

**INTERNATIONAL PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION: THE ENEMY OF LIFE**

Controversy in Canada has arisen over the grant of \$18 million given to International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) by Canada in 2006 for a three year period (see REALity, Jan/Feb 2010,). This grant, to date, has not been renewed by the government. With good reason.

IPPF has 150 member associations in 179 countries. It is one of the largest abortion providers world wide, and lobbies to redefine “sexual and reproductive health”, at every level of government to include abortion made available to women and adolescents. IPPF is one of the most strongly supported international NGO’s at the UN. It works with the UN Population Fund (UNFPA), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF).

No better example of the IPPF activities at the UN can be demonstrated, than by its actions at the recent (March 1-12th, 2010) UN Commission on the Status of Women. To start with, at this meeting, IPPF distributed bumper stickers stating “My Body. My Choice. My Pleasure”. This explicitly demonstrates IPPF’s determination to establish unrestricted sex and sexuality, no matter how perverse and damaging it might be, as an international human right.

IPPF also held an event at this meeting at which adults were ushered from the room because it was “for girls” only. Fortunately, one of REAL Women’s team included a 17-year-old young adult who was allowed to enter the meeting. By luck, she obtained a ringside seat at the event, sitting directly behind a row of individuals associated with IPPF. Throughout the entire proceedings, the latter made faces, laughed and mocked anyone who opposed IPPF’s positions. The panelists at this event talked about the right to sex, that abortion is freedom for young girls who don’t want to get pregnant, that sex shouldn’t be such a taboo subject, that more young people should be sexually active, that abortion is just a back-up contraceptive and a means to have good sex without consequences, such as having a child. One panelist suggested that making sex better for teens would be achieved by providing contraceptives in schools, and by teaching kids about good sex, instead of “scaring” them by informing them of health issues.

During the question period, a young woman bravely asked why, instead of pushing contraceptives on teens, was IPPF not teaching abstinence? The IPPF officials just laughed. Another question was raised as to the fact that since there are no UN documents referring to abortion: why is this issue being pushed at the UN? The response was that slavery was an issue and now it isn’t, and no one wrote up anything on that in any official document! The majority present in the room clapped at this “brilliant” reply.

The IPPF also distributed at this CSW a brochure promoting teen sex called “Healthy, Happy and Hot – a Young Person’s Guide to their Rights, Sexuality and Living with HIV”. The brochure was for young people with HIV, and graphically depicted both same-sex and opposite sex couples in great detail “exploring their sexuality”. The brochure stated:

Young people living with HIV may feel that sex is just not an option but don’t worry – many young people living with HIV live healthy, fun, happy and sexually fulfilling lives. You can too, if you want to! Things get easier (and sex can get even better) as you become more comfortable with your status).

This was just the beginning. Over the next two pages, the brochure emphasizes the point that “young people with HIV have the right to decide if, when, and how to disclose their HIV status.” It does explain some of the benefits of disclosure, like the shared responsibility of ensuring sex is safe, but the decision is still up to the HIV carrier.

A few pages down, the words “Sexual Pleasure” are printed at the top. Below it reads:

Young people living with HIV have the right to sexual pleasure. Sex can feel great and can be really fun! Many people think sex is just about vaginal or anal intercourse...but there are lots of different types of sex.

The brochure explains different options that are too inappropriate to report here. The next page suggests people start masturbating, suggesting that it is a great way to find out what you find stimulating. Then it says, "Don't stop there: Find out how your partner's body works" then the brochure explains exactly how to do that.

The brochure does admit to some of the risks of sexual activity, including HIV and STDs (sexually transmitted diseases/infections), but assures readers that they have a right to health services that will help them monitor their sexual and reproductive health.

Canadian taxpayers should not be required to financially support this organization.

Please let the government know that it should not fund International Planned Parenthood with our tax money.

Please write to:

The Honourable Stephen Harper

Office of the Prime Minister

80 Wellington St.

Ottawa ON K1A 0A2

Fax: (613) 941-6900

The Honourable Bev Oda

Minister of International Cooperation

House of Commons

Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

Fax: (613) 992-2794

Your MP

House of Commons

Ottawa ON K1A 0A6

## **THE BOORISH BEHAVIOUR OF CANADIAN FEMINISTS AT THE UN**

It's an embarrassment to be a Canadian at the UN, not only because of Canada's shocking policies there, but also because of the boorish behaviour of feminist Canadian NGO's attending these meetings.

During the recent UN Commission on the Status of Women meeting in New York in March, a statement criticizing the Conservative government was distributed by a coalition of Canadian representatives from labour unions and a feminist organization. These women were from the Canadian Labour Congress (CLC), the Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF), the Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC) and the Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA). Their statement purported to represent the view of "civil society" in Canada – especially that of women and girls. It stated that it was a "reality check" on Canada's lagging performance in achieving women's equality.

During a plenary session of the meeting, the Canadian Minister Responsible for Women's Issues, Helena Guergis delivered Canada's statement to the member nations. The Canadian feminists sat in the gallery during her speech. Their initial strategy was to stand up with their backs to Ms Guergis while she delivered her speech and then walk out during her speech. As luck would have it, however, several REAL Women members, just by chance, sat down among the feminists. The latter assumed our presence was a deliberate strategy to deter them from carrying out their plans (it wasn't, as we didn't even know their plans!) Walking out on Ms Guergis's speech and turning their back on her, however, would not be effective with REAL Women still left sitting in the gallery. The feminists, therefore, resorted to their usual tactic of loudly booing, hissing and essentially doing their utmost to behave in a boorish manner during Ms Guergis's speech. Their obvious intention was to drown out her speech and cause her embarrassment.

At the end of Ms Guergis's speech, the State delegates, as well as the REAL Women present, politely applauded Ms Guergis as they did for all speakers.

The feminist NGO's, however, decided to put a spin on Ms Guergis' speech, by sending out a press release alleging there was no reaction, and silence in the room following her speech. This story was dutifully reported by the left-leaning Toronto Star, (which always reports, or manufactures, any information that is damaging to the Conservative government, no matter how slight). The Toronto Star reported on March 12, 2010, that the Minister's speech was not well received by the plenary meeting since little reaction occurred when she finished. This, of course, was nonsense. Reaction to her speech was no different than that of any of the other speakers: a distorted story indeed. You had to have been there to get the real story. One shouldn't rely on feminist press releases and the Toronto Star to get the truth.

## **PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE**

This particular President's message is about saying "thank you".

To begin, I want to thank the Northern Ontario Chapter of REAL Women of Canada for hosting the 2010 national conference in North Bay. It was a welcoming, friendly and well-organized conference. The speakers were informative, addressing communication, blogging and the importance of our work. Again, thanks to the organizing committee, Pauline Guzik, Kathie Hogan, and Jeannine Lebel, and all the committee members. It was a great day!

Secondly, a thank you to our wonderful members for your financial and moral support. Your membership strengthens our determination and our voice to speak out on pro-family, pro-life issues. You can greatly assist our organization in a couple of other ways too. Please find one new member, and join our REAL Women of Canada Fan Page on Facebook.

Third, I invite you to join me in personally thanking the many politicians who publicly support our pro-family values. REAL Women is always encouraging members to contact politicians, to oppose or to support a particular piece of legislation. Now I am suggesting the few names of a few politicians who deserve our thanks, and I am sure you can think of others to add to the list.

Prime Minister Stephen Harper for his decision to not include abortion in Canada's G-8 maternal health care initiative.

Prime Minister Stephen Harper  
Office of the Prime Minister  
80 Wellington St  
Ottawa ON K1A 0A2  
Email: pm@pm.parl.gc.ca  
Fax 613-941-6900

The Hon. Jason Kenney, Minister for Citizenship & Immigration, for the decision to exclude mention of gay rights in the new Canadian citizenship guide.

House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax: 613-992-2235  
E-Mail: Kenney.J@parl.gc.ca

MP Rod Bruinooge, Chairman of the Parliamentary all-party Pro-life caucus, for introducing private members Bill C-510 to make it a crime for a person to coerce a woman to have an abortion against her will.

House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax 613-943-1466  
Email: Rod@bruinooge.com

MP Maurice Vellacott, for his many public statements on maternal health care, the abortion issue, family concerns, and for private member's bills on equal parenting and conscience rights for health care workers.

House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax 613-992-3085  
Email: Vellacott.M@parl.gc.ca

MP Brad Trost for his petition to cease CIDA funding of International Planned Parenthood and for statements on maternal health care.

House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax 613-996-9899  
Email: Trost.B@parl.gc.ca

MP Joy Smith for her private member's bill (Bill C-268) to establish a 5 year mandatory minimum sentence for offences of human trafficking of persons under 18 years of age.

House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax 613-996-9125  
Email: Smith.J@parl.gc.ca

The three Liberal MP's who voted against the Liberal motion to support the full range of family planning initiatives (including abortion) in Canada's foreign aid. These MP's are:

Paul Szabo, Dan McTeague, and John McKay  
Email: Szabo.P@parl.gc.ca Fax 613-996-3267  
Email: McTeague.D@parl.gc.ca Fax 613-992-5880  
Email: McKay.J@parl.gc.ca Fax 613-9928968

Surface mail address for all MP's:  
House of Commons,  
Ottawa ON K1A 0A6

As I said, there are probably other politicians who deserve a "thank you letter", so don't hesitate to send them a personal note of appreciation.

## **THE UN COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN - 2010**

Each year, the UN Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) meets to further the empowerment of women worldwide. REAL Women sent a team of six representatives to attend this year's meeting from March 1 – 12, 2010.

The meeting brought together more than 3,400 participants, representing over 460 non-government organizations (NGO's) from 138 countries for the purpose of reviewing the 15-year implementation of the Platform for Action agreed upon at the UN's Women's Conference held in Beijing in 1995.

The combatants in this battle of words, psychology and endurance, were, on one side, in over-whelming numbers, the hardline feminist NGO's and State delegates who were protected with a strong armor provided by the UN bureaucracy. The latter placed aggressive, hard, impatient women to lead the meetings; readily provided access to meeting rooms, and, in general, provided all that was necessary to assist the feminist activists.

On the other side, in much smaller numbers, were the defenders of life and family, whose State delegations and NGO's had as their only armor, their courage and determination to resist provisions in the text which would introduce a global progressive, Marxist world. The UN bureaucracy was not available to assist them; meeting rooms were scarce, UN computers were tied up, etc. That is, pro-life efforts were not made easier by the UN bureaucracy.

There were two main resolutions at this meeting, which became the bone of contention. The European Union (EU) put forward a resolution on HIV/AIDS. This was of importance because this resolution referred to another document entitled "The International Guidelines on HIV/AIDS and Human Rights", which contained expressions that support abortion, same-sex marriage and sexual rights. Canada supported the inclusion of this resolution in the text. Fortunately, during negotiations, the HIV/AIDS resolution was removed from the final draft.

The second and main resolution was on maternal mortality and was put forward by US President Obama's delegation. This resolution was very deliberate, since it had also been advanced in the 2009 annual report of the World Health Organization (WHO) which claimed maternal mortality was one of the top ten global causes of death for women, which list included cancer, accidents, etc. This was not a correct statement. WHO included this false information for the purpose of promoting abortion, alleging it was "necessary" to reduce maternal mortality. That was also the implication behind the US maternal mortality resolution at the CSW.

That is, the U.S. hoped that this resolution would gain ground on the ideological battlefield by including references to "sexual and reproductive rights" in the text, ie. to include the right to unlimited access to contraception and abortion.

The delegates favouring the resolution to include "sexual and reproductive rights" had an amicable relationship with the chair who smiled upon them each time she gave them the floor. Those delegates who opposed the abortion / contraception language were given the floor with an air of impatience. These few brave nations included Poland, Ireland, Malta, the Holy See, Costa Rica, Chile, St. Lucia, Iran, and Syria, among others.

Dr. Alexandra Colen, a member of the Belgian Parliament, who was a member of the Belgian delegation at this conference, is also pro-life and pro-family, and therefore did not belong to the progressive Marxist "in-crowd" at the conference. It was her first opportunity to observe the UN at work. She stated that:

I was witnessing a chapter of the Marxist push to reshape the world which triumphed in the West with the sexual revolution of the 1960s and 1970s. The Marxist agenda, however, is one of global scope and its proponents will not rest until they have eradicated every last remnant of pre-sexual-revolution morality. Since the 1960s they have acquired powerful instruments to achieve this aim. They manipulate the complicated and non-transparent bureaucracy of the UN (they fondly refer to it as "the system"), which exerts powerful pressure on the governments of the world. Through this bureaucracy they aggressively advance their cause, initiating attacks on the core-values of family-based societies, especially the Judeo-Christian values that have shaped Western civilization, at every opportunity.

She commented on the maternal health resolution:

This March, in New York, the issue was not the plight of ill and dying mothers, but the promotion of a general acceptance of abortion as a form of healthcare, through UN texts which are binding for the member states.

Canada at the UN CSW

Canada was at the forefront supporting the US resolution to have "sexual and reproductive" rights included in the text of the maternal mortality resolution.

Further, the Canadian delegation:

Supported the proposal that the HIV/AIDS resolution be included in the text;

Supported that "unsafe abortion" be included in the text. This expression implies that abortions, when "safe", are

acceptable and would be free of any physical or psychological risks. It ignores the rights of the unborn child; Supported the expression “young girls” be included in the resolution on maternal mortality. The purpose of including this term was to be able to use it in future negotiations to achieve independence for young girls from their families on sexual and abortion rights, eliminating parental consent.

At the end of this battle, the expression “sexual and reproductive rights” was included in the text, but a number of states, including Poland, Malta, Chile, St. Lucia, Iran, Syria, Qatar and The Holy See made statements, stating expressly "that sexual and reproductive rights" and "health services" in the text should not be misinterpreted to include abortion. Canada, of course, did not make such a statement, since it supported the expression being included in the text.

## **FEMINISTS TRAUMATIZED BY FUNDING CUTS**

Federally funded feminists are traumatized by funding cuts to two of their major concerns: feminist groups and foreign aid for abortion. Outdated and unpopular radical feminist ideologies, out of control mismanagement of tax dollars and a lack of demonstrated accountability have finally led to a long overdue evaluation of grants and contributions by the federal government (see REALity, March/April 2010 “Mismanagement at Status of Women”).

### **Feminists Meet to Discuss Cuts**

Upset by the loss of taxpayer dollars, about 80 professional feminist foreign aid advocates gathered in a Senate conference room on May 3, 2010 to agonize over funding cuts to what they call “gender equality and women's rights.” Announced on AWID letterhead (Association for Women's Rights In Development), international feminists came to give the Canadian sisterhood some sympathy and encouragement. AWID is described as “an international ... feminist, agenda-setting ... organization working for women's rights and economic justice.”

The participants reported a deep chill in Canadian government bureaucracies and NGO's. Many foreign aid organizations, focusing on “gender equality” and “reproductive rights”, apparently can no longer count on Canadian tax dollars to export feminism to the third world. Suggestions were made that the government had been listening to extremist, fundamentalist, religious groups.

One of the speakers, Joanna Kerr, formerly of AWID, North-South Institute, Oxfam, Nobel Women's Initiative and Society for International Development, listed the following funding cuts, which will affect international feminism:

Match International, that received \$400,000 a year from CIDA, has now closed down after receiving funding for 34 years;

International Planned Parenthood Federation, received \$6 million from CIDA in 2009, and \$44.5 million in the last 10 years, funding that has not been renewed this year;

The UN feminist agency, UNIFEM’s bilateral funding has dropped from \$4.5 million to \$230,000;

Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) which delivers 80% of Canada’s foreign aid has had its gender equality specific programming cut from 1.85% to 1.01% of the total \$3 billion budget, down to merely \$32 million a year for gender centered foreign aid;

Foreign Affairs has eliminated its Women's Equality Division, which promoted the feminist package of demands at the United Nations.

### **Legal Challenge of Funding Cuts**

Joanna Kerr also stated that lawyers were hard at work planning to legally challenge the government on funding cuts to feminist groups on the basis that the cuts are a breach of the ODA (official developmental assistance) Federal Accountability Act. That is, the feminists claim these cuts are not consistent with international human rights standards – although it is feminists only who view contraception and abortion as human rights. This legal challenge is reportedly

being coordinated by the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (which received \$1.7 million last year from the federal government), an organization made up of other leftist government funded organizations, whose funding is also in question.

Robert Fox, of Oxfam Canada (which received \$29 million last year), praised women as “important change agents”. He admitted, “we are adrift” and “have been silenced by the environment in which we find ourselves.” Oxfam Canada “has recently made a strategic decision to shift its programming, including its campaign and advocacy work in Canada, to focus on women's rights” (FAFIA website 2007.)

#### Senator Nancy Ruth's Advice

It was the advice of their sister feminist, Senator Nancy Ruth, that really set the participants' teeth on edge.

In response to fears that Canada would not include abortion in its maternal health care proposal at the G-8 meeting, to be held in Huntsville, Ontario, June 25 and 26, 2010, Senator Nancy Ruth (a conservative senator appointed by former Prime Minister Paul Martin) stated that she attends Conservative caucus meetings and thought the best strategy for feminists was to “shut the f\_\_k up” on the abortion issue. She warned of a backlash. “Canada is still a country with free and accessible abortions. Leave it there. Don't make it a national issue or a G-8 issue.” She recommended that instead, feminists should “take over” the Foreign Affairs Committees in the House of Commons and the Senate to make the feminist agenda “structural.” The women in the room were in no mood to take her advice! In fact, her sister feminists turned against her, deliberately misrepresenting her advice as yet another effort by Stephen Harper to implement his hidden agenda. Apparently, females in the Senate are not supposed to think for themselves and are mere marionettes under the control of male leaders.

#### Feminist Meeting Co-ordinated with Parliamentary Committee Hearings

##### Foreign Affairs Committee

The next day, May 4, at a House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee hearing, Margaret Biggs, the President of CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency - annual budget \$3 billion) assured worried Liberal, Bloc and NDP Members of Parliament, whose questions consistently focused on abortion, that “nothing has changed at CIDA regarding funding and policy. Canada has never funded abortion directly, she said, but funds “health systems” which then can choose what to do with the Canadian money. She added that CIDA “continues to integrate gender equality in everything we do”. While the foreign aid feminists at the Senate meeting had confidently proclaimed that contraception and abortion are established human rights and part of family planning, Margaret Biggs stated that there was an international consensus is that “abortion is not viewed as a form of family planning.”?

##### Status of Women Committee

On the following day, May 5, another House of Commons Committee, the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, heard from a panel of carefully selected witnesses, who were all abortion advocates. These included:??

- ACPD, Action Canada for Population and Development (Katherine McDonald)
- Oxfam (Robert Fox)
- The Guttmacher Institute (Planned Parenthood) (Sharon Camp)
- White Ribbon Alliance for Safe Motherhood (Maureen McTeer).

All lamented the possibility that third world women might not advance because of a lack of abortion services and gender equality training from Canada. These feminist activists rejected the Canadian government's preference for genuine health care for women over abortion. This, they said was undemocratic, a breach of international standards and a move which would ruin Canada's international reputation as a global leader in “human rights.” Maureen McTeer pointed to religious beliefs as the source of opposition to the feminist agenda.?

No pro-life, pro-family group was included in this “democratic” consultation. Any effort by the Conservative MPs on the Status of Women Committee to add a fresh perspective to the narrow feminist preoccupations was swiftly curtailed under the unyielding control of the Chairperson, Hedy Fry, MP (Vancouver Centre).?

It is significant, however, that even the pro-abortion Globe & Mail in several recent editorials stated that fixation on abortion by feminist groups instead of other key maternal health issues, was harmful. Even the pro-abortion UNICEF has warned against this fixation on abortion.

The Canadian public and journalists are not interested in this feminist agenda: The Status of Women Committee had been hastily moved to a larger room to accommodate journalists and cameras, which didn't show up! All is not well for feminists.

## **SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT CONSIDERS ABOLISHING HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL**

In 1947, Saskatchewan was the first province to establish a Human Rights Commission. The Commission was established to protect individuals from discrimination in four areas: employment, accommodation (renting premises), services (as in a restaurant) and membership in organizations.

The human rights machinery, as established, is comprised of two parts: the Commission, which sorts through the facts and evidence and mediates the complaint between the parties. If there is no resolution, then the Commission refers the case to the Human Rights Tribunal. The latter consists of individuals appointed by the government to adjudicate such cases. These tribunal members are not necessarily lawyers, and they frequently represent special interest groups or liberal activists, such as feminists, homosexuals, etc.

Other provinces quickly followed Saskatchewan in establishing human rights commissions and tribunals. The federal government established its commission and tribunal in 1977.

In recent years, possibly because of the dwindling number of genuine human rights offences, these Commissions have begun to concentrate on the provision in their legislation, which prohibits speech that exposes individuals to hatred, ridicule, belittling or otherwise affronts the dignity of a person. Applying this broadly worded provision has led to human rights tribunals becoming the arbiters of free speech in Canada – resulting, in many cases, in the denial of the right to members of certain groups to openly express an opinion.

Unfortunately, the tribunals are not bound by normal legal rules, but may choose to use whatever evidence strikes their fancy, including hearsay and mere speculation. Intentions do not matter, nor does the truthfulness of the statement. This has led to some very bizarre decisions, such as a \$17,000 fine paid to a Filipino family for restraints placed on their son from eating (in Filipino tradition of cutting his food with a fork and scooping it noisily into his mouth with a spoon) in a school cafeteria. This habit apparently disturbed the other children, but the Tribunal found that the school had discriminated against the boy on the grounds of race and ethnicity. An obese woman living in a condominium was given compensation by a Tribunal for being denied a parking spot close to the front door of her building; an employee in a McDonalds restaurant in Vancouver, with a medical condition, was, apparently, discriminated against because she was required to wash her hands; Ontario transsexuals were given the right to have surgery from surgeons who are not qualified to perform that type of surgery; and the rights of an individual who had bi-polar disorder and had manic episodes was discriminated against because he was refused the right to test artillery devices in Ontario.

The list of these bizarre, new human rights, discovered by the Tribunals, is, if nothing else, ingenious.

Complainant Does Not Have to Experience Discrimination

An odd quirk of these commissions is that one doesn't have to actually be directly affected by the supposed



discrimination in order to lay a complaint. One merely has to lay a complaint, on the basis that an offense might have discriminated against a specific group, even though the complainant is not a member of that group. He then reaps a financial reward for laying the complaint.

An example of this is the complaint laid against youth pastor, Stephen Boissoin, in Alberta for a letter he had published, opposing homosexual activities, in his local newspaper. A complaint was laid against him by a heterosexual Calgary education professor, Darren Lund. In 2008, the Alberta Human Rights Tribunal member, Lori Andreachuk, imposed a lifetime ban on Mr. Boissoin re: speech on the issue of homosexuality, as well as the payment of a \$5,000 fine to be paid to Mr. Lund “for his hurt feelings”, along with an apology to him. Similarly, an Ottawa lawyer Richard Warman, although not Jewish, has made a comfortable sum of money (\$45,000) for himself in the last few years by laying a series of complaints, alleging discrimination against Jews.

All this is a bizarre twist on the meaning of “human rights”, put into the hands of powerful special interest bureaucrats, appointed to impose political correctness on the public by way of forced apologies, outlandish remedies and stiff fines – punishments approaching those allowed by an actual court of law.

#### Saskatchewan Proposed Solution to this Distortion of Human Rights

In April 2010, Saskatchewan Justice Minister Don Morgan proposed that the Saskatchewan Human Rights Tribunal be scrapped and any complaints that the commission can’t resolve should be referred directly to the courts (the Saskatchewan Court of Queen’s Bench).

According to Saskatchewan’s Justice Minister, since the government appoints both the commission, which receives the complaints, and the tribunal, which adjudicates the complaint on referral from the commission, this gives the appearance of collusion, which is not a healthy indication of either impartiality or justice.

In an editorial (April 17, 2010), the National Post stated that the proposal by Saskatchewan to abolish its Human Rights Tribunal and move the caseload to the courts was a great idea. The editorial stated that the application of due process, including a proper hearing in front of a judge fully trained in Canada’s constitutional traditions, was a welcome change from the “Star Chambers” or kangaroo courts previously provided by the tribunal.

Unfortunately, the Saskatchewan Justice Minister has stated that the Commission intends to continue to pay all the costs of the complainant, all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada, if necessary, while the respondent must still foot the entire bill for his defense. Nor, under this system, can the respondent apply for dismissal of a nuisance or frivolous lawsuit – but must go forward to defend himself, no matter how absurd the complaint.

#### Conclusion

Although we appreciate the Saskatchewan government’s proposed changes to its Human Rights Commission, its proposal is very limited, and will in no way, protect Canadians from these power-mad commissions. Instead, the commissions should be permanently disbanded.

### **WOMEN DOING WELL — MEN NOT SO MUCH**

In 1986, the federal government passed the Employment Equity Act, which targeted the hiring of four designated groups: women, aboriginals, visible minorities and the disabled.

At the time this bill was drafted, men dominated the public service with 58% of the jobs and more than 95% of the executive jobs.

Not any more. There has been a tremendous flip flop in these figures, with women now holding 55% of all jobs in the

public service and about 43% of the executive positions.

Although women are still clustered in the clerical and administrative jobs in the public service, what is amazing is that there are now more women than men in the “knowledge” occupations, with numbers doubling in executive, computer, scientific and other professional fields between 1996 and 2006. To her credit, Maria Barrados, president of the Public Service Commission, has stated that in view of these statistics, it’s time to reconsider whether women be granted preferential treatment as they did in the past.

61% of university graduates are now women, and, as a result, women are making tremendous strides – not just in the public service, but in other areas as well. For example, women are starting small businesses at twice the rate of men. Women entrepreneurs now hold ownership in about 45% of Canadian small and medium enterprises and are providing 1.7 million jobs in Canada, as well as contributing more than \$18 billion to the country’s economy.

What About Men?

Where does this leave men? Why are they not graduating from university in at least equal numbers as women? Why are women dominating the traditional male fields of medicine and law? Why were 63.7% of the high school dropouts in 2004 – 2005 males? What is happening to young men?

It’s time to take a serious look at this strange new phenomenon, which is leading to profound changes in society.

Reasons for Male Drop-Out

Unfortunately, one of the main reasons for this change in behaviour in men is that feminist theory has had a hard, ruthless grip on education. Young men are now given second place to females who are given priority, encouragement, and advantages. In effect, young men are no longer encouraged to succeed but, instead, are being forced to pay, by neglect, for the supposed past discrimination against women. Also, young men are no longer encouraged to assume the traditional role of husband, father and provider for the family. Why should they bother? Why commit to marriage, when one can have an enjoyable sex life and companionship without ever assuming responsibility for that relationship?

Further, men today are being held responsible for domestic violence, when studies show that women are equally responsible for it. Why are men forcefully removed from their homes, based on assumptions only, with no evidence, that the male is an abuser? Why are fathers required to pay child support, but there is no requirement that mothers provide the father access to their children for whom he is paying that support?

As so long as feminists are permitted to promote the absurd premise that women are “victims”, who require affirmative action and other privileges, the situation for men and society will continue to deteriorate.

This is one of the reasons why the Status of Women must be abolished. Either that, or, at the very least, an agency must be established for the “Status of Men” so that they, too, can have a voice at the cabinet table to point out the heavy discrimination and downright mistreatment they receive in today’s society.

## **REALity UPDATE**

Our bi-monthly publication, REALity, provides an opportunity to share with our members the latest political and social developments in Canada and abroad. REALity provides information that isn’t usually reported in the mainstream media. As a result, we regard REALity as a very important part of our work.

It has been suggested to us, however, as a way to reduce our costs in regard to REALity, that it could be sent by email to those of our members who would like to receive it in this format. This would also make it easier to share the news

magazine with your friends and family.

Not all of us, however, prefer the new technologies and do not use email. For such members, we would continue to send REALity by regular mail -- but perhaps in a less expensive version. In all cases, the content will be much the same.

Our members are very important to us – each one of you matters to us. As a result, we don't want to make any significant changes in regard to REALity without having first consulted with you.

If you would be willing to receive REALity by e-mail, could you please let us know? If so, please send us your e-mail address. Of course, it will be very important that you notify us of any future changes in your email address.

If you don't want or are unable to receive REALity electronically, could you also let us know if a less costly mailed version would be satisfactory for you? The less costly version would have fewer graphics and be without colour.

Also, it would be helpful for us to have your views on the content of REALity. Are the articles too long, detailed and technical? What topics would you like us to cover? Would you prefer a more executive summary version, without all the background details and references to studies on which we base our analysis? Any suggestions on this would be most appreciated. Don't worry about hurting our feelings: after our long years on the forefront of controversial issues, we can certainly take constructive criticism from our devoted members!

Please send your responses to the National Office:

REAL Women of Canada  
National Office  
Box 8813, Station T  
Ottawa, ON K1G 3J1  
realwcna@on.aibn.com

If any changes take place, they will not occur for a while, in order that we will have time to consider your comments carefully. Many thanks for any of your contributions to these possible changes to REALity.

### **REAL WOMEN OF CANADA ANNUAL CONFERENCE APRIL 17, 2010**

North Bay, Ontario — Hosted by Northern Ontario Chapter, REAL Women of Canada

The Northern Ontario chapter of REAL Women did a wonderful job in organizing this year's annual conference in North Bay. It was truly a warm and friendly meeting but it still managed to be kept right on schedule! All the speakers were interesting and provided helpful information to support the traditional family in Canada.

Our deepest thanks to our hard working members of the Northern Ontario Chapter of REAL Women of Canada. We can't thank you enough for all you did to make such a great day.

Summaries of the speakers are as follows:

#### **USING LANGUAGE TO IMPACT ON OUR CULTURE**

Summary by: Cecilia Forsyth, National President, REAL Women of Canada

Talk By Dave Quist, Executive Director of The Institute of Marriage and Family Canada (IMFC)  
the policy arm of Focus on the Family Canada

Dave Quist began his talk by highlighting the nuances and changes to language and how we communicate, showing how each affects Canadian society now and in the future. Society has accepted subtle changes to the language we

use, without considering the outcome of such changes. To influence society, we must learn how to use language to best present alternative positions and solutions.

Language can be used to cloud a situation. Changing the definition of marriage led to a new definition of parent. The natural parent became the legal parent. This change in terminology contributed to the legal status of the three-parent family in Ontario, and will likely be used in order to continue to stretch and alter family law.

There are also times when clarity is required, but not given. The Prime Minister's proposed maternal health plan for the G-8 meetings in June is an example. It is a simple concept - to improve the maternal care of pregnant women and infants through better nutrition and supplements, access to clean drinking water, inoculations and the availability of the safe delivery of babies. However, opposition parties and special interest groups use vague definitions of maternal health care to include abortion.

Mr. Quist then shared his ABC's of communication:

#### A - Stands for Audience

The first thing to consider is your audience. Who is your target audience? Are they politicians, media, business owners or the water cooler crowd?

Politicians need to hear how proposed policy legislation will affect their biggest resource - THE VOTER. To influence elected officials, we must understand how they think and act. Rather than looking at long-term outcomes, many politicians look at the next election. Our challenge is to put forward a long-term plan with short-term goals, making it a win-win solution for everyone

The media audience is biased, but we are also perceived as biased. The key is to present our data well, giving the 10 second sound bite for radio or TV.

An audience of business owners will want to know how the policy proposals will solve their problems concerning staff, production, morale, costs, etc.

The water cooler audience is the staff of the business owners. They are concerned about their children's education and care, high taxation and so on. They want to know how proposals apply to them personally.

#### B - Stands for being bold and brave

There are times when it is difficult to do or say what you need to. Preparation, practice and perseverance is imperative to effectively move our message ahead.

B also stands for Bring your Brain. No matter whom you are talking to, think about what you say, take the high road, no personal attacks, and keep your eyes on your end goal. Using research and data to support our premise makes our position stronger.

#### C - is for Clarity

Clarity means being able to describe the issue, the policy or the point of view in terms that are unambiguous and concise. Misleading, false or partial statements will discredit our position. Be calm, clear, and concise.

#### S - Stands for Story

Telling a story helps an audience to quickly grasp a concept, making it easier to understand and remember. Raw data or statistics can be mind numbing, but a story about a personal involvement will have people's attention and come alive.

There is another S, which stands for Simple. The bottom line is that simplicity is best understood.

Mr. Quist concluded by reminding us to move forward with sound ideas, good policies and unbiased research, to remember our ABC's, to keep it simple and tell a story.

### **BLOGGING TO BREAK THE FEMINIST MONOPOLY**

Summary by: Corry Morcos, President Alberta Chapter, REAL Women of Canada

Talk by: Suzanne Fortin, Blogger of the Big Blue Wave

Suzanne Fortin, a young mother with three young children and little free time, became aware that her home computer was a tool that could be used to battle the culture wars from her home. She started with a small blog ("blog", for "web log"), "Big Blue Wave", and wrote mainly about pro-life concerns. As blogging became more popular, Suzanne's blog did too. Today, her blog is hugely popular, and well regarded by social conservatives.

Blogging is still new territory for some. Suzanne explained that a blog is an alternate news source, and often counter-cultural to the message of the mainstream media. A blog is often updated on a daily basis, and usually deals with current issues. The interesting thing about a blog is that it has none of the limitations of the mainstream media. Bloggers can invest more time and space in researching a story. Most importantly, a blogger is not limited by the usual left wing bias that we have come to expect from our media. Blogging is an alternate media source, a tool toward a freer market of ideas.

Suzanne's talk, "Blogging to Break the Feminist Monopoly," gave several examples of how bloggers were making a huge difference in the culture. Suzanne's interactive talk allowed the audience to view a television report about abortion censorship on the university campus in Victoria, and then follow the write up of a Maritime blogger to get a totally different approach to the same story. Suzanne also talked about an upcoming Human Rights case against comedian Guy Earle, which was the subject of a complaint by two lesbians, who alleged he discriminated against them during a performance in a Vancouver bar. Suzanne went to Mr. Earle's blog to read his exact comments on the case, something that the mainstream media had not covered.

Suzanne encouraged all to become more aware and supportive of blogs. Read and follow a blog. If you appreciate the work of the blogger, consider making a donation to help defray costs. Best of all, talk about blogs, and pass along the information to others.

Fortunately for REAL Women supporters, bloggers are working hard to break the monopoly that the left wing has enjoyed in the mainstream media. Kudos to Suzanne at "Big Blue Wave" for all her efforts!

### **HOW TO LOBBY YOUR MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT**

Summary by: Lorraine McNamara, Ontario Board Member, REAL Women of Canada

Talk By: Pat O'Brien, Former Liberal Member of Parliament

Pat O'Brien, a delightfully down-to-earth politician who has served for 25 years in several elected offices, such as City Councillor and School Trustee, and especially 12 years as a Member of Parliament, expressed his gratitude for the work of REAL Women in supporting families and the protection of human life. Mr. O'Brien eventually resigned from the Liberal Party because he could not support its position on same-sex marriage.

Pat O'Brien admitted that he found politics rewarding - but also stressful. Even when Parliament is not sitting, Members of Parliament are expected to be active in their constituencies and can be approached by their constituents at that time. Too many Canadians assume that their representative is not interested in their views, but his personal experience is that, with rare exceptions, this is not the case.

People of faith, he said, must take the responsibility for the direction in which society is moving, and must be involved in the political process. There are different ways in which the public can be involved. Drawing on his extensive experience, Mr. O'Brien offered a number of Do's and Don'ts on how to effectively influence your Member of Parliament.

## Do's

DO Pray for your Members of Parliament, their spouses, and their children. There is great stress on married life due to the absence from their spouse in Ottawa for long periods of time. The divorce rate among MP's is high. Pray also for your representatives to be enlightened with respect to issues such as the importance of human life. Never underestimate the power of prayer.

DO Write personal notes or letters to your MP, in your own words, stating your views clearly. Be sure to sign the letter and include your full contact information so he/she knows it's from a constituent, e.g. addresses, phone and fax numbers. Such letters can be sent postage-free. Personal letters carry far more weight than e-mails or petitions, which can often be ignored.

DO Make an appointment to speak personally with your MP about matters that concern you. Be realistic about the length of time you require - 15 minutes is probably an acceptable time limit. Also, be clear about how many people will attend and limit the number to three or four people at most. If such a request is denied, this will give a good idea about where your representative stands on the issue involved.

DO Invite your MP to speak to your organization, service club, community group, etc. about matters of concern. If an electoral candidate meeting is planned, then all candidates must be invited. Pat mentioned that he had addressed a radical-feminist meeting where the audience was stacked, and this was not easy, but anyone running for office should have enough courage to face opposition.

## Don'ts

DON'T Use offensive language, berate your Member of Parliament or use threats such as "I won't vote for you". Be polite and respectful, even if there is a major difference of opinion.

DON'T Use a form letter or postcard to contact your Member of Parliament. These have minimal effect, because they indicate minimal involvement. Also, do not rely on e-mail messages or petitions, because unless they are followed by a personal contact, they are not always effective. (It should be noted, however, that when an issue arises which requires an immediate response, such as a vote coming up quickly in Parliament on an issue, such as euthanasia, for example, it is a good idea to send an e-mail immediately - followed up by a letter or phone call.)

DON'T Flood your Member of Parliament's fax machine or e-mail with numerous repetitive communications. This risks angering your MP and his/her staff, and is counter-productive.

DON'T Focus your efforts on lobbying MP's other than your own. The most effective lobby effort will usually come from the constituents of any given MP.

Mr. O'Brien stressed again that concerned Canadians must become involved in the political process, and do their best to shape how our country runs. He noted that when it came to the same-sex marriage issue, the religious lobby started far too late. This should not happen again. He also stressed, again, that we must pray constantly for the laws we know are truly in the best interest of this nation and all her people.

## **THE SIGNIFICANCE OF REAL WOMEN OF CANADA**

Summarized by Pauline Guzik, Director-at-Large, Northern Ontario Chapter, REAL Women of Canada  
Talk by Gwen Landolt, National Vice President, REAL Women of Canada

REAL Women of Canada originated at a critical period in Canadian social history. It emerged from an event that profoundly changed the social fabric of our country. That event was the sexual revolution of the 1960's and 70's. The Judeo-Christian values on which our nation is founded, were challenged by those wishing to replace duty and responsibility towards one's family and country with individual wishes and desires, as espoused by the adherents of

feminism and homosexuality. This revolution led to a weakened country, weakened families and weakened faith, in ourselves as a nation.

The feminist movement championed the concept that women's personal happiness and fulfillment had priority over home, family and men. Feminist strength triumphed via the support of the media, the judiciary and the financial support of the government, through the Status of Women. Feminists assumed the role as sole spokespersons for all Canadian women, demanding that many aspects of society, including education, government and religion be restructured to address perceived injustices. REAL Women stepped forward to contradict the feminist ideology, claiming that women do not all think alike, but rather, espouse a variety of views, shaped by differing social, cultural, educational, religious and economic backgrounds. REAL Women presented a voice that wanted to return Canada to the values that made it a strong nation, values based on strong families. In a strong Canada, children are central to women's lives, not housed in national daycare programs, or worse, aborted when perceived as troubling distractions to women's economic independence and achievements. Although feminists still hold positions of authority in the courts, in the media and in universities, REAL Women has been acknowledged as a legitimate and credible organization, speaking on behalf of many Canadian women.

### Homosexual Agenda

The rise of the homosexual agenda also challenges the family values on which Canada was founded. In an effort to have society accept homosexuality as normal behavior, activists have gained credibility by way of the media, the courts and the educational system. The activists claim that same-sex attraction has a genetic basis and that, as persecuted victims, homosexuals must be protected from rejection, even that based on moral considerations. In fact, no valid scientific study has indicated that homosexuality is genetic. This was not enough to stop the federal government under Prime Minister Paul Martin, from legalizing same-sex marriages, claiming it was a civil rights issue, based on equality. Same-sex marriage is not a civil rights issue because homosexuality is a behavior, not a right. The only sexual relationship that the state must endorse is the one between a man and a woman, which, by nature, is the relationship that produces the next generation, a fact crucial to the future of society. Same-sex marriages serve no public role in society.

We must, however, show compassion towards homosexuals in order to assist them with their problems, stemming from their same-sex attraction.

Like feminist activists, homosexual activists desire to adapt society to their own concept of morality and behavior. The gay agenda permeates the school system, through curricula that portray only positive messages about homosexuality, with no mention of its genuine, negative aspects.

REAL Women does not tolerate the invasion of Canadian families by the social engineers of the feminist and homosexual movements. We will continue to expose the attempts of these activists to push parents aside, in order to gain control of our children's minds.

The National Archives of Canada has acknowledged the significance of REAL Women of Canada by requesting that our material be stored there, in order to ensure that REAL Women's record be acknowledged in the social history of Canada.

REAL Women's efforts will continue until the traditional family values that founded our nation are restored.