

COMPLAINT LAID AGAINST ONTARIO CHIEF JUSTICE McMURTRY ON SAME-SEX MARRIAGE DECISION

There is no doubt that the decision by the Ontario Court of Appeal in June 2003 to support same-sex marriage was pivotal to the final unfortunate outcome of this controversial issue. The courts in other provinces followed Ontario's decision - even to the extent of adopting its wording. The federal Liberal government refused to appeal the Ontario decision. The only "loose end" on the issue was a vote in Parliament. The Liberal government under Prime Minister Paul Martin and many MPs argued that the issue had been settled by the court and that Parliament, therefore, had "no choice" but to follow the ruling. The Liberal government claimed it had to follow the court decisions and, for this reason, refused to allow any amendments to the bill and all 29 NDP MPs and 39 Liberal Cabinet Ministers were forced to vote for the bill, thus depriving their constituents of any meaningful participation in the debate. Debate was further curtailed by the Liberal government by way of imposing closure. In short, legalization of same-sex marriage was far from a democratic process, starting with the appointed judges usurping the role of the legislature on this controversial issue.

It would appear however, that the decision of the controversial Ontario Court of Appeal was based on a grave judicial impropriety on the part of Chief Justice Roy McMurtry. On July 17, 2006, REAL Women of Canada laid a complaint against Chief Justice McMurtry based on the apparent impropriety. We have not had a reply to our complaint

Complaint Against Chief Justice McMurtry

The complaint against Chief Justice McMurtry on same-sex marriage was based on the fact that he had a clear conflict of interest in the case. This is based on a letter written by Mr. Justice McMurtry's son, Jim McMurtry, published in the "Vannet" newspaper chain in BC. In this letter, Mr. Jim McMurtry acknowledged that his sister, the daughter of Chief Justice McMurtry, was living in a homosexual union. The homosexual union of Judge McMurtry's daughter gives rise to an apprehension of bias in that Mr. Justice McMurtry had a personal interest in the same-sex marriage case and its outcome. This was in conflict with his judicial duties and responsibilities and he had a duty to recuse (disqualify) himself from the case. He did not disclose, on the record, the fact of his daughter's homosexual union, which was a fact directly relating to the case.

It is significant that Mr. Justice Rosenblatt, a member of the New York Court of Appeal, which rejected same-sex marriage on July 6, 2006, recused himself from that case because he had a conflict of interest due to having a lesbian daughter. If Chief Justice McMurtry's refusal to remove himself, or place on record the fact of his daughter's same-sex union, is acceptable, then it would appear that Canadian courts follow a lower standard of conduct than other common law courts.

Mr. Justice McMurtry, in his capacity as Chief Justice, was responsible for selecting the judges who heard this crucial appeal with him. This raises an apprehension of bias that the judges Mr. Justice McMurtry selected, contrary to his duty to act responsibly and impartially, were sympathetic to same-sex marriage and his own personal view on the issue of same-sex marriage.

Chief Justice McMurtry Attends Party with Homosexual Litigants

Following the handing down of the decision, Mr. Justice McMurtry, in apparent wanton disregard of judicial convention, ethics and behaviour, attended a public celebration of the same-sex marriage decision on June 26, 2003. At this party which was sponsored by the Law Society of Ontario, Mr. Justice McMurtry was photographed with his arms around the same-sex couple, Kevin Bourassa and Joe Varnell (see photograph) around whom the same-sex marriage case centered. This photograph is available on the internet. In January 2001, this same-sex couple, just two and a half years prior to the Ontario Court of Appeal decision, contrary to the law, had entered into a form of

marriage at the Metropolitan Community Church of Toronto (MCCT). Mr. Justice McMurtry's decision included an order that the Registrar General of the province of Ontario register the marriage certificate of Kevin Bourassa and Joe Varnell. This order retroactively legalized and gave legal force to the marriage ceremony, despite the fact that the ceremony had no legal validity at the time it was performed. This action, by the McMurtry court, is conduct that undermines the fundamental obligation of a judge to remain impartial.

Ontario Court Decision Prevents Judicial and Parliamentary Review

A further apprehension of bias arises from the fact that the court ruled that its decision take effect immediately. This reduced and even blocked the possibility of an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada - an appeal being an integral part of the judicial system. Further, the order that this decision must take effect immediately gravely affected any meaningful debate in Parliament, an institution that is of paramount importance in our system of government. Instead, the court's order circumvented Parliament, by its rendering same-sex marriage a legal reality solely by judicial fiat. This creates a reasoned suspicion of a lack of impartiality on the part of Chief Justice McMurtry and his court.

Magnitude of Costs Awarded Lawyers for Homosexual Litigants

The magnitude of the amounts of the costs awarded by the Ontario Court of Appeal in this case is of interest. Toronto lawyer, Martha McCarthy, who acted on behalf of the litigants challenging the traditional definition of marriage, received \$645,000 and Toronto lawyer, Douglas Elliott, who acted on behalf of the Toronto homosexual church, the Metropolitan Community Church of Toronto, received \$409,162 (Lawyers Weekly, November 19, 2004). The court, led by Mr. Justice McMurtry, made this latter award to MCCT's legal counsel, notwithstanding the fact that the court had dismissed that church's legal arguments.

Chief Justice McMurtry Ignores Ethical Guidelines

It is clear that Chief Justice Roy McMurtry blatantly ignored the ethical guidelines set out in the document, Ethical Principles for Judges, prepared by the Canadian Judicial Council, by participating in the same-sex marriage decision and celebrating its outcome later with individuals directly involved in the legal challenge. It is the duty of a judge to disqualify himself when there is a conflict of interest between his personal interest or that of his immediate family. This he did not do. The decision to party with the litigators following the decision is also in contravention of judicial convention and conduct.

Complaint Against Chief Justice McMurtry

It may be, however, that our complaint may not be properly considered by the Council since Chief Justice McMurtry is himself a member of the Council, as is Chief Justice Heather Smith of the Ontario Superior Court, who had previously handed down a decision in support of same-sex marriage, in November 2002. She was also present at the Ontario Law Society celebration of homosexual rights in June 2003. These judges are in a position to lobby their fellow jurists on the Council to dismiss the complaint. The Judicial Council is a self-regulated agency that, according to established precedents, appears frequently to have more interest in protecting the judges from the public, than protecting the public from the improper conduct of judges.

Chief Justice McMurtry will be retiring in May 2007 when he reaches 75 years of age. It is also possible that the Judicial Council may want him to retire without a "blemish" - even a well deserved one.

Contrast Between U.S. and Canadian Courts

Homosexual activists in the U.S. viewed with amazement the capitulation of the Canadian courts, which fell like dominoes after the politically correct interpretation that homosexual relationships were equal to or the same as heterosexual relationships. These activists looked to their own courts, therefore, for a swift and easy method of achieving their objective, by way of by-passing the legislatures on the same-sex marriage issue. The US activists

already had one success in legalizing same-sex marriage with the Massachusetts Supreme Court, doing so in 2003. Thus, they were confident that the U.S. courts would follow the Canadian courts' example and rule in favour of same-sex marriage.

U.S. homosexual activists launched a series of legal challenges on same-sex marriage through their court system. This strategy, however, turned out to be a major mistake. The U.S. courts have shown themselves to have more depth and integrity, as well as obviously being made of sterner stuff than to yield to the politically correct power brokers, as occurred in Canada on the legal challenges for same-sex marriage.

In July 2006, the New York Court of Appeal and the Washington Superior Court both rejected same-sex marriage—mainly because of their concern for the well being of children. It is significant that the concern for children was the reason that the National Assembly in France in January 2006 rejected same-sex marriage as well. In sharp contrast, Canadian courts never bothered to consider the welfare of children in their decisions to support same-sex marriage. Instead, following the Ontario Court decision, they focused only on the so-called "equality" rights of adults. A tragedy. Furthermore, the Canadian courts cannot state that the issue of the welfare of children was never argued before them, as REAL Women made this issue a prominent part of our presentations when we appeared before the courts on the same-sex marriage legal challenges.

Another significant difference between the US and Canadian courts is that the U.S. courts agreed that it was not for them to say whether same-sex marriage is right or wrong, but rather it was an issue for the elected representatives to decide. If only Canadian judges had such common sense and less ego!

To date, supporters of the traditional marriage definition in the U.S. have won in seven different state courts. Within the last two decades, five U.S. high courts, Massachusetts, Vermont, Hawaii, New York and Washington have ruled on the constitutionality of marital status with only Massachusetts so far legalizing "gay marriage" (in a 4-3 decision). It's an excellent record for traditional marriage.

Chief Justice McMurtry's "Gift" to his Daughter

Chief Justice McMurtry of the Ontario Court of Appeal has given his lesbian daughter a personal "gift" by his decision on same-sex marriage, but he did so at the expense of society and the administration of justice in this country.

It is one thing for the decision on same-sex marriage to take place fairly and honourably, but quite another when the decision is based on the apparent improper and unethical conduct of the judge, who was central to the debate.

NATIONAL CHILD CARE BATTLE FADES FOR NOW

Dark clouds arose over the issue of child care in the 2004 and 2006 federal elections when former Liberal Prime Minister, Paul Martin declared his government would implement a universal child care plan similar to that of the province of Quebec. This was a very bad idea as the Quebec program on child care has been found to be inadequate and detrimental to children. (See REALity, March/April 2006, "Children Rescued from Child Care," p. 10.)

Undeterred, on February 16, 2006, the child care lobbyists, flush with taxpayers money handed to them annually by the federal Status of Women (\$483,713 in the fiscal year 2004 - 2005)" launched a Canada-wide campaign called, "Code Blue" to lobby the provincial and territorial governments and parliamentarians to implement the former Liberal government's National Child Care Plan.

At the provincial premiers' first meeting with Prime Minister Harper in February 2006, the Premiers urged Mr. Harper to honour the deals on child care that they had made with the Martin government in 2005. Mr. Harper turned a deaf ear and continued on with his plan to give an annual payment of \$1200 directly to parents with children under 6 years of age.

Premiers Back Away From Day Care Battle

The premiers next met with Mr. Harper at the end of July 2006. At this meeting" Morna Ballantyne, Co-ordinator for Code Blue, personally attempted to confront the premiers to urge them to promote the former Liberal government's national day care agenda. She did this by:

Requesting the opportunity to make a presentation to the Premiers' Conference. She was turned down flat by the premiers on this request.

She and a few other activists then showed up at the Premiers' Conference bearing a petition of some 78,000 names calling on the premiers and Mr. Harper to restore the Martin deal. They couldn't get past the front door.

The activists next demanded that the premiers come out and accept the petition, but they refused. Even those premiers most sympathetic to them, such as NDP Premiers -Manitoba's Gary Doer and Saskatchewan's Lorne Calvert - were not interested. The communiqué issued by the premiers at the end of their conference made no reference to child care at all.

Ms. Ballantyne then sent a follow-up letter to the premiers requesting individual meetings with them. She has not received a response from any of them.

What Happened to the Child Care Juggernaut?

The reason the child care lobbyists appear to be having so little success with the premiers, despite the vast quantities of money they receive from the Status of Women to lobby them, is due to the "dead horse" argument, as expressed by a spokesman for Saskatchewan Premier Lorne Calvert, who stated, "Harper is not going to change his mind on child care." Further, the premiers are preoccupied with lobbying Ottawa for more money with no strings attached. A simultaneous push for restoration of funding for child care, with strings attached, would have been counterproductive for them. Hence, their lack of enthusiasm for the project.

New Child Care Study

The C.D. Howe Institute recently commissioned a study, co-authored by John Richards, Professor of Public Policy, Simon Fraser University in Vancouver and Matthew Brzozowski, Assistant Professor of Economics at the University of Western Ontario. The study released in July, 2006 found little evidence that daycare improves the well-being or the prospects of children in most stable, middle-class families. Their study indicated that day care provides no significant improvement (and perhaps some decline) in outcomes for children. If Canada is to invest in child care, the co-authors of the study suggest it would be better to focus the money on "at risk" children from poor or troubled families than to spread it around to everyone in a national child care program. Surprisingly, in an editorial (August 12, 2006), the Globe and Mail, formerly a supporter of a national day care program, agreed that the government should follow the recommendations of the Richards - Brzozowski report which the editorial claimed "made sense."

Other Solutions for Low Income Families

REAL Women, however, has some concerns about establishing child care centres in low income neighbourhoods. It is a questionable approach to define a family as "disadvantaged", simply because it consists of a single parent or because the family has a low income. There are examples of well-off parents whose children are also "at risk" for a variety of reasons.

Targeting Child Care Centres for Low Income Neighbourhoods

Targeting child care centres for low income neighbourhoods is based on the assumption that low income families do not use formal child care centres because they cannot afford them and that, if child care centres were more fully

subsidized, poorer mothers would use them in great numbers. In fact, evidence in the U.S. indicates that a shortage of child care facilities or a lack of funds to pay for child care has little effect on a low income mother's decision to take or not take a job and use subsidized child care. It would seem that single mothers or low income mothers are like most other mothers - they prefer to look after the children themselves or alternatively prefer informal child care arrangements - generally with a relative.

The better approach for supposedly "at risk" children may be to provide funding for local community centres where parents can attend and be provided with the opportunity to learn parenting skills, near their children while they are being supervised. Lending toys and books should also be made available at such centres. This kind of community centre would also provide an opportunity for parents, especially single parents, to socialize, network, and reduce some of the isolation they may be experiencing.

Child Care Lobbyists Won't Give Up

This is not the end of the child care battle in Canada. The child care lobbyists are not about to stop their efforts and are determined to obtain the security of caregivers on a unionized government payroll. This has been the real objective all along for their advocacy for a national day care plan.

These child care advocates have learned, however, if nothing else over the 30 years of lobbying, that they must trim their sails whenever the political winds turns against them. For example,

In the 1980's, the child care lobbyists realized that the link between day care and feminism was hurting them. They had been pushing for a national child care program, arguing that women had the right to work outside the home to obtain economic independence and must be released from the obligations of home and children by way of institutionalized child care facilities. This position was based on the book, "The Feminine Mystique," by Betty Friedan (1964) who called the home a concentration camp to which women should not be bound. However, this argument was not a winning one with the general public. As a result, the lobbyists changed the expression "day care" to "child care" in order to change the emphasis to the care of a child rather than to a repository for children to free the mother from the home.

In the mid' 90s the lobbyists changed their focus again to highlight scientific studies which purportedly showed that the first six years of life are crucial to a child's brain development. "Child care" then was re-named "early childhood education" which required a trained worker with two years education on early child development in order to stimulate and educate the child. It was argued that this care was superior care to that provided by parents. Former Liberal leadership candidate and MP, Carolyn Bennett, went further on February 26, 2006, when she stated that denying children child care would turn them into criminals. She stated this on CPAC (parliamentary channel) on a panel with REAL Women researcher, Diane Watts. On May 4, 2006, Ms. Bennett repeated this position on the Mike Duffy show, seen on CTV. A similar comment was made by Liberal Senator Francis Fox when REAL Women appeared before the Senate Committee studying the child care bill on June 20, 2006. He stated that although investing in a national child care program was expensive, it was preferable to investing in penitentiaries!

Since the child care lobbyists have failed to change Mr. Harper's mind on the "early childhood education" argument, they will now have to figure out a new position to advance their cause. We await their next innovation.

The Conservative government is now pursuing the second part of its child care plan - namely it proposes to spend \$250 million annually to create 125,000 new child care spaces over the next five years. What this entails is not yet known. Three members of REAL Women were asked by Human Resources Development to attend a meeting in Ottawa on September 14, 2006 to discuss this policy with members of the Human Resources Policy Division. Details about the meeting will be included in the next issue of REALity.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

As the summer leaves our beautiful country, washed away by the rains of fall here in BC, we are back into the rhythm of school. Does anyone else feel pulled in several directions at the same time?

So how, as busy Canadians, can we possibly find time to do one more thing? Especially when that one more thing is something outside our comfort zone like calling or visiting our MP, or writing a letter to the editor?

When I became National President in June, I had a vague idea that I would just say no to any other commitment which came along, and thus have plenty of time for the work which I was about to undertake. What a surprise I was in for! Unforeseen family matters have come up, financial matters cry for attention, kids need rides, phone calls need to be made.

Earlier this month, REAL Women of Canada was invited to a bilateral meeting with Human Resources and Social Development. So off I flew to Ottawa again, this time to a private meeting with Barbara Moran, Acting Director and Maureen Edgar, Policy Analyst, of the Child and Youth Policy Division, Social Policy Directorate, of the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Development. Gwen Landolt, National Vice President, Cecilia Forsyth, Saskatchewan Chapter President and I attended.

Read more in the next issue about what went on! I know that sometimes it seems like things will never change, or one person can never make a difference, but though life is not fair, I can truly tell you all that God is good; for as a need comes along, I am provided with the resources to cope with it and make it better, or find a solution to it. Before you receive this newsletter, MPs in Ottawa will decide whether or not to reopen the issue of the definition of marriage in Parliament. Considering the facts in this bad law's short history; considering that the report of the Justice Committee sent across Canada to research the issue was never tabled (presented) in Parliament as it should have been; and considering that France's elected National Assembly researched the same question and decided not to change the definition of marriage because it would not be in the best interests of children, I certainly hope our MPs do vote to re-open debate and then vote to undo this disastrous social experiment.

As always, we continue on - regardless of the outcome of our efforts. We are determined that the voice of reason and common sense be heard regardless of those who want us to be silenced. We won't be.

Laurie

THE MUDDLED THOUGHTS OF CHIEF JUSTICE MCLACHLIN

For a Chief Justice, Beverly McLachlin of the Supreme Court of Canada certainly can make some very ill-considered remarks. For example, at a dinner on May 6, 2002, honouring the retiring Madame Justice Claire L'Heuraux Dubé, hosted by the Ontario Bar Association and the Law Society of Upper Canada, Chief Justice McLachlin stated that Madame Justice Claire L'Heuraux Dubé had given her some good advice:

... Claire gave me a great deal of practical help. I was contemplating these huge red robes with ermine with some consternation. She said, 'Well, they're very hot, but let me tell you my secret. We don't wear anything under them.'

Madame Justice McLachlin then stated, "I invite you to let your imagination run wild!!!" How does she want Canadians to envision her? Her less than well thought out comment scarcely promotes either dignity or respect for the court or for herself.

At the recent Canada Bar Association meeting held in St. John's Newfoundland in August 2006, Madame Justice McLachlin was at it again. She stated that the presence of four women out of nine judges on the Supreme Court of Canada made for a "happier" court because the female judges had arranged for yoga classes for themselves. (Can't

they participate in the latter on their own time like everyone else?) She also said that because of the women judges, there are now cakes for the judges' birthdays, nicer pictures on the walls, better food in the dining room and a piano. How nice. The women judges are apparently just a group of happy homemakers away from home, building a comfy little nest for their fellow judges - right in line with the stereotype of females.

Yet, she had more to say. She argued that women were essential to the bench because female litigants may feel outnumbered and intimidated if they were to face a courtroom full of men. According to her written remarks, "The reality is that many people, particularly women, may have less than complete trust in a system comprised predominantly of middle-aged white men in pin-striped trousers." Spare us such nonsense. We are much more concerned, for example, by the feminist ideologies of judges on the court than the matter of the judges' gender. Far better nine fair-minded, reasonable, and objective male judges than narrow-minded feminists on the court, who cannot or will not see beyond the sisterhood's agenda.

Finally, Chief Justice McLachlin stated that the justice system needs the perspective that women bring to judging based on their life experiences. "In this respect", she stated, "women can make a unique contribution to deliberations of our courts." Why? Women do not think alike since their "life experiences" differ widely as do those of men. Chief Justice McLachlin hastily acknowledged this in her prepared text, "To suggest a single feminine world view discounts the incredible variety and diversity of women." If so, then why does she suggest that women, who are individuals with views independent of their gender, make a "unique contribution" to the court? Chief Justice McLachlin needs to do a little more thinking before she utters any more such muddled thoughts.

If Chief Justice McLachlin is trying to "humanize" the court by her remarks, she is not doing a terribly good job of it.

COUNTER-OFFENSIVE BY THE STATUS OF WOMEN

REAL Women stirred up a hornet's nest in regard to the federal Status of Women.

You will recall that when the new Parliament opened last April, REAL Women sent a letter to "friendly" MPs and the Cabinet, expressing our concerns about the Status of Women agency, and the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women, raising objections to their funding feminist only organizations. We also questioned why the Status of Women holds a Cabinet portfolio.

The bureaucratic response from the Minister Beverley Oda's office was to dismiss our concerns outright. We were furious and notified both Ms. Oda and also Prime Minister Harper of the unacceptability of this response. Within two weeks REAL Women was invited to attend a meeting with the Minister (See REALity, March April 2006, page 3 and, "Status of Women Opens Its Doors," July August 2006, page 5.)

This immediate response by the Conservative government to our letters apparently spoke volumes to the Status of Women bureaucracy. For the first time in the 33 years of its existence (it began under Trudeau in 1973), the Status of Women realized that it was not in control of the government's agenda on funding and other policies. Ominously, the bureaucrats also realized that their future livelihood might well be at stake in this debate, especially if their activities came under scrutiny by the Conservative government. This both infuriated and alarmed them.

Almost immediately, they began a counter-offensive against REAL Women.

There is no one better placed administratively to coordinate such a counter offensive than the Status of Women, which has first-hand information on the issue, and has, as a practical matter, on record, all the names and addresses of feminist groups and shelters across the country. Also, an application was made under the Access of Information Act, requesting all documents relating to REAL Women's objections to the Status of Women. The purpose of this application was to expose (and pressure) MPs who have written to the agency to support REAL Women and its perspective on the Status of Women.

Since the documents to be released under the Access to Information Act involved REAL Women, we were required under the Act to acknowledge the release of these documents, which we were invited to review before they were released. During the review of these documents, we came across a departmental memorandum, dated April 19, 2006, advising the regional directors of the Status of Women of an important teleconference call to be held later that day to discuss "REAL Women". Shortly after that conference call conducted by the Status of Women, feminist columnists began to attack REAL Women after years of ignoring us. For example, former Globe and Mail reporter, Heather Mallick wrote on the CBC website on June 29, 2006, about the supposed threat that REAL Women was to women and all that they have achieved in past years. She stated:

If REAL Women were successful, the result would be bullying of these women: those wanting off welfare, but who can't afford child care ... poor women who need abortions and women beaten to a pulp who are afraid to venture on the street.

REAL Women has also received some nasty, even vile e-mails and letters from feminists. The latter do not take a back seat in viciousness to some of the e-mails we receive from homosexual activists. (We keep these letters and e-mails all on file for future use).

The theme of these many letters is that if REAL Women's complaints about the Status of Women are acted upon, then "shelters for abused women and children to protect them from violence" would have to be disbanded. Of course, there is no mention of the studies, which indicate that half of domestic violence is instigated by women. The letters also claim that women need the support of the Status of Women to work for pay equity, marital property and senior women's financial security, etc.

These issues, however, are matters of provincial jurisdiction only. They do not fall within federal jurisdiction and there is no reason why the federal government is funding so generously these provincial issues and organizations. Further, there is no reason why the Status of Women is included in the Cabinet. Why don't the disabled or aboriginals have a place at the Cabinet table? Why do "women" as a group, have priority? Why not men? The argument that women as a group require special recognition because they are "victims" of a patriarchal society is long outdated. The vast majority of women are capable, independent and perfectly able to make their own decisions about their lives.

Yet, letters to MPs are flooding in, supporting the purported vital work of the Status of Women. It is likely that the issue of the Status of Women will also be used by the opposition, encouraged by the public servants employed by the Status of Women, to attack the Conservatives in the next election, probably arguing that they are anti-women and biased.

REAL Women's concerns about the Status of Women however, continues to gain momentum and support especially from conservative internet blogs. This intense support from the bloggers was noticed by Canadian Press which published an article on the large number of blogs supporting REAL Women. The Canadian Press article ran in nine major daily newspapers across the country and resulted in REAL Women having many media interviews about the Status of Women funding. In short, the Status of Women counter offensive backfired on it.

Canada has the most powerful feminist lobby in the world, and this is entirely due to the fact that the government - that is, the taxpayers - fund it. The feminist grip on policies in Canada has been sustained for far too long. No one has dared to criticize the Status of Women before.

The feminist lobby was hard at work in question period on September 21, 2006 probing Minister Oda. Liberal M.P. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grace - Lachine) asked that the Minister not jeopardize the survival and the work of women's groups that represent thousands of Canadian women.

However, it was M.P. Belinda Stronach, (Newmarket - Aurora) who got down right rude and insulting when she stated:

The Prime Minister's Chief of Staff, Ian Brodie, has said that the organization, REAL Women, raises, interesting points that warrant close inspection. This is a group that is anti-choice, anti-gay, does not support equality for women and wants to obliterate the Department on the Status of Women. This group's website even has links to sites that suggest that day cares do not care and homosexuality is a psychological disorder.

With budget cuts on the horizon, who is the minister listening to, Ian Brodie, the right-wing organization, REAL Women, or will she stand up and defend the rights of Canadian women?

I want to add that promoting equal rights for Canadian women is never a waste.

In response to Ms Stonach's remarks the Conservative MPs pounded their desks and called out "hurrah for REAL women"

On September 25, 2006, the Conservative government announced long overdue cuts to a number of government departments including the Status of Women. The latter's budget was cut by \$5 million out of a budget of 23 million. It is an excellent beginning on what we hope will be the eventual elimination of the Status of Women.

HOMOSEXUALS FIGHT OVER SPORT EVENTS

In 1982, the first Federation of Gay Games (FGG) was held in San Francisco. The Games, however, have long been a financial disaster. For example, the FGG lost over \$1 million at the gay games in Vancouver in 1992 and similarly, in New York City in 1994. It also went bankrupt in Amsterdam in 1998, and in Sydney, Australia, in 2002.

Ever hopeful, however, in 2001 the FGG awarded the Gay Games 2006 to Montreal. The committee organizing this Montreal event was headed by former Canadian Olympic swimming champion Mark Tewksbury (Barcelona Olympics 1992). The Montreal committee made great plans, predicting at least 24,000 participants at the games with a budget of \$20 million. Money appeared to be no problem, since the federal government, under the Liberals, the provincial government of Quebec and the City of Montreal immediately kicked in around \$5 million to start things off. Former Liberal Minister of Heritage, Liza Frulla co-hosted a fundraising dinner in 2003 for the FGG. The City of Montreal also offered to provide free facilities and services such as policing for the games. All was well.

The FGG, however, was keenly aware of the bankruptcy of the previous Gay Games and therefore asked the Montreal organizers to scale back the Games to an expected 12,000 athletes and to base the event on a \$16 million budget. Mr. Tewksbury argued, however, that the lowest Montreal could go was 15,500 athletes to break even and refused FGG's demands.

The FGG knew, however, that another financial meltdown of the Games would spell ruin, not just for the games in Montreal, but also for the FGG itself.

Negotiations between the FGG and Mr. Tewksbury went on for two years with the Montreal Committee refusing to accede to the demand that FGG control finances for the Montreal Gay Games.

With no agreement forthcoming by 2003, the two factions separated, with FGG then awarding the official Games to Chicago instead of Montreal. The Montreal organizers, however, decided that they would proceed with their own games, which they called the "Outgames." The latter was set to take place July 26 to August 5, 2006 and the Chicago Gay Games was scheduled for the week earlier, July 15 to 22, 2006.

An added incentive to bring in participants to the Montreal Games was the inclusion in the program of an international conference on homosexual/lesbian rights. The guest speaker at the opening dinner at the conference was none other than Canada's former Supreme Court of Canada Judge Louise Arbour, currently the head of the UN Geneva-based Human Rights Council. During her speech, Ms. Arbour urged members of the

homosexual/lesbian/trans-gendered community to make greater use of the international rights institutions to promote their cause. As if these activists weren't already!

The Montreal Outgames had targeted 16,000 to take part, whereas the Chicago Games projected 12,000 participants. The battle for the athletes began with both sides courting athletes to their separate games. The Montreal event was heavily promoted around the world and, as a result, drew contestants from Canada, Europe and the rest of the world. The event in Chicago drew participants mostly from the United States.

Participants at the Differing Sports Events

The Chicago event claimed it had 12,000 participants or registrants. It received extensive television coverage and the Chicago Sun-Times newspaper not only provided financial contributions, but also free advertisements. Yet the public stayed away. Even during the opening and closing ceremonies, the stands never came close to capacity. The Montreal Outgames had targeted 16,000 registered athletes. However, according to its press release, only 10,248 athletes actually registered, well below target. The Outgames also claimed 1,516 attended the homosexual/lesbian conference and 835 registered for the cultural events, such as choral performances and dancing exhibitions. However, the number of participants at the Outgames were not nearly as high as had been predicted. The Outgames tried to put a positive face on the disaster and to justify the various government grants by claiming the event had brought millions of tourist dollars to Montreal. However, merchants in Montreal reported a mixed bag in regard to financial returns. According to the homosexual newspaper Capital Xtra, (August 17, 2006), many of the merchants did not see the revenues they were told to expect. The Montreal Gazette reported that some merchants made formal complaints to the Outgames organizers because of poor attendance at the Games which led to disappointing financial returns for them.

As in Chicago, the stands at the Montreal Outgames, both at the opening and closing ceremonies, were only half-filled, despite the fact that k.d. lang entertained at the opening ceremonies and Liza Minelli at the closing ceremonies (Capital Xtra, August 17, 2006).

Rivalry to Continue

Even with these losses, neither game event appears to be relenting. Two separate homosexual sports events are now scheduled in the future: the official FGG to take place in Cologne, Germany, in 2010, and the official Outgames to take place in Copenhagen in 2009.

Purposes of the Gay Games

Organizers of these homosexual sports events claim that their purpose is to bring the gay community together. That they do, in more ways than one. The "extracurricular" activities for these events give rise to a surge in infection rates of sexually transmitted diseases, according to Montreal's health officials. As a result, the latter amassed large stocks of the so-called morning-after HIV drug. The drug called Post Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP) can be started within 72 hours of sex and invokes a month-long course of treatment. According to Dr. Rejean Thomas, president of the Clinique Medicale l'Actuel, the pill is not intended to be used in place of the condom, but as a back up when drugs or alcohol diminishes "safe" behaviour. The use of PEP is considered controversial by many AIDS workers, fearing that homosexuals may rely on the drug, rather than on practicing so-called "safe sex," i.e., use of condoms.

However, the real objective of these sports events for homosexuals was admitted by a member of the participating homosexual volleyball teams from Ottawa when he stated that the games offer a great way to meet other gay men (Capital Xtra, July 20, 2006). Also, these sports events are used to promote the acceptance of the homosexual lifestyle as "normal" and mainstream, which it is not.

Intolerance of Homosexuals

When the Outgames in Montreal was opened by lesbian singer, k.d. lang, she used the occasion to attack Prime Minister Stephen Harper for his refusal to attend the games. She claimed that his refusal to do so was "intolerant" and his action based on "unfortunate ignorance." The Conservative Party was represented by Public Works Minister and Senator Michael Fortier who, true to homosexual activists' customary "tolerance", soundly booed him when he appeared, even though he supports same-sex marriage.

It seems, however, that the homosexual politicians in Canada dutifully turned out for the Outgames. These included:

MP Réal Ménard (Bloc Québécois) (Montreal)

Honourable Scott Brison MP, (Liberal leadership candidate) (Nova Scotia)

Honourable Bill Graham MP, Interim Leader of the Federal Liberal Party and Leader of the Opposition (Toronto)

M.P. Bill Siksay (NDP) (British Columbia)

MP Mario Silva (Liberal) (Toronto)

Other politicians attending the Outgames included:

Gilles Duceppe, MP and leader of the Bloc Québécois

Jean Charest, premier of Quebec

Honourable Hedy Fry MP, (Liberal, Vancouver Centre and Liberal leadership candidate)

Honourable Ken Dryden MP, former Liberal Minister of Social Development

Honourable Denis Coderre MP, (Liberal, Minister of Labour Critic and the Critic for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec) and

Liza Frulla, former Liberal Heritage Minister

One has to wonder why homosexuals think that they are so important that the Prime Minister is required to attend their events or that spectators are interested in watching events based not on athletic skill, but merely on the participant's sexual orientation. Both the Chicago and Montreal sports events showed the fallacy of this belief. Homosexuals are not asking for tolerance, but rather for state approval of their lifestyle by the presence of our public leaders. Fortunately, Prime Minister Harper had more sense than the other political leaders and did not attend this sports failure.

THE AIDS CONFERENCE CIRCUS

The 16th international conference on AIDS held in Toronto in August was a three ring circus. In the main ring were the chief entertainers, former U.S. president Bill Clinton, philanthropists Melissa and Bill Gates and Stephen Lewis, who performed for the crowd while bestowing, at the same time, lavish praise on one another for their commitment to "the cause".

Little was accomplished at the conference because, as stated by Canadian Health Minister Tony Clement, the meeting was so politically charged that it was "becoming a place where you couldn't have a rational discussion". Stephen Lewis, former Ontario NDP leader, now the UN's special envoy on AIDS in Africa, had a grand time performing for the crowd, repeatedly condemning Prime Minister Stephen Harper who had the good sense to stay away from the circus. As stated by Globe & Mail columnist Margaret Wente (August 17, 2006) "If I have to hear Stephen Lewis lecturing us with his apocalyptic rhetoric one more time, in think I'll choke". She recommended that Mr. Lewis take an Ativan to calm down.

Failure of AIDS Prevention Campaigns

After 25 years and many billions of dollars spent on AIDS, prevention is a ghastly failure since the number of persons

living with AIDS has increased dramatically. In short, even though there are promising drug treatments that prolong the lives of AIDS patients, tragically, society is still not coming to grips with the disease. According to the UN and World Health Organization (WHO), HIV/AIDS has increased by over 20% in Canada since 2000. In August, 2006, overall, it was estimated, by the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC) that there were 2,300 to 4,500 new HIV infections last year, compared to an approximate 2,100 to 4,000 infections in 2002. The prescription cost for each patient is between \$10,000 and \$20,000 each year. The financial cost, plus the human suffering involved with AIDS, is monumental.

Yet, it is easy to avoid AIDS. A person who is chaste before marriage, faithful in marriage and married to someone who is also faithful and doesn't inject illegal drugs has very little chance of becoming HIV positive. The only exception is when our blood system becomes contaminated as occurred in the 1980s because of the then Canadian Red Cross' failure to raise the politically incorrect question of homosexual's contributing to the blood system. (See REALity, September October 1998.)

We know it's a preventable disease because Uganda has shown this and knows what has to be done to stop AIDS. Throughout the 1980's, the rate of HIV/AIDS climbed to a staggering 30% of the Ugandan population, in line with most other countries of Africa. But since the establishment, in 1987, of the country's home-grown programs of abstinence and marital fidelity, the HIV/AIDS rate was reduced to as low as 6.2 per cent. The Christian churches, Catholic, Anglican and Evangelical, worked successfully with the government to develop policies to promote marital fidelity and a "no grazing" message to "stay with your husband, stay with your wife." It worked.

In the last year, four other countries have imported the Ugandan program and are seeing some success already. HIV/AIDS rates are starting to fall in Kenya, Zimbabwe, Rwanda, and Swaziland since they began the implementation of the programme.

If prevention is so easy, why is the epidemic continuing unabated? The reason is that a coalition of AIDS patients and activists has set up an AIDS industry, which has vetoed every tested public health strategy for controlling this sexually transmitted disease. Don't tell people not to engage in promiscuity, prostitution, and injection drug use, they insist, just tell them to be "responsible" and use condoms for "safe" sex.

This hasn't worked because people who engage in frequent multi-partnering, employ sex workers, and have substance abuse problems are, by definition, not responsible. The research shows there is a clear connection between irresponsible sexual behaviour and alcohol and drug abuse. Twenty-five years of experience has proven that no matter how much safe-sex education the irresponsible receive, they will not use a condom every time and even if they did, there still is no guarantee of safety. The epidemic continues, unabated.

AIDS activists are also exerting constant pressure to keep budgets high and accountability of these programs minimal, while demanding the usual sexual freedom, especially for homosexuals. These policies ensure that new infections occur. Their strident voices and aggressive tactics include nullifying ideological opponents, which helps deflect evaluation of their own ineffectiveness. Just ask billionaire philanthropist Bill Gates, who at the Toronto AIDS conference inadvertently tripped on a land mine in his opening remarks. He mentioned abstinence and faithfulness within marriage as strategies to combat the deadly disease. This provoked loud unanimous boo's from the audience. Mr. Gates quickly recovered from his faux pas and launched into a discussion about why U.S. President Bush's ABC program (abstinence, faithfulness and condoms) does not work. Mr. Gates' experience was a snapshot of the problem - AIDS is handicapped by AIDS activists who fight furiously against the idea that AIDS programs should target certain sexual behaviour. In short, there is an increasing war against abstinence programs. In fact, there is much invested by some, both monetarily and ideologically, in not encouraging abstinence, as they are more interested in protecting and promoting sexual liberties than in preventing new infections.

How much longer are we going to allow this AIDS establishment to prevent standard public health strategies from being put in place to fight against the spread of AIDS? Standard public health practices include mandatory testing of the at-risk population, eg. pregnant women, etc., contact tracing and partner notification, abstinence education, closing down establishments that cater to male/male sexual activity with heavy substance abuse eg. crystal meth in

"gay" bathhouses, and the prohibiting homosexual oriented youth programs in our schools since the lives of youth are at stake and they must be dissuaded from engaging in any sex outside marriage - especially dangerous male-to-male sex.

Homosexuals and the Canadian Blood Supply

It is discouraging that a court challenge has been commenced to prohibit the Canada Blood Services (CBS) from asking the pertinent question when people are donating blood, as to whether the contributor had engaged in male-to-male sex. The homosexual lobby group EGALE in May 2006, was added as a party in the case. It claims such a question by CBS is "discriminatory". EGALE argues that the issue to be addressed by CBS is risky sexual behaviour, not sexual orientation. Yet, the entire court case was commenced because a homosexual falsely declared "no" to a query on the CBS screening questionnaire asking whether he had had sex with a male since 1977. Soon afterward, the homosexual contacted the agency to admit that he had lied and that he strongly objected to the screening procedure. Fortunately, the CBS was able to remove his blood from the system before it was infused into someone else. However, this situation indicates how risky it is to allow homosexuals to give blood, since their response, as shown, is not always reliable. Consequently, it is better to prohibit homosexuals from giving blood, since AIDS is not curable at this point in time and homosexual sexual activity is high risk - infinitely more so than heterosexual sexual activity. The Canadian AIDS Society is also intervening in this case as a "friend of the court".

What about the public's rights in this case? We have to rely on the "wisdom" and "common sense" of a judge to protect us from AIDS in the blood supply. Unfortunately, we know from past experience that these two characteristics are not in abundance in our politically correct justice system. This test case is to reach the trial stage in May, 2007.

AIDS organizations that receive public funding must be held accountable. They must be prohibited from enabling behaviour that causes the transmission of HIV. In short, AIDS must be treated as the terrible epidemic it is. Three ring circuses don't cut it: We must get serious about this disease.

U.S. FORD MOTOR COMPANY PUSHING THE HOMOSEXUAL AGENDA

Even though the Ford Motor Company in the U.S. is facing bankruptcy and laying off thousands of employees, it has dug in its heels and insists on continuing to finance homosexual organizations and same-sex marriage, while refusing to fund any organization on the opposite side of the issue.

Ford, which also manufactures Jaguar, Volvo, Land Rover, Mazda, Lincoln and Mercury, is now facing grave financial problems on a number of fronts, including stiff competition from Japan (Toyota) and Korea (Hyundai) as these foreign cars are made more efficiently than American models. In fact, the Ford Motor Company lost \$1.44 billion (US) through the first half of 2006 with its U.S. market in a 10-year decline.

Another problem for U.S. Ford is the boycott by more than 20 pro-family groups in the U.S., initiated by The American Family Association because of Ford's support of the homosexual agenda. Ford's stock has dropped more than 14% since the boycott began, reaching the lowest point in nearly 20 years. The stock is now \$8.02 and is expected to fall to \$3.00 in a matter of months. At U.S. Ford's annual shareholder's meeting, held on May 11, 2006, Ford Motor Company Chairman, William Ford Jr., stated that Ford "was profitable in most of the world with the exception of our North American automotive operations".

This is not to say that the two other big U.S. automobile manufacturers, General Motors and Chrysler Daimler are not also in financial trouble, but Ford's trouble is much worse. Its market share fell from 25% early this decade to 15%. Ford is being hammered in the U.S. market by fuel conscious consumers who are ditching Ford's gas-guzzling SUV's and pick-up trucks and shifting to smaller vehicles such as the popular Toyotas. But Ford, is also being hammered by the fact that it continues to alienate consumers by its insistence on supporting the homosexual agenda. It sponsors gay pride parades and gives hundreds of thousands of dollars to homosexual political groups, which are vigorously

pushing homosexual demands. For example, Ford Motor Company is a "platinum Sponsor" of the U.S. Human Rights Campaign ("HRC"), which is the leading advocate of homosexual marriages. In order to be a "Platinum Sponsor", Ford was required to give HRC \$150,000.

Ford was the first and only U.S. auto company listed on the 1999 Gay and Lesbian Values Index of top 100 companies working on homosexual issues.

U.S. Ford also carried a bizarre anti-traditional family TV ad. The Ford commercial shows two parents, two children and a dog spending a weekend shopping, driving and hanging out on the beach - but at the end of the day, the father is dropped off at his apartment. "Thanks for inviting me this weekend," he said, while hugging his children. "Sure," responds his apparent ex-wife, perched behind the wheel of the Ford Freestyle. The commercial ends with the father waving as the car drives away.

The ad, according to Ford's General Marketing Manager, John Felice is a "true reflection of the world today", adding that Ford wasn't making any kind of social statement with the ad which he called a "celebration of family" and a tribute to "the versatility of life itself." No wonder Ford has trouble selling its cars.

Ford Motors in Canada

The situation with Ford Canada is different in that Ford sales increased 13% here last year. According to Marketing Magazine's June 12, 2006 issue, which featured homosexual marketing in Canada, Ford Canada placed an ad in the September 2, 2005 Toronto edition of the homosexual newspaper Xtra. It was a full-page ad for the Escape Hybrid in which the copy read:

Like you, Ford doesn't compromise.

However, a closer look revealed a pink ribbon, indicating the car maker is a proud sponsor of the Canadian Breast Cancer Foundation - but without any reference to the gay community! The ad was not the only mixed message from Ford. Despite the ad's prominent position on the inside front cover of an overtly gay publication, Ford officials say they know nothing of efforts to target Canada's gay community. When asked whether his company has placed ads in gay publications, Ford Canada's public affairs manager Chris Banks said, "Ford of Canada, I don't believe we ever have."

Maybe that's the reason why Ford Canada had a 29% increase in sales in August, which boosted its market share to 13.8% from 11.6% a year earlier.

U.S. Ford's Philanthropic Foundation

Ford established the Ford Foundation back in 1936 which is now based in New York to carry out philanthropic work on behalf of the company. Unfortunately, however, most of its philanthropic work in recent years is directed to fund homosexual organizations and feminist groups around the world, many of which are active at the UN. For example, according to the Foundation 2005 annual report, the Ford Foundation gave \$2 million to the organization established by Planned Parenthood, called "Catholics for Free Choice", whose purpose is to agitate for abortion world wide, claiming it represents a "Catholic" viewpoint. Hardly.

The Ford Foundation does make some grants to a few worthy organizations, such as refugee and immigrant groups, but the main thrust of its grants totaling \$205,289,770, last year, seems to have been to support feminists, pro-abortion and homosexual organizations. Included in these grants was \$100,000 to the Canadian organization set up by Planned Parenthood in Canada in 1998 called Action Canada for Population and Development (ACPD). The purpose of ACPD is to push abortion and homosexual rights around the world.

The Ford Foundation, in short, is not interested in supporting pro/life/family organizations - only those that are aimed at changing the social values of a country for the worst, such as widening access to abortion and feminism and acquiring privileges for homosexuals.

The U.S. Ford Foundation does not represent mainstream America, and neither does the U.S. division represent the views of mainstream Americans. On the other hand, Ford Canada, because it has not become embroiled in left wing politics in Canada, is not in nearly as much financial difficulties as is the U.S. division. If it is smart, Ford Canada will keep it that way.