

THE FEDERAL ELECTION



When the votes were counted, the Conservatives held, amazingly, 167 seats (from 143 seats in 2008)...

That was one crazy election! It started out so decorously with the three major parties lined up according to established ritual, in an orderly manner: Conservatives vs. the Liberals, and then, of course, that third party, the NDP, was given its token acknowledgement.

The mainstream media (MSM) actually believed this scenario. They breathlessly reported that there would be an invigorated Liberal leader Ignatieff. Alas, during the course of the election, that hoped-for prince began to turn into a political frog, falling to third place in popular support. Yet, a new, political prince began to emerge – namely, Jack Layton of the NDP. Support for him rose higher and higher – especially in Quebec. The MSM soberly reported that the NDP was becoming a threat to a Conservative majority.

The political scene then erupted into something akin to Alice in Wonderland's Mad Hatter Tea Party. The Conservatives called on the Liberal supporters to vote for them, to avoid the trauma of the NDP forming the government. The Bloc in Quebec called out in anguish that the NDP was only "fool's gold", and the Liberals serenely insisted that all was well for them in their traditional role as the natural governing party.

When the votes were counted, the Conservatives held, amazingly, 167 seats (from 143 seats in 2008), the NDP 102 seats (from 36 seats), the Liberals 34 seats (down from 77 seats) and the Bloc 4 seats (down from 49 seats).

Mr. Layton's success in Quebec was due to his becoming a seductive prince charming to the population, promising

them dreams, such fantasies as extending French language rights to all workers in Quebec under federal jurisdiction and, heaven forbid, reopening those grim constitutional debates. Everything Quebec desired was promised, both financially and constitutionally. Mr. Layton would be Quebec's sugar daddy for an exciting future. Perhaps too, Quebec was tired of the smug Gilles Duceppe and the Bloc who assumed they were the only authentic choice of Quebec.

In the rest of Canada, the split on the left between the Liberals and the NDP allowed the Conservatives to come up the middle, leading to their comfortable majority.

English Debate

The turning point of this election occurred during the English debate. The three opposition leaders behaved like adolescents throwing mud at the only man in the room, Mr. Harper. With his experience and calm demeanour, he deftly threw off their charges. Perhaps, too, it was NDP leader Jack Layton who really changed the direction of the election when he reported that Mr. Ignatieff had missed 70% of the votes in the House of Commons. Mr. Ignatieff, who had been talking incessantly about Mr. Harper's arrogant behaviour, was suddenly the Emperor with no clothes. He never recovered.

Canadians were just sick and tired of the constant bickering in Parliament over arcane procedural points and the alleged ethical infractions by the Conservatives. These were matters that did not resonate with voters, who were more concerned about practical matters, such as the economy, jobs and health care.

Another factor was that Canadians wanted a calm, experienced hand to steer them through future troubled waters. Consequently, they voted for Mr. Harper in the 2011 federal election and gave him his long sought majority. †

THE AFTERMATH OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION

Now that the dust has settled, and the Conservatives have a majority of seats in the House of Commons for the next four or five years, there will be some changes ahead.

Legislative Changes

Mr. Harper will be able to have his long sought crime bills passed. They have been blocked in the past several Parliaments

by the opposition. Mr. Harper plans to place eleven different crime bills into one omnibus bill. It will include such issues as protection of children from predators, minimum sentences for serious crimes (preventing lenient liberal judges from passing sentences that amount to no more than a slap on the wrist); prohibiting house arrest for serious crimes, and preventing pre-trial imprisonment reducing time in jails. He will also

introduce legislation to cut off taxpayers' money being used to pay the election expenses of the political parties (\$2 per vote). Henceforth, the parties will have to get donations from their party supporters. Senate reform will include reducing senators' term of office to eight years from the current retirement at 75 years of age, and legislating provincial senate elections. The latter is deeply opposed by the provincial premiers, who want to be the sole spokespersons for their respective provinces. They do not want an independent and possibly contradictory provincial voice heard in the senate.

The long gun registry will also disappear.

A Calmer House of Commons

The House of Commons should be somewhat calmer as the number of opposition "gotcha" moments will be reduced. Bizarre private members bills, such as an environmental bill and the controversial transgendered bill, which were allowed to escape into the Senate by the combined support of the opposition parties, will now be stopped at the 2nd reading in the House of Commons. These bills landed with a thud on the Senate floor, where they were kicked under the table by Senate Majority Leader Marjorie LeBreton, thereby delaying their debate. However, she couldn't keep this up indefinitely. It's better for these private members bills to be stopped in the House of Commons.

Seismic Changes in the Political Parties

The most crucial changes will occur within the political parties, themselves. Although, no one can predict the future with accuracy, it is, nonetheless, understood that the following will occur within the political parties in the next few years.

1. The Conservative Party

It is possible that Mr. Harper will resign before the Conservative mandate expires in 2015 – 16. He will wait until the economy is well on its way to recovery, and the debt more or less under control. He would have also achieved his twin goals of plunging a stake into the heart of the separatist movement in Quebec, and breaking the Liberal brand that had dominated Canada during the 20th century.

Mr. Harper, the quintessential Canadian, unpretentious and unassuming, will probably, gratefully retire into private life with his family, and a quiet executive job, probably with a Calgary company, leaving his past to historians.

At his retirement, however, there will be a possible struggle for the soul of the Conservative party. It will likely be between fiscal conservative, former MP and Environment Minister Jim Prentice and social conservative Jason Kenney. Mr. Prentice retired last year to Toronto's Bay Street to acquire financial credibility, and obtain support from Canada's leading corporate heads to strengthen his position in a future leadership race.

Splitting the vote on the left can no longer continue. Such an undertaking will be complicated and difficult, fraught with egos and policy accommodations. However, it must be done. But because Jack Layton and the NDP are now triumphant, he will have a lot of influence in how this merger occurs.

2. The Liberal Party

Defeated Liberal leader Michael Ignatieff has resigned as leader of the party. It may be that he called this election, in part, to provide himself with a graceful exit from politics by being defeated in the election.

He was initially asked to become the Liberal leader on the expectation that he would be another supposedly charismatic, brilliant, erudite Trudeau to lead Canadians into the future. There was one flaw with this scenario. Mr. Ignatieff had no talent for the job. He had neither a political nor a people instinct. Despite his best efforts, he came across as effete, disdainful, and elitist. Canadians can spot a phony when they see one.

The likeliest Liberal to take over the party is MP Bob Rae (who always thought that, due to his previous experience as an NDP MP and Ontario provincial premier, he should have been the party leader instead of Mr. Ignatieff). Mr. Rae has explained away his disastrous time as NDP premier by contending that he learned from his mistakes. One wonders, however, whether his enthusiasm to implement socialist principles overrides his political judgment. For example, it was Bob Rae's motion in the House of Commons, to include abortion in the G-8 maternal health care policy, that went down to embarrassing defeat. A more politically careful MP would not have pushed such a controversial motion, especially without complete caucus support.

Mr. Rae is probably too old and weary to lead his party in the 2015 election. However, before he retires, he has one crucial responsibility to carry out: to bring about the merger of the Liberal and NDP parties. Splitting the vote on the left can no longer continue. Such an undertaking will be complicated and difficult, fraught with egos and policy accommodations. However, it must be done. But because Jack Layton and the NDP are now triumphant, he will have a lot of influence in how this merger occurs.

The new party could reasonably be called, the Liberal Democratic Party of Canada.

Who will lead it? It is uncertain at this early time. It might possibly be New Brunswick Acadian Dominic LeBlanc, who seems well grounded and politically astute. It won't be Justin Trudeau. He has to first discover who and what he is. Perhaps, his health permitting, Mr. Layton will stick around to fill this role.

For the time being, thank goodness, we can expect a few years of relative stability and political peace in Canada. †

THE DEPRAVITY OF PAEDOPHILIA

There seems to be no boundaries on the absurdity of some of Canada's elites. They do not think deeply. Rather, they make proclamations based on their ideology and a simplistic analysis, relying on their doctrinaire positions to provide credibility for their statements

The statement of retired psychologist, Hubert Van Gijseghem, from the University of Montreal, made to the House of Commons Justice Committee, in February 2011, is a strong case in point.

Professor Van Gijseghem was testifying on Bill C-54, which imposed a mandatory minimum penalty for sex offenders of children.

Professor Van Gijseghem presented to the Committee the startling notion that pedophiles are grappling with their sexual orientation just like any other individual grappling with heterosexuality or homosexuality. Therefore, he concluded we should not be too hard on them, since they have a sexual orientation that cannot be changed.

One can only speculate in which halls of learning that Professor Van Gijseghem wandered, to conclude that there are individuals who "grapple" with their heterosexuality.

To claim that pedophilia is merely another sexual orientation, i.e. that it should be regarded as normal and accepted, is to relieve child rapists of their moral and legal responsibility for their crimes against children.

Pedophiles share a sense of sexual and emotional entitlement so exaggerated that they feel they have the right to sexually abuse children. This is normal?

To accept such a notion is to degrade humanity.

Society's Incremental Justification for Depravity

The proposal that paedophilia is just another sexual orientation is a continuation of the slippery slope down which our society is heading.

Abortion, homosexual practices that are allegedly

equivalent to heterosexuality, same-sex marriage, it's all the same bundle of offensive behaviour, which provides no benefits for society but legally allows self indulgence, narcissism, abuse without boundaries and a lack of empathy for others. Although these activities have been made legal in today's society, they remain neither moral nor acceptable.

Approval of these acts is all based on supposed "compassion" and "tolerance" for the unfortunate individuals who want to exercise their desires without recrimination. It is far from bigotry to reject these behaviours. It is both reasonable and proper to do so. To be intimidated by those individuals who seek justification for their unacceptable behaviour is to reject our responsibilities to society.

There is an established legal doctrine called "Parens Patriae", which means the state must protect those who cannot protect themselves, such as children, the mentally ill or otherwise disabled or vulnerable persons. That is, the state has a duty and responsibility to protect the helpless, such as children, from abuse and exploitation by pedophiles.

REAL Women's Warning

In 1996, when then Minister of Justice Allan Rock amended the federal Human Rights Act to include protection on the grounds of sexual orientation, REAL Women testified before both the House of Commons Justice Committee and the Senate Legal Affairs Committee, warning that the undefined expression "sexual orientation" would be exploited by pedophiles and their supporters in due course. And so it has come to pass.

We are grateful, however, that the Conservative government has brought forward Bill C-54, which protects children from sexual abuse, the government ignored the distorted advice of "experts", who attempt to pass themselves off as "knowledgeable", when they, in fact, lack both understanding and common sense. †

NEW BREEZES BLOWING RE ILLICIT DRUG USE



Hungarian born U.S. citizen, billionaire George Soros, has used his enormous wealth to lavishly fund NGO's world wide to legalize and normalize illicit drug use.

He uses these NGO's to promote a policy called "harm reduction". The latter is based on the notion that individuals are going to use drugs anyway, so why not supply them with clean needles in a "safe" (i.e. clean, and free from the police) clinic to carry out their injections. Better still, supply them with free heroin, crack pipes, etc. The end purpose of this is to bring about the break down of laws prohibiting illegal drug use, and ultimately to legalize the use of all drugs.

Canada has not escaped George Soros's interference with our drug laws. Harm reduction NGO's and individuals in Canada have been funded by him for years. They use his money to hire public relations firms to plant favourable articles in Canadian

newspapers and to promote advocacy research so as to argue that "scientific evidence" indicates harm reduction is the best approach to drug use. They organize high-end meetings in Canada to argue the advantages of harm reduction policies, and have attended international meetings on Soros's dime, in order to promote such policies. A course is now available at York University in Toronto on harm reduction, so as to further the influence of that philosophy in Canada.

Meeting in Vienna – March 2011

Every March, representatives from around the world gather in Vienna at a meeting organized by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). However, NGO's supporting abstinence based policies, have always been under-funded, and often cannot afford to travel to Vienna for these meetings. As a result, the well-funded pro-drug lobby has become very dominant

there in recent years. As a consequence of this dominance, at the meeting in Vienna in 2009, a group of countries, lobbied by Soros funded NGO's, mostly from the west, i.e. the European Union, Canada and the U.S., proposed that harm reduction should be placed in some of the resolutions. Fortunately, this proposal was stopped by Russia, Latvia, the U.S.A., Italy and Sweden, among other nations.

After this defeat, the Soros backed NGO's have not been as active, either at the 2010 meeting or the March 2011 meeting, where the abstinence based NGO's became the most dominant for the first time in many years: at the 2011 meeting, these NGO's were, for the first time, better prepared and better organized. They hosted many more side events and attended the side events sponsored by the Soros funded NGO's, at which they asked many difficult questions. This new dynamic at the UNODC is promising for the future.

Further, at the March meeting, Sweden played a major role. The latter has Europe's lowest rates of crime, disease, and medical and social problems stemming from drug addiction.

This is due to the fact that Sweden employs a program of compulsory drug treatment for addicts. This success is similar to that achieved by drug courts in Canada, which ensure that addicts undergo treatment and rehabilitation as an alternative to a conviction and court record. The success rate of treatment obtained either voluntarily or by court order, is the same.

Sweden's Minister of Children, Maria Larsson, spoke at the 2011 meeting about the right of the child to be protected from the illicit use of drugs. She made the special point that the protection of the child is a human right, based on Article 33 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. She stated that protecting children from illicit drugs is not an option. It is an obligation under this UN Convention.

This obligation should apply to Canada, where the Vancouver Drug Injection Site allows 16 year old adolescents to use its premises.

The harm reduction wave may have reached its highest point. After Vienna, in March 2011, there is a new breeze blowing. The world must now aim for no illegal drug use. †

LEGISLATION KILLED BY THE ELECTION



When the 40th Parliament ended on March 25, 2011 some 40 bills died on the Order Paper. The election, which will cost taxpayers some \$300 million, led to the demise of some important bills. However, on the positive side,

there were a few bills we didn't mind losing at all!

The Positive Bills Lost

- Bill C-54, a government bill, *Protecting Children from Sexual Predators Act*, died in the Senate. The objective of C-54 bill was to treat child sex abuse as a serious offence with increased penalties to prevent the commission of such offences against children.

The Conservative party announced, however, during the election, that if re-elected, it would bring back a number of crime bills, including one with the objectives in Bill C-54.

- Bill C-422, a private members bill introduced by MP Maurice Vellacott (CPC, Saskatoon-Wanuskewin) died in the House of Commons. It amended the *Divorce Act* to make equal shared parenting the presumptive arrangement in child custody and access cases. This presumption would be made unless it could be proven that the best interests of the child would be affected.

The Negative Bills Lost

- Bill C-389, Bill Siksay's (NDP, Burnaby/Douglas) transgendered bill amended the *Human Rights Act* and the *Criminal Code* to give special protection to undefined "gender identity" and "gender expression", i.e. protection for the transgendered. This bill was fast tracked through the House of Commons and was in the Senate when the election was called and, therefore, died in the Order Paper.

- Bill S-204: For the fourth time, Senator Celine

Hervieux-Payette introduced a bill to amend the *Criminal Code* to remove Section 43, which protects parents and teachers from being charged with a criminal offence for using reasonable force to discipline children. Section 43 was challenged in the courts over several years. REAL Women intervened in its defense in all the levels of court to the Supreme Court of Canada. The Supreme Court of Canada upheld the section, but read-in several qualifications such as limiting spanking to children between age 2 and 12.

- Bill S-206. Another bill introduced by Senator Hervieux-Payette, mandates female quotas on boards of directors for publicly traded companies, banks, insurance companies, trust companies and crown corporations. This bill, if passed, would fundamentally restructure Canadian business. The bill is part of an ambitious agenda for feminist advancement promoted by the Status of Women funded groups – Equal Voice and the Jeffery Group – as well as the feminist global strategy organization called IDEAS.

Canadian Companies Reject Female Quotas

Shareholders of Canada's major banks have all overwhelmingly voted down a proposal to increase the number of women on its boards by way of a quota.

For example, Scotiabank stated in its proxy circular on the proposal that "it would be inappropriate to constrain the board in this regard by imposing a requirement that a fixed percentage of directors must be women".

What's Wrong with Female Quotas?

Quotas for women ignore the merit principle which is derived from education, training and experience. Further, the concept of forced parity is discriminatory in that if quotas are available to women only but not similar quotas for other groups, such as ones based on religion, colour, race, etc.

disadvantage is then created for others. That is, legislation promoting one group of individuals is to the detriment of other groups including qualified men who will be inevitably rejected for recruitment because of the requirement for female quotas. Quotas, therefore, are unsatisfactory. They are authoritarian, unfair and undemocratic.

It is not surprising, therefore, that proxy resolutions in

favour of quotas for women were overwhelmingly voted down, by major Canadian companies. Proxy resolutions have also been filed with Power Corp. of Canada, BCE Inc., Manulife Financial Corp., and Bombardier Inc.

Bill S-206 was intended to thwart the will of businesses by ordering, by federal legislation, that they tow the feminist line. This bill is no loss to Canadian society. †

PROVINCIAL GAMBLING SITES NOT WORTH THE RISK

B.C. is currently the only Canadian province with an online casino site, but Quebec and Ontario are planning to establish online gambling sites shortly. Nova Scotia has also expressed an interest in this possibility. They are doing so in the hope of greatly increasing their revenue. (See REALity Sept/Oct 2010 – “Provinces Take Up Gambling”.)

However, Canadian experts on online-gambling question whether provincially run sites will be able to compete against the more than two thousand off-shore sites that, for the most part, have fewer regulations, lower fees and other incentives to keep customers loyal.

According to Professor Robert Williams, professor in the Faculty of Health Sciences at the University of Lethbridge and co-ordinator of the Alberta Gaming Research Institute, it's likely that many current players will stick with their favorite sites and not use the government site. Unfortunately, however, he stated that people who had hesitated to gamble online may now be enticed to try out the government run sites because they see it as a government-sanctioned activity. His concern is that this will create a new generation of problem gamblers. This, he says, happened in Britain and Sweden when they launched their own gaming sites.

John McMullan, a professor of Sociology and Criminology, at St. Mary's University in Halifax, in an article published in July 2010, in the *Journal of Gambling Issues*, provided details as to how criminals collude, cheat, and use sophisticated computer props to shut down gambling sites altogether for extortion purposes. He gave as examples, cases where cyber criminals have commandeered hundreds of computers to launch “D-DOS attacks” (which stands for Distributed Denial of Service) against gambling sites. According to Professor McMullan, these attacks herd computers together, and direct a large number of requests at the site, so the site actually crawls to a stop

or is taken down because it can't manage all of the requests coming at it. The criminals then extort ransom monies from the site, which has been so sabotaged that it has ceased to be competitive.

Another example Professor McMullan cites was a recent scandal that occurred at the world's biggest Online Gambling site, PokerStars.com. This scandal required the company to pay players close to \$2 million U.S. after a band of players in China went online to the site and colluded and fixed games. These players knew what hands their fellow players in China were holding, and who had the chip stacks, which gave them a tremendous advantage.

Professor McMullan has also documented scores of cases where cheaters have used special software, readily available online, to help them play and calculate odds against unsuspecting competitors at online gambling sites. Millions can be made with these computer-assisted programs.

The fact is that even online gambling sites that tout having the best safeguards are vulnerable to malicious activity, ranging from cheating to criminal fraud. Experts fear that the provincial governments, which are in the business of running traditional casinos and conventional card games, do not have the technical expertise and savvy to keep ahead of sophisticated rings of international cyber cheats.

Yet, the provinces are more interested in easily accumulating revenue from provincially operated online gambling sites, no matter what the risk to their citizens.

Canadians are certainly not afraid of making a bet according to Statistics Canada. Canadians spent nearly \$14 billion on government run gambling in 2009. This revenue came from lotteries, video lottery terminals, casinos and slot machines. This is the temptation for the provincial governments to expand its online gambling sites. †

A HOMOSEXUAL'S LIFE —NOT SO GREAT

It is obvious that two men together and two women together are not physically designed for sexual connection. That is why their sexual acts are unnatural. They are only an improvisation of nature's competently designed sexuality.

Because these sexual acts are a bizarre imitation of natural, male-female sexuality, same-sex activity results in medical and psychological problems for those who insist on engaging in these activities.

Homosexuals/lesbians, themselves, admit this. However, they never acknowledge the stark truth that many of their problems would cease if they stopped engaging in these unnatural acts. They persist in doing so, and demand that the government pick up after them, by paying out millions of dollars to cover their resulting health problems. They argue that “homophobia” has led to discrimination against them by the health system. In effect, these activists are claiming that

it's all the government's fault that they are facing health problems and premature death. In short, homosexual activists want to continue their harmful behaviour and lifestyle and expect the government (i.e., the taxpayers) to give them, as their entitlement, special funding to deal with their resulting medical problems.

In February 2009, a complaint was laid by some homosexual activists with the federal Human Rights Commission. They claimed that they were experiencing lower life expectancy than the average Canadian, a high suicide rate, and high rates of substance abuse, smoking and depression. They complained about inadequate access to care for HIV/AIDS treatment and cancer – both anal cancers and those caused by the exposure to human papillomavirus which leads to head, throat and neck cancers. Violence and bullying were also included, as well as problems with blood donations, because homosexual and bisexual males are barred from donating blood if they have had sexual intercourse with another man since 1977. They claim this policy has “no basis in science”. Homosexual activists allege these problems have all been caused and accelerated by discriminatory policies by health officials.

‘Cruising’ a Part of Homosexual Culture

One of the characteristics of the homosexual/lesbian relationship is its instability. There are exceptions, but the average length of homosexual relationships is, at most, 2 - 3 years. Unlike heterosexual relationships, it is typical for homosexuals to agree to have casual sexual encounters with others, while in a so-called “stable” relationship. This is understood as being a part of their culture. This expectancy, however, only compounds their health problems.

Old and Alone

The homosexual lifestyle of promiscuous sex and short-lived relationships has created another problem for them – no one to care for them when they grow old.

The Centre for Health Policy Research at the University of California, Los Angeles, based on the data from the California Health Interview Survey, gathered in 2003, 2005,

The homosexual lifestyle of promiscuous sex and short-lived relationships has created another problem for them —no one to care for them when they grow old.

and 2007, found that older gay and bisexual men - ages 50 to 70 - reported higher rates of high blood pressure, diabetes and physical disability than similar heterosexual men. Older gay and bisexual men were also 45 percent more likely to report psychological distress and 50 percent more likely to rate their health as fair or poor. In addition, one in five gay men in California was living with H.I.V. infection. Half of older, gay and bisexual men lived alone, compared with 13.4 percent of older, heterosexual men.

Older lesbian and bisexual women experienced similar rates of diabetes and hypertension, compared with straight women of their age, but reported significantly more physical disabilities and psychological distress, and were 26 percent more likely to say their health was fair or poor. More than one in four lived alone, compared with only one in five heterosexual women.

As stated by Steven P. Wallace, associate director of the U.C.L.A. Center for Health Policy Research and lead author on the study, “*The gay culture tends to be youth-driven, and the aging community network doesn’t usually think about gay and lesbian elders.*”

In short, the constant pursuit of casual sex and unnatural sex acts result not only in health and emotional problems, but also in having no life partners or adult children to care for homosexuals/lesbians in their old age. To be old and alone is part of the homosexual culture too.

How can we visit these sad problems on our youth, telling them that homosexuality is equal to heterosexuality? It isn’t. It is abuse of vulnerable children to fail to disclose to them the truth about homosexuality. †

SUPPORT OUR WORK TO DEFEND THE TRADITIONAL FAMILY

DONATE TODAY _____
Contributions are not tax deductible
Receipts sent upon request.

SIGN UP OR RENEW YOUR MEMBERSHIP
Individual & Family \$25.00 Group \$30.00
Includes REALity, provincial and national memberships

(PRINT)

Name _____ Telephone _____

Address _____ City _____

Province _____ Postal Code _____ Email _____

Payments may be made online at www.realwomenca.com or by mail. Thank you!



WE NEED YOU TO BE OUR FAN ... NOW

Keep abreast of late breaking news on social and family issues by joining the REAL Women of Canada FACEBOOK page. It is easy to do and is free. Go to the REAL Women of Canada website at www.realwomenca.com and click on the blue Find Us on Facebook icon. Click on the LIKE icon at the top of the Facebook page. Also, invite your family and friends to become fans. †

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE FEDERAL ELECTION

[M]ost of Canada has not bought into the NDP agenda.

The mainstream media (MSM) has been swooning over the NDP's increase in seats from 36 to 103 in the recent election. It cannot praise Mr. Layton enough for his remarkable success. Yet, the fact is that over half of the NDP seats (59) are from the province of Quebec. In the rest of Canada, the NDP only picked up eight new seats. It's a gain, which is better than losing seats for sure, but it indicates that most of Canada has not bought into the NDP agenda.

For that matter, the NDP hasn't exactly captured, in any depth, the population of Quebec either. It seems that the NDP's massive support there was due, if anything, to the fact that Quebec just got tired of the Bloc Quebecois. Quebec suddenly realized that the Bloc, created as a temporary party, had been in place too long. The Bloc Leader, Gilles Duceppe, has represented Quebec in Ottawa for close to 20 years. He lost his seat in the election, but leaves the federal scene with a smile on his face since he leaves with a whopping \$171,000 annual pension: not bad for a party leader whose sole objective in Ottawa was to break up the country.

Quebec's Shifting Political Allegiances


One would have to be naïve to believe that the NDP are in Quebec to stay. Quebec voters have a history of shifting their political allegiances "en masse". In 1984 the Progressive Conservatives under Brian Mulroney, swept the province, jumping from one seat to 58 seats. In 1993 the Bloc reduced the Progressive Conservatives to a single seat, with the Bloc winning 54 seats. In the Quebec provincial election in 2007, the Action Democratique du Quebec party became the official opposition to the Liberals, with 41 seats up from five seats, and then returned to just a handful of seats in the following provincial election.

NDP Taken By Surprise

No one was more surprised by its tremendous upsurge in Quebec than the NDP itself.

It didn't even have many experienced candidates to run for office. As a result, four university students at McGill University in Montreal, members of the NDP Club there, agreed to run as candidates. They did not campaign, but all were elected! A 19-year-old, first year student at the University of Sherbrooke, Pierre-Luc Dusseault, became the youngest MP ever elected in Canada. He had planned to spend this summer working at a local golf club, but now, instead has to contend with a \$157,731 annual salary as a sitting MP. If he manages to hold onto his seat for another term, so as to complete six years in office, he will receive an annual pension of \$27,000 at age 55 years for the rest of his life.

Another NDP candidate elected from Quebec was Ruth Ellen Brosseau who was the assistant manager of a pub in Ottawa. She agreed to allow her name to stand to represent the party, apparently as a favour to a friend at the NDP National Headquarters. She never canvassed in her riding, spent a week of the election campaign vacationing in Las Vegas, but she won, even though she is English speaking in a riding that is 97% French speaking. Ms Brosseau was kept away from the media for a week following the election. When she finally met the media, she admitted she has never been in the riding, but heard it was a very nice place. The Liberal candidate alleges that Ms Brosseau's nomination papers were falsified and a complaint has been filed against her.



The Green Party

This election was the Green Party leader, Elizabeth May's third try for election. She ran this time in B.C. in the Saanich-Gulf Islands (Sidney-Vancouver Island), defeating Conservative Minister of Sports Gary Lunn. The riding has the third largest senior population in Canada. Unlike the other party leaders, Ms May spent only eight days of the campaign outside of her riding. One of the reasons for her win is that the Green Party poured nearly all its resources, time, energy and 2,000 volunteers into this single riding. As a result of the party placing all its bets on the one riding, the party's national popular support fell from 7% in the 2008 election, to 4% in the 2011 federal election. Undaunted, however, the party strategists now plan to target eight ridings, at most, in the next federal election.

The Conservatives are the True Winners

Lost in the media haze surrounding the election is the fact that the Conservative Party was the real winner of this election. The Conservative Party received 39.6% of the vote and 54% of the seats across the country. However, factor out Quebec—that is, examine the rest of Canada without it

—and the Tory numbers rise to 47.7% of the vote and 68% of the seats.

In fact, the Tories received almost as many votes in Ontario (2,455,900) as the Liberals did in the entire country (2,783,175).

The Conservatives were able to achieve this remarkable result, notwithstanding the MSM continually ignoring the surging support for the Conservatives and the polls predicting only a strong minority for the Conservatives. The Conservatives were partly successful because of their inroads with the ethnic vote, which bled the Liberal fortresses in Vancouver and Toronto. Long held Liberal seats, such as those of MP Ken Dryden (York Centre) and hard-core feminist Maria Minna (Beaches-East York), were lost. The Toronto riding of Don Valley West, formerly held by Liberal homosexual activist and United Church Minister, Robert Oliphant, was lost to Conservative Michael Carmichael (his third try at the Don Valley West riding). The riding of another Liberal homosexual, Mario Silva (Davenport) was won by the NDP.

Whether one supports the Conservative Party or not, it cannot be denied that Mr. Harper is an outstanding leader of his party. †

FEMINIST WINS AND LOSSES IN THE ELECTION

The number of female MP's now makes up a quarter of seats ... most, however, are from the NDP.

Feminists are pretending that they are bolstered by the 2011 election results. The number of female MP's now makes up a quarter of seats in the 308 House of Commons. That is, there are now 76 women MP's, up from 69 elected in 2008. Most, however, are from the NDP, which consists of 40 women in the 103-member caucus. What is not mentioned is that the percentage of women in the NDP Caucus in 2011 is less than the percentage after the 2006 election.

The Conservatives' caucus consists of 17.5% (29) women, and the 34 member Liberal Caucus now includes only six women (17.6%).

FEMINIST LOSSES

Feminists lost some of their furious warriors in the election. These include:

Marlene Jennings (Liberal)—Montreal's Notre Dame de Grace—Lachine



Ms Jennings has been an MP since 1997. Her most recent claim to inclusion in the feminist "hall of fame" was to introduce a bill near the end of the last session of Parliament that would provide for additional financial payments to political parties for each female candidate elected. This bad idea has now been mercifully put to death.



Anita Neville (Liberal)—Winnipeg South

Ms Neville, four times elected Liberal MP, lost her seat to NDP Mike Radcliffe. Ms Neville was the Liberal party's spokesperson on women's issues. She repeatedly hurled insults at the Conservatives, claiming they had "silenced" women by funding cuts to feminists or/and had denied women their rights.



Maria Minna (Liberal)—Beaches-East York

Ms Minna has been an MP since 1993 and was once thought to be invincible in her riding. Not anymore. As the minister responsible for CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency) from 1999-2002, she was instrumental in promoting the policy that gives women's development priority in Canadian foreign aid.

REAL Women has tangled with these female MP's time and time again. We're not sorry that they have now disappeared from the political scene.

FEMINIST GAINS

The NDP victories in the Quebec City area include two feminist activists, Anne-Marie Day, in Charlesbourg Haute Saint Charles, and Annick Pappillion, in the riding of Quebec. These female MP's join the outspoken, re-elected NDP Irene Mathysen (London-Fanshawe), who was head of the NDP's women's caucus in the last Parliament. As far as we can recall,

Ms Mathysen never spoke in the House of Commons on any issue other than women's rights. She appeared obsessed with her "women are victims" theme. She was so immersed in the issue, that she even imagined a picture of a naked woman on the laptop of Conservative MP James Moore (Port Moody Coquitlam Port Coquitlam). She angrily brought this disgraceful image to the attention of the Speaker. It turned out, however, that the picture was that of Mr. Moore's girlfriend in a bikini on a beach. (The latter was accompanied in the photograph by her dog, possibly female, who was not wearing any clothes!)

The Green Party's Elizabeth May, Liberal Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre) and Block MP Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic) can be counted on to promote the feminist cause whenever called upon to do so.

STATUS OF WOMEN COMMITTEE

The Standing Committee on the Status of Women will now be chaired and controlled by Conservative MP's.

Previously, this Committee served as a platform for

feminist MP's to promote their special interest agenda. Under the opposition feminist control, the Committee carried out "investigations" of Conservative policies, such as, its reducing funding to feminist organizations and dismantling the Court Challenges Program. The Committee demanded that a gender analysis be carried out by all government departments and agencies etc. Their list of complaints and proposals was endless.

Now that feminists have lost control of the Committee, like a balloon without air, the Committee will be left in a heap on the floor of Parliament. Although the feminist NDP members of the newly constituted committee will do all in their power to continue their outrageous demands and criticisms of the government, the Conservative majority will keep them nicely in line.

The best solution would be for this Committee to be abolished altogether, along with the Status of Women Agency. Another solution would be to establish a Committee on the Status of Men, so as to provide them with a platform to promote their concerns as well. †

ONTARIO ACTIVIST JUDGES AND MARIJUANA



[A] decision by an Ontario judge exemplifies the actions of liberal activist judges ... who are playing a game with the federal government's laws and regulations prohibiting marijuana use.

Ontario's activist judges have done it again. They have struck down the laws prohibiting marijuana for the third time in a dozen years.

The most recent decision in April, was by a single judge on the lower Ontario Superior Court, Mr. Justice Donald Taliano. He ordered a marijuana smoker, Matthew Mernagh, who was using the drug supposedly for medical purposes, to be given a personal exemption from criminal prosecution, allowing him to grow and buy his own pot freely without a license. Mr. Mernagh is a well-known marijuana advocate who has been charged many times for possession and production of marijuana. Mr. Mernagh claimed he was unable to find a doctor to give him a prescription for marijuana required for his medical needs.

Doctors Avoid Marijuana Prescriptions

There is good reason for a scarcity of physicians willing to prescribe marijuana for medical purposes. There is no scientific proof that marijuana is medicinal and no method of determining what dosage, if any, should be prescribed. Consequently, doctors have boycotted such prescriptions so as to protect themselves from litigation.

Judges Playing Games

This decision by an Ontario judge exemplifies the actions of liberal activist judges on the Ontario courts who are playing a game with the federal government's laws and regulations

prohibiting marijuana use. The drug activists' true goal in legally challenging the laws on medical marijuana is to achieve an across-the-board legalization of all marijuana uses. By this backdoor excuse of claiming medical need, the Ontario judges are obligingly joining in the campaign to decriminalize marijuana and to legitimize it.

In 2003, The Supreme Court of Canada, in a decision on marijuana (*R. v Malmo-Levine*) stated that marijuana can alter mind function and impair health. Consequently, it concluded that the federal government has every right to control or prohibit its use. The Ontario judges, however, have simply ignored this precedent by the Supreme Court and instead, have applied their own personal beliefs on the issue.

It is contrary to established court procedure, however, to ignore decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada. In our legal system, courts are bound by the Supreme Court decisions and are compelled to follow them. This is called Stare Decisis, and it is an affront to our judicial system that Ontario judges are simply not complying with this rule of law.

These Ontario judges, therefore, are acting arbitrarily with unfettered and unrooted power by deciding whatever they like on whatever basis they choose. They have no particular insight and no special knowledge to do so. Nonetheless, they take every opportunity to turn society in the direction they want, not necessarily in the direction that society wants or needs.

The damage caused by these Ontario judges over the years is incalculable. Their decisions include legalizing same-sex marriage, granting the legal absurdity of the three-parent family whereby same-sex partners and the sperm donor are all deemed parents of a hapless child, and striking down the prostitution laws enacted to protect both society and prostitutes from exploitation and abuse, etc. The Ontario courts are leaving a long trail of disaster behind them.

The decisions by these activist judges are direct assaults on democracy. Parliament was established in order for elect MP's to debate and resolve political issues of the day. Ill-informed judges, who use selected evidence to promote their own personal views, e.g., the prostitution decision in September handed down by Madam Justice Susan Himel does not respect democracy.

Judges are ill positioned to make such decisions, because they have limited access to social data on issues and are isolated from

society. They have little exposure to differing perspectives on the issues. On the other hand, Parliament has research capabilities, access to the differing views of the public, and provides extensive debate so as to permit ample airing of issues. Consequently, Parliament is in a position to make legislative decisions on important issues, while isolated judges, who believe that their political appointment to the bench provides them with absolute power to rule over our lives, do not. †

THE FARCE OF TORONTO'S GAY PRIDE PARADE

Toronto's Gay Parade is a farce. It is supposed to represent a proud, strong and independent homosexual community. However, the truth is, it cannot even manage its own affairs, either financially or politically.

For example, despite the fact the federal Conservative government gave the parade \$400,000 in June 2009, the parade still managed to run up a \$400,000 deficit. This debt was partially mitigated by its reserve funds. Apparently, it is in financial trouble again, but the federal government no longer plans to fund it.

The parade is also experiencing political turmoil. A controversial group, known as Queers Against Israeli Apartheid (QuAIA) insisted again last year that it be part of the Gay Parade. A political storm erupted as various Jewish groups and the Toronto City Council raised objections to its participation. City Council voted to make its funding available to the parade conditional on it complying with the city's anti-discrimination policies, i.e. rejecting participation by QuAIA. In short, the Pride Parade was told either to ban the QuAIA or receive no city funding. As a result, the parade banned QuAIA and took the city's money. The parade organizers then promptly cashed the cheque and, as promptly, let QuAIA back into the parade! No qualms about morality.

The Toronto City Council has no intention of being fooled again this year. It has told the parade that it will not be awarded money from the city until after the parade is over. Last year, the city gave the Gay Pride Parade a \$123,807 grant and \$245,000 worth of services (police assistance and clean up crews), which significantly impact on its budget.

What is a Gay Pride Parade?

These parades are well known for their full nudity, open engagement in public sexual acts and a deliberate disregard

for behaviour acceptable to most sectors of Canadian society. The parade is about hedonistic exhibitionism and narcissism, promoting a deadly form of sexuality. The parade is designed to shock and titillate and the week-long "celebration" has become an excuse for partying, drug use and promiscuity.

The purpose of these parades is to provide the general public with exposure to the homosexual culture, which is based solely on sexuality. The idea is to break down resistance to nudity and promiscuity and, therefore, gain acceptance for them. Another purpose is attempting to change Canadian society itself so as to integrate homosexual culture i.e. sexuality and promiscuity, into mainstream Canada.

Why are Taxpayers Contributing to this Unacceptable Activity?

Although the Conservative federal government is apparently no longer funding this parade, the Ontario Provincial Government is providing \$400,000 (about \$100,000 more than last year) of the taxpayers' money. Also, as mentioned above, the City of Toronto may well be making its usual financial contribution providing the matter of QuAIA's participation is resolved.

Why Isn't the Gay Pride Parade Self-Supporting?

The Gay Pride Parade should be able to stand on its own. It could if it did, in fact, have all the support it claims to have. It is hardly a triumph for this event to be frantically seeking government funding for its existence. How can the parade organizers and the homosexual community be strong and full of "pride" when their "centre piece" is, in fact, a confused, dependent organization, so immature and inadequate that it is unable to manage its own affairs? †

CANADIAN MUSEUM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS CAREENS OUT OF CONTROL

The Canadian Museum for Human Rights (CMHR) in Winnipeg was the inspiration of Israel Asper, who put \$22 million of his own money into it. In 2007, when private contributions fell short, the federal government kicked in \$100 million towards the museum's construction, plus \$22 million a year to cover its operating costs.

This new tax supported national museum, is wildly over budget. There also seems to be no controls on its spending. For example, former acting CEO, Patrick O'Reilly, just weeks

before handing over the reigns to a new CEO in September 2009, spent ten days in Australia at a cost of \$7,863.90 for some speaking engagements. For this he charged \$1,048.33 for meals alone. During his last three months as acting CEO, he ran up a travel bill of \$32,753.20, which included trips to Europe, New York, Toronto, Vancouver and Halifax.

The current CEO, Stuart Murray, a former Manitoba Conservative leader didn't take long to learn the lavish spending ways of his predecessor. He was appointed in September 2009

and, in the first 9 months as CEO, racked up \$27,034 in travel expenses including tax-payer funded trips to San Francisco, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Boston, New York and Washington, D.C. The tax-payers also paid for airfare and accommodations and meals so that he could visit the Guggenheim Museum in New York while he was on a personal vacation in Spain in October 2009. Mr. Murray also traveled to Ottawa, Toronto and Montreal to meet with senior government officials and a senator. This cost the tax-payer \$3,156.00. The following month he flew again to Ottawa to meet the U.S. Ambassador to Canada and CBC officials in Toronto. These expenses are on top of his salary, which is between \$167,300 and \$196,900.

It is obvious that Mr. Murray, instead of using modern technology such as emails and faxes, prefers face-to-face meetings, as a result of which, he travels first class, stays at luxurious hotels and enjoys lavish meals — all paid by the tax-payers.

The Museum is controversial in other ways as well. A conflict has arisen between Holocaust supporters, who apparently have pride of place in the museum, and the supporters of the Ukrainian Canadian Civil Liberties Association. They believe that the Ukraine Great Famine of 1932-33 in Soviet Ukraine, during which millions of Ukrainians were deliberately starved to death by Stalin to free up land to establish collective farms, should be given equal recognition by the museum. There was not supposed to be a “hierarchy of suffering” in the museum, since it was supposed to be open to all points of human rights concerns — but that’s apparently not happening.

In fact, the museum has become a monument to the politically correct, and a shrine to the *Charter of Rights* and so called “Canadian values” as interpreted and determined by liberal judges.

On March 31, 2008 the museum released the list of topics that Canadians had supposedly ranked by subject, that they wanted to be addressed in the museum. The list provided is as follows:

Topics	Percentage	Topics	Percentage
Aboriginal (First Nations)	16.1%	Sexual Orientation	4.9%
Genocides	14.8%	Ethnic Minorities	3.8%
Women	14.7%	Slavery	2.9%
Internments	12.5%	Immigration	2.6%
War and Conflicts	8.7%	Charter of Rights	2.3%
Holocaust	7.0%	Disabilities	2.0%
Children	5.9%	Universal Declaration of Human Rights	1.8%

Since the museum’s Content Advisory Committee consisted of predominately well-known radical feminists and homosexual activists, it is not surprising that “women” i.e. women’s history, undoubtedly seen through a feminist lens, is listed as the third most prominent category. Sexual orientation is also included as a “must see” category, undoubtedly promoted by the former acting Chief Co-ordinating Officer of the museum, Patrick O’Reilly, a homosexual activist.

No place has been included in the museum for the devastating attacks and harsh discrimination against helpless unborn children in Canada by abortion. Concern about this was raised time and again across Canada to the Content Advisory Committee in its consultations with the Canadian public.

The Museum of Human Rights is an expensive monument to support the views of politically correct elitists and former Prime Minister Trudeau’s controversial *Charter of Rights*. This museum does not represent the perspective of most Canadians. Why are the taxpayers paying for this shrine to left-wing human rights activists? †

NOW, ABOUT THOSE BURKAS



One doesn’t usually care what individuals choose to wear on our streets—providing it’s not too immodest.

Islamic women wearing burkas, swathed in cloth from head to toe, certainly make the cut in the area of modesty!

A Sikh wearing a turban, a Hutterite or Amish community member are different in appearance, but they don’t cause many raised eyebrows—at most, only mild curiosity.

The burka (an all-over covering with a mesh panel through which the wearer peers) and the niqab (a veil with a narrow slit for the eye), however, pose quite a different problem, since the wearers of these garments cannot be identified. (A hijab is a headscarf, which is quite a different matter).

Quebec Bans the Burka and Niqab

In March 2011, Quebec, under Liberal Premier Jean Charest, became the first province in Canada to introduce legislation (Bill 94) banning the wearing of the burka and niqab for those seeking government services, such as applying for a Medicare card, automobile registration, attending university or colleges, visiting a doctor, etc.

Muslim Immigration in Quebec

Perhaps Quebec felt compelled to take this action because Quebec’s Immigration policies prefer French-speaking migrants, such as those from France, Lebanon and the French speaking North African countries of Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia. Consequently, close to half of Quebec’s immigrants are now Muslim. Also, Quebec is a French-speaking minority in North America and believes its survival is precarious. This creates tensions that have been manifested in efforts to limit the spread of the English language (Bill 101) and the perceived threat of so-called religious fundamentalists who are allegedly undermining Quebec’s “values”.

France Bans the Burka and Niqab

In October 2010 the government of France, under President Nicholas Sarkozy, passed legislation banning the wearing of burkas and niqabs in public. This law came into effect in April 2011. Henceforth, anyone caught wearing these garments in public is subject to a fine of 150 Euros (\$216 US) or lessons in French citizenship.

France now has a Muslim population of 5 million, the largest in Western Europe. Hence, its concern about the wearing of

One doesn't usually care what individuals choose to wear on our streets... The burka and the niqab, however, pose quite a different problem, since the wearers of these garments cannot be identified.

these garments because of their supposed detrimental effect on French culture and traditions.

Wearing the Burka and Niqab are Not Religious Requirements

Ironically, the wearing of the burka and niqab is not religiously prescribed. That is, there is no requirement in Islam or the Koran for Muslim women to cover their faces. The wearing of these garments is a cultural statement rather than a religious requirement. The Muslim Canadian Congress argues, in fact, that the wearing of the burka and niqab is an insult to Muslim women, and it has asked Ottawa to introduce legislation that will "ban the wearing of the burka and niqab in public".

Canadians Object to Burka and Niqabs

The populations of Quebec and the rest of Canada don't often agree. However, according to a March 2011 Angus Reid Poll, they are united in their opinion that the wearing of these veils should be banned: Quebec records a 95% agreement, Alberta 82%, Ontario 77%, B.C. 70%, Atlantic Provinces 73%.

Problems with Wearing Burkas and Niqabs

These are some very practical concerns about the wearing of the burka and niqab in certain circumstances:

Public Safety

- In August 2010, veiled Muslim passengers were discovered boarding airplanes without security checks. Apparently, airport security, confronted by uncooperative veiled travelers, allowed them to board the aircraft without any face identification (e.g.,

failed to compare their passport pictures with the passengers' faces). The airport screeners were threatened with a lawsuit for daring to ask to see the faces of the veiled women, even in a private room. Fearing "racist" and "anti-Muslim" charges, and haunted by the specter of overactive human rights commissions and tribunals, the officials backed down. The veiled women were overheard laughing and commenting in Arabic about the "Simpleton Canadians".

- A person wearing a burka, masquerading as a Muslim woman, robbed a Scotiabank branch in Mississauga, Ontario and is still being hunted by the police. National newspapers did not cover this robbery, apparently fearing it would attract accusations of racism and Islamophobia.
- A Muslim woman wearing a niqab accused a man of sexual assault but wanted to give testimony in a Toronto court wearing her veil. She told the court it was a respect issue, one of modesty, a matter of Islamic honour. The lower court judge refused her request to testify behind her veil. On appeal, the court held that the decision to testify while wearing a veil must be determined on a case-by-case basis.
- Elections Canada agreed in 2007 to allow women to vote with their faces covered by niqabs and burkas. At the same time, the *Elections Act* provides that voters are required to produce photo identification before being allowed to vote. How can election officials compare the photo to the person seeking to vote if her face is covered? An unresolved riddle.

A Possible Solution

Perhaps a solution to this problem is to accept Muslim women wearing their burkas and niqabs except when the state has a compelling reason to object, such as in the circumstances outlined above. That is, Muslim women are now in Canada, a remarkably tolerant country, but there are certain standards that must be applied, without exception, as to public safety, i.e. security on airplanes, driving cars, testifying in court and voting, when an unveiled face should be a legal requirement. This is not too much to ask of our new Canadians. †

REALity is a publication of

REAL
Women of Canada

PO Box 8813 Station T
Ottawa ON K1G 3J1

Tel 613-236-4001 Fax 613-236-7203

www.realwomenca.com ♦ realwcna@on.aibn.com

Publications Mail Agreement Number 40051461

Return Postage Guaranteed. *REALity* is a publication of
REAL Women of Canada PO Box 8813 Station T Ottawa, ON K1G 3J1