

HOMOSEXUALS PLAYING THE VICTIM GAME

Homosexual activists have a clear strategy to make society adapt to their purposes. Their game plan is based on two arguments from which they do not deviate:

1. Same-sex attraction is hard-wired like race and, therefore, cannot be changed.
2. Since they are “born that way”, they are persecuted victims who require civil rights to protect them from others who must be prohibited from condemning or rejecting them, regardless of any moral considerations.

These activists have skillfully used the media to propagate these two presumptions. For example, the National Post (April 5, 2008), stated in an editorial:

In fact, many Canadians still regard[ed] homosexuality as a lifestyle choice rather than what it is – a hard-wired aspect of a person’s identity, little different from their race or sex.

How valid is this presumption? Not very.

Homosexuals Not Born That Way

No rigorous scientific, in-depth evaluation of homosexuality indicating that homosexuality is genetic has ever been produced. Controlled studies have proven the contrary. The media, however, have periodically reported scientific claims of a genetic component to homosexuality. These studies appear to be “advocacy” studies conducted by those wishing to promote a particular perspective. None of these studies has held up under analysis and none has been replicated – a necessary element for scientific validity.

The conclusion that homosexuality is not genetic, but rather a learned behaviour or characteristic, is confirmed by the American Psychological Association (APA), which has always been sympathetic to the homosexual cause. The APA had shifted from its previous position, that homosexuality is innate, to the position that there is no scientific consensus on the cause of same-sex attraction. In this regard, the APA ignored over 100 years of research that indicates treatment of homosexuality can be beneficial if change is desired. Instead, it affirmed homosexuality as normal and positive.

A common sense indicator as to whether homosexuality is innate, or whether it is an acquired, learned characteristic is the fact that there are homosexuals who have changed their orientation to live out their lives, apparently in contented heterosexual marriages. Obviously, these individuals wanted to change, and they did.

Are Homosexuals Victims?

The “homosexuals as victims” argument is not born out by the facts either.

Toronto Hate Crime Unit

The Toronto Police Services Board reported 130 cases in 2007 of hate and bias crimes, down 20% from the 160 cases in 2006. It was the lowest number recorded, since 1993, when the Police Hate Crime Unit was established.

It should be pointed out that these statistics consist of unproved complaints, rather than actual convictions. The alleged complaints occurred mainly against blacks who are the most targeted group, followed by the Jewish community, then homosexuals, followed by Muslims, Pakistanis and Chinese.

That is:

1. racial incidents were 34%;
2. religious bias incidents 29%; and
3. homosexual incidents (which includes homosexual, lesbians and transgendered) 17%.

In 2008, the Toronto Police Report stated that there were 34 complaints made because of sexual orientation, or 22% out of a total of 153 complaints. The Jewish community made 56 complaints, or 37% of the total.

It is important to note that Toronto has the highest number of homosexual residents in Canada. Consequently, it is highly unlikely that incidents of alleged offenses against homosexuals would be higher anywhere else in Canada.

In June 2008, Statistics Canada also released a report on the national hate crimes for the year 2006. Its figures represent hate crimes reported to police departments in three provinces: British Columbia, Quebec and Ontario – which cover 87% of the Canadian population. In total, these police departments registered 892 hate-motivated crimes nationally in 2006. They were as follows:

- § Race/ethnicity 62%;
- § Religion 21%; and
- § Sexual orientation 10%

According to this report, blacks were the most victimized racial group.

It is not acceptable that anyone of whatever colour, creed or orientation be threatened or assaulted, but the statistics indicate that offenses against homosexuals are not anywhere near the number of offenses based on racial and religious prejudice. In fact, it is obvious that the alleged offenses against homosexuals are not based on the data, but are being highly exaggerated by activists.

Yet, if anyone objects to homosexuals who play the victim game, they become the objects of intense attack by homosexuals, who allege, “hate” and “homophobia.”

“Homosexuals As Victims” Succeeds

There are two areas in which homosexuals have been particularly successful in convincing others that they are helpless victims. These are (1) in the courts and (2) in our educational system.

1. The Courts

Homosexuals have never been required to provide evidence in court of alleged discrimination against them. Instead, the courts have based decisions on the homosexual demands solely on the assertion by their homosexual litigants themselves that they have experienced discrimination and are victims in Canadian society. That is, homosexual litigants are not required to provide the court with credible data or documentation to support their claims of discrimination. Instead, the Canadian courts have accepted, without questioning, that homosexuals experience disadvantages or discrimination in Canada because of supposed stereotyping and prejudice against them and therefore are helpless victims who need protection.

2. Crusade to Indoctrinate Children

Homosexual activists are using their alleged “victim” status as an excuse to gain access to the schools to undertake a program of indoctrination of children. This has been made easier for them by the fact that same-sex marriages are now legal in Canada, which places their sexual relationship on the same level as heterosexual relationships, though same-sex relationships do not make a contribution to society similar to that of heterosexual relationships. That is, same-sex unions do not produce children and their same-sex relationships, therefore, are merely a personal matter

between the same-sex partners. Consequently, their relationships are not as relevant to the State, which has an interest only in those relationships from which children are produced – because procreation is essential for the future of the State.

Notwithstanding this reality, to ensure that their sexual orientation continues to be respected and accepted by future generations, and acknowledged as equal to heterosexual relationships, activists are demanding that positive messages about homosexuality be included in the educational system. In short, they wish to indoctrinate children in our schools on the homosexual issue, portraying it as only positive, with no information provided on its very real negative aspects.

Educational Programs on Homosexuality

In order to gain access to the schools, therefore, activists present homosexual/lesbian students as victims of intolerance and bullying, which necessitates special school programs to protect them. There is no proof, however, that homosexual/lesbian students are singled out for bullying anymore than other students for whatever reason e.g., too fat, too thin, Christian, etc.

Gay-Straight Alliance Groups in the Schools

Homosexual activists have also been establishing so-called “Gay-Straight Alliance” groups in the schools. Their purpose, of course, is to “educate” students on homosexuality and to provide support and acceptance of students having a same-sex attraction. These clubs are simply indoctrination centres set up to give homosexuality a high profile and sympathy in Canadian high schools in order to normalize such sexual activity.

Human Rights Commissions

Another approach taken by homosexual activists is to indoctrinate students within the education system by way of Human Rights Commissions. This occurred in B.C. when a “married” homosexual couple, Peter and Murray Corren, who reside in the Vancouver area, laid a complaint before the British Columbia Human Rights Tribunal alleging that the B.C. Department of Education was “discriminating” against homosexuals in the schools by failing to teach that homosexuals are equal to heterosexuals and need to have their diversity respected.

Instead of defending the integrity of the school system, the then British Columbia Attorney General Wally Oppal, in order to head off any litigation (the Human Rights Tribunal was sure to rule that the BC Department of Education was guilty as charged), capitulated to the complainants and entered into an agreement with them. He agreed to include homosexual values and “tolerance” throughout the entire education system in every class from kindergarten to grade 12. He also agreed to provide an elective course for grade 12 students on the subject of social justice and human rights, focusing on identities and orientation of homosexuals. Parental authority to withdraw their children from any classes was not supported. Further, the Correns, under this agreement, were to be given a privileged position over the public curriculum to determine whether it was sufficiently “gay-friendly”. A draft of this new pro-homosexual teachers’ guide, “Making Space, Giving Voice”, was released by the B.C. Department of Education. An extensive critique of it has been completed by the Catholic Civil Rights League and can be found at <http://www.ccrl.ca/index.php?id=4932>.

These pro-homosexual changes in the curriculum are being rigorously opposed by pro-family groups in B.C., including REAL Women’s B.C. Chapter. Although opposition to this program is very apparent, the B.C. government has, to date, resolutely proceeded with its plans to change the curriculum in accordance with the Corren agreement. Parents in B.C. are being requested to “resist, counter and protest” this new curriculum and pro-family groups are doing all they can to resist the implementation of these propaganda programs.

All the above attempts to indoctrinate students by homosexuals is a red light flashing to all parents, who must resist this attack on parental authority with all their might. For example, if homosexuals are successful in BC, we know that in a short period of time, similar programs will be implemented throughout Canada. We cannot allow our children to

be used as pawns in the promotion of a special interest group, carrying out a dangerous social experiment.

Inherent in the propaganda to normalize homosexuality are blatant double standards and hypocrisy: of course, the irony of this is completely lost on the “compassionate, inclusive” enforcers who are trying to bludgeon all of society into going along.

Homosexuality is Not Normal

Finally, even though the media, the courts and the educational system are straining to normalize homosexuality, the fact is that it is not normal. The simple fact is that nature did not create the human body to express itself in a same-sex manner: society does not have to abandon common sense and accept this abnormality as acceptable. Rather, our compassion should be directed to assisting homosexuals to find help with their obvious sorrows and difficulties. Abandoning them to their deviancy is not the answer – helping them is.

CANADA'S REFUGEE PROBLEM

Refugees. What is Canada going to do about all the refugees pouring into this country? In 2008, there were almost 37,000 asylum seekers entering Canada. There is a backlog of more than 62,000 claims pending. Some of these claimants, unfortunately, are using Canada as an easy mark to evade normal immigration procedures.

The truth is that many of these refugees are not “real” refugees, according to the UN definition, which is someone fleeing persistent persecution, making it impossible to survive in that country. Canada's refugee system allows anyone in from anywhere. Refugees are now pouring in from Mexico and so are the Romas from the Czech Republic, in the same way that mainly Sikhs did from India in the 1980's.

Since January 2008, 1,506 Romas (once known as gypsies), from the Czech Republic applied to Canada as refugees. They move mainly to southern Ontario (usually the Hamilton area), where an estimated 8,000 such refugees now live. Minister of Immigration, Jason Kenney, ordered a study on the treatment of Romas in the Czech Republic. In late June, Mr. Kenney reported that, according to this study, Romas do not suffer state sanctioned discrimination in that country – although they do seem to experience some discrimination by their fellow countrymen.

It is significant, however, that the Czech Republic has been a member of the European Union since 2004. As a result, residents of the Czech Republic have freedom of movement among all European countries, with no visa required. That is, Romas can easily look for improved prospects anywhere in Europe. However, they are seeking asylum in Canada because here they are entitled to social assistance, health care, free legal advice and education for their children.

This is because of an absurd decision by the Supreme Court of Canada, in *R v Singh* (1986), handed down by the first female (and feminist) Supreme Court of Canada judge, Bertha Wilson. Her decisions are well known for their ideological fervour, rather than common sense. In *R v Singh*, Judge Wilson declared that anyone entering Canada would be entitled to all the benefits of the Charter of Rights. This has resulted in a very costly process for taxpayers. It is estimated that the cost of maintaining one refugee is approximately \$10,000-\$12,000 per year. To add a final insult to Canadians, if, after all legal maneuvering to remain in Canada fails, the claimant can be buoyed up by the fact that there is little effort made by immigration enforcement officials to find and deport rejected claimants. Four years ago, the auditor-general reported to Parliament that there were 36,000 outstanding warrants for the arrest of rejected claimants. Since then, that number has increased, with the result that many refused refugee claimants are now happily living very comfortable lives in Canada. Any offspring is automatically entitled to Canadian citizenship.

Long Legal Process Permitted

It can take a year or more before a refugee hearing even takes place. Even if the Immigration and Refugee Board (IRB)

finds that the claimant is not a genuine refugee, the refugee claimant can use the legal processes to delay removal for years. After the IRB hears the application, it can be appealed to the Federal Court, then to the Federal Court of Appeal, or back to a different panel of the IRB, and it can eventually end up in the Supreme Court of Canada. The process is so extended, that it can take up to 15 years. Finally, if all else fails, the claimant can apply to the Minister on compassionate and humanitarian grounds. Naturally, this decision by the Minister can also be appealed to the Federal Court. Who pays for all of this? You do.

Strong Immigration Lobby

One of our problems is that any changes to tighten this lenient refugee system are vigorously lobbied against by the powerful immigration lobby, which consists of immigration lawyers, who make their living off this loose system, and the Canadian Council for Refugees (CCR) that claims to represent more than 180 immigrant organizations – most of which are subsidized by the federal government. The CCR opposes any major improvements in the Canadian refugee law, pursuing its cases to the Supreme Court of Canada, if necessary. It also conducts letter-writing campaigns and petitions, drafting letters to lobby MPs and Senators. The CCR is a strong and ruthless opponent to any changes in the system.

Politicians Reluctant to Anger Ethnic Groups

Politicians are reluctant to anger any ethnic groups, since the latter hold critical votes in an election. As a consequence, countless Ministers of Immigration and Citizenship, both Liberal and Conservative, have been bumped off the scene without making any changes to the system. They come roaring into office, but leave with a whimper, never tightening the refugee system.

US Concerned

Certainly, the United States has become deeply concerned about Canada's open refugee policy, which makes it easy for potential terrorists to enter Canada as asylum seekers – a concern shared by many Canadians. It is a fact that most of the suspected foreign terrorists identified today in Canada have entered as asylum seekers. It is no secret that Canada is accepting many thousands of immigrants from countries supportive of terrorism. Since 1996, for example, Canada has had almost 140,000 immigrants from Pakistan, over 75,000 from Iran, and approximately 33,000 from Algeria. None of these immigrants may be terrorists, but the reality is that only some of them are checked for security and the vast majority of them are not even seen by a Canadian visa officer before obtaining their visa.

Our open refugee system also undermines the measures taken by both Canada and the United States to ensure the safety and security of their citizens, such as Canada's Anti-terrorist Act. In short, it appears that winning and maintaining the ethnic vote and clinging to our sacred symbols of multiculturalism and diversity are more important to politicians than taking tough measures to protect our national security.

As a result of Canada's failure to tighten up its refugee system, the U.S. is, quite rightfully, working towards a tough border policy between the two countries. This will paralyze tourism and trade – and might well destroy our good neighbour policy.

Canadians Have a Welcoming Tradition

Canadians have been justly proud of our noble tradition of refugee protection and asylum. We should retain our reputation as a haven for the dispossessed and persecuted. It is the right thing to do. However, we must not let our concern for Canada's reputation for compassion replace common sense.

Conservatives Attempting to Deal With Refugee Problem

The Conservative government, however, is attempting at last to come to grips with our refugee problem. In July,

Immigration and Citizenship Minister, Jason Kenney, announced that refugees from Mexico and the Czech Republic must now have visas before they can enter Canada.

Developing a common security screening system for people entering the U.S. and Canada and acknowledging that the primary threat – apart from home-grown terrorists – comes from countries that produce terrorists, should be the approach taken by Canada. A common security screening system should be put in place now, before more harm befalls us. We trust that this is the direction the Conservative government will take.

We must ensure that real victims of persecution get swift relief and protection in Canada, and that economic migrants, seeking to abuse our generosity, are quickly shown the door.

Please write to the following on this critical issue:

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper
Office of the Prime Minister
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A2
Fax: 613-941-1920

The Honourable Jason Kenney, P.C., M.P.
Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism Canada
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 1L1
Fax: 613-992-1920

Your M.P.
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

THE TYRANNY OF THE UN CONTINUES

If the UN would only do what it is supposed to do. Its priorities should be humanitarian aid in times of disaster, such as earthquakes and tsunamis, working to eradicate disease, feeding the world's hungry and working for peace in troubled times. If these humanitarian efforts were competently carried out by the UN, this organization would receive much acclaim and respect. However, this is not happening. The UN has not generally been successful in carrying out such humanitarian initiatives, for a multitude of reasons – one being that its real interest lies elsewhere.

In recent years, the UN has been attempting to force on the world the perspective that the UN is the global authority on values and behaviour, regardless of the sovereign right of nations. The controversial positions the UN takes on abortion, sexual rights, homosexuality, women's and religious rights, etc., have nothing to do with the treaties which state members have ratified. Instead, the UN has set up an elaborate machinery to force its will on nations – regardless of whether the policies have been approved by member states in the treaties or otherwise.

The UN is, in fact, at the forefront of the international effort to undermine families and faith, even though numerous treaties conspicuously provide that religious freedoms and the rights of families are being universally recognized human rights.

The UN carries out its anti-family policies by way of the unaccountable, unrepresentative UN monitoring committees, which review each country's compliance with UN treaties, and then berates certain countries for their failure to provide feminist/homosexual/abortion legislation, even though the treaties do not include such provisions. For example, since 1995, there have been over 100 instances where UN monitoring committees, consisting mainly of pro-abortion NGOs, have pressured nations to legalize or increase access to abortion. Moreover, UN agencies, such as

the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) have also established committees of their own to promote unrestricted sexual practices, as well as abortion, homosexuality and protection of the transgendered. The most recent examples are as follows:

Sexual Guidelines

Two UN agencies, the UNFPA and the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), proposed in June a set of international sex education guidelines, supposedly aimed at reducing HIV. In effect, the Guidelines are aimed at changing the world's culture on sexuality and calls for a \$2.3 billion budget to fund abortions worldwide. The UN plans to distribute these guidelines to education ministries, school systems and teachers around the world to help guide teachers on what to teach young people about sex.

The Guidelines are shocking. They take the view that sexuality educators, not parents, have the responsibility over education on health and sexual matters. These Guidelines are based primarily on the research undertaken by the highly controversial Sexuality Information and Education Council of the US (SIECUS). One of the latter's members assisted in the drafting of the Guidelines, which include the following:

§ Five to eight-year-olds are to be told "touching and rubbing one's genitals...can feel pleasurable." They learn about "gender stereotypes" and that anybody (regardless of sexual status) can "raise a child and give it [sic] the love it [sic] deserves."

§ Nine to twelve-year-olds learn about how to procure and use condoms, emergency contraception, the "signs and symptoms" of pregnancy, and all about sexual pleasure and orgasm. They learn that abortion is safe and they discuss "homophobia, transphobia and abuse of power." They learn about their rights – to decide for themselves about whether to become a parent and to have access to anti-retroviral therapy (ART).

§ Twelve to fifteen-year-olds are told about their right to safe abortions and post abortion care, how to use emergency contraception, and that the size and shape of the penis or breast does not affect sexual pleasure.

These Guidelines, understandably, have created a huge controversy. As a result, UNFPA pulled back on the project, and has asked that its name be edited out of the published materials.

The duplicity and hypocrisy of UNFPA, however, knows no bounds.

UNFPA Hypocrisy

During the same week, in September 2009, that UNFPA pulled its name from this graphic sex guide, it co-sponsored a conference in Berlin, together with the German government, to train 400 activists to demand that countries fund and provide this sex education program and access to abortions to all youths. The sessions at the conference focused on training activists to agitate for more money from countries and foundations in order to pressure governments to provide sex education and abortion, and to train youths to advocate for abortion and sexual rights. Materials, entitled "Ensuring Women's Access to Safe Abortion" and "I Need an Abortion", were distributed to attendees.

Although this conference was billed as a "global" event, conference organizers admitted that they deliberately blocked any participants who did not agree with their "reproductive rights" (abortion) agenda. Participation at the conference was by application only. Potential attendees had to fill out a lengthy questionnaire and provide detailed answers about the activities of their non-governmental organization (NGO), particularly how their NGO supports the "sexual and reproductive health and rights" aspects of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD).

Media representatives were also put through a similarly rigorous screening by the conference organizers. Citing "space constraints," media representatives were required to "apply" for the opportunity to cover the conference,

even if paying their own way, and only those media in support of the Conference agenda were admitted.

UN Promotion of Social Rights for Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

If the above is not sufficient to ring alarm bells about the UN, another committee of the UN, the Committee on Human Rights, is in existence in order to monitor compliance with the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. This Committee recently advised UN members that they must grant broad new human rights on the basis of "sexual orientation and gender identity", as a new category of prohibited grounds of discrimination. This Committee also demands in its interpretation of the treaty, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, that transsexual, transgender and intersex also be protected. The Committee demands sweeping changes to national laws, policies and changing practices and attitudes within families and cultural institutions; non-complying nations will be in "violation" of their obligations under this international law. (The document, called "General Comment 20," was released on July 2, 2009.)

It is clear that the Committee has radically interpreted this UN International Covenant to include provisions for transsexual, transgendered and "intersex" rights. That is, this unethical and unaccountable committee of "experts" is telling countries, which have repeatedly rejected -this very interpretation, that they must now change their laws, policies and even attitudes about the family in order to accommodate this new homosexual agenda.

The Problem with the UN

Former U.S. Ambassador to the UN, John Bolton, appointed by former U.S. President George Bush, put his finger on the root cause of the problem with the UN. According to Mr. Bolton, the UN has a free rein with its annual \$15 billion budget (including \$4 billion from the U.S.) to do what it likes. This freedom is due to the shocking fact that the UN does not keep track of its spending! As a result, over the years, there have been numerous scandals, such as the "oil for food" program in Iraq and "cash for weapons" in North Korea, as well as the UN's deviation into sexual and homosexual matters. Unfortunately, the UN has been using much of its funds for this "rights" advocacy, rather than on services and humanitarian aid.

At the UN, liberal countries (like the European Union, (EU), and the US under President Obama) work in close partnership with the special interest groups of feminists and, more recently homosexual organizations to set the agenda. Member states rarely debate these radical issues. In short, these powerful special interest groups, working with UN officials and political blocs at the UN, have destroyed the original mission of the UN.

UPDATE ON CANADIAN MUSEUM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ITS HOMOSEXUAL SPECIALTY

If anyone has any doubts about REAL Women's concern regarding the exhibits that will be included in the new Human Rights Museum in Winnipeg, which are to be selected by a "special" committee of feminist/homosexual supporters, a news release from the Gay Calgary and Edmonton Magazine, will be of interest.

According to this news release, the Chief Operating Officer of the Human Rights Museum, Patrick O'Reilly, was the keynote speaker at the opening of Vancouver's Queer Hall of Fame in September

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

September is a defining month. School begins along with many other activities and programs that occur during the school year. Parliament has also resumed sitting in September, so this might be a good time to take a look at some basic do's of letter writing and at the language used in our letters to MP's.

For example, “child or fetus” is one of the most glaring examples. Pro-abortionist propaganda has always manipulated this language to its advantage. The dehumanization of the unborn child is key to the abortion movement. Even with the advances of ultrasound, we are still fighting an uphill battle convincing the public at large that the unborn child, is a child not just a “blob of tissue.” Regrettably, in the past several months, I have even noticed some people in the pro-life movement using the term “fetus” when referring to the unborn child.

It is noted that “fetus” is a medical, scientific term for a specific stage of pre-birth development. The words “baby”, “child”, “person”, “tiny human being” and “he or she” accurately speak to the humanity of the unborn and apply to every stage of development. Noted US pro-life author and leader, Dr. Jack Willke, has warned us to never use the word “fetus”. Instead, he says we should always speak of the “baby” or any of the other above terms when speaking of the unborn child.

Gender feminism has also caused a major change in the words we use. The U.N. Conference on Women held in Beijing in 1995, firmly entrenched gender feminism and all its trappings. It shifted the argument from a belief in the moral and legal equality of the two sexes - male and female - to a very different ideology. “Gender” now means that men’s and women’s roles are “socially constructed and subject to change.” In other words, it means the different roles of men and women are not the result of biology, but, rather, are the result of social construction - a product of human thought and culture only!

Since gender is considered a “social construction”, they argue that individuals should have the right to choose their gender and their sexual identity. The term “gender”, by the way, is interpreted to include not only male and female, but also other genders - homosexual, bisexual, and transsexual.

Husbands and wives in recent years have become spouses or partners. Sons and daughters become children (not untrue, but a sexless term). Parents became guardians or care givers. Words like feminine, masculine, womanhood, manhood, motherhood and fatherhood have all but disappeared from common usage.

There are many other examples with which we are all too familiar. Chairman has become a chair; a postman is a postal carrier; a fisherman is a fisher; a fireman is a fire fighter; a policeman is a police officer. Terms that indicate our natural male or female nature have been dropped from our language.

Public opinion can be affected by the words we use, especially when discussing pro-life or pro-family matters. We must learn to make our words work for us, not against us.

Here are the ABC’s of letter writing: Address the person you are writing to properly. Be brief and to the point and be respectful not rude. Clear - be specific in your complaint, suggestion or praise. Discuss only one issue in each letter and write in your own words. Every so often write a letter. Facts - be factual. Give your name and address so the MP knows the letter is from his constituent. Have a relationship with your provincial/federal politicians.

It is so important to speak out by letters to politicians and newspapers and on talk radio and public meetings. We have to do it, otherwise it is assumed that all the public goes along with the news of the left-wing “elites” (media, university professors, etc.) who are attempting to dominate the public debate.

Good luck in our important mission to let our politicians and the media know we are present, alert and we care what happens to this country!

Cecilia Forsyth

GARDASIL — IS IT SAFE FOR MY DAUGHTER?

By C. Gwendolyn Landolt, National Vice President, REAL Women of Canada

There is limited data on the effects of this anti Human Papillomavirus (HPV) drug on pre-teen and early teenage girls, yet this age group is the primary target for the vaccine. Gardasil was tested on about 1,200 girls ages nine to 15. Clinical trials of the HPV vaccine involved pre-screened participants without any medical conditions. Mass immunization programs in the schools will result in almost every girl being vaccinated, including those with undiagnosed medical conditions.

The long term neurological or immune system effects of the vaccine are completely unknown. It is uncertain if any of those vaccinated will develop fertility, cancer or genetic damage. Merck, the drug company that produces Gardasil, admits the above possibilities have not been studied.

Merck reports that side effects of the vaccine include pain, swelling, itching, and redness at the injection site, fever, nausea, dizziness, and headache. Merck's vaccine brochure also states "This is not a complete list of side effects".

Serious side effects from Gardasil include blood clot, paralysis, seizures, stroke, cardiac arrest, lupus, thrombosis, vasculitis, Guillain-Barre Syndrome (a rare disorder) and death. Merck claims there is no proof that Gardasil is responsible for these illnesses or deaths.

According to records from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System, since the vaccine was approved in 2006, the total number of Gardasil-related deaths is 47. Of the 47 deaths, 41 occurred within a month of receiving the vaccine and, of those deaths, 17 were within two weeks of receiving the vaccine. The cause of death is unknown in most of the cases.

In 2008, the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) documented 7,723 adverse events related to Gardasil, of which 1,061 were considered 'serious' and 142 considered 'life threatening'. Since June 2008, the VAERS reports show 235 cases of permanent disability. There were 29 new cases of Guillain-Barre Syndrome and 147 cases of spontaneous miscarriages when the vaccine was given to pregnant women.

The federal and provincial public health agencies in Canada have approved the HPV vaccine for girls and young women, aged 9 to 26. These agencies claim the vaccine is safe, with few side effects, but they do not report the safety concerns and risks associated with the vaccine. REAL Women believes that parents need to know all the facts about Gardasil when considering the vaccine for their daughter.

A brochure outlining these concerns and risks is available from the Canadian Institute for Education on the Family (CIEF). If you would like a copy or if you would be willing to distribute this brochure to parents of young girls, please let them know. Call 306-253-4789 or email information@cief.ca. The brochure is on line at www.cief.ca.

REAL WOMEN INTERVENES IN LEGAL CHALLENGE OF THE PROSTITUTION LAW

REAL Women, together with the Christian Legal Fellowship and the Catholic Civil Rights League applied to intervene in the legal challenge of the prostitution law. However, Mr. Justice Ted Matlow of the Ontario Superior Court refused our application. His reasons for doing so, if left unchallenged, would have set a very dangerous precedent. He refused our application on the grounds that our views "reflect the views of only a small segment of Canadian society," would create the impression that the court and intervenors had a "special relationship," and that our intervention would be "very controversial." His decision certainly created a new law on court interventions. It appears to have been based more on politics than legal precedent.

His decision was appealed, and on September 23rd, 2009, his decision was overturned by the Ontario Court of Appeal.

In a 3-0 ruling, the appeal court said that our organization had a legitimate contribution to make to an issue that has a clear moral dimension.

It then ruled that Mr. Justice Ted Matlow of the Ontario Superior Court had misunderstood the case and used flawed reasoning in his decision to exclude us.

The case will be argued before the Ontario Superior Court commencing Monday, October 5, 2009.

THE WORLD CONGRESS OF FAMILIES V AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS

The organizers of the World Congress of Families (WCF) chose to hold the fifth Congress in the Netherlands, because it is the heart of liberal Europe. It was in this country that many of the destructive anti-family policies of today first became socially and legally acceptable. For example, thirty years ago, the Netherlands shocked the world with its policies on physician assisted suicide, unrestricted abortions, legal non-medical use of drugs, wide open prostitution, and finally, same-sex marriage (1994). If Europe has lost its soul, one can look to the Netherlands for showing the way.

It is interesting, that in 2007, when the WCF IV was held in Warsaw, the European left mocked the Congress for holding its meeting in such a socially conservative country. However, when it was announced that the fifth Congress was to be held in the heart of liberal Europe, the European left was outraged that the Congress was daring to trespass on its territory

The Autonomous Feminist Action (AFA) organization in Amsterdam posted on its website, in July, a menacing drawing of a man and a woman with a child and a cross between them, with a dotted line going through the necks of the couple and a pair of scissors ready to cut off their heads. It warned that the Congress was a group of “fundamentalistic [sic] Christians” who “will plead for going back to Christian traditions of traditional relationship between man and woman.” The AFA described WCF as anti-feminist, anti-abortion, homophobic and opposed to divorce. It was joined in its protest by homosexual groups, who found it intolerable that the Netherlands would be the host of an organization promoting the natural family of mother, father and children.

On July 30th, the Amsterdam offices of EuroCongress were vandalized and damaged. EuroCongress is the professional conference organizer for World Congress of Families V – Amsterdam, August 10-12, at the RAI Centre.

These vandals defaced and damaged the outside of the EuroCongress building by smearing paint, and writing various obscenities and anti-Christian slogans. How very illiberal and intolerant of a supposedly, liberal, tolerant nation! The purpose of these threats was, as usual, to intimidate people, in order to keep them away from the Congress.

On the morning of the first day of the Congress, an uninspiring motley group of just ten, bedraggled picketers stood outside the Convention Centre for an hour (see photograph). They then disappeared and never showed up again. As usual, it's the intimidation tactic that prevails: all these agitators accomplished was to expose themselves as bereft of common sense.

Many Countries Represented at WCF V

Representatives from over 61 countries attended the WCF V. Speakers included scholars and leaders with Catholic, Judaic, Islamic, Protestant and secular backgrounds. Speakers, such as the Chief Rabbi of the Netherlands, the President of the Pakistan Family Forum, the Archbishop of Utrecht, the former President of the US Southern Baptist Convention and the Executive Director of the Evangelical Fellowship of Zambia represent a sample of the religious diversity at the Congress. In fact, many WCF speakers do not agree on specific religious practices, but they do share values and principles regarding family, marriage and children as found in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948.

The knowledgeable speakers from around the world provided an exciting and varied program. They discussed parental rights, home-schooling, preserving marriage, declining birth rates, internet pornography, combating trafficking in women and children, defending the family at the United Nations and other international forums, and supporting families in the developing world, among other timely issues confronting the family.

The next WCF (the sixth!) is to take place in May 2011. The Selection Committee for the Congress will be meeting in late November to review the applications from countries wishing to host the next Congress.

THE WAY WE WERE: TRUDEAU'S STAMP OF CORRUPTION

Our decadent times today, to put it bluntly, can be traced directly to Prime Minister Trudeau, who, in 1969, used his majority to bring in a destructive bill on abortion and homosexuality: in addition to their legalization and the terrible aftermath to humanity, the bill also brought two other tragic consequences, from which Canada is still reeling.

One of these tragedies is that this bill fundamentally changed our political system so that Parliament has now become a travesty of democracy. That is, MPs today vote according to the precedent set in 1969 on this bill by Mr. Trudeau – namely, they now vote as they are told, not in accordance with their consciences, or the views of their constituents.

The second tragedy was that it began the long journey to our country's moral decay: there is now little resistance to immoral behaviour – any behaviour is now tolerated.

Although the horrors of abortion and homosexuality were both included in the bill, we will limit this article to the homosexual aspect of the bill, which legalized homosexual acts (referred to as “buggery” in the 1969 Criminal Code) for all consenting adults 21 years and older.

The Omnibus Bill – 1969

The bill in question (C-150) was an omnibus bill, with 120 clauses dealing with a number of wide ranging issues: abortion, contraception, homosexuality, gambling, gun control, driving under the influence, cruelty to animals and others. The was introduced into Parliament by Justice Minister John Turner in December 1968, but it was the initiative of Mr. Trudeau, who drafted it when he was the Minister of Justice, just prior to his election as Prime Minister upon Lester Pearson's retirement.

The Bill Proudly Identified with Trudeau and the Liberal Party

Justice Minister John Turner admitted in the House of Commons on January 23, 1969, that the bill bore Trudeau's “indelible imprint”, since it was Trudeau:

Who had the courage to assemble it, to introduce it into Parliament and to defend it across the land

The government fully endorses this bill.

Turner went on to say:

It is a government bill, bears the government stamp and will be supported by the government.

We feel bound to the bill as the principal item of social reform in this session of Parliament. It is identified with our Prime Minister and party.

We believe, therefore, that on the one hand, we have the right and, on the other hand, the duty to stand behind the bill in all stages of debate that will follow.

Not one Liberal member rose in the House of Commons to speak against the homosexual aspect of the bill and only

one Liberal, Gordon Sullivan (Hamilton Mountain, ON), broke ranks with his party to vote against the bill.

However, Professor Dalton McGuinty, (father of present Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty), who was then president of the Ottawa-Carleton Liberal Association, did disassociate himself from the Liberal Party over the bill, particularly the abortion clause.

Homosexual Newspaper, Capital Xtra, on the Omnibus Bill

The homosexual newspaper, Capital Xtra, published an article, in May 2009, celebrating the 40th anniversary of the decriminalization of homosexuality by this bill. Entitled "Trudeau's 'indelible imprint'", this very revealing article was written by retired Liberal Senator Laurier LaPierre, a self-identified homosexual, previously married and the father of two adult children.

LaPierre writes that Trudeau aide and Liberal Cabinet Minister, Marc Lalonde, believed that the omnibus bill was a "personal initiative of Mr. Trudeau". Tim Porteous, Trudeau's executive assistant, said the bill suited Trudeau's concept of the "just society" and his "sense of mischief", and that "he liked to provoke people". Porteous referred to Trudeau's awareness of homosexuals "working in professions that might be helpful to him – for example, in the broadcast business – who would be much more likely to support him because he'd been the author of that bill."

Don McLeod, author of the homosexual friendly book Lesbian and Gay Liberation in Canada, according to Laurier LaPierre:

...believes that if the amendment decriminalizing gay sex had stood alone, it would not have passed.

According to McLeod,
We would have had to wait until the 1970s or so. But since it was lumped in with lotteries, it passed.

LaPierre probes Trudeau's methods in the article. He quotes Trudeau's memoirs:

I needed first of all to persuade my Cabinet colleagues that it was appropriate to put these controversial subjects on the order paper in the Commons. Several of them objected strenuously, some for political reasons, some for moral ones. But I held my ground until finally, tired of arguing, even the opponents ended up saying, 'if you want to risk destroying yourself, it's up to you.' And I had carte blanche.

According to Marc Lalonde:
Homosexuality was not particularly high on the priorities of the government of the day.

LaPierre sums up the event: Trudeau's omnibus strategy, combined with party discipline and a majority government, ensured that the more controversial aspects of Bill C-150 would ultimately be adopted. The Edmonton Journal described the government's process on this bill as:

Arrogant, authoritarian, undemocratic, brutal and downright immoral.

Trudeau and Turner Knew the Profound Implications of the Bill

On January 23, 1969, Justice Minister Turner stated in the House of Commons:

I speak this afternoon with the confidence that this legislation is the most important and all-embracing reform of the criminal and penal law ever attempted at one time in this country. The omnibus measure contains matters of deep social significance which, in the course of time, will affect the lives of most of us, perhaps each one of us, in varying degrees.

Debate Unwelcome

The Progressive Conservatives (PC) and Ralliement Creditistes (RC) who were the opposition members in Parliament, made it clear that they did not want the debate. For example:

The Honourable John Flemming (Carleton-Charlotte, NB,) PC stated in the House of Commons:

Why should we wrap all these measures together? I assume the government is trying to hide something...[the homosexuality clause] is repugnant to the majority of the people of Canada... This provision should not be in the bill.

Other opposition members noted that there had been no great public pressure or public clamor for the amendments on buggery and bestiality (as homosexuality was then referred to in the Criminal Code).

Walter Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris, MB) PC

This is being done without any public pressure. The initiative has come from the government.

Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West, AB) PC

I must confess, I am a little ashamed to talk about that problem in this house, in such dignified surroundings. When I say this, I express an opinion of the great majority of my constituents. It is almost scandalous to see that the representatives of the people must presently discuss these matters.

Walter C. Carter (St. John's West, Nfld. & Lab.) PC

If homosexuality were practiced on a widespread scale, society would break down. If it were universally practiced, the human race in a matter of time would become extinct. Obviously, therefore, it cannot be said to be conducive to social progress...

The bill gives legal recognition to a practice that is basically anti-social. If I voted for the bill, it would mean that I am condoning that which I feel if carried out on an unrestricted basis would destroy the way of life we have painfully built up over the centuries.

André Fortin (Lotbinière QC) RC:

Just as we worked for the alcoholics' rehabilitation, we must try to rehabilitate the homosexuals since they have a disease, a sexual deviation.

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix QC) PC:

The minister knows quite well that, in general, homosexuals do not wait until they are attracted by persons of age.... Homosexuals are mostly inclined to pervert youngsters and the minister opens the door even wider.... Instead of voting legislation to help homosexuals cure themselves since they are really sick, the way is cleared for them to act more freely.... [The government] shirks its duty because the first obligation of a government is to legislate in order to protect society as a whole.

Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants, NS), PC:

I do not think... that we help society by making certain sexual aberrations permissible under the code. This might allow any pervert who molests children to think if his neighbour down the street can be a homosexual and mingle with his kind he himself has the right to follow his own inclination to savage young children.

Trudeau, however, made clear in the Calgary Herald (December 20, 1967) why he decided to make all these startling changes by way of an omnibus bill:

These amendments would have a better chance of passing if they were included in a bigger, diverse bill with its obvious advantages of psychological inertia.

Trudeau's Confusion Between Public and Private Morality

We will never know whether Trudeau confused private and public morality in order to deliberately confuse the public about the implications of his bill, or whether he himself misunderstood the difference between private and public morality when he made his famous statement that the state had no place in the bedrooms of the nation. Trudeau, then Justice Minister, stated, in a scrum outside the House of Commons, on December 21, 1967, as follows:

It's bringing the laws of the land up to contemporary society I think. Take this thing on homosexuality. I think the view we take here is that there's no place for the state in the bedrooms of the nation. I think that what's done in private between adults doesn't concern the Criminal Code. When it becomes public, this is a different matter. (http://archives.cbc.ca/politics/rights_freedoms/clips/2671)

Justice Minister Turner reiterated the concept when he stated, on April 17, 1969, during the debate:

In the same way, acts between people who suffer under a sexual deviation — as long as it doesn't involve the corruption of a minor, as long as it doesn't involve force, as long as it is not done in public — if in fact it consists of adult, mature, private behaviour, however repugnant as I've said to most of us, these are matters for personal conscience and should not be in the public criminal domain... We are not for a moment conceding that homosexual acts are in any way to be equated to ordinary, normal acts of intercourse,

I resent very much the argument... that this legalizes homosexuality... It surely does nothing of the kind.... The clause does not promote such acts.... It does not even legalize this kind of conduct.

Turner stated on CBC Radio on April 20, 1969 (CBC digital archives):

All it does is recognize what those of us who support the bill recognize that there are areas of private behaviour which, however repugnant, however immoral, if they do not directly involve public order should not properly be within the criminal law of Canada. (http://archives.cbc.ca/politics/rights_freedoms/clips/2699)

These statements by Turner and Trudeau about private and public morality were spoken in the midst of a family-oriented nation, then protected by law from such travesties as lewd Gay Pride Parades and pride weeks in major cities across Canada, the CRTC approved gay television channels, swingers' clubs, with wife swapping, gaining Supreme Court sanction, parental rights being overturned by preferential treatment for homosexuals, and homosexual couples overseeing curriculum content for students from kindergarten to high school, such as happened in British Columbia. Private indeed!

Progressive Conservative Walter Dinsdale had these prophetic words to say in the House of Commons, on April 17, 1969, about Trudeau's famous quip about the bedrooms of the nation:

...murder your wife in the bedroom and you will see how fast the state will deal with that problem. But if you become involved in spiritual and psychological degradation of this kind you are actually committing an act that involves spiritual and even sociological death because... this is not an act that involves only the individual concerned. It has widespread sociological implications.

The new morality is merely the old permissiveness that has dragged down men and nations from the dawn of creation as the result of a complete reversal of values, with evil becoming good and good becoming evil.

That is precisely the philosophy the minister was supporting this afternoon.... we are dealing with the gross perversion of a very high and noble function which is involved in perpetuating the species.... It strikes at the heart of our basic social institution, the family.... Homosexuals prey on juveniles. It is something that spreads like a plague, for there is no more destructive drive than the sexual impulse running wild.... It is a psychological and deep-seated spiritual disease which requires therapeutic rather than punitive treatment, but there is nothing in the amendment to the code that deals with the therapeutic aspect of the problem

The Infamous Bill Passes

After intense opposition from the Progressive Conservative and the Ralliement Creditiste members, and a filibuster led by the latter's leader, Real Caouette (Temiscamingue, QC), Bill C-150 passed in the House of Commons on May 14, 1969 by a vote of 149 to 55: 119 Liberals, 18 NDP and 12 PC voted in favour of the bill. As mentioned above, one Liberal broke ranks and voted against it, joining 43 PC's, MP's and 11 RC.

The ever obedient, Liberal-dominated Senate quickly passed the bill which received Royal Assent on Aug 26, 1969.

Trudeau in Vancouver's Queer Hall of Fame

Pierre Trudeau is one of the first "progressives" to be inducted into the Queer Hall of Fame, which opened in Vancouver this September, for being active in bringing about changes in human rights. His son, Justin Trudeau (Liberal, Papineau, QC), expressed appreciation of the honour on behalf of his family in a recent letter to the Queer Hall of Fame in which he stated

I know that the decriminalization of homosexuality 40 years ago was something that my father was very proud of. (Toronto Star, September 20, 2009)

The Independence of Yesterday's MPs

It is evident from the quotes included in this article that, in 1969, Members of Parliament exercised their freedom of speech to a far greater extent than is the case today. Because of a chill on speech, Parliamentarians today are fearful to offend, even with statements of truth which clearly represent the convictions of their constituents. Rarely, if ever, do MPs openly defy their party's policy on any issue.

In contrast, amid ridicule, Ralliement Creditiste leader Real Caouette, correctly prophesied that homosexual marriage was on the horizon.

Roland Godin (Portneuf, QC) RC also stated:

With the amendment regarding homosexuality, we can expect weddings.

Honourable Hugh John Flemming (Carleton-Charlotte, BC) PC objected to the clauses on homosexuality when he stated:

It makes respectable and legal something the effect of which would be to destroy, cut down and reduce the morals of our country. This is not a good thing.

I cannot vote to place a stamp of respectability on something that is degrading and demoralizing.

Bernard Dumont (Frontenac, QC) RC quoted a letter from the Association of Graduate Nurses of Saint Henri, Levis: As for homosexuals, it is possible some of them are suffering from mental illness which the state must detect and cure, but it is not the majority. You know quite well, the more the law will be permissive in that respect, the more corrupters there will be who will endeavor to take our youth along the road to perdition and moral depravity.

Conclusion

This is just a small sample of the objections made by the Conservative and Creditiste MPs, but with no objections from the Liberals or NDP, to the homosexual amendment in this omnibus bill.

This debate demonstrates that, unfiltered by media selection, Canadians, far from being boring and submissive, were

part of a very vibrant culture, founded on sound social norms, which were eloquently defended in Parliament by their representatives.

Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau imposed his will on Canadians in 1969. Therefore, Pierre Trudeau is very much responsible for the negative consequences of his bill. Canadians have paid a terrible price for one man's arrogance and insolence.