudgingly passed into law with either one or the other of the opposition parties backing the government, not out of belief, but out of pure necessity.

The opposition parties, however, all together outnumber the Conservative in the House of Commons, in the Senate and on all the Committees. Consequently, the opposition parties are now gleefully passing private member's bills into law in a number of areas on which the Conservatives are diametrically opposed.

For example:

Liberal MP Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Quebec) introduced a bill on the environment ordering the government to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 35%. This objective is one which even Liberal leader Stéphane Dion, in his previous life as the Liberal Minister of the Environment, conceded could not be achieved. This bill has been passed by both the House of Commons and the Senate.

NDP MP Denise Savoie (Victoria) introduced a Bill (C-303) to establish a national day care plan in Canada. This bill masquerades as only a bill to fund "early child education" and "early learning and child care program," but, in effect, is the old Liberal child care plan resurrected. The bill will have 3rd and final reading in the House of Commons in September when Parliament resumes sitting after the summer recess. It will undoubtedly pass with the united support of the NDP, Liberal, and BQ.

Senate Blocking Legislation

The majority Liberal Senators are having a high old time refusing to pass any bills that are not to their choosing. For example:

- The majority of Liberal Senators shelved the government's legislation to restrict a Senator's term of office to eight-years instead of the current 75 years of age.

- The Conservative Bill C-22 to raise the age of consent for sexual activity from 14 years to 16 years (if it were up to REAL Women, we would have had it raised to 18 years!) still is before the House of Commons for 3rd and final vote, after which it will be sent up to the Senate. It is expected the bill will have a difficult time in the Senate where it will come under fresh attack because it does not lower the age of consent for anal sex now set at 18 years of age.

- A troublesome private member's bill (S-207), which prohibits parents from spanking their children, was introduced into the Senate by Liberal Senator Celine Hervieux-Payette back on April 5, 2006. The bill received second reading in

the Senate on December 14, 2006 and provides that section 43 of the Criminal Code which now permits the spanking of children providing it is reasonable under the circumstance, be removed from the Criminal Code. Parental authority in regard to raising their children has been a major concern for REAL Women and we have intervened in three different court trials when S.43 of the Code was being legally challenged. In all of these court challenges, the courts have upheld our arguments that parents should be permitted to spank their children if it is reasonable. There is, of course, a large difference between the spanking of a child by a loving parent and child abuse, which difference the courts clearly understood. The Supreme Court handed down its decision on this issue on December 16, 1998 and we had hoped that this matter would be finally settled then. It seems, however, that those in the Senate, who believe that the State and not the parents should determine the methods for raising of the children are doing their utmost to navigate around the court decisions by bringing Bill C-207 forward. The bill will receive third and final reading in the Senate in the fall. This bill is in keeping with a Senate report last April by the Senate Standing Committee on Human Rights, which also recommended that the spanking of children be abolished.

There are also many flagship criminal justice initiatives of the Conservative government left unfinished when Parliament recessed for the summer on June 22nd. They will continue their rocky journey through the Senate when Parliament resumes sitting on September 18.

All in all, Parliament seems to be stalled with the Opposition parties using their united voting power to prevent the Conservatives from getting legislation passed and also initiating their own liberal agenda.

It is quite a mess! The Senate, by the way, consists of 62 Liberals, 22 Conservatives, 3 Progressive Conservatives, 1 NDP, 5 Independents and with 12 vacancies making a total of 105 seats.

Senators, of course, represent no one in Parliament but themselves, in that they have no constituency and were appointed to their positions only because they contributed to their political party - either by services rendered or for their generous financial contributions to the party. The basic salary for a Senator is \$125,800 annually. The purpose of the Senate is supposed to be to serve as a chamber of sober second thought. Instead, it has become the legacy of one-party rule, a permanent Liberal establishment that seeks to frustrate a Conservative government at every turn, by pushing the limits of what is democratically tolerable.

What to do about it? Short of opening that can of worms known as a constitutional amendment, it seems that a minority Conservative government will continue to swim in shark infested waters.

WORLD CONGRESS OF FAMILIES IV DEFIES THE ANTI-FAMILY EUROPEAN UNION

The World Congress of Families IV, held in Warsaw, Poland, May 11 - 13, 2007, defied the European Union (EU), which insists that Europe implement, as its state religion, an atheistic and nihilistic philosophy.

That is, the Congress was extremely important because it defied the edicts of the EU and instead, the 3,300 delegates discussed issues from a pro-family perspective. These issues included abortion, homosexuality, same-sex marriage, population decline, pornography, the importance of marriage, and the impact of the news and entertainment industry on the family, etc.

This approach by the Congress differed markedly from the EU's pro-homosexual/abortion and anti-family policies administered by the 5,000 EU bureaucrats operating from Brussels, through the European Court, the European Human Rights Council, and the European Parliament, regardless of the views of its member nations. This EU coup is taking place, despite the fact that the Treaty of Rome, which first established the EU in the late 1950's, specifically provided that member states of the EU were to retain the right of sovereignty over their own domestic affairs. Instead, the EU is operating like a totalitarian government demanding obedience to its policies.

It was a hectic three days in Warsaw for the delegates from 64 countries, many of whom came from Eastern Europe. The latter, who experienced trauma under a Communist dictatorship which lasted from the end of World War II to 1989, are determined to retain their independence from a dictatorship. Delegates from Latvia, Slovakia, Estonia, the Czech Republic, and the Ukraine, and, of course, Poland expressed concerns about the attacks on the family by the EU. Their presence at the Congress served notice of their independence from the growing totalitarianism of the EU. These East European countries, having lived under Communism for so many years, knew from experience how important the family is to a stable society. This is because the family teaches the hard truths of moral values. It forms the child's character and gives the young the ability to grow up to become independent, stable, functioning, and compassionate individuals, and to be dependable and loyal workers, or independent, forward-looking entrepreneurs. Such individuals are also much more difficult to control. As a result, such individuals and their families tend to be regarded as a threat to totalitarian governments.

Consequently, it is not surprising that every totalitarian movement has tried to destroy the family unit. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wanted the independent family destroyed, as did Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin. They believed the family was a dangerous threat to the power of the State and, therefore, undertook to take away the rights, responsibilities and authority of the family.

The family unit, built on the foundation of marriage between a man and a woman, is regarded as dangerous by the totalitarian state because the family, while raising its children, passes on tradition, culture and faith - all of which confront the state when it wishes to impose its own will on the public. For example, Soviet leaders in 1917 regarded the family as a hindrance to structuring the new socialist regime and regarded the family as the prime source of potential opposition. The Soviets, therefore, worked toward the disintegration of the family by transferring the care, education and maintenance of children from the family unit to state run child care centres, entirely under the control of the regime. This effectively ended the family's socialization functions in Soviet society.

American sociologist, Christopher Lasch, described the family as "a haven in a heartless world" , since it is the only institution which provides children with a love that is centered on them. All other institutions, including schools and the day care centres, are intentionally designed to be impartial. But, in order for children's personalities to develop in a healthy manner, it is necessary that someone care intensely for them: so intensely as to give them priority over all other children. It is within the family unit that both this kind of intense caring usually takes place and strong independent characteristics are encouraged. It is because of these factors that dictators seek to destroy the family unit by removing children from its care and responsibility.

Mikhail Gorbachev, in his book *Perestroika: New Thinking for our Country and the World* (1988) acknowledged that the dysfunction in Soviet society, as evidenced by pervasive alcoholism, high divorce and abortion rates, and very low birth rates etc. might well have been caused by the separation of young children from their mothers.

EU's Alarm at Poland

Although Poland has been a part of the EU since 2004, it is determined, as are some other East European nations, to set its own course. For example, while Christianity is in steep decline across most of Europe, Poland's Catholic faith burns brightly: its churches are overflowing. On Sundays, the masses have to be broadcast outside the church for those unable to obtain a seat inside. Worshippers kneel down devotedly in rows on the sidewalk outside the church to follow the mass being said inside the church. Because of its faith, Poland has embarked on a cultural war with the EU. The President, Lech Kaczynski, and Prime Minister of Poland, Jaroslaw Kaczynski (identical twins born 45 minutes apart), are outspoken in their rejection of same-sex marriage, homosexuality and abortion, which the EU describes as "crucial European Values."

At the World Congress of Families, the Minister of Education and Vice Prime Minister of Poland, Roman Giertych, and the Speaker of Parliament, (Sejm) Marek Jurek, both stated that Poland had no intention of agreeing to the demands of the EU. Moreover, in March 2007, Mr. Giertych told European news reporters that Poland would not back down on plans to oppose abortion and homosexuality should they be enshrined in any future European constitution. Giertych

called abortion "a new form of barbarism," and warned of the impending demise of Christian-based culture in Europe when he said,

A nation which kills its children is a nation without a future. A continent which kills its children will be settled by people who do not kill theirs.

Giertych then called for a serious discussion of the Christian foundation of morality that has sustained Europe over the centuries - a discussion denied by the movers and shakers at the EU.

Poland Further Enrages EU

Poland further enraged the European power brokers by recently entering into an independent agreement with the U.S., similar to the agreement also made by the Czech Republic, to establish an anti-missile defence base on its territory. Two other European Union countries Bulgaria and Romania have also expressed interest in allowing anti-missile bases on their territory. The growling and ever difficult Russian bear, President Vladimir Putin, is situated on one of Poland's borders. Russia is flush with oil and gas profits and is threatening to turn its cruise and ballistic missiles in the direction of Western Europe, in retaliation for the agreement by its former satellites to allow the U.S. to place the anti-missiles base on their soil. On another border, a revitalized and dominant Germany is also a problem, as well as Iran's build up of nuclear weapons. Poland, therefore, has good reason to protect itself by its agreement with the U.S. However, the EU believes that it will become a superpower equal to that of the U.S., and, therefore, is upset that Poland has gravitated independently to the U.S. Poland also thumbed its nose at EU policy when it supported the U.S. and NATO in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, to the rage of the EU bureaucrats. The latter believe that the EU should speak and act for all of Europe and that its member nations should assume a subservient role in foreign affairs.

EU Flexes Its Muscles Against Poland

In order to intimidate Poland, the EU has flexed its muscles. In a 6-1 decision in March, the European Court of Human Rights ordered Poland to pay 25,000 Euros (approximately \$35,587.00 Cdn.) to a Polish woman who claimed her rights were violated when she was denied an abortion. The Council cited Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which provides for a person's "right to respect in private life." But, in fact, Article 8 of the Convention does not even mention pregnancy or abortion, the European court created this so-called "right" to abortion out of thin air.

In June 2006, the Polish Minister of Education Giertych banned the distribution of an EU manual on human rights education which, among other provisions, equated homosexual relations with heterosexual marriage. He also dismissed the Director of Polish In-Service Teachers for publishing and distributing this controversial manual. The Council of Europe blasted the Minister and Poland for this rejection of "European Values" and has now threatened retaliation by cutting off Poland's EU subsidies.

How long Poland, along with other East European countries, can stand up to the powerful European Union is the question. The World Congress of Families, held in Warsaw in May, was a tremendous show of support for these brave countries. The Congress strongly indicated to these countries that they were not alone in their struggle for traditional family values and independence.

Lasch, Christopher, (1995) "Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged", W.W. Norton & Co. Inc., New York
Gorbachev, Mikhail, Perestroika: "New Thinking for Our Country and the World", 1988 ISBN: 0006373569

REAL WOMEN'S BOOTH AT THE WOLD CONGRESS OF FAMILIES IV WARSAW, POLAND MAY, 2007

By Doris Davarsi, President, British Columbia Chapter, REAL Women of Canada

REAL Women was one of the sponsors of the World Congress of Families IV held in Warsaw on May 11-13, 2007. As a result, we were allotted space to set up a booth during the Congress. My husband and I had planned to attend the

Congress, so we agreed to look after REAL Women's table.

On our arrival in Warsaw, we immediately went to the Palace of Culture and Science to set up the REAL Women's booth. I was full of energy and also had the able help of my husband, a REAL man, in organizing the booth. We were so early, that there was a crew hammering away, still setting up other booths. Our booth, however, was ready for us and we proudly set out our material and hung up our REAL Women of Canada banner. We were ready for action!

Friday morning I was at my booth early, ready to go. People began to stroll through the exhibitors' area. A mix of languages could be heard, young and not so young mingling, laughing, chatting, and admiring the material displayed. The atmosphere was uplifting and encouraging. What a wonder to behold, thousands of people gathering from all over the world and all of us with the same concerns. It is exhilarating to know that there are so many who share the values which are so often disparaged in Canada. However, here we were in the midst of a gathering from all around the globe and it was an incredible feeling to be able to participate and be part of this great event.

When people walked by I would call out a hearty "dzien dobry" (good morning in Polish which took me a while to figure out how to pronounce). If no answer was forthcoming, I would then move to Good Morning, Guten Morgen, Bonjour, and at that, my good mornings ran out. Usually, by that time, the person would chuckle and come over. The first thing everyone would usually ask was what REAL stood for. Then I had to explain who we were and what our mandate was. Often men took one look at our banner and then moved to other booths. I didn't let them get away that easily, though, and would call out to them to come back. I always had to explain that we were a women's organization but we like men and we work with them and are in no way against them. Some people stopped at our booth, however, because they thought the name was intriguing. There was occasionally someone who would walk up to me with the finger wagging, tsk, tsking and saying, "You Canadians, are you all nuts up there?" They were all good-hearted scoldings and I assured them that REAL Women was not part of the nutty decisions but that we were fighting them fiercely. People from Eastern Europe had little knowledge of what was happening in Canada and when I explained to them some of the issues that we had been involved in, the last one the three-parent case, they were absolutely horrified.

Many people spoke English but I also had the opportunity to chat both in German and French, which I speak. With some people the conversation was conducted in a mix of languages and the use of hands, which was challenging but also lots of fun. Of course, the first question was always "Who or what is REAL Women?"

Many Polish people did not speak English and this made things very difficult. However, I was rescued by a young Polish woman who came to the REAL Women booth on the Friday morning, introducing herself as Joanna Pyzel. She is an architect and she was so interested in REAL Women that she stayed with me for a long time. She grabbed every Polish speaking person and explained to him or her about REAL Women and had them sign the Petition of the Citizens of the World to the Canadian government opposing legalization of same-sex marriage. Joanna managed to have everyone sign the Petition and several people took extra copies to have their friends and families sign. Joanna came back again in the afternoon, continuing to explain to people about REAL Women and asking them to sign the Petition. Joanna spent so much time at our booth that I finally declared her an honorary member of REAL Women! She eventually took several copies of the Petition and she is still collecting signatures to this day.

One young woman came by our booth on Saturday afternoon. She was with the Polish YWCA and wanted to know all about REAL Women. Considering that we are a women's organization she felt we would have much in common. I had to inquire cautiously into the Polish YWCA philosophy and then explained to her that the Canadian version was anything but Christian. She assured me that in Poland the YWCA still functioned according to its Christian roots. I was delighted to hear that.

Throughout the days at the Congress, I switched between attending sessions and manning (oops, womaning) the booth, meeting a wide variety of individuals, from priests to lawyers, from homemakers to politicians to executive directors of pro-family organizations. I also met journalists, who were extremely interested in the work REAL Women is doing and asked to be kept informed. The material in my suitcase was gone very quickly, as were the pens with the

REAL Women logo.

REAL Women's reaching out beyond the borders of Canada and participating at the World Congress was not only a great experience but also highly beneficial as we have made and sustained contacts all over the world. We can achieve so much more when we work with others all around the world and an event such as this Congress is one venue that helps us connect with others.

I hope I will see many of you at the next World Congress of Families. The location and date is to be determined later. So far, proposals have been received from Latvia, Ireland, France and Mexico to hold the Congress in their countries. We hope you will be on the look-out for REAL Women's booth as we will be sure to be there!

HOMOSEXUAL MYTHS

The secular media in Canada have their own agenda. They promote their favourite issues, never worrying too much whether the "facts" presented supporting their arguments are accurate. It is enough for the media that the "facts" are persuasive and that the frequent re-telling of them results in their becoming unimpeachable information. Goebbels would be proud. It is in the contentious issues of homosexuality that this strategy is most apparent.

1. Incidence of Homosexuality in the Population

The claim that 10% of the population is homosexual has been central to the homosexual activists' effort to legitimize their lifestyle. This 10% figure is unblushingly and routinely repeated by the secular media. The latter should be thoroughly ashamed of themselves for doing so. According to the 2003 Canadian census, the incidence of homosexuality amounted to a modest, approximate 1% of the population. This low statistic in Canada is similar to other statistics around the world indicating that 1 - 3% only are homosexual.

The mythical 10% figure was derived from the 1948 and 1953 Kinsey Reports. Dr. Kinsey was an Indiana University zoologist who openly espoused unconventional, unorthodox and even illegal sexual behaviour, including sex between adults and children and between humans and animals. His "research" has been entirely discredited - but the myth he created lives on, thanks, mainly, to the media.

2. The Link Between Homosexuality and Pedophilia

Homosexual activists loudly proclaim that there is far more pedophilia among heterosexuals than among homosexuals. This is not true. Nothing can change the carefully documented studies on this issue that show that the incidence of pedophilia is much more prevalent among homosexuals. Because they cannot refute this clear evidence, homosexual lobbyists attempt to discredit those who raise the high incidence of pedophilia among homosexuals by attacking them as "homophobes" and "gay-bashers". These taunts, however, cannot change the facts, which damage the homosexuals' carefully crafted (and deceitful) public image.

It is well known and logical that pedophiles purposefully seek employment that will bring them into proximity with the greatest number of children possible. The most "promising" jobs of this nature include clergymen working in youth ministry, Boy Scout leaders and school teachers.

This is primarily why homosexual teachers have been involved in more than 80% of all recorded cases of teacher/pupil sex. And it may also explain why homosexuals are trying so hard to force the Boy Scouts of America to accept homosexuals as leaders. For homosexual child molesters, recognition by the Boy Scouts would provide more ready access to children they can abuse, but would also serve as social recognition and approval for their homosexual acts. This cannot be allowed to happen.

3. Homosexuality Can be Changed

One of the more controversial claims by homosexuals is that they cannot change their orientation because they are born that way, ie. that homosexuality is biologically determined. There is little support for this in science.

Dr. Lisa Diamond, whose study was reported in the Monitor on Psychology in 2000, concluded that "sexual identity is far from fixed in women who aren't exclusively heterosexual";

Dr. Kenneth Zucker, in the careful analysis of the innate/immutable argument of homosexuals, concluded that "sexual orientation is more fluid than fixed";

Dr. Warren Throckmorton, has noted that sexual orientation, once thought to be an unchanging trait, is actually quite flexible for some people;

Dr. Robert Spitzer, who was an active supporter of gay activism and played a pivotal role in 1973 in removing homosexuality from the psychiatric manual of mental disorders, now challenges the assumption that homosexual orientation can never be changed.

4. Homosexuals Have Not Taken Advantage of the Legalization of Their Relationships

In their attempt to smash centuries of tradition, which has recognized in law only the relationships between a man and a woman, homosexual activists have strenuously argued that the legal recognition of their partnerships would benefit not only themselves, by stabilizing their relationships, but society as well. It turns out that this argument was pure malarkey. Instead of stabilizing their relationships by legalization, all that has been achieved is to destabilize society by the undermining of traditional marriage in those countries that were unfortunate to have been blindsided by homosexual pressure.

The trend to undermine traditional marriage is evident in the Netherlands, which has allowed homosexual couples to register their partnerships since 1997 and has legalized same-sex marriages since 2000. Statistics there now show that the out-of-wedlock birthrate has increased by an average of 2% a year - more than in any other country in Western Europe. The number of marriages there is also declining faster than in any other country in Western Europe.

Rate of Legalized Homosexual Unions

It appears that few homosexuals have actually availed themselves of the revolutionary right to have their partnerships legalized. This was disclosed in a recent study by a team of Swedish and Norwegian scholars who analyzed data collected in their respective countries. Both these countries enacted laws granting homosexuals the legal right to register their partnerships, which gave them a civil status (1993 in Norway and 1995 in Sweden). Although these countries did not actually grant legal marriage to homosexual partners, the researchers concluded that, in practice, the rights granted homosexuals did not deviate much from the concept of marriage in any substantial way.

The researchers calculated that there was a ratio of around seven same-sex legal registrations to every 1000 opposite-sex marriage in Norway, and a ratio of five new partnerships to every 1000 opposite-sex marriages in Sweden. The researchers also found that not only was the legalization of same-sex unions relatively rare in comparison to heterosexual marriages, but also that their legalized partnerships were remarkably fragile and of short duration. According to this study, the divorce risk for same-sex partnerships of men is 50% higher than the corresponding risk for heterosexual marriages. Such a finding - that homosexual couples have a propensity to quickly break apart - should not be surprising since it has long been established that promiscuity is inherent in homosexual behaviour and that, on average, their relationships even with legalization, last only, on average, 2 to 3½ years. That is, legalizing same-sex relationships has benefited very few couples and a high proportion of them, who legalize their unions, are soon separated.

Significantly, the researchers in the Swedish and Norwegian studies emphasized that their findings went well beyond their two countries, in that:

Many of the demographic characteristics of our Scandinavian couples resemble those found for other populations of same-sex couples, such as same-sex co-residents in the United States.

Incidence of Same-Sex Marriages in Canada

In 2003, the British Columbia and Ontario courts legalized same-sex marriage. There is only data available at this time from British Columbia because Ontario's marriage registration forms do not contain information identifying whether the marriage is same-sex or opposite-sex.

According to a Statistics Canada report, released on January 17, 2007, 775 same-sex marriages took place in British Columbia in 2003, and 55% of the couples who entered into these same-sex marriages were not residents of Canada. This means that there were only 319 same-sex marriages performed in British Columbia in 2003 by Canadian residents. We do not know yet how many of these 319 couples are still together today, but judging from the other studies, their numbers are not likely to be high.

Although there are no records kept on the number of same-sex marriages performed in the entire province of Ontario, the City of Toronto (which is the home of the largest concentration of homosexuals in Canada) has recently released some eye-opening statistics on the number of same-sex marriages performed in Toronto.

2006 - A total of 924 licenses to same-sex couples was issued. Of these, 338 were for American same-sex couples and 479 for other nationalities. There were only 107 licenses issued to Canadian same-sex couples.

2007 - Thus far this year (six months) there were a total of 320 same-sex marriage licenses issued by the City of Toronto. Of these, 118 licenses were issued to American same-sex couples, 201 were issued to those of other nationalities and one license was granted to a Canadian same-sex couple.

It would appear that same-sex marriage has not been for the benefit of Canadian same-sex couples, but rather for foreign same-sex couples to allow them to "marry" here and then use their so-called marriage for the purposes of a legal challenge in their own legal system. So far, foreign same-sex couples married in Canada have brought legal challenges in Israel, Ireland, UK, New York State and New Jersey.

REAL Women was right to have sent out the message to the world citizens apologizing for permitting same-sex marriages here (See Reality, May/June 2007, p. 15).

There is much harm being caused by same-sex marriage, yet the media blindly promote it as a human rights issue - as if.

Blanchard, Ray et al, "Fraternal Birth Order and Sexual Orientation in Pedophiles." Archives of Sexual Behaviour, Volume 29, Number 5 (2000), pages 463 to 478.

Kurt Freund, Robin Watson and Douglas Rienzo. "Heterosexuality, Homosexuality, and Erotic Age Preference." Journal of Sex Research, February 1989 [Volume 26, Number 1], pages 107-117.

Erickson, W.E. et al, "Behavior Patterns of Child Molesters". 17 Archives of Sexual Behavior 77, 83 (1988)

Ibid

Dressler J. "Gay Teachers: A Disesteemed Minority in an Overly Esteemed Profession". Rutgers/Camden Law Journal, 1978, 9(3), pp 399-445.

Diamond, L.M. (2000). Sexual Identity, attractions, and behavior among young sexual minority women over a 2 year period. Developmental Psychology, 36(2), pp. 241-250.

Zucker, K.J. (2003). The politics and science of reparative therapy. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 32, pp. 399-400.

Throckmorton, W. Initial Empirical and Clinical Findings Concerning the Change Process for Ex-Gays. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, June 2002.

Spitzer, Robert L. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, Vol. 32, No. 5, October 2003, pp. 403-417.

Kurtz, Stanley, *Dutch Debate*, July 21, 2004, www.nationalreview.com/script/printpage.p?ref=/kurtz/kurtz200407210936.asp,

Standing Out, February 23, 2006, www.nationalreview.com/kurtz/kurtz200602230800.asp

Andersson, Gunnar, et al., *The Demographics of Same-Sex Marriage in Norway and Sweden*, *Demography* 43 [2006]: 79-98.

McWhirter, David and Mattison, Andrew. *The Male Couple: How Relationships Develop*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1984, pp.

252, 253; Michael, Robert T. et al., *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey*, Boston: Little, Brown & Company, (1984), Bell, A.P.

Weinberg, M.S., *Homosexuality: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1978, pp. 308-309;

see also Bell, A.P. and Weinberg, N.S. and Hammersmith, S.K., *Sexual Preference*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981, Van

de Ven, Paul et al.,

A Comparative Demographic and Sexual Profile of Older Homosexually Active Men, *Journal of Sex Research* 34 (1997): 354.