

**THE CANADIAN MUSEUM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IS A MESS**

The Human Rights Museum in Winnipeg, the construction of which began last April, is a mess.

This is due to the fact that the museum has established a biased and duplicitous Content Advisory Committee to determine which displays will be installed in the museum. This Committee has already begun a series of public consultations across the country, beginning on May 21, 2009, which will continue until January 2010.

The problem with this Content Advisory Committee, whose decisions are to be approved (rubber stamped) by the Board of Trustees, is that, while it is supposed to be comprised of "human rights experts, scholars and specialists", in fact, it is mainly comprised of feminist/homosexual activists and their supporters. In fact, eleven (11) of the sixteen (16) committee members are feminist/homosexual activists.

Museum officials must think Canadians are either dupes or fools to believe that the only human rights specialists available in this country are radical feminists and supporters of the homosexual agenda. The Committee is an insult to the Canadian taxpayer who has already paid 100 million dollars for the construction of the museum and who will be supplying 22 million dollars annually to maintain it (See REALity, July/August 2007 "What Kind of Human Rights Museum is This?")

For what purpose was the museum's Content Advisory Committee loaded with feminist activists? Clearly, it is to serve as a propaganda device to promote and affirm feminist/homosexual ideology and a left-wing interpretation of human rights as "progress" in Canada. Such "progress" would include abortion on demand, lesbian/homosexual rights and benefits, pay equity, affirmative action and the denigration of men whom feminists regard as dangerous because of the "patriarchal" society. Feminist "human rights" breakthroughs in family law, in regard to custody and access and in sexual assault, pursuant to which men have been severely undermined, will also undoubtedly be included in the museum displays.

It is common knowledge that feminists don't actually believe in "equality" rights for women, but rather have a vested interest in the practicality of feminist theory that provides superior rights for women. This bias will inevitably be depicted in the so-called "progressive" human rights museum for Canadians and will serve as a powerful tool to champion the left-wing interpretation of human rights.

The feminist members of the Content Advisory Committee are as follows:

1. Constance Backhouse: She is a long time feminist activist and professor at the University of Ottawa. She is a member of the Board of Directors of the feminist Claire L'Heureux-Dubé Fund for Social Justice (Claire L'Heureux-Dubé is a retired feminist judge of the Supreme Court of Canada) and the Women's Education and Research Foundation of Ontario. She has authored books on the women's (feminist) movement, sexual harassment, sexual assault in Canada, etc.
2. Natasha Bakkht: She served as a law clerk for feminist Supreme Court Judge Louise Arbour. Her research interests are in the areas of religious freedom and women's equality. She is a member of the legal arm of the feminist movement, the Women's Legal Education and Action Fund (LEAF).
3. Laurie Beachell: He is the National Coordinator of the Council of Canadians with Disabilities. He has worked collaboratively with numerous "equality seeking" (feminist) organizations to advance the left-wing theory of equality.
4. Jennifer Breakspear: She is a human rights activist working on human rights, and lesbian, gay, transgendered and bisexual rights (LGTB).

5. Mary Eberts: She is a lecturer on issues of women's "equality". She is a co-founder of LEAF. She has acted as legal counsel for LEAF in many leading cases before the Supreme Court of Canada and Courts of Appeal.
6. Derek Evans: He has served as Deputy Secretary General of Amnesty International, which promotes abortion as an international human right.
7. Julie Latour: She works in promoting equality and the advancement of women. She is currently co-chairing the Canadian Bar Association (CBA) – Quebec's Women Lawyers Forum.
8. Diana Majury: She has been an active feminist for the past 30 years working primarily in the women's (feminist) movement on human rights, equality, violence against women and lesbian issues. She has been actively involved in both the feminist National Association of Women and the Law and LEAF. She is currently a member of the Women's Court of Canada project steering committee, which is rewriting court decisions from a feminist perspective.
9. David Matas: He is a human rights lawyer who has worked extensively with Amnesty International, which promotes abortion as a human right. He has served on the Canadian delegation in regard to the International Criminal Court which is feminist directed and controlled.
10. Patricia Monture: She is a Professor with the Department of Sociology at the University of Saskatchewan whose research and teaching includes women's rights and equality. In 2008, she received the Human Rights Award from the feminist Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies.
11. Ken Norman: He is a professor of Law at the University of Saskatchewan. He was a member of the executive committee of the board of directors of the now defunct Court Challenges Program, which funded hundreds of feminist and homosexual cases. He contributed chapters to the feminist book, *Equality and Judicial Neutrality* (1987), edited by hard line feminists Kathleen Mahoney and Sheila Martin.

It is the same old, same old, left wing activists promoting themselves and their own agenda – even under a Conservative government.

Nonetheless, we should not let this deter us: we will submit our stories to offset the feminist/homosexual propaganda at the museum.

REAL Women Meets with Museum's Content Advisory Committee, June 11, 2009

REAL Women was called in for a half hour private consultation with some members of the Content Advisory Committee on June 11th. During this consultation, REAL Women emphasized three areas that should be included in the Canadian Human Rights story.

1. the rights of the unborn,
2. the rights of non-conformist family-oriented women and girls who don't adhere to radical feminist ideologies,
3. the rights of men who have been marginalized while feminist special interest groups have taken center stage in Canadian policy.

REAL Women argued that defenders of these rights experience intolerance and discrimination. There have been over 3 million abortions in Canada since the legal protection for the unborn was removed. We argued that these are cutting edge human rights issues which may escape consideration as the publicly funded Museum, a crown corporation, picks well worn liberal causes and shuns human rights abuses which are not politically correct and not considered worthy of public funding. This, by the way, was one of the concerns expressed about the Museum by its founder, the late Israel Asper who stated "One is going to have to be very, very careful to prevent it from becoming a propaganda device for a particular point of view." (We further expressed our view that since the Museum is publicly funded it could not pick and choose which human rights it would highlight while ignoring others. To this, member of

the CAC David Matas commented:

I get your point, because it's a taxpayer funded institution, we have to reflect, I suppose, the whole population, rather than, as you say, pick and choose. What we're faced with, as you yourself indicated, is people with exactly opposing views that contradict each other .... My question is how do we accurately or fairly reflect conflicting or opposing views?

REAL Women responded by stating that the Museum must try to present the diversity of views in Canada. In fact this concept appears to be expressed by the Museum's Chief Coordinating Officer Patrick O'Reilly when he stated at public consultation in Ottawa on June 11, 2009:

The goal is not to find the truth or present a single story, but to consider each other's point of view.

Later that day between 7-9 p.m., a consultation was held by the committee with over 100 people present. It was obvious from this focus group round table, that feminism, GLBT (gay lesbian, bi-sexual and transgendered) aboriginal, racial and ethnic rights were well represented. The rights of the unborn, although referred to by REAL Women several times during the consultation, was ignored and was not included in the public plenary summation of human rights concerns. Members of the Content Committee present at this session were Constance Backhouse, Natasha Bakht, Mary Eberts, Derek Evans and David Matas.

If the Canadian Museum for Human Rights fails to reflect the human rights concerns of all Canadians, the entire project, no matter how lofty the intent, will be discredited. A great opportunity will have been thrown away because of the bias and intransigence of left wing and strongly feminist ideologues on the Content Committee. In fact, the entire tax funded exercise will in itself be a human rights abuse, characterized by discrimination and intolerance towards those who have been relegated to sit at the back of the bus.

REAL Women encourages all pro-life and pro-family Canadians to take part in these consultations so that the Content Advisory Committee and the Museum Board of Directors receive a clear message that Canadians do not all think alike and that all major human rights concerns must be included in this publicly funded, multi-million dollar ongoing endeavour. (The public engagement sessions are to take place, as follows:

September 21, 2009 – St. John's Nfld	September 23, 2009 – Halifax, N.S.
October 5, 2009 – Quebec City, QC	October 7, 2009 – Chicoutimi, QC
October 27, 2009 – Whitehorse, YK	October 29, 2009 – Yellowknife, NWT
November 3, 2009 – Moncton, NB	November 5, 2009 – Charlottetown, PEI
November 17, 2009 – Edmonton, AB	November 18, 2009 – Calgary, AB
(December 1, 2009 – Toronto, ON	December 3, 2009 – Thunder Bay, ON
December 7, 2009 – Vancouver BC	January 12, 2010 – Montreal, Quebec
January 26, 2010 – Winnipeg, MB	

Contact:

Canadian Museum for Human Rights  
269 Main Street  
Winnipeg, MB R3C 1B3  
[www.humanrightsmuseum.ca](http://www.humanrightsmuseum.ca)

In the meantime, as a Canadian taxpayer, please raise your objections to this biased Content Advisory Committee. After all, it is your money that is going to support this feminist/homosexual propaganda project. Please request that this radically biased Content Advisory Committee be replaced by a more objective, fair-minded one. Canadians don't deserve this dishonest manipulation of the Human Rights Museum at their expense.

Please 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 James Moore  
Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages  
12th floor, 15 Eddy Street  
Gatineau, PQ K1A 0M5  
Fax: 819 994-1267

Your MP  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

## **PRIVATE MEMBERS EUTHANASIA BILL FULL OF PROBLEMS**

When Bloc Québécois MP, Francine Lalonde (La Pointe-de-l'Île), tabled her euthanasia bill in Parliament on May 13, 2009, she claimed that abuses and the "hypothetical slippery slope" did not occur in the three European Union countries (Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg) and two U.S. states (Washington and Oregon) that have legalized assisted suicide. Her statement was wildly inaccurate.

### **The Netherlands**

The Netherlands has had 30 years' experience with assisted suicide. Initially, it was supposed to end the life of only consenting adults who were terminally ill. The reality of what happened in regard to the Netherlands' assisted suicide law is a warning. The law in the Netherlands has degenerated to become a sad testimony of what can happen to human life once a nation steps onto the slippery slope of assisted suicide. The Netherlands' law has now been stretched to include assisted suicide for many other individuals, including:

- Competent adults with incurable illnesses or disabilities although not terminally ill;
- Competent adults who are depressed, but not physically ill;
- Incompetent adult patients, such as those with Alzheimers and, therefore, unable to give a valid consent. In fact, over 500 (and possibly many more) adults a year die by way of euthanasia who were not mentally competent, and did not give their consent, but have been put to death;
- Infants if their suffering is "intolerable or incurable";
- Children aged 12 to 16 years may die by assisted suicide with their parents' consent, and if over 16 years old, may give their own consent for assisted suicide;

### **Switzerland**

The Swiss organization, Dignitas, assists suicides for those supposedly terminally ill, even if they are not Swiss residents. Many, however, in fact, do not have terminal or severe illnesses. Dignitas recently applied for legal permission to provide assisted suicide for a B.C. couple, George and Betty Coumbias, both 73 years of age. The husband suffers from serious heart disease; the wife is healthy but wants to die with her husband. In her words, "I don't think I can face life without George". If the requested permission is granted, all those afraid, or tired of living, will become possible assisted suicides under Switzerland's assisted suicide law.

There are three major reasons why individuals seek assisted suicide. They are:

fear of pain and suffering;

fear of loneliness and isolation; and

fear of death (which is odd since they are seeking death – but they think it is not as formidable if they can choose the timing and circumstances).

How much more compassionate is it to eliminate these fears by medication, companionship and counselling rather than eliminating the person? Refusal to pass an assisted suicide law would also go a long way to preventing yet another fear – for those who are living under a legalized assisted suicide law who don't want to die when they enter a hospital. They have a genuine and overwhelming fear that when a physician enters their hospital room that his presence means termination, not treatment.

#### MP Lalonde's Death with Dignity Bill

So, what does MP Lalonde's assisted suicide bill provide us? It allows a "medical practitioner" (not necessarily a physician) to assist in the death of a person who is "apparently lucid". (What does this mean? Frankly, we think anyone who supports assisted suicide is not "lucid"!) It all depends on how this term is interpreted and for what purpose. The person seeking assisted suicide must be a consenting person 18 years or older and he or she must:

experience severe physical or mental pain (depression) without prospect of relief; or  
be dying from a terminal illness (but there is no definition of terminal illness).

How does one determine "no prospect" of relief from physical or mental pain? How about medication and counselling?

Further, the language of the bill does not make clear whether another individual may assist a medical practitioner to assist in the suicide, e.g. how about your nephew who is tired of waiting around to inherit your estate and wishes to "assist" in your suicide? The medical practitioner is defined as "a person duly qualified by provincial law to practice medicine". Does this include your podiatrist or dermatologist? The bill does require that all requests for assisted suicide should be "free of duress". But what about those vulnerable people who feel pressure to choose death because they believe they are a burden to their family financially or emotionally? Our health care facilities are already under strain caused by an aging population. Will health care providers be constantly under pressure to terminate life? Some may give their consent "without duress" but who will know this for certain?

This is MP Lalonde's third attempt to bring in a bill on assisted suicide. Her husband, Guy Lamarche is the communications director of the euthanasia lobby group "L'Association québécoise pour le droit de mourir dans la dignité". Ms Lalonde herself has cancer. Is she feeling subtle pressure or duress to relieve her husband of his burden? Who knows her "private" reasons or "duress" for this bill?

Ms Lalonde's bill is number 42 in the private members bill order of precedence. Unless an election is unexpectedly called, the assisted suicide bill will be debated on second reading this fall. If it passes second reading, it then goes to the Justice Committee for review and then is returned to the House of Commons for final debate and vote. We hope this bill will not get that far.

MP's must know that assisted suicide is unacceptable to Canadians. This country has enough problems without dispatching citizens to their death on request. Let us assist them with the love and compassion provided by palliative care, rather than killing them off by way of assisted suicide.

Please 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 Robert Nicholson  
Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada  
284 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H8  
Fax: 613-954-0811

Your MP  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

### **PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE**

It is an honour and a privilege to serve as the new President of REAL Women of Canada.

To begin with, I would like very much to thank some very important individuals.

First, I wish to thank Laurie Geschke, who served as President for the past three years. Her leadership and guidance, especially with the Board of Directors, was greatly appreciated. She also led productive and efficient Board meetings. Thanks again, Laurie, for your service.

Secondly, I want to thank the Alberta Chapter of REAL Women for hosting the 2009 annual Board meetings (AGM) and national conference in Edmonton June 4-6th. These events were well planned. The conference speakers were stimulating and informative. A special note of thanks is extended to Alberta Board members Corry Morcos and Jill Cahoon for heading the organizing committee which did such a marvellous job.

Thirdly, I want to thank our wonderful members for their support. Your financial, moral and prayerful support mean so much to us and keeps us going strong in our work to build a better society.

Perhaps too, I should add my thanks (tongue in cheek) to Liberal opposition leader Michael Ignatieff for deciding not to have a summer election! It is the last thing Canadians want for their summer time enjoyment. It now appears that Mr. Ignatieff is considering early November as a possible election date.

With that in mind, it is a great opportunity for us to visit our local MP during the summer months. It is especially worthwhile to develop an on-going relationship with your MP, especially if she/he is supportive of pro-family, pro-life values and beliefs. Even if your MP is not supportive he/she needs to hear from constituents. Whatever your situation, visit your MP to share your concerns, solicit you MP's support and express your appreciation for your MP.

Visiting your MP is especially important now, after the Conservative government gave \$400,000 of taxpayer dollars to the recent Toronto Pride Parade. This was an unnecessary waste of tax dollars. Please contact your MP, the Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Small Business and Tourism to object to this outrageous use of government funds.

For further background on this shocking government grant to the Toronto Gay Pride Parade, please go to [www.rightthecourse.ca](http://www.rightthecourse.ca). Also write:

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper  
Office of the Prime Minister  
80 Wellington Street

Ottawa, ON K1A 0A2  
Fax: 613-941-6900

(The Honourable Diane Ablonczy  
Secretary of State for Small Business & Tourism (658 Confederation Building  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax (613) 992-2537

Your own MP  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
(For contact information: go to [www.parl.gc.ca](http://www.parl.gc.ca).)

Please know that REAL Women won't be resting over the summer months! There is always so much to do. It is as always, however, a great privilege to carry out our work and we are delighted to be able to do so.

Have a great summer!  
Cecilia Forsyth

## **RIGHTS FOR PARENTS IN ALBERTA**

By Jill Cahoon, Alberta Representative, National REAL Women of Canada Board

The Government of Alberta recently undertook an evaluation of the Alberta Human Rights, Citizenship and Multiculturalism Act and made several changes in the process, as well as the qualifications of those administering the act to enable it to better represent Canadian Law.

It added a vital new provision, Section 11.1, in the proposed legislation that states that a parent or guardian of a child has a right to be notified in advance of any curriculum that explicitly teaches religion, sexuality or sexual orientation, and that the parents may take the child out of that part of the curriculum without academic penalty. This recognizes a parental right, in regard to a child's education in sensitive subjects, as an enforceable human right.

This legislation does not apply to subjects that may indirectly relate to religion, such as women's rights or the Holocaust, but addresses subject matter and curriculum that explicitly and specifically teaches religious doctrine, human sexuality and sexual orientation. If a student asks a random question during class related to religion, sexuality or sexual orientation, the teacher is still encouraged to assess and appropriately respond to the question as they do at present.

Teachers are angry over this provision. They argue that it is the responsibility of the school board to give parents notification of curriculum to be taught regarding religion, sexuality and sexual orientation, and not the teacher. However, under this amendment, teachers are required to respect the written request of a parent to opt their child out of the curriculum without penalty as per the notice sent out. The procedural changes made to the Act will make it very difficult for anyone, including parents, to bring frivolous charges against any individual, including teachers.

It will now be incumbent upon school boards to notify parents of the inclusion of these specified areas and encourage those responsible for curriculum to consider the rights of parents and the responsibility of school boards and teachers.

The Alberta Government recognized that parental rights are most appropriately treated as human rights. Article 26(3) of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that "parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children." If parental rights are important enough to be enshrined in the UN

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, they should be protected under our own human rights legislation. Government policy can change with every new Minister and Government and can also be greatly influenced by unelected bureaucrats in some instances. Thus, enshrining parental rights in legislation is a way of ensuring the rights of parents are adequately protected well into the future. This point is reinforced by the current state of affairs in British Columbia where the former Attorney General entered into an agreement with a homosexual couple to include homosexuality in all subject areas, and to eliminate the rights of parents to opt their children out of this curriculum. (See talk by Doris Darvasi, BC Board member of REAL Women of Canada, "The British Columbia Homosexual Corren Agreement and its Aftermath")

### **REAL WOMEN OF CANADA ANNUAL AWARD**

Since 1995, REAL Women has given an award to an individual who had made an outstanding contribution to preserve and promote traditional family values in Canadian society. The nominee may not be a member of REAL Women of Canada.

This year's award was given to Ezra Levant, lawyer, and former publisher of the Western Standard, who has, so ably, exposed the corruption and totalitarianism of the Human Rights Commissions across Canada. Mr. Levant's book, Shake Down, describing the often outrageous decisions of the Commissions has made the best seller list in Canada. (See REALity, May June 2009, for a review of his book.)

Mr. Levant has done a great service to those who adhere to traditional values and who have been under constant attack by the Commissions.

### **THE UNITED NATIONS – A SERIOUS THREAT TO OUR HUMAN RIGHTS**

Summary by Lorraine McNamara, Ontario - Durham  
Talk by Ginger Malacko, REAL Women of Canada, Representative at the UN

Although she is young in years, after having been involved in various UN conferences and meetings for the past ten years, Ginger Malacko is an old hand at observing the duplicity occurring at the United Nations. She warned that the information reaching the public through such agencies as the media and universities does not reflect the truth.

Originally, the UN was a forum for mediation, the promotion of peace, and was intended to help eliminate terrible diseases and poverty. It has failed. As more countries joined the UN, the standards for membership diminished. Only about 30 percent of UN nations today are considered to be free, and many countries do not even want peace.

Since the original mandate of the UN has failed, it has become instead the champion of "human rights", setting a standard for all countries, regardless of differences or needs.

Entitlements are not human rights and to a great extent it is entitlements, not human rights, that the UN promotes. The UN claims that entitlements are human rights, and that, for example, everyone has the "right" to abortion and sexual pleasure. If we have a "right" to sexual activity, how would that change our laws on pornography, education, prostitution, etc.?

The UN Is A Horrible Place, Doing Horrible Things

There is a huge bureaucracy at work at the UN to promote the emergence of the UN as the moral authority for the entire world: in other words, a global government. Many UN workers are ideologically driven. Ginger noted that she had seen a whole "underground city" in the New York headquarters, where numerous rooms and chambers were filled with people publishing documents to re-educate the world on human rights. The UN is a horrible place doing



horrible things.

There are two things for which we would probably give our lives: family and faith. Those of us who are devoted to the family will not let the UN dictate to us. So the UN has now found a way to undermine the family – through promotion of physical addiction, particularly sexual addiction, which would change the way people see the world. The UN wishes to promote sex as a human right so we will look at the world differently and allow the UN to dictate to us.

On the issue of abortion, clever methods are used to promote worldwide abortion rights. The word “abortion”, however, is never used at the UN. There have been incremental changes in the language over the years. The term “reproductive health”, which is a euphemism for abortion, has become “sexual and reproductive health”, and “sex education” has become “sexuality education”, which encompasses more than just information about one’s body. These terms are used over and over in UN documents.

Unfortunately, many countries do not have expertise in the UN’s official languages and must rely on interpretation by others. Some countries also rely on foreign aid and are afraid to protest against the wishes of countries which provide such aid. There are cases also where a country’s delegate, under UN influence, has acted in defiance of the country’s actual policy position on an issue under discussion at the UN.

There are also UN monitoring committees to review each country’s compliance with UN treaties. These Committees berate a country for its failure to provide feminist/homosexual/abortion legislation, even though the treaties do not include such provisions.

The Battle Is On Our Doorstep

Ginger said that we must fight for Canada and keep the UN out of our government, our communities and our homes. We must learn about genuine human rights, and become aware of how the UN is messing with our country.

## **HUMAN RIGHTS — CANADIAN OVERVIEW WITH EMPHASIS ON RELIGIOUS FREEDOM**

A talk by C. Gwendolyn Landolt, National Vice President, REAL Women of Canada

There is a collision of rights under the Charter and the Human Rights Acts that has arisen between religious freedom and homosexual rights.

The Charter of Rights

The Charter provides for the protection of religious freedom in two sections: S.2 and S.15. One might assume, therefore, that this double protection strengthens religious freedoms in Canada. This is not the case. The guarantees for religious freedom in the Charter have, in fact, most often been used to restrict or narrow religious freedom rather than expand it, especially when it has come in conflict with the “equality” rights of homosexuals. The latter’s rights, by the way, were “written into” the Charter by the Supreme Court of Canada in 1995 in the case of *Egan v. Canada*, which decision overruled the decision of the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons in 1980-1981, which deliberately excluded sexual orientation from the Charter by a 22 to 2 vote. To correct this “error”, the court “read-in” protection for homosexuals stating that “sexual orientation” was analogous to the other protected groups listed in S.15 of the Charter. Once this provision for protection on the ground of sexual orientation was written into the Charter by the courts, the way was opened for escalating demands by homosexual activists.

The Courts

The Supreme Court of Canada decision *M v H* in 1999, which held that family benefits should be extended to homosexual partners, was a groundbreaking decision since it recognized the legitimacy and equality of same-sex

relationships with heterosexual relationships. *M v H* set the stage for the subsequent court decisions in favour of same-sex marriage.

Thus, even though religious freedom is written precisely and clearly into two sections of the Charter, it has been squared off against homosexual rights, which were manufactured and written into the Charter by the courts.

### Courts' Attempts to Balance Competing Rights

In its effort to provide a supposed "balance" between religious freedom and homosexual rights, the Supreme Court of Canada has decided that religious rights should be divided into two distinct and separate parts, i.e., one part being the right to hold a religious belief, and the other part being the right to act on those religious beliefs. The court concluded that the right to hold a religious belief had constitutional protection, but that acts based on one's religious beliefs in the public square did not have constitutional protection.

It is obvious, however, that religious belief by its very nature forms a central part of a person's essential being – his/her inner self, and determines how that person relates to the world, directly influencing his behaviour. Consequently, this court-imposed balance or accommodating of religious rights by separating religious rights from religious actions has an air of unreality about it and is merely an artificial construct that provides no balance at all. To separate religious belief from religious acts indicates the judiciary's failure to recognize the social and cultural dimensions of religion, its tremendous contribution to society by upholding moral standards and social order, and by providing invaluable social services.

The practical result of the separation of religious belief from religious action is that a believer's beliefs cannot restrict or regulate the rights of homosexuals and their values in the public square, but that homosexuals and their values prohibit and restrict believers in the public square.

### Religious Belief and Public Policy

The rights of religious believers have been trampled on in the public square based on the dubious argument that religious doctrine is irrelevant in determining secular laws and human rights and, therefore, must be excluded from legislative and judicial debates. Why should this be? Why can't religious belief contribute to the public debate, especially since most Canadians do have a religious belief? Fairness would require such an inclusion in public and judicial debates.

Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin, however, in discussing the tension between the rule of law and religious freedom states that the rule of law is all encompassing, and sweeps everything into its orbit. She believes the ultimate victor in the tension between religion and homosexual rights has been decided, and the only issue is how best the rule of law can placate claims of religious freedom. The peculiar separation of religious beliefs from religious action is the court's answer to placating religious believers. This solution is both unacceptable and unreasonable.

### Maintaining a Just Society

Why is "toleration" only a one-way street? Why are limitations justified on religious belief or practice when similar limitations are not placed on non-religious beliefs and practices? Such a position contradicts the court's own position that there is no hierarchy of rights under the Charter, i.e. that one right cannot trump another right.

A just society has a responsibility, within reason, to protect the freedoms of those who hold traditional religious beliefs, just as it now protects homosexual rights.

It is essential, therefore, that all beliefs systems (homosexual and religious) be permitted to operate freely and be accommodated in the public square on a "live and let live" basis. This would provide true equality under Canadian law that is not currently present.

## HUMAN RIGHTS — THE ALBERTA EXPERIENCE

Summary by Laurie Geschke, Past National President, REAL Women of Canada  
Talk by Lorne Gunter, Newspaper columnist, Member of Editorial Board, National Post

Lorne Gunther's talk focused on Human Rights Law in Alberta, a province, which Lorne says, is "confused" on the issue. He believes that there should have been enough Albertans to rally and support the provincial MLA's initiative to abolish the Alberta human rights legislation this spring. Instead Bill 44, which enshrines the right of parents to withdraw children from classrooms when controversial issues of religion, sexual orientation and sexuality are being taught, was added to the legislation. That is, instead of abolishing the Act, Bill 44, only provided a token for parents. He went on to say that human rights legislation was originally created to adjudicate disagreements over employment and accommodation only, but these commissions have strayed so far from their original mandate, that they are unrecognizable.

Lorne evaluated human rights legislation in several jurisdictions around the country on a scale of 1-10, where ten was really stifling personal freedoms and one was protecting them. He gave the Canadian Human Rights Act, with its 100% conviction rate for supposed "hate" comments a rating of 9. The Ontario Human Rights Commission was rated 12 on a scale of 1-10 because it has the power to go out and look for its own cases to investigate and prosecute. Further, the Ontario Commission has, for many years, been allowed to operate without any controls to balance its left-wing enthusiasm and pragmatism. For example, it was the Ontario Human Rights Commission which advised Scott Brockie, a Christian printer in Toronto who refused to print material for a homosexual organization, that the Commission would not proceed against him, if he would agree to pay \$5,000 to the complainants. Normally, this type of action is called extortion.

Brockie did not pay, and the rest is history. He lost his case before both the Human Rights Tribunal and the Superior Court of Ontario.

Human rights commissions consider themselves arbiters of "hurt feelings". However, Lorne pointed out, "we don't get royalties from someone who reads our articles or stories and are inspired", so why should we be penalized if someone is upset or hurt?

In Alberta, the Human Rights Commission has had the right to investigate complaints by court mandate on homosexuality since 1999. Lori Andreachuk, a member of the Alberta Human Rights Commission, stated, when she was investigating and ruling on the Stephen Boissoin case, that "the eradication of hate speech was more important than the preservation of free speech". Paster Boissoin had written a letter opposing homosexuality, which was published in the Red Deer Advocate. He lost his case before the Commission. Isn't freedom of thought, opinion, belief and religion set out in S. 2 of the Charter, Lorne asked?

Finally, Lorne warned that citizens need to watch the "independent investigative authority" now being sought by both the federal and provincial human rights commissions. If granted, this will make them even more powerful and dangerous. Instead, Lorne suggested:

Removal or limited funding being awarded to HRC's;  
Abolish the Commissions' ability to carry out political investigations;  
Redrafting rules of evidence admissible in HRC hearings to disallow hearsay; and  
Making it mandatory that there be clear, unbroken and solid evidence presented at hearings before decisions are made.

In conclusion, Lorne stated that in any legislative tussle over curtailing unwanted, invasive powers of human rights commissions, the battle will be fought in the media.

Lorne's talk was entertaining, informative, and he spoke entirely without notes. It was a good thing I took the ones that I did!

## **THE APPREHENSION OF DRUG ADDICTED MINORS**

Summary by Jeannine Lebel, Ontario Board Member, REAL Women of Canada

Talk by Audrey Halliday, Co-founder, Parents Empowering Parents

Audrey Halliday, co-founder of PEP (Parents Empowering Parents), gave an account of her family's personal journey to help a son addicted to Methadone. How could a handsome, happy athletic teenager with a wonderful sister and two loving parents choose drugs? It made for a harrowing time for his parents

Mrs. Halliday related her search for help after her son went missing for days and was brought home by the RCMP. Although he had lost 40lbs, had not eaten or slept, the family was expected to care for him. Even with the help of family support workers and addiction counselling, their son continued to deal drugs and steal to fuel his drug addiction.

And like all addicts, the son refused to admit to his drug problem. The parents had all the responsibility but no control over him. Society claimed that the son had a right to choose his life style. In order to protect a younger sibling, the parents were forced to give their son the heart-wrenching ultimatum - accept treatment or leave the family home. The son chose the latter, but cold nights, hunger and hardships, were not enough to stop his addiction.

After a lengthy process of learning the system, a system that does not work for the addict, the family, the community or law enforcement officers, the Hallidays became a catalyst, for the government to look at adolescent drug abuse. The Hallidays had formed a group with other parents who were also living the nightmare of a drug-addicted child. They called their organization Parents Empowering Parents (P.E.P.: the website is: [www.pepsociety.ca](http://www.pepsociety.ca)). The organization provides education, innovative programming, support and hope for individuals or families dealing with substance abuse/addiction. This volunteer group was responsible for the Alberta legislation entitled, "Protection of Children Abusing Drugs Act." (PChAD) which constructively and compassionately addresses the problem of a drug addicted child in that province.

This legislation was passed in July 2006, and, under this legislation, parents may ask the court for an apprehension and conviction order for their child to be taken to a safe house for up to five days, even if carried out against the child's wishes. In the safe house, the child is provided with counsellors and staff for treatment and detoxification. The child can request a review of the confinement by way of the courts (a legal aid lawyer is provided for the adolescent).

This legislation was amended in the spring of 2009 to provide:

Increased confinement for 10 days;

Possibility of confinement for 5 more days after approval by court;

Disclosure of information to the parents on the child's treatment and care without the child's consent if it is in the child's best interests that this information be released.

During the first 14 months of this legislation being in effect, there were 618 admissions to a safe house. Half of these admissions were voluntary. By March 2009, there were 1,500 court orders to protect adolescents by putting them in a safe house.

Saskatchewan and Manitoba have passed similar legislation and B.C. is in the course of reviewing the legislation with a view to passing it in that province.

This legislation is the most positive direction taken on drug treatment for adolescents in Canada. It is long overdue,

and a fine model for all of Canada.

The Halliday's son, by the way, is now healthy, living on his own and working to complete an apprenticeship. A child saved from destruction and an inevitable and unenviable death is a wonderful achievement. Alberta has led the way on a very important family legislation.

## **HUMAN PAPILLOMA VIRUS (HPV) VACCINATION: THE CONTROVERSY**

Summary by Corry Morcos , President Alberta Chapter, REAL Women of Canada  
Talk by Dr. Robert Hauptman, MD, Chief, Dept. Family Medicine, St. Albert Sturgeon General Hospital, AB  
Chair, Salvus Family Medical Clinic

Dr. Hauptman started by explaining what a vaccine is in general, and the success of the more well known ones, such as smallpox, whooping cough, measles, mumps and rubella. The ideal vaccine prevents a communicable disease that causes significant illness in the general population, is safe, effective, as well as providing long-term immunity, and is cost effective. He went on to explain vaccine contra-indications and side effects, such as flu-like symptoms and anaphylaxis (allergies/reaction).

Dr. Hauptman then specified the attributes of the Human Papilloma Virus: it is common, and benign as in plantar and genital warts. Some strains can be associated with cervical cancer. However, 70% of infections clear by themselves within one year, and 90% within two years. As a result, HPV developing into cervical cancer is very rare. The incidence in Canada is 1,400 per year, with 400 deaths per year, a reduction of 75% over the last 50 years since the introduction of the Pap smear test. The controversy about the HPV is: is it advisable to universally provide it – untested – to pre-pubescent girls?

Dr. Hauptman pointed out that not all women have access to Pap test screening, or they are negligent in obtaining one. Smoking is also a contributing factor in the incidence of cervical cancer.

The Gardasil vaccine was introduced in 2006 to prevent strains 16 and 18 of the HPV from developing into cervical cancer and strains 6 and 11 into genital warts. The vaccine was recommended by immunization organizations, and governments in the U.S., and Canada complied.

The controversy over the vaccine arises from the question of whether healthy 9-12 year old virgins should be vaccinated against a sexually transmitted disease, by government decree, and with no research available on the effect of this vaccine on this age group. Also questionable is the high number of vaccinations for a relatively low infection rate.

Dr. Hauptman suggested that this money would be more wisely spent on education of healthy lifestyle choices, including cessation of smoking and abstinence from sexual activity.

He concluded that, in principle, the vaccine is safe, but should be targeted at older women who are sexually active and do not have regular Pap smears.

## **THE BC HOMOSEXUAL CORREN AGREEMENT AND ITS AFTERMATH**

By Doris Darvasi, BC Board Member, REAL Women of Canada

Homosexuals, Murray Warren and his "married" partner, Peter Cook, who combined their two names to "Corren," brought a complaint before the B.C. Human Rights Commission alleging that the Ministry of Education had failed to make the B.C. curriculum inclusive of positive and accurate portrayals of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered

students and same-sex families. Rather than have this case decided by a Human Rights Tribunal, the BC government signed a Settlement Agreement with the Correns in a secret, binding, legal contract on April 28, 2006.

The Corren Settlement Agreement gave these two private citizens and activists a special role in the development and review of the B.C. educational curriculum. Not only were Murray and Peter Corren given an extraordinary role, but so were any organizations and groups which they named as having "... expertise in sexual orientation, homophobia and other issues of inclusion and diversity in the curriculum." The Ministry promised to "... solicit feedback directly from these organizations and groups regarding the IRP (Integrated Resource Package - that is, program of study). While the Ministry may consider comments from other organizations and groups, the Correns are the only ones who were legally guaranteed that the names they have put forward will be fully considered by the government for input.

Pro-family advocates were advised that the best approach to this agreement was to leave the Settlement Agreement unchallenged, and instead, pursue a course of having parents represented on the review committee. However, being on such a committee does not mean that parental views will be taken into consideration at all, as the aim of this settlement is to make the curriculum more gay friendly.

Out of the Corren Agreement have come two items that many are concerned about. One is the radical teachers' guide Making Space, Giving Voice, which instructs teachers on how to make every subject, at every level from Kindergarten to Grade 12, gay friendly. The other item is a new course, called Social Justice 12.

#### Social Justice 12 Course

The Settlement Agreement with the Correns provides that they will be provided with a draft of the sexual orientation/gender identity portion for their review. The Complainants then may consult experts, on a confidential basis, to assist them in providing comments. That is, this consultation with the Correns is to take place before the draft course is ever released to the general public. (Settlement Agreement, Section 3A)

The definition of "homophobia" in the glossary states that those who dislike homosexuality, demonstrate "prejudice, discrimination, harassment, and/or acts of violence". There is no room for a different opinion on homosexuality, even in regard to its health aspects.

Although this course is still elective, the nature of it is such that it lends itself readily to the introduction of propaganda and a very one-sided portrayal on a variety of controversial issues. For example, as there is an attempt to legalize Euthanasia/Physician Assisted Suicide in Canada, how long before our children are taught that it was "unjust" to deny people the right to die?

#### Teachers Delighted with Course

The B.C. Teachers Federation is delighted with the new course. In February 2009 the BCTF organized the first of four conferences in B.C., to teach teachers how to teach the Social Justice 12 course. The conference did not provide any opportunity for input from parents who want to resist manipulation of their children's curriculum to make acceptance of homosexuality a goal.

The underlying purpose of the course was clearly revealed by a picture of a staircase, distributed by the BCTF in its information packages: the goal is to move students' attitude towards LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered and questioning) people beyond tolerance to acceptance and then further along to support, admiration, appreciation and finally celebration.

#### Parents Uninformed About the Corren Agreement

Unfortunately, very, very few parents are aware of this insidious contract with the Correns. That is partially because the media has said very little about it and whatever has been said, is usually favourable to the Corren Agreement. As

well, the government has downplayed the concerns voiced and has been trying to pacify parents by saying that there is nothing to worry about. The government said that none of the Correns' recommendations can be implemented without the approval of the Ministry of Education. That means nothing, as the Correns will simply go back to the Human Rights Commission if they don't get what they want. Also, with a few exceptions, churches have not been willing to allow information on the Corren Agreement and its ramifications into the church to inform their people. This might be because they don't realize how seriously this affects traditional family values. Parents with children in private schools also assume they are safe and so don't bother about it. They are not safe.

The Corren Agreement is directed at indoctrinating innocent children. It is madness, led by a government out of control, which is undermining parental rights.

## **RESPONSIBILITIES IN EDUCATION: THE ALBERTA CURRICULUM**

Summary by Pauline Guzik, Ontario Director-at-Large, REAL Women of Canada

Talk by Wes Merta, Assistant Principal, Strathcona Christian Academy Secondary, Sherwood Park, AB

The province of Alberta has a generously funded education system that provides 100% funding to all public and Catholic schools. Christian schools, operating independently of the public system, receive 80% funding as do home schoolers. A Christian school may also operate within the public system. Such a school is the Strathcona Christian Academy Secondary School. It accommodates Grades 9 to 12, with an enrollment of 1000. This school began in 1980 as a private school, transitioning to the public system in 1998. The rationale for this change was that working within the public school system would be a better way to positively influence the school system. As a result, the Academy receives full government student funding and its teachers are members of the Alberta Teachers' Association. The Elk Island School Board, of which the Strathcona Academy is a part, regards the school favourably because the Board receives more funding from the government because of the increased student base. The School also provides a place to transfer Christian teachers who could be perceived as "trouble-makers" in the regular public system.

The transition was not without controversy, however. Many Strathcona Academy supporters felt the school had "sold the ship" to the public system. The Academy, however, retains a distinct nature and is unique in that it is privately owned, therefore receiving no funding for its facilities, other than for maintenance. This financial arrangement with the public board, however, does have the advantage of giving the Academy more power in negotiations with the School Board. In its relationship with the Board, the school has made it clear that the Christian values on which its educational philosophy is based, are non-negotiable.

Strathcona Academy administration follows several strategies to maintain a viable relationship as an alternative school within the public system. The school believes in being pro-active. Barriers must not be allowed to form based on pre-conceived ideas, fears, or misunderstandings about Christian schools. Relationships are established with board staff and with the public. The public is invited to the school for events. The school communicates its distinctiveness by having Scripture passages displayed in prominent places. The school offers to host school district meetings, including district Professional Development sessions. Other schools use Strathcona for drama and graduation events. Strathcona teaches the Alberta curriculum and ensures that its teachers are on government curriculum committees. As a result, they have been successful in instilling positive values within the official curriculum, such as Christian living and leadership training in spreading the Good News. Students are involved in curricular-based outreach trips around the world. Strathcona has not experienced much conflict regarding government forced curriculum because its teachers present issues, such as sexuality, from a Christian perspective. The school's administration has safeguards built in to the hiring process, allowing it to hire specific teachers without discriminating against others.

Strathcona Academy fully realizes that it is not immune from possible problems that might involve lawsuits: it must walk carefully and deliberately within the public system in order to maintain high educational and Christian standards.