

### **THE RESENTMENT OF THE LIBERAL ELITES**

The liberal elites in Canada can't forgive Mr. Harper's Conservatives for proposing alternative policies to theirs. These elites consist mainly of the CBC, government bureaucrats, university professors and most of the secular media. The current on-going dispute between the Conservative government and the bureaucrats in the Department of Foreign Affairs is a prime example of this on-going struggle, as reflected in the pages of "Embassy", a weekly newspaper on foreign affairs. No matter what the Conservatives do, according to "Embassy", it is always wrong. Whether it's the government's support of Israel, national defense, maternal health, (federal bureaucrats had advised the government to include abortion in its G-8 maternal health policy, which it fortunately rejected), refugees, trade issues, and, of course, recent cuts in funding to liberal international NGO's. According to reports in the "Embassy", these decisions by the Conservatives are all appalling.

The problem with the Conservative government was summarized in the "Embassy" editorial of June 16, 2010, when it made this revealing statement:

Since coming to power, the Harper government has gone out of its way to polarize Canadian politics like never before – and the consensus is that they have been extremely successful. ...

In effect, the editorial is saying that prior to the Conservatives forming the government, the liberal elites determined policies, which through a combination of inertia and status quo, and a lack of choice, the public accepted. However, Mr. Harper has provided alternative policies with which much of the public now seems to be in agreement. As a result, the liberal elites in Canada, no longer wield the power and influence they formerly had. This shift, they claim, has "polarized" the public. That is, providing alternative policies is considered unforgivable to the elites, who seem to believe that there is only one way to approach issues: their way. However, Canada is the richer for a broader and deeper debate on matters of public policy, which is being provided by the alternative policies proposed by the Conservatives. This situation is also far more democratic as levers of power are no longer under the control of a mere handful of liberal elites.

It is this conflict that is central to the secular media's constant attacks on Mr. Harper personally and his policies.

### **A BREACH IN THE WALL OF LEFT-WING MEDIA**

Pierre Karl Péladeau, a conservative Quebec media tycoon, announced in early July that he is launching Sun TV cable news – an English language, all news conservative leaning channel that will be in direct competition with the left-wing news cable channels, CTV News and CBC News network. At present, the latter two networks have a distinct advantage over the proposed conservative cable news network (called "Fox News North" by liberal pundits) because they both hold Category A licenses, which requires all cable companies to carry them. The awarding of these licenses is the responsibility of the CRTC (Canadian Radio Freedom Commission), which regulates broadcasting in Canada.

The CRTC has refused Sun TV cable news a Category A license. However, the CRTC has announced that, starting next year, cable news (and sports) channels will no longer be protected by the Category A, "must carry" licenses. This means that the two protected, liberal orientated cable all news channels will be thrown into open competition with Sun TV for subscribers when the Sun TV starts up in January. A 2008 study by Pew Research Center in the US shows that the cable news audience is now larger than that of the regular network news programs. This finding also applies to Canada. This means that the subscriber base for cable news channels is large and will grow even larger, in a highly lucrative market.

The left-wing media are largely of the view, however, that Sun TV will fail to find an audience. Liberal media claim that they currently provide fairness, balance and objectivity, so that Sun News will be irrelevant to Canadians. However, Canadian studies indicate this is not the case.

Ryerson University professors Marsha Barber and Ann Rauhala (the latter was, at one time, a reporter with the Globe & Mail), published the results of a survey in 2005 in the Canadian Journal of Commentators, which found that news directors, who have the most direct responsibility for programming, were more politically and socially liberal than most Canadians.

In 2003, in the book "Hidden Agenda: How Journalists Influence the News", by the University of Windsor's, Lydia Miljan, and University of Calgary's Barry Cooper, found that Canadian journalists regularly "slant" their coverage in order to favour liberal news over socially conservative perspectives.

David Haskell, an associate professor of journalism at Wilfred Laurier University, researched national news media's relationship to evangelical Christians for 11 years. In his study, published in the Journal of Communication and Religion, he found evidence of negatively slanted coverage on evangelicals. He found, for example, that journalists working for CBC-TV used omission, exaggeration or misrepresentation of information, in order to present evangelicals and the positions they held in the worst possible light.

The colourful 35 year old, Kory Teneycke, vice president of Sun News TV, was, until last year, the Communications Director for Prime Minister Harper. Mr. Teneycke states that his goal is to create a "punchy, provocative right-of-centre network" to shake up what he describes as the "lame-stream media".

The arrival of Sun TV News means that, at last, Canadians will have a Canadian option when it comes to cable news broadcasts and current affairs programming. What a great break-through! REAL Women can hardly wait until January when the network commences operation. It won't be a moment too soon for us. Over the decades, we know only too well, from experience, how little balance and fairness there has been in news and current affairs programming in Canada.

## **PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE**

In this President's message, I wanted to comment on the effects of same-sex marriage which recently became legal in California and in Mexico.

The California Marriage Protection Act, Proposition 8, was overturned by federal Judge Vaughn R. Walker. Passed by California voters in November 2008, the Act recognized "only marriage between a man and a woman." It did not prevent same-sex couples from having civil union ceremonies to publicly profess their commitment to each other.

However, Judge Walker, who is homosexual, ruled Proposition 8 had no rational basis and was unconstitutional. His ruling appears to be based on personal beliefs not solid legal facts of law. According to the Judge, "moral and religious views form the only basis for a belief that same-sex couples are different from opposite -- sex couples."

He further ruled that marriage is simply "an expression of emotional support and public commitment" open to any couple regardless of gender. This opinion reduces marriage to just another living arrangement between any two people based on feelings with no special meaning or significance in society. Giving non-marital relationships the same status as marriage does not expand the definition of marriage. It destroys it.

Advocates of same-sex marriage claim that it will not impact traditional marriage. It may be true that an all-male or all-female marriage will not affect my marriage. However, legalizing same-sex marriage will impact society's definition and understanding of marriage. Redefining marriage redefines the family which redefines parenting.

Canadians already see the effect of same-sex marriage in our country. It is considered to be “intolerant” to publicly express disapproval of these so-called marriages. Canadian courts and Human Rights Tribunals consistently rule against freedom of religion when religious beliefs are pitted against the so-called sexual orientation rights.

Schools teach that the homosexual lifestyle including marriage is equal to the heterosexual lifestyle. Same-sex couples having children (by way of a third party) or adopting children is permissible and promoted. Movies and TV programs portray same-sex marriage and parenting as positive and healthy equal to the traditional Mom and Dad family.

Same-sex “marriage” is deeply detrimental to society.

## **AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNDER REVIEW**

A ray of sunshine recently penetrated the fog of political correctness, when Treasury Board president Stockwell Day, who is responsible for the public service, announced in July that a review of the government’s affirmative action policies would be undertaken.

The affirmative action policies under review apply to federally regulated institutions namely banks, broadcasters, telecommunication companies, railroads, airlines, maritime transportation companies, etc.

In making the announcement. Mr. Day stated:

... no Canadian should be barred from a federal job because of race or ethnicity. While we support diversity in the public service, we want to ensure that no Canadian is barred from opportunities in the public service based on race or ethnicity.

Jason Kenney, Minister of Immigration who was also involved in the decision, stated:

Hiring should be based on merit. I strongly agree with the objective of creating a public service that reflects the diversity of Canada, and with fair measures designed to reach that goal. But we must ensure that all Canadians have an equal opportunity to work for their government based on merit, regardless of race or ethnicity.

Mr. Kenney’s statement reflects the position REAL Women has taken on the issue since our inception in 1983.

### **Affirmative Action**

Affirmative action policy is based on the feminist theory that women are helpless victims in a patriarchal society and need to be given special advantages in hiring to achieve “equality” with men. In the U.S., they call this feminist dream policy, affirmative action, and in Canada it is sometimes referred to as “employment equity”. This is a term coined by the feminist (now Supreme Court of Canada judge Rosalie Abella) who was the sole commissioner of the 1984 Royal Commission on Equality in Employment. Economist Martin Loney stated in his book, *The Pursuit of Division: Race, Gender and Preferential Hiring in Canada*, that Ms Abella’s Commission had no factual data to support its recommendations. It was just typical feminist advocacy “research” carried out with a preconceived objective. (See review of Dr. Loney’s book in REALity March/April 1999, and REALity May/June 2000, “The Feminist Canaries are Singing Again”.)

In 1986, based on the questionable recommendations of this Royal Commission, the federal government passed the Employment Equity Act (later amended in 1995) which targeted and recruited four designated groups: women, aboriginals, visible minorities and the disabled. Women now hold 55% of all jobs in the public service, so it is only reasonable that this outdated policy should be reviewed. (See REALity May/June 2010, “Women Doing Well-Men Not So Much”.)

## Liberal Opposition Leader Ignatieff Supports Affirmative Action

It comes as no surprise that Liberal opposition leader Michael Ignatieff has come out swinging in favour of affirmative action, accusing the Conservatives of “taking Canada backward”. This is a bizarre statement, since the Conservatives were moving forward with their review, with the objective of adopting policies to match the times, whereas Mr. Ignatieff is firmly rooted in the feminist past, whatever the issue – abortion, day care, etc. One can only speculate that this is due to the intimidation of Mr. Ignatieff by the many hard-core feminists in his caucus. Alternatively, he may fear the anger of his colleague and rival Bob Rae, who breathes down his neck, waiting until the right time and place to take over. It’s coming.

Mr. Rae is firmly rooted in the NDP and only put on a Liberal tunic because it was opportune to do so. He remains emotionally and intellectually a socialist, and only Mr. Ignatieff stands in the way of his ambition to change Canada as the Liberal leader with a more socialist agenda.

### The Weakness of Affirmative Action

Affirmative action contorts society in order to obtain equality of outcome, rather than equality of opportunity.

The truth is that we human beings are not equal: we are not born equal, but differ in many important ways such as intellect, physical make up, ambition and energy, etc.

The government must assure that public service hiring is based on merit – presumably through examinations and interviews, which are open to all candidates with the best qualified being hired, regardless of gender, race, and ethnicity. It is a ray of sunshine that such a policy may be implemented.

Please write to Prime Minister Harper and Treasury Board President Stockwell Day, thanking them for the review of the affirmative action policy. Their addresses are as follows:

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister Stephen Harper  
Office of the Prime Minister  
80 Wellington St,  
Ottawa ON K1A 0A2  
Fax 613-941-6900

Honourable Stockwell Day  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax: 613-995-1154

## **PROPAGANDA WAR ON DRUGS AT AIDS CONFERENCE**

Those campaigning for the legalization of non-medical drugs, never stop their propaganda, and use every weapon available to achieve their objective.

The 18th International Aids Conference in Vienna in July 2010 presented an ideal occasion to push their agenda using AIDS as a protective cover. That is, although it was supposed to be an AIDS conference, the drug liberalizers, known as harm reduction supporters, manipulated the AIDS agenda at the conference as a platform for advocacy for drug liberalization, which they veil as “human rights” for drug users.

The annual AIDS conferences are always wild, undisciplined circuses (a participant was trampled by elephants with whom he was attempting to dance at the AIDS conference in Thailand in 2004). This year's conference in Vienna was little different, with loud angry complaints against governments, including that of Canada, for their failure to throw even more money into the AIDS pot.

This year the drug liberalization humbug was added to the shouts of these AIDS activists, who claimed that failure to liberalize the drug laws was fueling the HIV epidemic with overwhelming health and social consequences. A document demanding drug liberalization, called the "Vienna Declaration", was distributed at the conference. This document was written by "public health experts" who, without exception, happen to be drug liberalizers, supporting the harm reduction ideology. The latter posits that drugs should be decriminalized to allow addicts clean needles, free drug injection sites, etc. which will supposedly reduce the "harm" of addiction. Such policies, however, only deepen the addiction, leading to increased usage and an eventual painful death for the addict. Even though such a policy is reckless and useless, enthusiasts of harm reduction tirelessly produce "research" to support their claims and it was this advocacy research which formed the basis of the Vienna Declaration.

The greatest costs of illegal drug use, however, are not generated by the criminal justice system, but by the non-medical drug use itself. These costs include not only sickness and death, but also reduced productivity and the high healthcare costs generated by illegal drug use.

Impartial scientific research (as opposed to the advocacy harm reduction research frequently quoted in the media), indicates that the prohibition of illegal drug use reduces use among HIV/AIDS patients, as well as the non-infected population vulnerable to HIV/AIDS infection by way of contaminated needles. The tragedy is that illegal drug use exacerbates weaknesses in the immune system, making individuals with AIDS more susceptible to infection and death. Marijuana use causes impaired immunity and opens the door for the virus that causes Kaposi's Sarcoma – life-threatening for individuals with HIV/AIDS. Marijuana also contains bacteria and fungi that put users at risk for infection. Illegal drug use among AIDS patients is life threatening because these drugs lessen the effectiveness of anti-retroviral medications.

Also, non-medical drug use is associated with increased risky sexual behaviors which promote transmission of HIV/AIDS in a way that needle exchange cannot prevent.

It is clear that drug policies must be determined objectively, not based on ideology as set out in the Vienna Declaration.

#### Canadian Government Opposes Vienna Declaration

The Canadian government, understandably, refused to sign the Vienna Declaration stating that it was inconsistent with Canada's anti-drug policy. Canada did announce, however, at the AIDS conference, that it was contributing \$60 million to an AIDS international global research project with the Gates Foundation for HIV/AIDS vaccine research.

This did not satisfy the activists. At the conference, July 18-23, 2010, a group of Canadian activists childishly trashed the government of Canada's exhibit booths at the conference, because the government didn't agree with them. Such actions hardly provide confidence in the judgement of these individuals.

#### The Elephant in the AIDS Room

It is not a great mystery what one of the main causes of AIDS is namely the sexual behaviour of homosexuals. All the talk about fighting AIDS is useless without coming to grips with the problem of homosexual behaviour. Yet, this is never ever mentioned at these AIDS conferences and, therefore, continues to be an elephant in the room. All the money in the world is not going to curb the AIDS epidemic unless and until its cause is acknowledged and properly dealt with.

A coalition of AIDS patients and activists, has instead set up an AIDS industry, which has vetoed every tested public health strategy for controlling this sexually transmitted disease. Don't tell people not to engage in promiscuity, prostitution, and injection drug use, they insist, just tell them to be "responsible" and use condoms for "safe" sex.

This hasn't worked because people who engage in frequent multi-partnering, employ sex workers, or have substance abuse problems are, by definition, not responsible.

Fighting AIDS, therefore, is handicapped by AIDS activists, who furiously oppose the idea that AIDS programs should target certain sexual behaviours and practices. In short, there is an increasing war against abstinence programs. Much is invested, both monetarily and ideologically, in not encouraging abstinence, as AIDS activists are more interested in protecting and promoting sexual liberties than in preventing new infections.

#### HIV Cases Return to 1980's Levels

It is not surprising, therefore, that HIV and AIDS cases in Canada are today at the same level as when the epidemic began in the early 1980's. In 2008, there were approximately 3,300 new HIV cases in Canada, according to the data obtained from the most recent report on HIV/AIDS from the Public Health Agency of Canada.

Although the majority of these cases arise from men having sex with men, intravenous drug users and bisexuals are spreading AIDS to the heterosexual community as well.

Decriminalization of drugs will only add fuel to the AIDS fire, which is already burning out of control.

Antoniou, T., & Tseng, L. (2002). Interactions between recreational drugs and antiretroviral agents. *Annual of Pharmacotherapy*, 36, 1598-1613.

Cabral, G.A., & Vasquez, R. (1992). Delta-9-Tetrahydrocannabinol suppresses macrophage extrinsic anti-herpes virus activity, *Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine*, 199(2), 255-63.

American College of Allergy, Asthmas and Immunology. (2004, November 17). Immunological changes associated with prolonged marijuana smoking.

Tashkin, D.P., Baldwin, G.C., Sarafian, T., Dubinett, S., & Roth, M.D. (2002). Respiratory and immunologic consequences of marijuana smoking. *Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 42 (11 Suppl), 71S-81S.

Wu, T.C., Tashkin, D.P., Djahed, B., & Rose, J.E. (1988). Pulmonary hazards of smoking marijuana as compared with tobacco. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 318(6), 347-351.

Fleisher, M., Winawer, S.J., & Zauber, A.G. (1991). Aspergillosis and marijuana. [Letter]. *Annals of International Medicine*, 115, 578-579.

Ramirez, J. (1990). Acute pulmonary histoplasmosis: newly recognized hazard of marijuana plant hunters. *American Journal of Medicine*, 88(5), 60N-62N.

Taylor, D.N., Wachsmuth, I.K., Shangkuan, Y.H., Schmidt, E.V., Barrett, T.J., et al. (1982). Salmonellosis associated with marijuana: A multi state outbreak traced by plasmid fingerprinting. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 306(21), 1249-1253.

Ghaziani, A. (2005, October). Crystal methamphetamine use and antiretroviral drug resistance. A pilot study of behavioural and clinical correlates. *International Association of Physicians in AIDS Care. IAPAC Monthly*, 297-299. Retrieved July 9, 2010 from <http://img.thebody.com/legacy/Assets/22/36/meth.pdf>

Wechsbert, W.M., Parry, C.D.H., & Jewkes, R.K. (2010 May). Drugs, sex, gender-based violence, and the intersection of the HIV/AIDS epidemic with vulnerable women in South Africa. RTI Press. Retrieved July 9, 2010 from

<http://www.rti.org/pubs/pb-0001-1005-wechsberg.pdf>

Colfax, G., Coates, T.J., Husnik, M.J., Huang, Y., Buchbinder, S., Koblin, B., et al. (2005). Longitudinal patterns of methamphetamine, popper (amyl nitrite), and cocaine use and high-risk sexual behavior among a cohort of San Francisco men who have sex with men. *Journal of Urban Health*, 82 (1 Suppl 1), i62-i70.

## **MARIJUANA IS DANGEROUS**

Those who support the legalization of marijuana pretend that it poses no dangers. This false argument should be halted in its tracks before even more individuals get caught in the marijuana trap.

Study after study has pointed out the dangers of marijuana. The most recent study was carried out by Amy Porath-Waller, senior research and policy analyst for the Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse (CCSA). In August, she pointed out that chronic marijuana use can cause neuro-cognitive impairment, such as memory and retention loss, as well as mental health problems like psychosis, depression and anxiety. And because cannabis is often smoked unfiltered in larger puffs with longer breath-holding, it can also lead to respiratory problems and possibly lung cancer.

Studies have also found adverse effects on the development, behaviour and mental health of offspring of women who use cannabis while pregnant.

Because of potential cognitive impairment, chronic users could face limited educational and occupational achievements.

Previous studies have also reached the same conclusions (REALity Jan/Feb 2004 and REALity Nov/Dec 2004).

Why then do many ignore these plain facts and blindly rely on the empty statements of the drug liberalizers? This may be due to the fact they believe that the marijuana available today is the same as the marijuana sold 30 years ago. It is not.

Levels of tetrahydro-cannabinol, the psychoactive substance in pot, are about four times higher today than they were in the 1970's.

The lack of education on the actual dangers of marijuana may also explain the confused findings on the marijuana poll by Léger Marketing, conducted from July 26-28, 2010. According to this poll, 21% think the federal government should decriminalize marijuana, allowing its use without penalty, and 34% think marijuana should be totally legalized and taxed just like tobacco and alcohol. However, 20% of Canadians take the opposite view and believe there should be tougher penalties for marijuana use.

The false belief that marijuana is not dangerous has led to the heavy use of marijuana in Canada. According to the 2007 World Drug Report by the UN Office on Drugs and Crime, Canada has the dubious honour of leading the industrialized world in marijuana use, at least when calculated as a percentage of population. According to this UN report, which is a staple of police forces around the world, 16.8 per cent of Canadians between the ages of 15 and 64 smoked pot or ingested one of its derivatives last year.

That's well above the world average of 3.8 per cent for the same demographic and ahead of almost every other country in the world, save for Ghana (21.5 per cent of the population), Zambia (17.7 per cent) and the tiny island-states of New Guinea and Micronesia (29 per cent each).

Fortunately, the Conservative government appears to have no interest in liberalizing the law. Instead, it has brought in a slew of anti-drug initiatives, going after the crime syndicates growing and selling marijuana, which is mostly sold in

the U.S. According to a recent RCMP report, marijuana growing is an annual \$7.5 billion business and is connected to such problems as weapons and explosives, trafficking, cocaine smuggling and stock market fraud.

This highly lucrative business in Canada has been encouraged by liberal judges imposing only “slap on the wrist” penalties for drug violators. As a result, the marijuana growers and traffickers regard these penalties as simply the cost of doing business, and as no deterrent to them. Consequently, they continue to grow rich, preying on the vulnerability of the misguided.

To offset this, the Conservative government has tabled a bill which provides for a minimum sentence for marijuana growers/traffickers, thus putting some teeth into the law. The Conservatives also launched the National Anti-Drug Strategy in 2007 to combat the “danger and destruction” of illicit drugs, investing \$230 million for prevention and treatment.

### Court Legalizes Marijuana for Medical Purposes

In 1999, the liberal Ontario Court of Appeal, relying on little or no evidence to support its conclusions, declared marijuana use legal, for medical purposes. The Minister of Health at that time, Allan Rock, whose mind seems locked in the heady days of his youth in the 1960’s, apparently was thrilled with this foolish court decision, and, consequently, did not appeal it.

In July 2003, the Canadian Medical Association, however, insisted that “the government has not made the case for the safety of the medical use of marijuana”, and strongly recommended that the physicians of Canada not participate in dispensing marijuana under existing regulations, and warned that those who do, do so at their professional and legal peril.

At present, benefits from the use of marijuana for medical reasons continues to be unproven.

Despite this, because of the 1999 Ontario Court of Appeal Decision, and the ineptitude of Allan Rock, as of June 2009, 4029 Canadians are now smoking pot legally for so-called “medical” reasons. Marijuana is easily available in pill form – but it’s the smoking of the drug that the users prefer to assist them with their medical problems.

## **TAXPAYERS FUND THE ELECTION OF FEMINISTS**

The Status of Women (SOW) is keen on getting more women elected to public office, and taxpayers’ money is at the disposal of feminists to accomplish this objective.

In 2009, the SOW gave \$1.2 million to the feminist organization, Equal Voice, which was organized in 2001 to carry out this special work. The huge grant was in addition to the customary, approximate \$70,000 grant Equal Voice receives from the SOW each year. The purpose of this huge million-dollar grant, according to the mission statement of Equal Voice, “is to promote the election of more women to all levels of government and, ultimately, change the face of Canadian politics”. In its promotional material, Equal Voice claims that polling data consistently demonstrate that “women” care about different issues and that a critical mass is needed before legislatures produce public policy representing “women’s” concerns. It goes on to state, “How can a democracy be deemed legitimate if it fails to represent half its population?”

Equal Voice suggests that to level the playing field, parliaments and political parties must implement well funded national action plans to reduce the barriers by: recruiting and training women candidates, and introducing family friendly work environments, proportional representation, electoral financing reforms, quotas and targets, constitutional reforms, and public awareness campaigns.



## Discredited Feminist Concept

The problem is that Equal Voice continues to promote the discredited feminist concept that “women” all think alike, (ie. support feminism) and that all we need to do is get organized and then “we” can change society. As REAL Women has frequently pointed out, women do not think alike, nor do we share a common experience. We are as individual and different in our views and experiences as are men. No one can speak for all “women” in Canada anymore than anyone dare speak as a single voice for all Canadian “men”.

It is not surprising that Equal Voice has come up with this tired concept of “women united” when one looks at its Advisory Board, which is made up of the Canadian feminist “old-girls” club. They include:

Kim Campbell, who in the 2003 federal election brought the then Progressive Conservative party to its knees by electing only two MP’s to Parliament.

Former Senator Pat Carney, whose vote in 1992 was the deciding vote that defeated Prime Minister Mulroney’s proposed abortion legislation.

Liberal Sheila Copps (former member of the notorious “rat pack”), who is well known for her rhetorical excesses on all matters on which she may or may not have any knowledge.

Judy Erola, who as Liberal Minister Responsible for the Status of Women, famously stated in 1983, that women at home did not contribute to society and recommended that the income tax exemption, allowed a married person who remained at home, be eliminated. This bizarre comment by Ms Erola was one of the reasons that REAL Women was formed in 1983.

Barbara Hall, currently the commissar of the justifiably discredited Ontario Human Rights Commission.

Alexa McDonough and Audrey McLaughlin both strikingly unsuccessful as leaders of the federal NDP.

Anita Neville, currently a Liberal Member of Parliament for Winnipeg South Centre who is unfailing in her attempts to resurrect, at every opportunity, all stagnant feminist policies from the 1960’s and 1970’s.

Lesbian Senator Nancy Ruth, who causes havoc wherever she treads. It was her suggestion that led to the ill-fated attempt to change the lyrics of the National Anthem.

Senator Lucie Pepin, a birth control activist and former president of the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women. She was a protégée of former Liberal Minister of Health Marc Lalonde who appointed her candidate in his Montreal riding when he resigned his seat. She was elected as MP in 1984 and defeated in 1988, apparently due to her strong pro-abortion stance which cost her the Hasidic vote. She was appointed to the Senate in 2007 by former Liberal Prime Minister Jean Chretien.

## SOW Makes Further Grants to Equal Voice

The million-dollar grant to Equal Voice is not the only funding that this organization has received from the bountiful basket provided by the Status of Women. Equal Voice is one of SOW’s most favoured sisters. Other examples of funding include the grant in March 2008, when SOW gave \$60,625 to that organization to create “a new stand-alone module with content and tools specifically for aboriginal women”, whatever that means: it’s feminist talk understood at least, hopefully, by SOW’s bureaucrats. In June 2010, SOW helped fund a cocktail party in Ottawa entitled “A Midsummer Night’s Dream” which was “by invitation only”. This, despite the fact that taxpayers were financially supporting it.

In April 2010, Equal Voice, in partnership with the Canadian Club, held a luncheon for 400 guests at the Royal York Fairmont Hotel in Toronto at which the guest speaker was Anne McLellan, former Attorney General under Liberal Prime Minister Jean Chrétien. In her speech, Ms McLellan lamented that there was a pervasive democratic deficit

because 52% of the population is overwhelmingly “underrepresented”, as policy and lawmakers in Canada’s halls of power. All along, we mistakenly had thought that our MP’s represented everyone in their ridings. Does this mean that if a female MP is elected, she must then be representing only the females in her riding and that men are not represented by her? That is the ludicrous corollary of Ms McLellan’s argument.

#### SOW Has a Challenge

SOW and Equal Voice are facing a challenge in changing Canadian culture by having more women elected to public office. This challenge is due to the fact that, according to a research paper presented on June 1-3, 2010, at the Canadian Political Science Association Annual Meeting held at Concordia University in Montreal, Canadians don’t care about this issue. The paper concluded that neither men nor women are particularly concerned about the number of women in parliament, nor do they believe that policies or regulations should be introduced to increase the number of women candidates put forward by Canadian political parties. The paper, written by Assistant Professor Amanda Bittner of Memorial University, graduate student Jillian Terry of Carleton University (Ottawa) and graduate student Susan Piercey of Memorial University, St. Johns Nfld. argues that the relatively low number of women elected to the House of Commons is closely linked to the lack of concern about the issue on the part of the Canadian public. Simply put, they state “people don’t care, so women aren’t there”.

At the present time in the House of Commons, women comprise 22% of the MP’s. Among the provincial and territorial legislatures, women represent 23% of members. And they account for 23% of people on municipal councils in Canada.

Why is it that these feminist activists in the SOW and Equal Voice cannot comprehend the relatively simple fact that voters elect candidates on the basis of their policies, not on the basis of their gender?

Please write to Prime Minister Harper and to the Minister Responsible for the Status of Women, Rona Ambrose, and your MP, requesting that the feminist Equal Voice cease to be funded.

Their addresses are as follows:

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister Stephen Harper  
Office of the Prime Minister  
80 Wellington St,  
Ottawa ON K1A 0A2  
Fax: 613-941-6900

Ms Rona Ambrose  
Minister for the Status of Women  
House of Common  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax: 613-996-0785

Your MP  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

#### **MAVERICK CANADIAN AMBASSADOR IN ROMANIA**

The reason that Canada establishes embassies in foreign countries is to provide representation to promote its perspective to that country, as well as to promote Canadian trade and business. Also, embassies assist Canadian nationals who may encounter, for example, legal problems in that country, or a loss of their passport, theft of money, etc. Embassy staff, familiar with the country and its procedures and culture, are in a position to resolve these

difficulties. Briefly stated, an embassy and its staff are supposed to provide a presence in a foreign country to assist Canada and its nationals.

However, it appears that the Canadian ambassador in Bucharest, Romania, Philippe Beaulne has decided to pursue his own agenda. That is, to provide, contrary to the values and views of the majority of Romanians, support and solidarity for Romanian lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgendered (LGBT). Beaulne claims that by doing so, he is only supporting those human rights stipulated in the 1948 UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The document, however, does not mention protection on the basis of sexual orientation, but lists protection for the universally accepted human rights, such as freedom of religion, speech, right to life, liberty and security of persons, freedom from arbitrary arrest, to own property, etc. It should have occurred to Ambassador Beaulne that these rights are also available to the Romanian LGBT community as they are to all residents in Romania.

Despite this, Mr. Beaulne signed a joint statement with the embassies of South Africa, Australia, Czech Republic, France, Germany, the UK, Holland, Spain, Sweden and the U.S., supporting a Bucharest Pride Festival and parade. This was a direct interference with the democratic process and domestic policies of Romania, which is strongly opposed to special rights for homosexuals. According to the media, the number of participants in the gay pride march in Bucharest was estimated at 350, with no major Romanian politicians present. The views of the Romanian Evangelical Alliance, representing 60,000 Romanian Evangelicals, was ignored by Ambassador Beaulne's statement, as were the views of other religious and many other organizations in that country.

When this matter was brought to the attention of Philip Pinnington, Director, EU Member States, he justified this interference by stating:

It is common for Embassies to offer support for the actions of legitimate non-governmental organizations, which reflect the country's priorities.

Priorities? Whose priorities? In a letter to Prime Minister Harper and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, dated June 10, 2010, REAL Women stated:

The Canadian government has distanced itself from pride festivals in Canada by refusing to fund them, as many Canadians find gay pride displays objectionable and anti-family. Why then has the Canadian embassy in Romania interfered in the domestic and cultural affairs of Romania, apparently contrary to the views of religious and other organizations in that country?

At the very least, Canada should maintain an official, respectful neutrality regarding controversial domestic issues being debated in sovereign countries.

This is particularly the case, as Canadians do not wish other countries to interfere with our democratic process and domestic policies. For example, it was highly offensive to most Canadians that US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton criticized Canadian policies on a number of issues when she attended a meeting of G-8 foreign ministers in Ottawa at the end of March 2010. Why then are we deliberately offending many Romanians by failing to be neutral on their own domestic policies?

The Romanian government does not need or desire Canada to interfere with its domestic concerns.

It appears then that Ambassador Beaulne, by signing this controversial statement, purporting to represent the Conservative government, was, instead, presenting his own personal views.

This is perplexing, because according to an outraged editorial in the Embassy newspaper of June 9, 2010 (which reflects the views of many of the bureaucracy in Foreign Affairs):

Diplomats and ambassadors posted overseas have been working under the ironfisted regime that controls the messages they are allowed to deliver. Public appearances, speeches, statements and everything else are vetted by the Prime Minister's Office. This represents an unprecedented level of control ...

Apparently, not enough control.

The Prime Minister's office replied to our letter on June 17, 2010 stating that, since it was a matter under the jurisdiction of Lawrence Cannon, Minister of Foreign Affairs, the matter had been referred to him.

We are still waiting for Mr. Cannon's response and will be interested to see how he reconciles Ambassador Beaulne's publicly stated opinions with government policy.

## **EUTHANASIA — QUEBEC STYLE**

Euthanasia and assisted suicide are prohibited under Canada's federal Criminal Code. The provinces, however, have the responsibility of enforcing the Criminal Code, and the province of Quebec has its own ideas on how legal issues should be enforced – under its own terms and conditions. Thus, the province could effectively legalize both forms of medical killing, by directing provincial Crown prosecutors not to lay charges against doctors who end the lives of the terminally ill, elderly or the profoundly disabled.

In order to establish its own approach to the issue, Quebec has had to first set the stage for this. Consequently, the Quebec National Assembly has established a special 15-member Commission, headed by Geoffrey Kelley, a member of the National Assembly. After hearing from legal, medical, ethical and philosophical experts, this Commission released, in May of this year, a consultation document entitled, "Dying in Dignity".

This was followed by the announcement by the government that it was soliciting feedback from Quebec citizens about whether euthanasia and assisted suicide are acceptable forms of "care".

In August, the Commission began travelling to travel to eleven major cities in the province to consult with interested parties on the issue.

**REAL Women Submits Brief to the Commission**

REAL Women's Quebec Chapter, VRAIES Femmes du Canada, submitted a brief to the Commission. We hope that our Chapter will be selected to present the brief orally to the Commission in order to make a strong impact on it.

**Quebec Always Differs on Moral and Social Issues**

The province of Quebec always takes a different approach to moral and social issues than the rest of Canada. This occurs whether the issue is abortion, marijuana, premarital sex, marriage (or lack thereof), homosexuality, same-sex marriage, etc. Quebec's approach is far more liberal than that of the rest of Canada. Consequently, it is no surprise that public opinion polls in Quebec indicate that the vast majority – 77% according to an Angus Reid poll in February 2010 - believe that those with terminal illness should be entitled to determine the timing of their death. Chairman of the Commission, Kelley, however, insists the Commission will conduct an open debate and has no preconceived notion of what will be decided. Right.

**Grassroots Opposition to Euthanasia**

It is reassuring, however, that an organization opposed to euthanasia was formed in Quebec in June. It is headed by Dr. André Bourque, who has 30 years experience in family medicine in Montreal, and is an associate professor in the Department of Family Medicine at the University of Montreal and former head of General Medicine there. The

organization is called Vivre dans la Dignité (Living with Dignity) and is working with a broad cross-section of ordinary Quebecers, including business people, physicians, lawyers, pharmacists and health care professionals to offset what the organization calls “propaganda and misinformation” on the euthanasia issue.

One of the organization’s members is Dr. Marc Beauchamp, a prominent Montreal orthopedic surgeon, who is an outspoken critic of the leadership of the Federation of Quebec Specialists and General Practitioners for what he calls its attempt to “manipulate” public opinion in favour of euthanasia and assisted suicide. He dismissed as “embarrassing rubbish” a much-publicized survey the Federation of Specialists released, showing 75% of its membership supporting euthanasia and assisted suicide. Dr. Beauchamp stated:

The response rate to the specialists’ survey was only 23 per cent – less than the turnout for municipal elections on a matter that is of fundamental professional importance to doctors. The questions were so amateurishly biased that most of the doctors I know looked at it and refused to respond to such rubbish.

Vivre dans la Dignité will be making a submission to the above-mentioned traveling Parliamentary Commission.

As aptly stated by Linda Couture, a specialist in public health communications, and a director of Vivre dans la Dignité:

Euthanasia and assisted suicide are killing, plain and simple. We cannot allow killing to be confused with health care in Quebec.

### **CUTS TO AID A GOOD IDEA? 'DIALOGUE' AMONGST YOURSELVES**

A social entrepreneur explains why CIDA's decision to untie aid is a step in the right direction  
Reprint from Ottawa Citizen, July 31, 2010 By: Scott Gilmore

The government recently decided that after 40 years it will no longer fund the Canadian Council for International Co-operation, the umbrella group for 90 non-government development and aid agencies.

By the end of this column, the odds that I'll be invited to any more Canadian NGO roundtable-stakeholder-forum-workshops will be smaller than Mel Gibson being asked to host Nickelodeon's Kids' Choice Awards.

To be honest, I'm not really going to miss the invitations. They arrive in the mail every other week and usually abuse the word "dialogue" -- as in, "This meeting will allow key stakeholders to dialogue with the minister on the critical challenges facing the world's poor."

Inevitably, during such round tables, it emerges that the critical challenge is that the government isn't giving enough money to Canadian aid organizations.

Not long ago I accepted an invitation to attend a meeting of Canadian NGOs to discuss Afghanistan with Bev Oda, the minister for the Canadian International Development Agency. I was impressed by the turnout around the very large conference table. There were dozens of NGOs dedicated to eradicating every evil known to man from human-rights violations to malaria to a lack of school supplies. Oddly, only a couple of these organizations were actually operating in Afghanistan. I couldn't figure out why the rest were there. Lord knows if my charity wasn't neck deep in the Afghan sand, I'd have been back in the office sneaking sips of whiskey from my desk drawer and hoping the intern couldn't see.

As soon as the microphones were turned on, I had my answer. Every speaker wanted to talk to the minister about money -- as in, "Why aren't we getting more of it?" ... "Why was our latest proposal to host healing circle therapy seminars for homeless and starving victims of genocide (true story) not funded?" and "Why is CIDA not channelling more aid through its Canadian 'partners?'" Imagine a pack of tweens whining for an increase in allowance and you'll have nailed it nicely.

I left early. Frankly, we don't rely solely on CIDA for our funding and we'd rather talk about Afghanistan. (It had also occurred to me that the intern might be using my absence to nip into my whiskey.)

The problem with these meetings is that Canadian NGOs have built a far too comfortable relationship with CIDA over the years. Here is how it works: The NGOs demand that CIDA spend more money to help the world's poor. CIDA -- wanting to be seen to be helping -- offers grants to support their projects. The NGOs spend the money as fast as they can, stopping only long enough to demand once again that CIDA spend even more money to help the world's poor. Rinse and repeat.

The NGO world insists the amount the government of the day is seen to care about the world's poor is directly proportional to how much it spends. Thus we have the often-repeated goal of dedicating 0.7 per cent of national income to aid. (It's like insisting the quality of a movie is directly proportional to how much is spent filming it.) Unfortunately, this nuance is lost on the NGOs who don't waste much time demanding (of themselves) that the existing levels of funding be spent efficiently or effectively. For them, it's all about volume.

CIDA is trying to change this. It has been focusing funding on specific sectors and specific countries, and most notably it has untied aid, so that non-Canadian agencies can compete for grants, too.

The idea is that aid money should go to the organization that can make the biggest difference, not to the Canadian organization that whines the loudest.

And publicly the Canadian NGOs embraced this. The Canadian Council for International Cooperation (an association of aid organizations) was especially loud in its praise for untying aid: "We welcome this important announcement, which demonstrates the government is serious about making aid more effective."

Well, it turns out, to the CCIC's surprise, CIDA was a little too serious about making aid more effective. So serious, in fact, that they decided their money should be used "for real development work on the ground" and not for organizations that will use it to host yet another round-table where they can "dialogue" with the minister and demand more money.

In other words, they cut funding to the coalition of aid organizations! "Outrage! Bloody murder! Brutal partisanship!" yelled CCIC president Gerry Barr.

In its press release, the coalition noted that since two-thirds of its budget was core funding from CIDA, its very existence was threatened because it couldn't make up the shortfall.

Now, step back for a second. The CCIC is an industry association. Although its industry is aid, it is still an industry association. Imagine if Industry Canada provided the Aerospace Industry Association of Canada with two-thirds of its budget so that the AIAC could then lobby Industry Canada to change its aerospace policies (and give it more money). Insane, right? Not in the aid industry, because there they take the word "partners" very seriously. CIDA gives the CCIC money so the CCIC can ask CIDA for more money. That's what partners do.

Which brings me to the part of the article that will ensure I don't get any more invitations from my colleagues in the Canadian NGO community.

I think it's great CIDA has untied aid. This is one step closer to creating an aid industry where the best ideas get funded, not the coziest partners. And while I regret that several people have lost their jobs, I think it's a good thing CIDA is ending this ridiculous "partnership" and is cutting CCIC's funding.

The Canadian government is not the first to do this. In June, the New Zealand government aid agency stopped funding its local aid industry association, the Council of International Development (which also cried bloody murder, for the record).

This is part of an emerging trend amongst government donors to focus on impact and effectiveness in the face of

budget pressures. In Washington, Canberra and London, governments are undertaking wholesale examinations of how they spend their money and who they spend it on. The days of funding the same NGOs year after year are gone.

There is some hope for CCIC, though. The organizations in the United Kingdom and the United States which play the same role get less than 15 per cent of their funding from their governments. The balance comes from their member NGOs who pay dues, which makes perfect sense. If Bombardier has to pay the AIAC to lobby the government for money, then why shouldn't a Canadian NGO have to do the same?

There are many reasons why the aid industry has failed so miserably in its goal to eradicate global poverty. The symbiotic NGO-donor relationships that encourage greater spending over greater impact is only one reason, but it's an important one.

I'd happily toast an end to those damned workshop-seminar-dialogue-forums, but -- just as I feared -- the bottle in my desk is gone!

Scott Gilmore is the Founder of Peace Dividend Trust, a not-for-profit that finds, tests, and implements new ideas for improving aid and peacekeeping.

## **PROVINCES TAKE UP GAMBLING**

There are some who will do anything for money. There is now a bill before the California State Legislature which will legalize and tax marijuana in order to reduce California's huge deficit of \$42 billion. California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger stated he would welcome public debate on the bill which would, if passed, provide a lucrative new revenue source for the bankrupt state. He also stated that California should first study other countries that have legalized marijuana and other drugs before making such a decision. Such studies, if objective, would disclose the terrible harm marijuana causes for vulnerable individuals who, until it became legal, would have never considered smoking marijuana. Unfortunately, legalizing marijuana makes its use socially acceptable to many. (See article, Marijuana is Dangerous)

Another government leader, Ontario's Premier Dalton McGuinty, has decided that legal, online gambling will be an answer to his prayer for revenue. He hopes it will put a dent in his \$19.7 billion deficit and he plans to initiate online gambling in 2012. The provincially run gaming site will offer ultimately everything from lottery ticket sales to interactive casino-style games and poker online. It is estimated that in the fifth year of operation, the site could start to bring in \$100 million annually and will continue as a reliable source of revenue for the province.

The Ontario government has rationalized this project by claiming that it is simply cutting out the \$400 million that is leaving Ontario by way of illegal online wagering operations, mostly offshore. There are now more than 2000 internet gaming sites operating world-wide at any one time. Many people stay away from these sites, however, due to fear of their unscrupulous nature, or having their credit card numbers stolen. The Ontario government argues that a government-run service will provide a safe and more regulated online environment for betting. However, if the government really wanted to stop the flow of money to offshore companies, it could demand instead that the internet service providers install technology that blocks access to the betting sites.

### **Other Provinces Have the Gambling Bug**

#### **British Columbia**

BC was the first jurisdiction to launch an online, casino-style gambling site in July 2010, offering roulette, black jack and craps. Poker is scheduled to be added next year. The site was shut down, however, within a few days after it was launched, because of the discovery of a security breach that allowed players to play with other users' dollars, and in some cases, to be able to see the other person's account balance and other personal information.

## Quebec

The province of Quebec is always cash-strapped because of its grandiose schemes, such as a \$7.00 a day child care system, which costs the government \$40 per day to operate for each child space, as well as its free IVF treatments for infertile women under the health care plan. So, Quebec is expected to introduce online betting in September.

## Alberta

Alberta is also likely to enter the gambling business. Albertans are the biggest per-capita gamblers in the country, and online gambling will be a response to the province's unusual current cash strapped situation. According to Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission spokeswoman, Lynn Hutchings-Mah, Alberta is still monitoring what is happening in other jurisdictions and has made no final decision yet. There are problems for Alberta in launching an online gambling site. Alberta has 24 traditional casinos, so adding an online version would further saturate the market. In addition, depending on how the internet operation is set up, an online service could compete directly with charity casinos and bingos, depriving the non-profits of revenue.

## Atlantic Provinces

The Atlantic Lottery Corporation has had an online gambling presence since 2004 through a website that offers bingo and lottery tickets and allows people to play interactive games. But, there is no option for games such as playing online poker, or online roulette, blackjack or craps. The Atlantic Lottery has stated that it won't make any further moves on its site until the four Atlantic provinces take a position on extending the online gambling.

## What's Wrong With Online Betting?

In the countries in Europe with online gambling, such as Sweden, the Netherlands and the U.K., as well as in the U.S., the basic contingent of visitors to game sites are pensioners. The game for them is a pastime. Online gambling becomes a substitute for social activity, – but leaves them alone without human interaction, and frequently in debt. The problem is also affecting younger people. Drawn in by the popularity of poker, half of all men in college in the U.S. are gambling on a monthly basis. Youths can go online with their parent's credit cards. According to the Toronto Star (August 15, 2010), "Statistics show a percentage of the gambling public is seriously at risk, with about one-third of all gambling revenue in the province – everything from casinos, race tracks, bingos, lotteries, etc. – coming from only 5 percent of gamblers." That's why anti-addiction advocates and researchers want the Ontario legislature to see beyond finances and ensure that safeguards are in place so the new online betting doesn't simply give vulnerable gamblers another tool with which to destroy their lives. Online gambling is also unsupervised, and people can do it 24 hours a day. That is, online gambling makes easy access for players, who, instead of driving out to a casino or bingo hall, can simply walk to their computer. Experts believe that this is the reason why research shows that problem gambling is three to four times higher among those who play online.

Unfortunately, online gambling also gives rise to the potential of money laundering and hackers intruding to obtain people's personal information. According to the RCMP, money laundering by organized crime groups is already rampant at Canadian casinos. Police acknowledge, however, that not a single person has been charged with money laundering because of other police priorities and a lack of resources.

## Ontario Thinks It Has All The Answers

Ontario thinks that it can come up with an ambitious and well-meaning security system to restrict problem gamblers. It plans to have an age verification system aimed at preventing minors from playing, and include responsible gaming control tools, such as a chat room for people who are worried they have a gambling problem and pop-ups that require players to set a maximum money and time per session. Ontario also plans to require players to submit identifying information, which is verifiable, before they are granted access to play. In short, Ontario believes it can provide a controlled gaming environment.



## The Problem

However, government operated, online gambling gives legitimacy to gambling, and will lead those, who have shied away from online gambling, to give it a try. For those who wind up addicted, they will simply take their business elsewhere if they are removed from the Ontario site. The reality is that people who are already addicted to it, as well as young people, will be engaged in internet gambling, and internet gambling will only make their problem worse.