

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN – A MONEY GRABBER

When the Status of Women Minister, Josée Verner, appeared before the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women on February 5, 2008, she stated, “Violence against women and girls is a major concern for Canadians. It is, therefore, a key priority for the Status of Women”. It certainly is for the Status of Women! Of the 60 projects approved by that agency, since October 2007, 34 were designed for violence against women projects. In addition:

\$7 million per year has been set aside for the Family Violence Initiative. This fund is co-ordinated by the federal Public Health Agency under Health Canada. It promotes public awareness of the risk factors of family violence and works with 12 different federal government departments and agencies to work against family violence. It also serves as a clearinghouse on family violence.

\$56 million has been allocated for prevention of violence programs on the reserves; and

\$179,000 has been given to a Quebec based feminist organization, AFEAS (Association for female education and social action) in order to counter violence against women. AFEAS has 300 groups across Quebec, which promote “social egalitarian feminism” designed to provide women with an “independent identity, equal status and freedom of choice.” In September 2007, AFEAS undertook a petition to overthrow the federal government’s decision to change the mandate, and cut budgets and the offices of Status of Women Canada.

Violence Against Women – A Sure Winner

Feminists have found that violence against women is a sure winner. Who can refuse them their sad claims of innocent women victims being brutalized by nasty men while their children look on in shock, horror and bewilderment? It is a terrible picture but one that is not necessarily accurate. Such situations do exist and society should do everything it can to stop abuse of women, but it is only a small part of domestic violence. Feminists persistently ignore the true facts about domestic violence – it is a two-way street with women being as responsible for it as men. Instead, feminists have erroneously insisted for over 30 years that it is women, and only women, who are victims of family violence. In doing so, they have suppressed research and any dialogue that could be perceived as having the potential to undermine their fictitious concept of domestic violence.

Government Funds Pour In

This suppression of the truth has been necessary in order to keep government funds pouring in to pay for women’s shelters (there are approximately 600 such shelters in Canada), rape relief centres, and special projects to protect women and children from abusive partners. In short, it was and is a sure fire method to obtain government funding and to ensure agitation against men, on the basis that it is only men who are abusers. Money is not being distributed to men’s groups or for male shelters in order to protect them from their female abusers. In short, funding for violence against women is a lucrative never-ending source of funds for feminists and there is no way they will allow this windfall to be cut off without a terrific battle.

The Story Behind Domestic Violence

A great deal of research has been conducted on domestic violence: this research is very enlightening and tells quite a story – a story rarely exposed to the public view.

A leading authority on domestic violence is Professor Murray Straus, professor of Sociology and Co-Director of Family Research Laboratory at the University of New Hampshire. In the mid-seventies, Dr. Straus and his colleagues made the disturbing discovery that women physically assault their partners in marital, cohabiting, and dating relationships as often as men assault their partners. This finding caused Dr. Straus and his colleagues to be excommunicated by feminists, whose work they believed was no longer trustworthy. Thirty years following the controversy, the overwhelming accumulation of evidence, from more than one hundred studies, continues to show approximately equal assault ratios between men and women. Also, the explosion of marital and family therapy has brought clinical psychologists face-to-face with the assaults by both parties, as compared to biased data provided by shelters for battered women, claiming that only men were abusers. Notwithstanding these developments, the “women only as victim” theory has persisted, mainly, according to Dr. Straus due to the efforts of feminists to conceal, deny and distort the evidence. Feminists, he claims, have carried out this concealment by:

- suppressing the evidence by researchers whose conclusions are contrary to their views;
- avoiding the obtaining of any data inconsistent with their male dominance theory. This is done by asking female participants in studies about attacks by their male partners and avoiding asking them if they ever physically retaliate against their male partners;
- citing only studies that show male perpetration of domestic violence;
- deliberately misinterpreting the results of studies which are contrary to their own views;
- creating “evidence” by citation, that is, by frequently citing previous publications that lack proper evidence, in order to “validate” the questionable evidence in these studies to support male only violence;
- obstructing the publication of articles with conclusions unacceptable to them and refusing to fund research that might contradict the view that male dominance is the cause of domestic violence;
- harassing, threatening and penalizing researchers who produce evidence that contradicts feminist dogma, as experienced by Professor Straus and his colleagues;

The above have created a climate of fear that has restricted research and the publication of the truth about domestic violence for the past 30 years.

Women Equally Instigate Domestic Violence

Objective family conflict studies, without exception, show about equal rates of assault by men and women. Most of these assaults are minor, such as pushing, shoving, slapping and throwing things. If these are initiated by the wife, however, this poses a risk of escalation to more dangerous assaults by the husband. It has also been established that men and women are instigators of family violence at the same rate.

In seeming contradiction, however, police records show that males are the perpetrators 80% to 90% of the time. This is because police statistics reflect only the cases in which the police become involved e.g., when there is an injury or threat of one. Because assaults by males are more likely to result in an injury, police are much more likely to be involved in male perpetrated assaults. Misleadingly, this excludes at least 90% of the cases of partner assault.

There are several other significant points about domestic violence:

- studies show that women are more likely to be seriously injured in domestic disputes, because men, generally, are physically stronger and are therefore capable of inflicting more harm,
- according to a 1993 Statistics Canada Survey on violence against women, there is more than four times as much assault (9%) experienced by women in common law relationships as experienced by legally married women (2%);

It is also interesting that domestic violence occurs more frequently in lesbian than in heterosexual relationships, supporting the view that relationship dynamics, not gender, rule domestic violence. This finding was confirmed by a Statistics Canada 2006 study in violence against women, released in October, 2006, which stated:

Spousal violence was twice as common among homosexual couples compared with heterosexual couples. Fifteen percent of gay and lesbian partnerships experienced violence.

Statistics Canada 2005 and also 2006 reported that 7% of Canadian women (654,000) and 6% of Canadian men (646,000) reported being the victim of spousal violence at least once in the previous five years.

The Ongoing Canadian Myth of Male-Only Violence

The 1993 Statistics Canada Survey, costing \$1.9 million, referred to above, according to researcher Professor Lupri, Professor of Sociology, University of Calgary, was funded by six federal governmental departments. A pivotal role was played by the Status of Women in this survey. The questionnaire used was the result of endless consultations with feminists, who were considered the prime “stake-holders” on the issue. It was, needless to say, a single gender national survey of females which neglected to ask them whether they themselves were ever responsible for physical or psychological violence against their male partners.

In his paper, Professor Lupri, also cites examples of the resistance to both funding and publishing research on the issue of female violence in Canada. He describes his frustrating experience with the Family Violence Prevention Centre of Health Canada (which receives \$7 million, as noted above). This government agency accepted only a “watered down” version of his original paper and insisted on deleting several very crucial sections. This occurred after several years of negotiations by the author with that agency to accept his paper.

This stonewalling and suppression of evidence points out the resistance of this government agency to acknowledge and accept the fact that violence against men is as serious a social problem as is violence against women. It also explains why in 2007, the agency funded the anti-male publication, “How Violence Against a Mother Shapes Children as They Grow” by Alison Cunningham and Linda Baker, who are responsible for other such anti-male “research” funded by the Public Health Agency of Canada. Dr. Murray Straus also mentions in one of his research papers that:

The Chairperson of the 1993 Canadian Commission on Violence Against Women stated at two hearings held by the Commission that nothing that Straus publishes can be believed because he is a wife-beater and sexually exploits students.

There was no factual basis for such an assertion.

That Commission, by the way, cost the Canadian taxpayer \$10 million and admitted that it reviewed the issue of violence through a “feminist lens” only. At page 4 of the Commission’s report, it stated:

[We] flatly reject any analyses that place any degree of responsibility for violence on the women themselves no matter their actions, appearance, demeanor or behaviour.

A Globe and Mail editorial (July 31, 1993) stated that the Minister Responsible for the Status of Women at that time, Mary Collins:

...couldn’t win by choosing a one-ideology panel. Instead of reaching out to a broad audience, she aimed to appease the feminists ...

And so it seems today, the Family Violence Institute, under the federal Public Health Agency, is continuing “to appease the feminists” instead of dealing with the true facts about domestic violence. This is a scandal.

Please write to Prime Minister Harper and the Minister of Health, Tony Clement and your MP, to request that “violence” in society be accurately dealt with, by including violence against men as well as women, and by rejecting the feminists’ transparent propaganda.

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
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Fax: (613) 952-1154

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

Straus, Murray A., "Processes Explaining the Concealment and Distortion of Evidence on Gender Symmetry in Partner Violence", published online, July 17, 2007; see also Straus, Murray A., "Future Research on Gender Symmetry in Physical Assaults on Partners", *Violence Against Women*, Volume 12 Number 11, University of New Hampshire, Durham, November 2006, and Straus, Murray A., "The Controversy Over Domestic Violence by Women - A Methodological, Theoretical and Sociology of Science Analysis" in Arriaga X.B. & Oskamp, S (1999), "Violence in Intimate Relationships" Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Feld, Scott L. and Straus, Murray A., "Escalation and Desistance of Wife Assault in Marriage", *Criminology*, Volume 27, Number 1, 1989.

Archer, John. 2000. "Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A metaanalytic review." *Psychological Bulletin* 126:651-680;

Straus, Murray A. 1999. "The Controversy over Domestic Violence by Women: A Methodological, Theoretical, and Sociology of Science Analysis." Pp. 17-44 in *Violence in Intimate Relationships*, edited by X. Arriaga and S. Oskamp. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage;

Straus, Murray A. 2005. "Women's violence toward men is a serious social problem." Pp. 55-77 in *Current controversies on family violence*, 2nd Edition, edited by D. R. Loseke, R. J. Gelles, and M. M. Cavanaugh. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Straus, Murray A., "Victims and Aggressors in Marital Violence," *American Behavioural Scientist*, Vol. 23, No. 5, May/June 1980, page 682.

Dutton, Donald G., "Rethinking Domestic Violence," University of British Columbia Press, 2007.

Lupri, Eugen, "Institutional Resistance to Acknowledging Intimate Male Abuse," (Revised paper presented at the Counter-Roundtable Conference on Domestic Violence, Calgary, Alberta, May 7, 2004).

Lupri, Eugen, "Intimate Partner Abuse Against Men," National Clearing House on Family Violence, The Family Violence Prevention Unit, Public Health Agency of Canada.

Straus, Murray A., "Processes Explaining the Concealment and Distortion of Evidence on Gender Symmetry in Partner Violence," *Supra*, p. 231.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSIONS

By Cecilia Forsyth, Provincial representative, National Board, President, Saskatchewan Chapter
REAL Women of Canada

Human Rights Commissions (HRC) are threatening the very rights they should be protecting. The rights to freedom of speech, freedom of expression, freedom of religion and freedom of the press are being suppressed and censored by the Human Rights Commissions.

For example, in its October 20, 2006 edition, *Macleans* published, "The Future Belongs to Islam," an excerpt from Mark Steyn's book, "America Alone". A human rights complaint followed, stating the magazine and Steyn's article "subject[s] Canadian Muslims to hatred and Islamophobia." The complaint was filed by Mohamed Elmasry, president of the Canadian Islamic Congress, with the Human Rights Commissions of Canada and Ontario, and in British Columbia by Elmasry and Naiyer Habib. Ontario's HRC decided it would not hear the case on the ground that it deals in denial of service on the basis of race, creed, etc, and a magazine is not a "service". (www.steynonline.com)

Another high profile case involves a complaint against Ezra Levant, an Alberta lawyer, author, and publisher of the now-defunct *Western Standard* magazine. Two years ago, Levant reprinted in his magazine a selection of the Danish

newspaper cartoons of the Prophet Mohammed. These cartoons had ignited violent protests throughout the Muslim world. As publisher of a news magazine, Levant believed Western Standard readers were entitled to an objective report of the Danish cartoon controversy. A radical Muslim imam, Syed Soharwardy thought otherwise. After the Calgary police refused Mr. Soharwardy's request three different times to arrest Levant, Soharwardy filed a complaint with the Alberta HRC, accusing Levant of fostering discrimination.

Mr. Levant appeared before the Alberta commission on January 11, 2008. In his opening remarks, he questioned the commission's attack on our fundamental freedom of free speech saying, "the commission has no legal authority to act as censor." Levant proceeded to outline Canada's 800-year heritage of free speech under common law, the 1948 U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Canada's Bill of Rights and Charter of Rights. Mr. Levant concluded by saying, "But it is not I who am on trial: it is the freedom of all Canadians." He videotaped the interrogation and posted it on YouTube as well as his website, www.ezrlevant.com.

Levant received notice on February 28, 2008 that Soharwardy had dropped his complaint with the Alberta HRC. However, an identical complaint was filed by the Edmonton Muslim Council, so the case against Levant proceeds.

Other human rights complaints which threaten free speech became public in February of this year. The targets of these complaints are Catholic Insight magazine (www.catholicinsight.com) and the federal political party, the Christian Heritage Party and its leader Ron Gray (www.chp.ca). These complaints were filed with the Canadian Human Rights Commission by Rob Wells (Edmonton) over comments in their publications on homosexuality.

Section 13 of the federal Canadian Human Rights Act is the key section that allows the HRC to censor freedom of speech in Canada. This section makes it an offence to "communicate any matter that is likely to expose a person or persons to hatred and/or contempt" within a host of privileged categories, such as race, sexual orientation, religion, etc.

At least two of the words contained in Section 13 have been interpreted by the Commission in a very detrimental manner. First, the word "offence" has come to mean "hurt feelings," and the word "likely" as in "likely to expose a person to hatred" has been very broadly interpreted so that once a complaint is filed, it is taken as proof that an "offence" has occurred. It is no wonder; Human Rights Commissions are called "kangaroo courts".

In a HRC case, there are no established rules of procedure for weighing and interpreting evidence, which can be a safeguard for both parties in an action. Furthermore, truth is not a defense in a human rights case. If a defendant argues the truth of his statements, it is used by the CHRC Tribunals as proof of guilt. In practice, there are no defenses available under human rights legislation, which may explain why no single person has ever won a case under Section 13 of the Canadian Human Rights Act in the Commissions' 30 years of existence!

There are other procedural flaws inherent in most Human Rights Commissions. Commissioners act as both judge and jury. They employ investigators to determine the facts of each case and then select the panelists for the Tribunal which will adjudicate these same facts. Those charged with human rights violations are denied the right of being presumed innocent until their guilt is proven, and the accused is forced to pay for his/her own defence – often tens of thousands of dollars, while the complainant's fees are covered by the taxpayer.

Another curious feature of the Human Rights Commissions is that anyone can file a complaint claiming offence, even if they are not a member of one of the "victim" categories. The filing of complaints is frequently done by Richard Warman, who has been the sole complainant in over half of all the cases brought before the CHRC. Since 2002, Warman has been a plaintiff on every Section 13 case, and he has won every one, acquiring damages in most of these cases. Richard Warman was formerly employed as an "investigator" of the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

Thankfully, one Member of Parliament sees the dangers of Section 13 in the federal Human Rights Act. On January 30, 2008 Dr. Keith Martin, Liberal MP for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca introduced a motion (M-446) calling on Parliament to delete subsection 13(1) of the Canadian Human Rights Act.

According to Dr. Martin, hate crimes, slander and libel would still be outlawed under the Criminal Code, while his motion will stop human rights tribunals from the arbitrary imposition of restrictions on Canadians' freedom of speech using taxpayers' money. "We have laws against hate crimes, but nobody has a right not to be offended," he said. "[This S.13 provision] is being used in a way that the authors of the Act never envisioned."

Many individuals and groups, including PEN Canada (An association of writers and supporters formed to defend freedom of expression) and The Canadian Association of Journalists (CAJ), support Keith Martin's motion to scrap the so-called "hate speech" section of the Canadian Human Rights Act, Section 13 (1), upon which many HRC complaints have been based.

To support Mr. Martin's Motion - 446, please write to:

Dr. Keith Martin, MP
300 Justice Building
House of Commons
Ottawa ON K1A 0A6
T 613-996-2625
F 613-996-9779

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

What to Do About The Human Rights Commissions?

Since 1989 REAL Women of Canada has voiced its considerable concerns about the wide powers of the Canadian Human Rights Commissions and their Tribunals, and we have consistently called for them to be abolished, with human rights issues being properly addressed directly by the courts. We, however, realize that the original purpose of Human Rights Commissions, for which they were originally established – to assist those who experience genuine discrimination in regard to accommodation, service, employment, and membership – is still valid. However, these Commissions are now involved with quite a different subject matter – namely censorship, even though Canadians are supposed to have the right to freedom of speech, expression, religion and freedom of the press.

These Commissions have not demonstrated their ability to carry out their responsibilities properly and it is doubtful they will do so in the future.

Please write to the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, and your MP expressing your concerns about the federal Human Rights Commission.

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

The Honourable Robert Nicholson
Minister of Justice
105 East Block
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
fax: 613-992-7910

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

Please also write to your provincial Premier, Attorney General and your member of the provincial legislature to express your concerns about the Human Rights Commission in your province.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Hello, everyone!

I have good news for you this issue! Bill C-2, raising the age of sexual consent from 14 to 16 years of age, was passed in the Senate and has received Royal Assent. It is now law in Canada. REAL Women was happy to appear as a witness before the Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs on February 22, 2008, to support this Bill. At last, some protection for our young people.

I also had the pleasure to be invited to a pre-release screening of the award winning film "Bella" in Vancouver. This film won the "People's Choice Award" at the Toronto Film Festival. It is to be released in only 15 selected theatres in Canada in April because the distributor doesn't believe it will be a box office hit. If you hear that this film is coming to a theatre near you, go see it – it has both a pro-life and pro-family message and it seems to me, would be most effectively directed at older teens and twenty-somethings. If it is not being shown in your area, call your Theatre Manager and request that it be shown. The best way to ensure the success of this film if it is shown in your community is that every "Bella" performance be sold out for the first two weekends. Do this by promoting the film with family, friends and your church community. Go to www.BellaTheMovie.com or www.BellaFaithNews.com or www.BellaResources.com for "Bella" materials and news.

Canada's "Silent No More" organization which deals with abortion's aftermath is having its first Post Abortion Healing & Training Conference April 18-20th at Lake Nakamun, near Edmonton, Alberta. It costs only \$150.00 per person, payable to "Canada Silent No More" and includes the conference, plus two nights accommodation, 3 meals on Saturday and breakfast and lunch on Sunday, and the use of the indoor pool, gym, and hot tub. This conference is critical because social conservatives need to be trained to answer all the deception and objections which pro-abortionists throw our way.

The government of Stephen Harper may be defeated by a vote of non-confidence in the weeks to come. We all must get involved in electing the candidate who best represents our worldview. Don't delay — get active now before Edmund Burke's famous adage becomes a sad prophecy: Evil triumphs when good men (people) do nothing.

Til next time!
Laurie

REAL WOMEN — A THORN IN THE SIDE OF BOTH FEMINISTS AND IMPRESSIONABLE POLITICIANS

By Doris Darvasi, President, B.C. Chapter, REAL Women of Canada

There is an old Chinese saying "May you live in interesting times." Well, Canadians certainly are living in interesting times and then some. Many of us wished for things to be somewhat less interesting! During the past 25 years many Canadians have been stunned at the developments that have taken place in this country and, with bewildered looks on their faces, have often asked themselves what was going on. As it has been said before, common sense is definitely no longer common. Our quest for tolerance has, at times, caused us to be sadly ineffective, and political correctness has pushed us over the edge into the unreasonable.

Over the years, most Canadians have observed what was happening to their country from the sidelines, all the while wringing their hands and lamenting “how could this have happened?” Others have taken action and become involved. They have contacted politicians, signed petitions, participated in rallies and contributed financially toward the fight for a better Canada.

Among those who took action were a handful of women in eastern Canada. Twenty-five years ago this little group decided that it was time to go to battle and combat the often-outlandish ideas that the radical feminist liberals were always pushing on the politicians. Many politicians, unfortunately, mindlessly fell for the presumptuous assertion that then-prominent feminists represented the “women” of Canada. In fact, they represented (then and now) only their own small special interest group. Logically, no one could possibly represent all women any more than anyone can represent all men. Yet, many politicians had very little backbone, and for the most part, went along with the feminist agenda, usually at the expense of the taxpayers.

So back in 1983 REAL Women was established and lit a candle in the political darkness of the day. That little light has grown into a large flame. REAL Women has been on the political forefront ever since and is a serious thorn in the side of the feminists and their acolytes, from local politics all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada. REAL Women has never shied away from tackling any issue. Years from now, when students study Canada’s past, the name “REAL Women of Canada” will show up everywhere as being a diligent force for decency.

All REAL Women historical material has been placed in the National Archives in Ottawa at the latter’s request not to be released to the public for 25 years, without REAL Women’s consent. It tells quite a story!

The fight is not yet over though; let us join hands to work toward a better Canada, for equality and freedom of religion and freedom of speech for all, the natural family and the rights of parents to raise their children without interference from the state. Our children deserve the best. Let us continue to be a “thorn in the side” of those determined to destroy the social fabric of Canada by destroying the traditional family and everything it stands for.

FEMINIST MANIPLUATION AT THE UN

The problem with UN treaties is that, customarily, it is the Prime Minister (presumably in consultation with the Minister of Foreign Affairs) who decides whether these treaties should be ratified (they usually are); the public is never the wiser, even though the public is tied to the obligations made under the treaties.

This problem has been recently exacerbated by the fact that the Supreme Court of Canada is now looking to these international treaties for “guidelines” in interpreting the legal challenges before them. This is the case, even though treaties are not supposed to be binding until their provisions have been passed directly into domestic law. This little detail, ie. the necessity of passing domestic legislation before the treaties are considered binding, no longer seems to stop the Supreme Court from legitimizing the treaties anyway, by way of its judgments. Because of this, such treaties are becoming much more significant.

New Procedures on Treaties

The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Maxime Bernier, announced, in January 2008, that the Conservative government will change the way it now signs on to international treaties. That is, the Conservative government has decided that all treaties will first be tabled in the House of Commons so that they will be open to public scrutiny and debate. Under the new process, MP’s will be able to review and discuss the treaty, and debate and vote on it before Canada formally agrees to ratify it. The government, however, will still maintain the legal authority to ratify the treaty, regardless of the vote in the House of Commons. However, the government will give consideration to the views of the House of Commons in coming to a decision. At least the public, under this new system, will get to know what the treaties actually say before being tied down by them! This is a welcome change and long overdue.

UN Monitoring Committees

Even if these international treaties are approved by Parliament before being ratified, there is still another problem: that is, the treaty monitoring committees – each treaty has its own monitoring committee – are busily re-interpreting the treaties according to a feminist agenda. Therein lies a big problem. Under a UN treaty, nations that have signed on to a treaty are required to submit reports every five years to the treaty’s monitoring committee to show that they are complying with the provisions of the treaty.

According to the UN protocol, the members of the monitoring committee should be “of high moral standing and competence in the field covered by the treaty”. Committee members are to be elected by UN members of their own nationality. The committee’s rules of procedure require that committee members solemnly declare to exercise their duties and powers “honourably, faithfully, impartially and conscientiously.” We wish!

Feminist Control of the Monitoring Committees

Because most of the UN treaties were passed decades ago, they were not written from a feminist perspective. Also, even if a new treaty is under consideration, most nations, who are members of the UN (there are now 192 countries), do not agree with radical feminist policies. Such policies which include abortion rights, redefining the family to include homosexuals, same-sex marriage and independence of adolescents from parental control (which would make it easier to provide the adolescent with abortion, birth control, access to pornography, etc.), and religion being subservient to other rights, would never get passed in the UN, even today.

Feminist Secret Agreement

To skirt the actual written provisions of these treaties, feminist activists met privately with the heads of the UN agencies in a secret meeting in Deep Cove, New York in December 1996. At this meeting, it was agreed that the monitoring committees would henceforth “re-interpret” treaties to provide a feminist interpretation to them, in order to coerce countries to implement feminist policies despite the fact that such policies were not actually written into the treaties at all.

As a result, for example, the monitoring Committee for the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), has now questioned more than 60 nations on their abortion laws, and has even gone so far as to create its own “general recommendation” that reads abortion into the document. By repeatedly demanding that every country implement abortion policies, which is euphemistically expressed in UN language as “sexual and reproductive health services”, the committee hopes that abortion rights will become accepted as part of international law. The CEDAW monitoring committee has met no resistance in interpreting the treaty from a pro-abortion perspective, due to the fact that about half of its members are employees of feminist NGO’s, including such radical NGOs as International Women’s Rights Action Watch (IWRAP), the Latin America and Caribbean Committee for the Defense of Women’s Rights, and the Global Fund for Women.

Canadian Feminist Organizations Assist Treaty Monitoring Committees

In order to provide “inside” information on each country’s support of feminist policies, feminist organizations in each country that makes its reports to the treaty Committee, provide the committee with a “shadow” report. These shadow reports provide information that the committee then uses to criticize the government for its failure to uphold feminist policies. The organization, the Canadian Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA), headed by Shelagh Day, former chairperson of the Equality Rights Panel of the Court Challenge Program (CCP), has made shadow reports to numerous treaty monitoring committees, since 2003, including the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW); the United Nations Human Rights Committee which oversees the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. In all its shadow reports before these committees, FAFIA has highlighted the

Court Challenges Program (CCP) as a vehicle promoting equality in Canada (for feminists). Lo and behold, the CCP was highlighted as a marvelous invention by the Canadian government in all the reports issuing from these various treaty-monitoring committees.

Committee Report Not Enforceable

In its shadow report in 2007, FAFIA mentioned the so-called scandalous decision by the federal government to shut down the CCP. It will be no surprise, when CEDAW's next report on Canada, severely criticizes the federal government for its decision to cut the CCP!

Fortunately, the reports of these UN monitoring committees are not enforceable. They are used only for propaganda purposes in order to pressure a government to uphold feminist policies. For example, when FAFIA appeared before the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, reviewing the CCP, on December 4, 2007 (See REALity Jan/Feb 2008, p.8), it referred to the "fact" that disbanding the CCP was a failure to comply with Canada's international obligations, as stated by the CEDAW monitoring committee.

Not surprisingly, when the Status of Women Committee released to the House of Commons the report on its review of the cancellation of the CCP in February 2008, it referred, of course, to the fact that Canada had failed to comply with the provisions of its international obligations under the CEDAW treaty.

The Status of Women report on the CCP, released in February 2008, stated:

Witnesses frequently observed that the CCP enhanced Canada's international reputation and its "human rights machinery."

The report went on to directly quote from the testimony of several feminist spokespersons who had appeared before the Committee on December 11, 2007:

The Court Challenges Program has been recognized repeatedly by international treaty bodies as a mainstay, a central component of Canada's human rights machinery, and a way in which we comply with those international human rights commitments. It's been recognized by the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in 1998 and 2006, by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women in 2003, and by the Human Rights Committee in 2005.

The need for such a program is supported at the highest levels of the international community. The United Nations committee on the elimination of racial discrimination and the United Nations Committee on Human Rights have both directed Canada to better ensure the efficiency and accessibility of the complaint systems related to racial discrimination and to enhance the legal system so that all victims of discrimination have full access to effective remedies.

Yet, these UN Committee reports referring to the Court Challenges Program were not only completely self-serving, but were based only on feminist malarkey!

Public Not Aware of these Shenanigans

This game plan, between the UN monitoring committees and feminist groups, in individual countries, working together to promote the feminist agenda worldwide, is largely unknown to the general public in member countries of the UN. Thus, when Canadian feminists complain that Canada has failed to comply with its international obligations, by failing to uphold UN treaties, this is propaganda only, though it does serve as useful fodder for the liberal media to attack the government.

Australia Refuses Harassment by the Committees

Australia did the right thing in 2000. It simply refused to report to these crazy monitoring committees and has refused to allow UN reporters (referred to at the UN as Rapporteurs) to enter Australia in order to bring back their own biased reports to UN committees. Canada would be wise to do the same.

Please write to Prime Minister Stephen Harper and Minister of Foreign Affairs Maxime Bernier and your own MP. Request that Canada follow Australia's example by both refusing to report to the monitoring committees and refusing to allow UN Rapporteurs into the country in order to report to their respective committees distorted and inaccurate reports on Canadian government policies.

Write to:

Right Honourable Stephen Harper
Office of the Prime Minister
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0A2
email: pm@pm.gc.ca

The Honourable Maxime Bernier
Minister of Foreign Affairs
Department of Foreign Affairs
Lester B Pearson Building, Tower A, 10th Floor
125 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, ON K1A 0G2
Fax: 613-996-9709

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa ON K1A 0A2

Shelagh Day, Chair, Human Rights Committee, Canadian Feminist Alliance for International Action, Evidence, December 4, 2007 (11:05).

Beverly Jacobs, President, Native Women's Association of Canada, Evidence, December 11, 2007 (12:10).

Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Memories — Highlights from the 1980's

1. First newsletter
Summer 1983

2. First Members meeting
May 10, 1984 at North York Public Library in Toronto attended by 70 people.

3. Analysis of 'equality rights'
January and fall 1984 newsletter warned that sections 15 and 28 of the Charter of Rights would allow abortion on demand, and extend rights for homosexuals, i.e. marriage, tax benefits and right to adopt children.

4. First submission to Parliamentary Standing Committee March 15, 1985
Margaret Goodier and our consultant Mr. Lyman MacInnis of Touche and Ross presented our response to the "Child and Elderly Benefits Consultation Paper". REAL Women stated a woman should have an option to remain in the home if she so chooses, and called for an increase in family benefits.

5. National lobby of MP's in Ottawa November 18, 1986
Presented MP's with "Who We Are" brief and pink cupcakes.

6. Spring 1987 Reality: What you can do for Real women.
Have a coffee party. Start your own local chapter. Write letters to newspapers and magazines. Write your M.P.
Organize a fund-raising project. Display our literature at your church, community event or wherever appropriate.

7. First Supreme Court case
Joe Borowski, former NDP Minister in Manitoba, began a legal challenge in 1983 to obtain protection for preborn children under the Charter of Rights. Granted Intervenor Status by the Supreme Court in the Borowski vs. the Attorney General of Canada case, which was heard on October 3, 1988, our lawyer Angela Costigan was eloquent on behalf of women and their unborn children.

8. What the papers said about our April 1989 conference
Pro Family Group Polishes Its Image: Members don't fit Sterotype says the headline of a full-page article in the Montreal Gazette, complete with a large photo of ten REAL Women from Quebec who attended.

Women's Voices: An editorial in the Thunder Bay Chronicle/ Journal: "The feminist movement represents one side of the women's movement...the other side, espoused mainly by REAL Women is just as determined and has just as much right to help (from the government) to put its case. But the feminists would deny this fundamental tenet of Canadian democracy...All women need active and well-financed representatives in Canada. And that includes REAL Women as well as the feminists".

Contrary Women's Views Not Accepted. A column by Claire Hoy in the Ottawa Sun: "REAL Women's crime, according to the National Action Committee (NAC) among others is that it does not accept the left-wing liturgy on the so-called women's issues of day care, abortion and equal pay for work of equal value

9. Fall 1989 Reality: Concern about The Human Rights Commission and Tribunals.
These bodies which have been given power to interpret the Charter of Rights, and to impose their decisions on Parliament, are composed of appointed individuals who may not have any particular qualifications for the job. Their bias is shown in their decisions.

Other problems are: 1. Conflict of roles - the commission is both investigator and prosecutor for the complainant. 2. The members make arbitrary decisions which affect our lives, but unlike MP's, they are not answerable to anyone for their decision. Members were asked to express concern to their MP.

10. Fall 1989 Reality: The Court Challenges Program
On October 3rd Real Women made a presentation to the Parliamentary Committee reviewing the Court Challenges Program, which has handed out millions in legal aid to radical feminists, homosexuals, and pro-abortion groups, but refused to help us in our intervention in the Borowski case.

GOVERNMENT INCREASES FUNDING FOR THE STATUS OF WOMEN

The Minister Responsible for the Status of Women, Josée Verner, appeared before the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women on February 5, 2008, to testify about what wonderful things the Status of Women was doing for women in Canada.

She referred to the fact that the funding for the Status of Women has been increased by \$8 million to \$20 million (a 75% increase) in the 2007 budget, and that the funding was the highest ever received by the agency.

It is significant, however, that even though the Conservatives have poured such generous funding into the Status of Women, the strict guidelines for making grants by the agency, established in September 2006, prevent any funding going for advocacy work (lobbying) or for "research" for feminist groups. As well, the government has changed the wording of the agency's mandate so that "equality" rights will not predominate. The promotion of "equality" as the major objective on the old mandate was used to prevent organizations, such as REAL Women, from receiving funding because we are not, supposedly, an "equality" seeking organization, since we do not accept feminist policies.

Now, funding is to go only to hands-on projects. The Minister for the Status of Women, Josée Verner, stated at this hearing of the Status of Women Committee, on February 5, "We do not provide funding to groups on the basis of what they are, but rather, on the basis of the types of projects that they propose."

The reason the Conservatives have poured so much money back into the Status of Women is that the feminists have planned to widen the voting gap between men and women (10% less women vote for the Conservative party than do men), by arguing that the Status of Women cutbacks and the cancellation of the Court Challenges Program were examples of the government's lack of concern for women in Canada. Hence, the Conservatives gave the Status of Women more money than ever.

However, at the same time, this government has continued to restrict the use of these funds for the promotion of feminist organizations and their policies. Now the funding is open to all women's organizations, regardless of their perspective, providing that such groups are proposing useful projects to assist women. Just how "useful" these projects are is now the question. See article "Violence Against Women Myth – A Money Grabber."

STANDING ON GUARD FOR THEE, THE PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE OF CANADA'S CHRISTIAN RIGHT

By Dr. Michael Wagner, Available from: www.ecpcentre.org

Although virtually all of Canada once supported the general principles of the so-called "Christian Right", this term has come to refer to a social movement working to conserve a particular set of socially conservative values which are optimal for human flourishing.

Over the years, these values have come under attack and Mr. Wagner's very readable book gives us, for the first time, a well-researched history of the Canadian response to attacks on the family and social conservative values. This is information that the liberal press has tried to ignore

Countless Numbers of Courageous Canadians Shape the Movement

Mr. Wagner provides a concise history of the many groups and political parties rooted in many denominations and backgrounds, which organized over several decades to combat social decline in Canada. The battles over abortion, pornography, homosexuality, marriage, school curricula and religious rights are deftly covered. The various court challenges, legislative battles, signature campaigns (over a million against legalized abortion), and judicial activist tactics are well summarized for an overview of important inter-linked events. Crucial names, quotations and events from both sides of the divide make interesting reading. Reference is made to hate literature, death threats and assaults on pro-life and pro-family supporters, intolerance which is rarely reported in our so-called mainstream media. Although hundreds are mentioned by name, the 274 pages cannot contain all the unsung heroes and heroines in many fields of endeavour, who selflessly came to the defense of life, family and genuine freedom during this dark period of our history. The author, however, highlights three Canadians who have had a major influence in shaping the social movement: Rev. Ken Campbell, journalist Ted Byfield and lawyer Gwen Landolt.

Ken Campbell's groundbreaking protest against immoral literature, homosexual activism and sex education in the school his children attended in the 1970's, gave birth to the Christian Right in Canada, according to Wagner. The Rev. Campbell heroically opposed the abortion industry.

Ted Byfield's Alberta Report and subsequent publications, as well as his many influential columns in various newspapers were always mindful of the fact that "the popular rejection of moral principle inevitably precedes and contributes to the fall of a civilization." His observation of media hostility to social conservatives after a decision unfavorable to pro-family Canadians is priceless: "By far the most shrill language occasioned by the Vriend Supreme Court of Canada decision came from those who were deeply deploring shrill language, and the most righteous of indignation emerged from those vehemently deploring righteous indignation. Obviously nobody can hate quite as fervently as the denouncers of hatred." Ted Byfield's humorous comments are effectively presented throughout the book.

Inside Radical Feminism

The author includes Gwen Landolt's prescient comments, made in 1981, which have stood the test of time:

The most important effect of an entrenched Charter of Rights would be that it would give rise to a shift in power from Parliament, which is subject to public opinion, to the Supreme Court of Canada, which is not.

...under an entrenched Charter of Rights, many of our fundamental rights and freedoms, which we now take for granted, and which have long been established in this country, may be lost, ...

As we now know, the courts have entered the political arena to shape social values and change Canada according to their particular designs.

The book gives a clear picture of REAL Women's policies and the damage feminism has done to the well being of women and families. A history of federal government rejection of REAL Women because it was not deemed to be promoting "equality", is provided. Michael Wagner contends that REAL Women "helped set back the feminist cause." He quotes Kenneth Whyte, now editor-in-chief of MacLean's magazine:

The group has touched off one of the noisiest, nastiest and most important political battles in the country today, a battle for the mind, soul and support of the average Canadian woman.... REAL Women has managed to put the brakes on a feminist-inspired drive towards socialism.... (1987)

Michael Wagner then concludes that "REAL Women was the strongest voice for the Christian Right in Canada, at least for the 1980s and 1990s."

Wagner quotes William Gairdner, author of *The War Against the Family* (1992), an important resource on the change in sexual order and state power against the family. Commenting on what he calls "the deadly conflict between statism and the whole idea of the private family", Gairdner observes "Inside every radical feminist is a little officer of the police state."

Michael Wagner's history of state driven revolution under the guise of human rights and women's liberation in Canada is an important contribution at this time, as a new generation experiences the bitter fruits of liberal "progress."

Hopeful Conclusion

In Wagner's book we see that hindsight is not always kind to major political and religious figures who played out the progressive script as they wittingly or unwittingly drove the advances of homosexual and "reproductive rights" interests. A kinder light shines on the many Canadians who responded by coming to the defense of the unborn, working to protect the innocence of children in our school system and opposing attempts to re-order marriage and family.

Michael Wagner's intelligent, thoughtful and courageous book points to better days as he lists the negative health effects of homosexuality, family breakdown, day care and risky behaviours, on men, women and children, with valuable references to current professional sources. He finds reason for optimism in the many studies showing that traditional, family-oriented, social conservative values lead to healthier, happier and longer lives, along with viable population replacement for those who adhere to these principles.

JUSTICE IN CANADA IS NOT BLIND

Canadians would like to think that justice is fair and impartial. That is, that justice is blind and applies equally to all citizens.

Unfortunately, this is not the case. Our justice system is neither fair nor impartial. Justice is not blind in Canada. Rather than applying the laws impartially and uniformly, Crown Prosecutors, who have the responsibility to prosecute those accused of violating a law, are allowed a very broad discretion – far too broad – in the laying of charges against an accused. As a result, some very significant cases have deliberately been derailed by Crown Prosecutors.

This was illuminated, in January 2008, with the retirement of Paul Culver, the Chief Prosecutor in the Toronto area. His office is arguably the most important prosecutor's office in Canada since it is where many precedent setting cases take place.

Mr. Culver reflected on his career, which began in 1975, in the *Globe & Mail*, (January 16, 2008). He stated that his office, in addition to murder, fraud etc. cases, was also responsible for what he called "social prosecutions" cases. He proudly stated that he was responsible for staying the charges against Morgentaler in the 1980's. (Because of its volatile and highly political nature, Ontario's Attorney General, Ian Scott, however, was also involved in the staying of the charge in the Morgentaler case.) Culver stayed the charges in the homosexual bathhouse raid in 1999 and the lesbian bathhouse raid in 2000.

Mr. Culver also stated that he was the prosecutor who withdrew the charges in the 1993 child pornography case against artist Eli Langer who drew pictures of young children having sex with naked, sexually aroused adults as well as pictures of children having sex with each other. Although the court upheld the child pornography law in that case, the charges against Mr. Langer were stayed by Mr. Culver, and Langer's pictures, previously seized by the police, were returned to him and exhibited in a local art gallery. That is, the prosecution dropped the charges against the artist and proceeded, instead, to put only the law before the court. Because of the testimony from the "expert" witnesses (artists protecting their own freedom to create) these shocking pictures were held, unbelievably, to be not pornographic. The pictures were subsequently published in a pedophile magazine "Men Loving Boys", published by NAMBLA, the North American Man-Boy Love Association. Although Mr. Culver did not refer to it in his interview, he was also responsible for staying charges against homosexuals charged with public indecency for walking nude in the Toronto Gay Pride Parade in 1997. The charges against them were stayed by the Chief Prosecutor on the ludicrous grounds that the homosexuals were not nude at all since they were wearing shoes.

In his role as Chief Prosecutor, Mr. Culver was not required to consult either the Attorney General or Solicitor General when he made these monumental decisions to stay charges on these social/moral laws. Clearly, because of his consistent practice of refusing to pursue Criminal Code violations of the social and moral laws prohibiting abortion, child pornography, homosexuality/lesbianism etc., Mr. Culver allowed his personal views on these issues to override his responsibility as a public servant to impartially enforce the law. Mr. Culver should have been removed from his public office years ago for failing to carry out his responsibilities appropriately, and for his abuse of office.

CANADIAN MUSEUM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

The Advisory Board for the Museum which, in 2007, replaced the Liberal appointed Board, launched public consultations to determine which human rights issues should be featured in the museum and how they should be presented.

The Museum provided a web site for the public consultations is <http://www.canadianmuseumforhumanrights.com/>. Unfortunately, the public consultations were to take place for only a brief period of time, February 5 to March 15, 2008.

If the web site for public consultation has been closed down by the time you read this, please do not hesitate to write or fax the Museum with your views.

The Museum's fax number, phone number and address are as follows:

The Canadian Museum for Human Rights

1560 CanWest Global Place , 201 Portage Ave. • Winnipeg, MB R3B 3K6

Phone: (204) 944-2476 / toll free 1-866-828-9209 • Fax: (204) 944-2479 • Contact: Diane Boyle