

UNVEILING THE SECRETS OF THE HOMOSEXUAL DEBATE

Why is it that 33 U.S. states have resoundly rejected same-sex marriage, either by way of referenda or legislation? Even the liberal states of California, New York, Maine and New Jersey have rejected same-sex marriage. What is the secret of the pro-family groups in the U.S. that has eluded Canada on the same-sex marriage issue?

There are a number of differences which made our efforts in Canada much more difficult. These include:

The definition of marriage in Canada under the Constitution Act of 1867 falls solely within federal jurisdiction, with the provinces having jurisdiction only to apply the federal marriage law. Consequently, homosexual activists in Canada had only to pressure the federal government, not the 13 provincial governments and territories to pass a law legalizing same-sex marriage. In the U.S., on the other hand, each state has the jurisdiction to define marriage under its individual constitution so that homosexual activists in the US have a much more difficult time because they have to lobby each of the 50 states individually.

There is a provision in most of the individual U.S. state constitutions for a referendum to take place when court decisions or legislations are unacceptable as long as a specified number of names have been obtained on a petition requesting such a referendum.

In Canada, only the federal government may call for a referendum on a constitutional matter (Referendum Act 1992). Obviously, the Liberal government, under Prime Minister Paul Martin, which brought in the same-sex marriage legislation in June 2005, did not want to hear from the public on the issue by way of a referendum or otherwise!

The U.S. voters play a much more influential role in legislative decisions, since members of the U.S. Congress are independent in their voting because they are not controlled by their political parties, as occurs in Canada. Consequently, elected U.S. politicians are more likely to respond to the voters' wishes, unlike the situation in Canada, where the views of the voting public are largely ignored – or at least, take a back seat to party policy.

That is, in Canada, the prime minister decides party policy and MPs dare not vote against the party, especially on a major issue, such as same-sex marriage. In 2005, Prime Minister Martin ordered all his Cabinet to vote for the same-sex marriage legislation (they all obediently did so), with only a few Liberal MPs daring to vote against the party's policy on the issue.

Most Significant Reason for the Legalization of Same-Sex Marriage

The above differences in Canada all took their toll on the outcome of the debate in this country. However, one of the most significant reasons that the federal Liberal government successfully pushed through same-sex marriage legislation was the terms on which the debate was framed.

In Canada, the issue was framed as an equality issue – the homosexual activists calling themselves the Canadians for Equal Marriage. That is, the debate was framed as a civil rights issue, similar, for example, to the right to vote, or protection under the law for race and gender. It was argued that homosexual marriage was a right or entitlement based on equality. However, homosexuality is not a civil right, it is a behaviour. That is, all scientific evidence indicates that no homosexual gene exists and that homosexuality is a psychological behaviour, rather than an innate, unchangeable characteristic, such as race and gender. Hence, the debate here was a false one.

Prime Minister Paul Martin encouraged this misinterpretation of the issue when he claimed that same-sex marriage was a civil or human right and a "charter" value. It was not. The Supreme Court of Canada did not order same-sex

marriage as a constitutional right at all -- it simply said the government could, if it so wished, provide a policy for same-sex marriage under the Charter – but there was no requirement that the Liberal government do so.

U.S. Approach

The pro-family approach in the U.S., however, was to frame the same-sex marriage debate on the basis that it would result in severe consequences for the public school system. In a series of ads, it was made clear that if same-sex marriage were legalized, it would lead to government indoctrination of the children in public schools and the suppression of free speech. These ads ran successfully in California's Proposition 8 referendum held in November 2008, which overruled the court decision in support of same-sex marriage. Again, more recently, in the Maine referendum in October these ads were highly effective and successfully diminished the civil rights argument. Same-sex marriage activists in the US did produce ads in retaliation, with state officials claiming, unsuccessfully, that same-sex marriage had nothing to do with education – which is clearly not the case.

Voters Concerned about Children

The voters in the U.S. were influenced by the warning that same-sex marriage would be a corrupting influence on their children. This became the hot-button issue during the same-sex marriage debates there.

We, in Canada, know that the ads sponsored in the U.S. by defenders of traditional marriage were correct in that same-sex marriage does have a serious impact on the education system. The normalization of homosexuality is now a part of school curricula – especially in B.C. and Ontario – and has led to a hostile environment for those with a socially conservative point of view on the issue.

Similarly, in the State of Massachusetts, where same-sex marriage was made legal by the court, legalization has been used as a hammer to force acceptance and normalization of homosexuality on children in the public schools. For example, the year following the legalization of same-sex families in that state, the elementary school curricula in Massachusetts taught children that same-sex couples were just like any other family. School libraries were quickly filled with books promoting homosexuality and gay marriage. A federal court judge in Massachusetts held that because same-sex marriage was legal, the schools actually had a duty to teach the normalization of homosexual relationships to children, and, further, that schools had no obligation to notify parents or let them opt out of these programs. Acceptance of homosexuality had become a matter of good citizenship!

Homosexuals Misunderstood the Effect of Pro-Family Ads

It was fortunate indeed that homosexual activists in the U.S. underestimated how deeply the carefully crafted public school message resonated with the public, and, ultimately, this led to the rejection of same-sex marriage in many states.

It is surprising though that they did not foresee this would happen as they had previously developed the concept of "safety" in schools as an effective way to promote homosexual advocacy and blunt pro-family resistance to it. This approach had been previously implemented in Canada and in some US States. That is, homosexual activists decided to make their campaign for the promotion of homosexual instruction in the schools, not as a fairness issue, but rather as an issue of "safety" for children. This was a particularly effective way to explain "homophobia" as a threat to student "safety," which, if permitted to exist, would create a climate where violence, name-calling, health problems and suicide would result. The "safety" issue argument automatically threw the pro-family position on the defensive and stole their line of attack. Portraying homosexuality as a "safety" issue in the schools, immediately gained favour in the eyes of the public and was one of the keys to their victory in promoting homosexuality in the schools. Similarly, pro-family ads during the same-sex marriage referendums in the US found favour in the eyes of the public and was key in rejecting same-sex marriage.

By the way, the claim that homosexual students were suicidal because of the alleged bullying of them has no

legitimate medical, psychological or factual foundation. In short, all the pro-homosexual programs in the schools, both in the U.S. and in Canada to-day, have simply been put together in order to normalize homosexuality in the minds of children, if possible, without any parental knowledge or consent, and is nothing more than a scam and deception.

In contrast, as we know in Canada, it is a fact that legislation of same-sex marriage does have a direct impact on the education system. The pro-family ads in the US were absolutely accurate.

THE SHAM OF ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN

There they go again. The feminist supporters of universal day care are determined to get their way, which is to establish an all day child care program in Canada. These lobby groups never give up.

They have bended and adjusted their terminology and strategy over the years in order to influence governments and the public in this regard.

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 day care program, arguing that women had the right to work outside the home to obtain economic independence and that they must be released from the obligations of home and children by way of institutionalized day 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 freeing the mother from home responsibilities.

In the mid 1990s, the lobbyists changed their focus again to highlight scientific studies, which showed that the first six years of life are crucial to a child's brain development. "Child care" was then re-named "early childhood education", which required a trained worker, with two years education in early child development, in order to stimulate and educate the child. It was argued that this care was superior to that provided by parents. It is this argument that is currently prevailing and has most recently been successfully applied in the provinces of Ontario and BC. These two provinces have agreed to establish all day kindergartens, with the state serving as the nanny. That is, although child care activists will not publicly admit it, these kindergartens are actually universal, government funded day care centres which are for the convenience of working parents rather than for the benefit of children.

Day Care Strategists Pressure Provincial Governments

The reason why these day care lobbyists have hit on the provinces to establish day care programs is due to the fact that the federal Conservative government has made it clear it is not interested in a universal day care program. Instead, the Conservatives established a \$100 per month direct payment to the parents for each child under six years of age. This way the parents decide themselves which kind of child care to choose.

Unfortunately, the Liberal governments in B.C. and Ontario have succumbed to the arguments of the day care lobbyists that an all day kindergarten, open from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., will provide children with what the lobbyists call a "seamless education system".

The real effect of all day kindergarten is to:

- allow the state to raise the children and control the children's values in accordance with socialist/Marxist principles;
- help fill the rapidly emptying classrooms due to the low birth rate in Canada (1.5 per woman of child bearing age);
- increase class size from approximately 20 students to 26 students each;
- provide more employment, power and influence to teachers and their unions;

expand employment for Early Childhood Education (ECE) teachers, with increased salaries. By transferring their employment to a school board and a unionized wage scale, their salaries will increase from \$30,000 to \$47,000 per year; and enable more women to enter the paid work force, which increases the tax base.

Supporters of All Day Kindergarten Deny the Truth

The implications of all day kindergarten, however, are never acknowledged by those pushing for it. Instead, they claim that their concerns are only for the children. They argue that an all day kindergarten is the right thing to do because children need intellectual stimulation in the disciplined environment provided by trained teachers. This, they argue will increase children's social/emotional development and intellectual skills and will lead, in due course, to higher employment and earnings, a more skilled work force, higher productivity and a drop in domestic violence and crime. (Don't ask!)

What is so odd about the supposed advantages for children of early education, is that there is no solid evidence of it having any long lasting, beneficial effect. For example, massive, six year research at the UK's Durham University found that in a comparison of almost 35,000 children, some who were home and some who were in outside care, there was no difference in the children's development levels. This study was substantiated by a study of primary education by Cambridge University, in a 608 page document called, "Cambridge Primary Review", which found that there was no evidence suggesting that a formal teaching environment benefited young children and in fact, could even be harmful, creating negative social and emotional development, aggression, and brain chemistry damage. At best, the evidence on the supposed benefits of early childhood education is highly inconclusive.

What do Children Really Need?

Anyone who has had anything to do with young children knows that children need an informal play-based education, which is easily provided in the home. Young children do not need or should not be required to fit into the structure and discipline of a classroom.

It is noteworthy that in Finland and Germany, children do not begin school until they turn seven years of age. Finland is regarded as having Europe's best education system, with that country's students regularly achieving top marks in reading, literacy and science in the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA). Incidentally, parents in Finland have a choice to raise the children themselves in the home with payment by the State of \$500 per month per child, or to place them in state operated child care. Not surprisingly, most parents in Finland chose to remain in the home to raise their own children until they enter school at age seven. That is, no doubt, one explanation for the high academic achievement of Finnish children.

Ontario

Even though the province of Ontario has a \$24.7 billion deficit so far this year, Provincial Premier Dalton McGuinty announced, in July 2009, that he plans an expensive, new program of all-day kindergarten. This new policy is based on the recommendation of Charles Pascal, a former Deputy Minister of Education and Social Service in Ontario, who released a report in June 2009 recommending all day kindergarten. His report was based on an often-cited report by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which calls for an integrated education agenda. The OECD plan is to move away from the "ideology" of the family and to "transition" to a new order, which will require "deep changes in societies in general and in the family structure in particular." A popular text book for day care staff describes OECD's program as "the vanguard in promoting" new values about family. OECD promotes a large flexible workforce by encouraging women to enter paid employment so as to create a full employment economy. According to OECD, early childhood education should be "part of national human capital development". But most Canadians believe that pushing mothers into the paid work force in order to broaden and strengthen the tax base should not be an objective of any child care plan.

Ontario Premier McGuinty, however, has proposed that the full time kindergarten program be launched, starting with 3-5 year olds in Ontario schools, in 2010 and 2011. He stated that the cost to the taxpayers would be \$500 million for the first two years of this program. When fully implemented, the project will cost \$1.5 billion annually.

A recent study, released in November 2009, by the Institute of Marriage and Family Canada reveals that full day kindergarten in Ontario will cost about double the initial estimate: eventually, the full program will cost the province \$6 billion annually, which is half the current Ontario Ministry of Education budget.

When Mr. McGuinty made his announcement, his intention was to employ only early childhood education teachers in the 3-5 year old classrooms. The Ontario teachers union would have none of this. It claimed jurisdiction for the whole school day for its members. Mr. McGuinty, afraid of angering the union, which has supported him politically, came up with a brilliant solution: that teachers (at \$60,000 plus annual salary) would work full days in the classroom to deliver the kindergarten (day care program) curriculum and oversee the program planning. The early childhood educator will also be present in the classroom (\$47,000 annually) at the same time. It is unclear whether the latter will only be responsible for the before and after school programs for which parents will pay "a reasonable fee" i.e. the fee will be subsidized. Thus, this full day learning program in Ontario will provide the world's most expensive day care.

British Columbia

The situation in B.C. is just as peculiar. Although B.C. has less of a deficit this year (\$2.8 billion) than Ontario, which is now a "have not" province, B.C. is still not "rolling" in money in these economic hard times. In order to keep the deficit at its current level, health authorities, school boards, colleges, arts groups, and Special Olympic programs have been hit by funding cuts.

Notwithstanding this, B.C. Premier Campbell announced, in August 2009, that the province would fund all day kindergarten for 40,000 five year olds, starting in September 2010. He has stated that it will cost the province \$130 million a year (he hopes!). Opposition NDP leader, Carole James, greeted the news of an all day kindergarten with delight.

This program was launched without any input from parents. Those groups that were consulted by the government will all materially benefit from an all day kindergarten through jobs, research contracts/grants, finances and union member fees, etc. For example, the consultation paper, of course, included references to OECD, the World Bank and the Human Early Learning Partnership (HELP) at UBC which is funded by the provincial government and which will gain even further influence with this new program.

The announcement for an all day kindergarten in BC was not met with universal approval, as the B.C. Teachers Federation and the B.C. School Trustees Association are upset by it. They state that although they support the concept of an all day kindergarten, they believe it will take funds away from the present educational system and will be adding another level of service to an already inadequately funded system. The teachers' federation is especially concerned about the increase in class size, frozen funding and lack of funding for structural maintenance, which will be undermined by money going to the all day kindergarten.

The B.C. School Trustees complained at their meeting in October, that there are not enough dollars in the education system to run even the current programs, let alone the new and expanded initiative of all-day kindergarten. According to BC NDP education critic Diane Thorne, "there is no money in this year's budget to implement all day kindergarten, despite the amount of prep work that needs to be done".

Both provincial leaders of BC and Ontario are presently treading in difficult political waters with their opposition parties rapidly gaining on them in the polls. These premiers seem to think that the all day kindergarten legislation, if passed, will serve as their legacy, as these programs will undoubtedly prove difficult to undo in subsequent years, as the public will begin to regard them as an "entitlement".

The only problem is that all day kindergarten will be to the detriment of young children and the taxpayer, who will have to pay for the programs through increased taxation. Apparently, however, in these two provinces at least, neither the public, nor the parents and their children, have been respected enough to be consulted.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

By the time you receive this newsletter you will have made your New Year resolutions, but I would like to offer a couple of suggestions for your list!

My first resolution is to do one personal action per month. It could be writing or phoning your elected government representative, local newspaper or phone-in radio show. It could be a prayer intention. It could be speaking out at a church, community or other public event. It could be sharing our REALity newsletter with another person. The idea is to get into the habit of being an advocate for the family.

My second resolution is to sign-up at least one new member for REAL Women in the coming year. Personal one-to-one contact is the most effective way of increasing our membership numbers. Please help us in this manner.

Like many Prime Ministers before him, Prime Minister Stephen Harper prorogued Parliament. Instead of resuming sitting at the end of January, Parliament will now begin a new session March 3rd. This means all pending government legislation will die, but not Private Member's Bills, which will resume where they left off once Parliament sits again in March.

Bill C-268 on Human Trafficking will resume Second reading in the Senate. Please write your Senators to encourage timely passage of this legislation. For a list of Senators go to www.canada.gc.ca or phone 1.800-266-7362.

Bill C-384, the pro-Euthanasia Bill, will be scheduled for second reading sometime in March. Please continue to contact your MP's to defeat Bill C-384.

Another action item is to write Prime Minister Stephen Harper to express your support of Conservative MP Maurice Vellacott, a strong pro-family MP from Saskatoon. Liberal Critic for the Status of Women, Anita Neville, is asking the Prime Minister to silence Conservative MP Maurice Vellacott because Mr. Vellacott continues to expose the link between abortion and the risk of breast cancer.

Women deserve to know the truth. So instead of silencing MP Maurice Vellacott, tell the Prime Minister You appreciate Mr. Vellacott and his concern for the well being of women.

I think this is enough action ideas for now! Hope to see many of our members at the 2010 Conference in North Bay in April. It promises to be an exciting event!

Cecilia Forsyth

RESISTANCE TO THE POLITICALLY CORRECT CAUSED BY INTOLERANCE

The Nov/Dec 2009 issue of REALity (p.12-14) included an article discussing the major institutions, agencies and individuals in Canada whose actions have led to a plague of political correctness. This has led to tremendous intolerance in Canada toward those with independent views. The latter are subject to degradation and humiliation for their unwillingness to conform to "political correctness."

The institutions insisting on political correctness include the Human Rights Commissions, the media, homosexual activists, schools and universities and the courts.

Canadians have a choice: to meekly submit, by conforming to politically correct demands, or to resist the totalitarian activism of these institutions. Fortunately, some of these institutions are now self-destructing without any help from us. For example:

(a) Human Rights Commissions

The excesses of the Human Rights Commissions (HRCs) have become fodder for ridicule, turning them into a laughing stock, providing one isn't the subject to a complaint before the Commission. The Canadian hero responsible for "outing" Canadian HRCs is Ezra Levant, lawyer and publisher of the former Western Standard Magazine (see a review of Ezra's book "Shakedown", REALity, May/June 2009, p.12).

As a result of the adverse publicity in the past year or so, these Commissions have begun to voluntarily apply a little more common sense in their decisions, unwilling to take the heat and public ridicule. This has caused a seismic upheaval in the Human Rights Commissions. For example:

The Canadian Human Rights Commission and the BC Human Rights Tribunal both beat a tactical retreat in the Mark Steyn/Macleans magazine complaint because of public pressure from both the left and right of the political spectrum, e.g., the writers' association, PEN Canada, the Globe and Mail and writer Salman Rushdie. The latter are no friends of the right, for sure, but, recognizing the danger posed by the Human Rights Commissions, they joined the opposition to them.

Alberta Human Rights Commission

Mr. Justice Earl Wilson of the Alberta Court of Queens Bench publicly pummeled the Alberta Commission and its panelist, Judge Lori Andreachuk, a divorce lawyer by profession, for her preposterous decision in the Stephen Boissoin case. The latter was a youth pastor who had written a letter published in the Red Deer Advocate in 2002 that was critical of the radical gay "agenda". Mr. Boissoin was sentenced by Ms Andreachuk to a lifetime ban from speaking about homosexuality in public and private life, ordered to write a letter of apology by which he would have had to renounce his faith, and was given a \$5,000 fine. All this was in addition to the enormous legal costs he incurred. In his judgement, Mr. Justice Wilson criticized the commission's procedures, lack of legal application, disregard of evidence and the bizarre legal punishment awarded. The truth about our human rights commission was once again exposed. Hopefully, the Alberta Commission will never recover.

S.13 of the federal Human Rights Act

The Conservative Policy Convention, held in Winnipeg in November, overwhelmingly voted (including Minister of Justice, Rob Nicholson) to remove S.13 from the Human Rights Act. This provision allows the Commission to censor "hate" speech on the Internet and other electronic media.

Human Rights Commissioner, Jennifer Lynch, ordered a review of the Commission by Professor Richard Moon from the University of Windsor. To the surprise of everyone (especially Commissioner Lynch), his report recommended that S.13 be repealed.

It is important that Canadians let the Conservative government know that S. 13 of the Canadian Human Rights Act must be removed. A similar provision is included in the Alberta legislation and it must also be removed. Please write to Prime Minister Stephen Harper and Justice Minister Rob Nicholson requesting that S.13 be deleted from the federal Human Rights Act and also to the Alberta premier to do the same. Their addresses are listed at the end of this article.

Human Rights Commissions know that they cannot continue to hand down their customary bizarre and repressive decisions. To do so costs them heavily in credibility and respect. We are witnessing the beginning of the journey, which will eventually bring to a halt the tyranny of Human Rights Commissions.

(b) The Courts

The courts are not so easily dealt with, as judges are appointed by the Prime Minister and remain on the bench until they reach 75 years of age. They cannot be removed from office unless they are guilty of “misconduct”, e.g., have committed a criminal offence, or “failed in the due execution of their office”. This is pretty vague stuff and that’s why so few judges have been removed over the years. Apparently, blatant bias by a judge is no offence. The courts in Canada have brought to Canadians: abortion on demand, same-sex marriage, legalized drug injection sites, legalized swinger sex, narrow application of obscenity, etc. – the list is endless.

One of the problems is that most of the judges sitting on the federal courts today were appointed by the previous Liberal government many years ago and these judges, with their “liberal” mind sets, are repeatedly promoting their own left-wing perspective and ideologies in their decisions.

Diminish the Power of the Courts

Many suggestions have been made as to how to diminish the power of elitist judges. One such recommendation was raised and passed at the Conservative Party Policy Convention in November 2009; one was to limit a judge’s term to 10 years – still leaving him/her 10 years to do damage. But this is better than the 29 years that Madam Justice Beverley McLachlin, for example, will have had on the Bench if she remains there until her retirement at 75 years of age.

Another solution to curtail the power of the judiciary is to amend Section 52, Part VII of the Charter, which provides that all laws are subject to the Charter. Since the Charter is interpreted by judges, they have a free hand to interpret it as they wish, in accordance with their own ideology. That is, this provision in the Charter allows the courts to overturn or amend legislation passed by Parliament. Will the Prime Minister open up the Charter of Rights to amend this provision? This is unlikely, not only because of his minority position in Parliament, but also because at present, he is focused on the economy and the deficit and doesn’t need any more highly volatile challenges.

Until such time as the Charter is amended, it is incumbent on the public to raise objections to the court for its frequent, questionable decisions. This can be done by letters to the editor and letters to members of Parliament, including the Prime Minister, demanding that only those judges who respect and defer to Parliament should be appointed to the Bench. The public also has to let Parliament know that it must use Section 33 of the Charter (the notwithstanding clause), which allows the reinstatement of a law for a five-year period (which can be renewed) if a law has been struck down as unconstitutional by the courts. The application of S.33 of the Charter would cause judges to hesitate to either re-write laws or overturn them. This clause has fallen into disuse because of concerns that the application of S.33 will undermine the Charter and the judiciary. That’s a problem?

The arrogant courts do not deserve our respect or deference nor should they receive it. This should be publicly acknowledged.

(c) Media

The media today are flailing around in a tailspin as newspaper owners grapple with declining advertising revenues, falling circulation and the free news available on the web. Moreover, many newspapers no longer have professional integrity. They do not actually “report” the news, but rather “reflect” on it, according to their own leftist spin. Who watches CBC or CTV or Global without prior knowledge that they are being given a spin on the news, rather than the news itself?

The Web “Reuses” Newspaper Reports

A study released in December 2009 on the use of US newspaper stories on the Internet, found that more than 75,000

web sites reused content from newspapers without authorization. The study found that articles from large national newspapers were reused as many as 15 times. Google accounted for more than 53% of this use and Yahoo for 19%, whereas blogs made up less than 10% of the top reusing sites.

Mr. Murdoch, Chairman of the international Newscorp, calls this reuse of his newspapers' content "theft". He threatened, in December 2009, to remove his newspaper chain from Google search engines and switch to rival Microsoft Corporation. As a result, Google has changed its policy and will restrict free access to about 5 clicks and will then require users to become subscribers if accessing directly for further information.

This may well be just a whiff of the future -- when all newspaper content on the Internet may be by subscription only.

It is a fact, however, that readers and viewers are abandoning newspapers and conventional television for cable and Internet all over the world. This has required newspapers and TV companies to make huge cutbacks because of the declining ad market. For example:

CanWest Global Communications Corp., which acquires 85% of its revenue from advertising, and which owns a national chain of ten big city newspapers, including the National Post, Montreal Gazette, Vancouver Sun, Calgary Herald, Ottawa Citizen, Winnipeg Free Press, Saskatoon Star/Phoenix, Victoria Times-Colonist, etc., has been forced to put its newspapers up for sale. Not only is the chain experiencing losses similar to those of other newspapers, but it is also dealing with a \$1.4 billion debt, brought about by the purchases, by CEO, Leonard Asper, (heir of founder Izzy Asper who died in 2003), of entertainment outlets, such as Alliance Atlantis Communications Inc. in 2007. (The latter is a media company which specializes in film productions and specialty cable shows, such as the Food Network, HGTV, Show Case, History Channel, etc). The debt from these purchases could not be absorbed by CanWest and this has exacerbated its difficulties.

The Toronto Star (known in some circles as the Red Star) has been battered by huge write-downs of its broadcasting assets, caused by its revenue slipping by double digits. This has led to restructuring at the Star, scores of employees being offered buyouts and the outsourcing of some of the newspaper's functions. TorStar's shares have slumped to historic lows. The only thing that is currently saving the Toronto Star is its book division, which publishes the popular Harlequin Romance novels, whose revenue climbed last year almost 4% to \$124.5 million.

Corus Entertainment Inc. (which owns more than 50 radio stations and a slew of specialty channels) has cut many jobs, as has the Sun Media chain.

In the US, the left-wing New York Times, which sets the politically correct standard for all other US newspapers, has been forced into a round of cuts, including layoffs of journalists and other employees. The paper has only been able to survive by the fact that last year it obtained a US \$250 million loan, at 14.1% interest, from a businessman in Mexico. In 2007 the New York Times received an award from GLAAD, a pro-homosexual media watchdog group, in recognition of the paper's favourable stance toward the homosexual agenda. In an editorial, on January 5, 2010, the New York Times screamed that three US Evangelical Christians, who had spoken the truth in Uganda about the detrimental effects of homosexual behaviour, were "hate-filled bigots" and made further wild, unsubstantiated charges against them.

Other major US city newspapers are in deep trouble. The Seattle Post-Intelligence is now available only on-line, and the Boston Globe is on a deathwatch.

The result of this is that the traditional media are no longer the gatekeepers that can admit or deny information. Consumers are their own editors, their own filmmakers, and their own disc jockeys.

Hopefully, the media will continue to be squeezed until such time as they return to reporting the news as is, not as the leftist journalists hope it is. If cutbacks are to take place, the programs on TV and radio, permeated with sex, violence and immorality will need to be removed.

The key to curtailing the media, however, is to target their advertisers. If you see something offensive in print or other media, let the advertisers of that program know. That is where the public can be effective, by advising the advertisers that its support of a particular program is offensive to the viewing public. Make a note of the advertisers on an objectionable program and then write to them to express your disapproval of their sponsoring such a program.

Conclusion

We can do nothing about changing the present situation if we remain passive. Alternatively, we can do something by raising our objections. Please do!

Meanwhile, REAL Women will be doing its best to raise concerns about the unacceptable control of our institutions by leftist ideologues. You can count on us for that.

Write to:

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

The Honourable Rob Nicholson
Minister of Justice
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Fax: 613-992-7910

The Honourable Ed Stelmach
Premier of Alberta
Legislature Office 307
Legislature Building
10800 97 Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5K 2B6
Fax: (780) 427-1349

FEMINISTS FOREVER WHINING

One thing that never changes is that feminists are forever whining. They believe they just don't get respect these days – a problem, they believe is caused by the inadequacies of the Canadian voter and the existence of REAL Women.

For example, one of their most constant whines is that women make up only 22% of the MPs at the moment. A recent book presents a eureka for feminists to explain why this dastardly situation persists. ?

A feminist University of Toronto professor of political science, Sylvia Bashevkin, has written a lightweight book, in which she goes on at great length about the "virulent strain" in Canada, which causes too much discomfort for Canadians when women are in power. She goes on to describe the pain and embarrassment of females who have run for office, such as Flora MacDonald, Sheila Coppins, Kim Campbell, Belinda Stronach etc., and that their words, wardrobes and private lives have been unkindly discussed in the media. This, the author claims, indicates a failure to take these women politicians seriously. She never mentions that these criticisms are levelled also at male politicians by the media. Not for a minute does Ms Bashevkin consider the fact that these women never had much of substance to say anyway. They were merely trendy feminists putting forward the feminist ideology, naively believing that

voters, especially women, would support them simply because they were women. We're not that stupid. Women vote, as do men, on the basis of the candidate and the party's platform - not because of gender. Who wants these women in public office? If elected, they use their elected office to further their own feminist beliefs, even if contrary to the views of a majority of the voters whom they are supposed to represent.

In her book, Ms Bashevkin also looks fondly across the ocean to tiny Belgium and the Nordic countries of Iceland and Norway, where half the cabinet are women, and Finland, which has 60% of its cabinet spots filled by women. Ms Bashevkin seems unable to grasp the significant fact that Canada is geographically quite different from these tiny countries, where a woman politician can put in a good day's work at Parliament, and then whip home in time for dinner.

In contrast, many of Canada's MPs have to travel wearily across several time zones and then change airplanes or to a car for further travel for several more hours, before they can reach their homes. We're lucky anyone, male or female, is willing to put up with this bone rattling existence and the endless fatigue.

Ms Bashevkin also claims that the Conservatives will never obtain a majority unless they reach out to achieve more women candidates, as the NDP and Liberal parties have done. The latter parties, however, do not seem to have done that well in recent elections, despite their heroic efforts to obtain women candidates. But we'll let that pass.

Intimidated By REAL Women

Ms Bashevkin also blames REAL Women for Canada's failure to further advance the cause of "women" in Canada. She is intimidated by the presence of REAL Women. In several passages that are unintentionally hilarious, she describes REAL Women as an organization, which is the "elephant in the living room", undermining the "women's" movement, since feminists were "no longer able to assert uncontested claims on behalf of the women of Canada". Again, Ms Bashevkin never for a moment considers: why should feminists speak for all women? No organization speaks for all Canadian men. Ms Bashevkin further claims, in an interview in the Hill Times (August 10, 2009), that the Conservative government has "significantly higher contacts with REAL Women, and that the latter's views find resonance with the current government" (If only that were the case!)

She hilariously describes REAL Women as a "secret, shadowy and ominous" organization, which has "managed to cultivate a compellingly authoritative voice". Well, good for us! She sees REAL Women as a threat (again, good for us: someone had to do it!). She wonders where our funding originates, "besides government grants."

As an incentive to having more elected women, Ms Bashevkin suggests that the political parties be required to have quotas, proportional representation and that there be mandatory voting. She also suggests that confronting this "looming but never silent elephant in the room" (i.e. REAL Women) can be achieved by the media probing our organization.

Although Ms Bashevkin is an academic, she seems absurdly lacking in research skills: with minimum effort, she could easily have found the answers to her inquiries. All she had to do was ask for a copy of our by-laws, which are no secret, as they were filed with the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada when we became incorporated in 1983. The by-laws scrupulously follow the requirements set out in the Corporations Act, pursuant to which REAL Women was incorporated.

However, in the interest of efficiency, we will attempt to answer her questions, which, we hope, will reduce her angst. Question 1. Where does REAL Women draw its members?

Answer: REAL Women of Canada (Realistic, Equal, Active, for Life) is a non-partisan, interdenominational organization of independent women. We come from all walks of life, occupations, social and economic backgrounds. Some members are employed full or part-time outside the home, while some work in the home and some do both. We represent a broad spectrum of Canadian women who, until our formation, had not had a public forum in which to express their views. It is all spelled out in our pamphlets, which are available on our website www.realwomenca.com.

Question 2. Whom does REAL Women represent?

Answer: See above.

Question 3. What sources of funding support the organization “besides government grants”?

Answer. REAL Women does not receive federal or provincial government grants. Our income consists of membership fees and donations from members. There is no outside funding. Ms Bashevkin could have learned this by reviewing the Public Accounts or by applying for this information under the Access to Information Act. REAL Women does this to determine feminist funding – so why can’t she do this also?

Question 4. How many members do we have?

Answer: REAL Women of Canada membership is comprised of:

General Membership. Open to all those who support the purposes and objectives of REAL Women upon payment of a membership fee. Family memberships are also available.

Associate memberships. Because our organization is a pro-family organization, its membership is open to men who support the purposes and objectives of REAL Women. Since REAL Women is a women’s organization, however, voting privileges are not conferred on associate members.

REAL Women also has over 100 affiliates. All together, we have approximately 55,000 members across Canada. Apparently as a feminist, Ms Bashevkin can’t conceive that REAL Women has actually sustained itself for 26 years without government funding.

Question 5. Are REAL Women leaders elected by the group’s general membership?

Answer: According to our By-laws, REAL Women is managed by a board of 20 directors. There is one representative from each province and territory for a total of 12, and eight directors-at-large. Directors-at-large are elected by the members at the annual general meeting.

Under the Corporations Act, the names and addresses of REAL Women’s Board members are filed annually with Corporations Canada (Form 3), and these names are available to the public.

Question 6. Who decides about issue priorities?

Answer: By-law 20 provides that the Board of Directors administers the affairs and authorizes expenditures on behalf of the organization. By-law 26 provides that the standing committees of the organization include the following: Executive; Finances & Budget; Promotion; Publications; Research and Studies; Policy & Planning; Legal & Political Action; Convention; Constitution.

According to the internal By-laws, established by the Board of Directors, any member may bring forward a Resolution to be voted on at the annual meeting, thus allowing input from the grassroots.

By the way, REAL Women is holding its annual conference in North Bay at the Clarion Pinewood Park Conference Centre on April 17, 2010, hosted by the Northern Ontario Chapter of REAL Women. Ms Bashevkin is warmly invited to attend to meet REAL Women members there. We are actually quite nice people.

CANADIANS FUNDING INTERNATIONAL PLANNED PARENTHOOD

In 2006, when pro-abortion MP Josée Verner (Louis-Saint-Laurent) was Minister of International Co-Operation, she approved a grant of \$18 million for International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) to be used for purposes of “sexual and reproductive health”. That is, to support one of IPPF’s objectives which is to extend abortion and population control worldwide. IPPF also adamantly opposes a physician’s freedom of conscience on abortion/euthanasia.

This Canadian grant to IPPF was for a three-year period (\$6 million per year) and it is now up for renewal (see REALity, Jan./Feb. 2008, p. 12, "Tax Money Still Tossed Around with Abandon").

Conservative MP Brad Trost (Saskatoon Humboldt) has drafted a petition objecting to Canadian taxpayers' money being given to this pro-abortion organization, which, Mr. Trost states, also pays its chief executive close to \$500,000 annual salary to promote this destruction of human life world wide.

Not to be outdone, a University of Saskatchewan student's union vice president, Chris Stachoff, has drawn up a counter-petition to support Canadian funding of IPPF. This is not surprising since student unions in universities across Canada have distinguished themselves lately by their zealous efforts to stamp out pro-life campus groups, which dare to put forward independent views on life issues. That is, Canadian universities now are hot beds of politically correct thought, instead of centres for intellectual growth and widening horizons, as they have been previously.

The pro-abortion student union's petition has been taken up by noted single issue Liberal feminist MP Anita Neville (Winnipeg South-Centre) and NDP MP Megan Leslie (Halifax), both always keen to support abortion and oppose any conservative initiative for any reason.

It would be appreciated if our members would help with Mr. Trost's petition which can be obtained at <http://thesheaf.com/2009/12/ussu-garners-national-attention/>. Scroll to the end of the article.

If you do not have access to the Internet, please phone/write/fax our national office to have a copy forwarded to you.

MP Trost has made some helpful suggestions about completing this petition:

There is no deadline for returning petitions.

Petitions do not need all 25 signatures; they will be presented with others to meet the 25 signature requirement. NO POSTAGE IS REQUIRED for mailing to the House of Commons

Petitions cannot be printed on the back of another document, although signatures can be continued on the back of a petition.

Only signatures of Canadian residents are permitted; there is no minimum age requirement.

The address may either be the petitioner's full home address, the city and province, or the province and postal code. As with the signature, the address must be written directly on the document and not pasted, taped, photocopied or otherwise transferred to it.

Mr. Trost has also requested that letters be sent to the following, to object to the renewal of the grant to IPPF.

The Honourable Bev Oda
Minister of International Co-Operation
House of Common
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Fax: 613-992-2794

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

With copies to Mr. Trost:
Room 113 Justice Building House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Fax: (613) 996-9899