

THE WHATCOTT DECISION: SCORE: HOMOSEXUALS 1 – RELIGIOUS BELIEF 0

[T]he Supreme Court of Canada recently granted homosexuals a home run, while striking down religious belief.

Working on the assumption that it can't do enough to provide rights and protections for homosexuals, the Supreme Court of Canada recently granted homosexuals a home run, while striking down religious belief. The score: 1—0 for homosexuals

The Charter of Rights protects religious freedoms in section 2 and section 15, but does not mention homosexual rights at all. Not to worry, the Supreme Court merely “wrote-in” protection for homosexuals in 1995 in Egan vs. Nesbit. That done, the Court has galloped ahead striking down left and right, all those interfering religious believers who assert opinions and beliefs which contradict, or impede the advancement of homosexual “progress” in Canadian society.

This is the approach the Supreme Court of Canada took in its decision on February 27, 2013, in the case of Whatcott and the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Whatcott is a former homosexual prostitute and drug addict who subsequently became a devout Christian. He saw it as his duty to expose homosexuality in many pamphlets that he wrote and distributed in Saskatchewan and Alberta, using language in his pamphlets that was blunt and forthright. His pamphlets reflected his personal, practical knowledge of homosexuality as well as his sincere religious beliefs on the issue. As such, they were definitely not written in language of polite social conversation—but in terms that Mr. Whatcott knew and understood: he said what he truly believed.

However, the Supreme Court was not sympathetic to Mr. Whatcott. It defined “hate” as those statements with the potential to incite or inspire discriminatory treatment of others, which may have occurred when an identified group was exposed to “detestation and vilification”. This could occur, according to the court, even if no actual harm was done.

Further, the court went on to say that it was no defence that:

1. the accused honestly believed what he stated;
2. the statement was true; and
3. there was no intent to express hate.

ATTEMPTING TO FIND BALANCE

In an attempt to try to appear “balanced” in its decision, the court also:

(a) struck down the provision in the Saskatchewan Code (and that of Alberta and the North West Territories, which had similar provisions) that allowed the Human Rights Commissions to find an accused guilty if the complainant experiences hurt feelings (paragraph 59) by way of ridiculing, belittling or offending their dignity. The court charged that these provisions were too vague and not sustainable; and

(b) stated that Biblical passages and beliefs and the principles derived therefrom could be advanced (thank heavens for small mercies!). However, that does not mean that religious interpretation of such principles cannot be considered “hate”. Can a pastor still claim that homosexuality is a sin and a destructive and evil force in society, etc.? This is uncertain from a reading of this judgment; and

(c) stated that the Christian belief that “one hates the sin but not the sinner” can no longer be a defence in a charge of “hate”. That is, the Supreme Court held that criticism of an individual's lifestyle can now also be treated as hateful speech against a minority group even though there was no “hate” expressed against that individual.

CONTENTS

THE WHATCOTT DECISION: SCORE: HOMOSEXUALS-1 — RELIGIOUS BELIEF-0	PAGE 1
TRANSGENDERED BILL PASSES HOUSE OF COMMONS	PAGE 2
WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED ABOUT FAMILIES	PAGE 3
THE LONG REACH OF GEORGE SOROS	PAGE 4
HOMOSEXUALS INTEND TO TRANSFORM SOCIETY BY WAY OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM	PAGE 5
HUMAN RIGHTS MUSEUM — A CENTRE FOR PROPAGANDA	PAGE 6

On this basis, the court decided that two of Mr. Whatcott's four pamphlets were "hateful" because they referred to homosexuals as sodomites and pedophiles, that they were spreading disease and, that their propaganda was unacceptable in public schools.

This conclusion by the Supreme Court of Canada directly contradicts the opinion of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal, which concluded that none of Mr. Whatcott's pamphlets constitute "hate" literature. So much for objective analysis by judges. This judgment is clearly a subjective interpretation based on the judges' personal ideologies.

It is noted that the Bible does refer to homosexuality as "sodomy". The Criminal Code, up until 1989, referred to homosexual acts as "buggery". (Homosexual NDP MP, Svend Robinson, had the Code amended that year to refer to homosexuality as "anal sex"). Is the word "buggery" also taboo along with sodomy?

Even homosexuals, themselves, acknowledge that their lifestyle is not healthy. They laid a complaint before the Canadian Human Rights Commission in February, 2009 listing the special health problems they experience as a result of their lifestyle and insist that the government must provide them with special funding to deal with their medical problems. They claimed that they experienced lower life expectancy than the average Canadian, a higher suicide rate, and higher rates of substance abuse, smoking and depression. They complained about inadequate access to care for HIV/AIDS and cancer—both anal cancers and those caused

by exposure to the human papillomavirus which leads to head, throat and neck cancers.

This list of health problems, provided by homosexuals, may all be true, exacerbated by their abnormal sexual activities, but to refer to them may now be "hateful" according to the Supreme Court decision in the Whatcott case.

Also, there is a link between pedophilia and homosexuality as there is a greater incidence of pedophilia among homosexuals than heterosexuals. This established, scientific fact may no longer be publicly stated because it might be interpreted as "hate" under the Whatcott decision.

This Supreme Court of Canada decision is truly garbled, inconsistent and is not based on any substantive evidence—just ideology. In short, how on earth is a citizen to determine whether one has crossed the line into "hate"? This decision casts a severe chill on freedom of speech and religion.

The all-powerful, preening members of the Human Rights Tribunals will presumably now be empowered to sort this all out and, as usual, their decision will go against the accused without the benefit of rules of evidence or procedures. The accused will have to pay the costs of a hearing from his/her own pocket, while the complainant's case will be looked after by the Commission at the taxpayers' expense. This is draconian.

Does one suppose these Supreme Court judges have actually thought through their decision in this "hate" case? One has good reason to wonder. †

TRANSGENDERED BILL PASSES HOUSE OF COMMONS

Private Member's Bill C-279 ... was debated at third reading in the House of Commons. ... A vote on the amendments and the bill on March 20 passed in the House of Commons 149 to 137 thanks to 18 Conservative MPs who voted in favour of this NDP bill.

Private Member's Bill C-279, which would add "gender identity" to the Human Rights Act and the Criminal Code, was debated at third reading in the House of Commons on February 27 and March 7. Sponsor of the bill, Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP) tabled amendments removing "gender expression", as a compromise move to bring some Conservative MPs to his side. A vote on the amendments and the bill on March 20 passed in the House of Commons 149 to 137 thanks to 18 Conservative MPs who voted in favour of this NDP bill.

With the addition of "gender identity" Garrison claims to be "completing the Canadian human rights agenda" and joining "the wave of change that is sweeping across the country to eliminate one of the last vestiges of legal discrimination and violence against members of our community."

VAGUE, UNDEFINED AND UNNECESSARY

"Gender identity" is a vague and undefined term. Sexual extremists drafted the so-called Yogyakarta Principles which attempted to legitimize all sexual activities. This document has been rejected by every member of the United Nations, yet, Randall Garrison proposed a definition of "gender identity" from the unacceptable Yogyakarta Principles. The latter defined "gender identity" as "each person's deeply felt internal and individual experience of gender, which may or may not correspond with the sex assigned at birth." These feelings, presumably, can change from day to day.

New terms are now entering the debate on gender identity, such as “gender varied”, “gender non-conforming”, without clear definitions. GLBT has morphed into GLBTQIA etc. The sponsor of the bill, Randall Garrison, has admitted “Once gender identity is in the human rights code, the courts and human rights commissions will interpret what that means.” (Xtra, June 5, 2012)

Many argue that C-279 is unnecessary because the transgendered have already had their complaints addressed by tribunals and courts, under discrimination based on sex and disability. Representatives of both the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal and Canadian Human Rights Commission affirmed this at Justice Committee hearings. Several court cases were cited during debate and by witnesses such as REAL Women at Committee.

LEFT WING SUPPORT

The Liberal, Bloc and Green parties support this NDP bill. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.), former Liberal Justice Minister under Prime Minister Paul Martin, defended C-279 at third reading. Mr. Cotler’s comments gives us a foretaste of what lies ahead if “gender identity” as proposed by Mr. Garrison, is passed into law. According to Mr. Cotler, the passage of Bill C-279 will expand government outreach to raise awareness of transgender issues; Human Rights Commissions will keep statistics on incidents of discrimination against them, and public officials will be given briefings and training on this issue.

Mylene Freeman (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, NDP) foresees proactive training for police, airport officials, teachers, legal personnel and medical personnel. This bill is supported by major unions such as

Canadian Labour Congress (“CLC”), Canadian Union of Public Employees (“CUPE”), Canadian Union of Postal Workers (“CUPW”), Canadian Auto Workers (“CAW”), Canadian Association of University Teachers (“CAUT”) and BC Teachers’ Federation, as well as student unions. Supporters are already building a new industry around “transgender”, at taxpayer expense, of course.

LGBT “COMMUNITY” DIVIDED

The NDP portrays the LGBTQIA (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, Intersex, Ally/Asexual) community as united, but, it is noted that there are serious divisions among the different identities, with Gays objecting to the Queers and Transgenders riding the wave of gay rights. NDP MPs also linked Bill C-279 to anti-bullying and “pink shirt day” spirit. Massachusetts, which has recently passed “gender identity” legislation, is experiencing an onslaught of activism in the schools where children are supported in their gender confusion and parents are stereotyped as barriers to their children developing the gender identity of their deeply felt choice.

As MP David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) pointed out at 3rd reading, it is risky and irresponsible to pass legislation which would include undefined terms to be left to courts and tribunals to define and expand upon.

Let us hope this NDP bill is defeated in the Senate for the sake of those who experience gender confusion. A 2011 long-term Swedish study found substantially higher rates of overall mortality, death from cardiovascular disease and suicide, suicide attempts, and psychiatric hospitalizations in “sex-reassigned” individuals, compared to a healthy control population. †

WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED ABOUT FAMILIES

This first report on the importance of a two parent family ... is a strong starting point in understanding a child’s development and well-being.

Because of the importance of raising children in the best possible circumstances, there is a strong need to assess family life across the globe.

As a result, a number of Foundations, non-government organizations, universities and the Ottawa based Institute of Marriage and Family Canada (a part of Focus on the Family Canada) collaborated to form The World Family Map Project. This undertaking was the initiative of Child Trends, an independent, non-partisan research centre that

provides research, data and analysis to improve outcomes for children.

In January 2013, the first findings of the World Family Map project were made public. The association reviewed family trends in 45 countries representing every region of the world and a majority of the world’s population. This review explored the links between family structure (i.e. the number of parents in the household) and children’s educational outcomes in low, medium and high income families. According to this report, marriage plays an important role in providing a stable context for bearing and rearing children, and for integrating fathers into the lives of their children, which relates directly to children’s educational potential.

Some of the findings of the World Family Map Project:

(1) Children living in two-parent families, that are middle or high income, are more likely to stay on track in school and demonstrate better reading literacy than children living with one or no parents. This is important for the future success of the children's employment and earning opportunities as well as their health outcomes.

(2) Childbearing outside of marriage is increasing in many regions. In Canada, 27% of children are born outside of legal marriage, compared to 41% in the United States, and 55% in Mexico. According to the 2011 Canadian Census, 19% of heterosexual couples live in a common-law relationship and most births from non-marital relationships come from this group.

(3) Eating meals as a family was found to be an important predictor of adolescent flourishing. In the North American countries, frequent family meal-sharing rates hovered consistently around 70% (in Asia – 67%, in Indonesia 85%, in Japan 69% and in Peru 86%). There was no specific breakdown provided for Canada in this regard.

(4) Support for voluntary single motherhood is markedly higher in North America, Europe, Australia and New Zealand than in other regions. In the United States, 52% approved of unmarried motherhood; 46% approved of it in Canada and 80% approved in Spain, in contrast to 32% in Poland.

(5) Despite the fact that single motherhood was approved by 46% of adults in Canada, 65% of Canadian adults expressed the belief that mother/father households were optimal for raising happy children. That is, the public's attitude in Canada was that, the ideal for a home is to have a mother and father, rather than a single parent.

(6) A clear majority (78%) of adults in Canada believe that working mothers do as well as mothers who are not in paid employment outside of the home.

(7) 83% of Canadians completely trust their families which they regard as a fundamental source of social solidarity, which provides emotional and social support. In comparison, 91% of both Turkish and Egyptian adults indicated complete trust in their families. 83% had complete trust in their families in Australia, 85% in South Africa, 63% in the Netherlands and 94% in Sweden.

This first issue of The World Family Map highlights the important role that families play in children's educational achievement. There are many other important dimensions to families that impact on children other than the number of parents in a household. These, however, will be examined in future reports. This first report on the importance of a two parent family, in regard to education, is a strong starting point in understanding a child's development and well-being. †

THE LONG REACH OF GEORGE SOROS

[I]f there is a law restricting morally subversive human behaviour, then Mr. Soros hates it, and uses his vast wealth anywhere in the world to change the policy.

George Soros, a Hungarian born, American citizen, has a net worth of \$19 billion. He uses his money as a tool to manipulate public policy globally. He does this through his Open Society Foundations, the objective of which is to overturn laws prohibiting human drug use, prostitution, homosexual practices and euthanasia, etc.

In short, if there is a law restricting morally subversive human behaviour, then Mr. Soros hates it, and uses his vast wealth anywhere in the world to change the policy to one more to his liking.

Mr. Soros' arm has, not surprisingly, reached into Canada on numerous occasions. He has provided funds for the so-called "harm reduction" drug organizations in Canada, which aim to decriminalize drug use in Canada. He bought ads in the 2008 federal election to defeat Conservative candidates. He tried to stop the Conservative Sun Media News (SMN) from obtaining a license from the CRTC to operate in Canada.

These activities, financed solely by Mr. Soros' vast wealth, have been carried out via his New York based, liberal organization, called Avaaz, which name means "voice"

in a number of languages. It has no Canadian website, no Canadian employees and no Canadian telephone number. The organization states in its press release that it is "funded by donations" (ie. those of Mr. Soros) and receives no government funds. It doesn't need any.

On February 21, 2013, Avaaz distributed a vicious press release attacking the Sun Media News application to the CRTC for "full carriage", ie: to place the channel on all cable systems, the same as the CRTC had given CBC News and CTV News when they started up (see REALity, March 2013). Sun News Media requested this so that it can be viewed in all Canadian homes, not just a few specialty channels as is the case at present.

The Avaaz press release was an eye opener: it called Sun's news broadcasts "filth" and "disgusting" and the "mouthpiece for the right wing". Just a guess, but it's likely that Avaaz doesn't much like conservative opinions!

The press release urges Canadians to raise "truckloads" of comments to the CRTC to tell them that Sun News "filth" on our TV is "not good for our country or our culture". It went on to say, "once it obtains 50,000 comments to the CRTC, it will hire a crack legal team to present its case to the CRTC".

How does this U.S. based and funded organization know what's good for Canadians? Obviously, it is of the opinion that Canadians need help in sorting out our own affairs. How arrogant is that? †

HOMOSEXUALS INTEND TO TRANSFORM SOCIETY BY WAY OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM

We must carefully elect governments who will not be manipulated by the media and pressured by left-wing activists to adapt our culture to accommodate the homosexual culture. It is up to us.

The tried and true method to transform culture is to control both the media and the educational system.

A prominent example of this successful approach occurred in Quebec in the 1960's where the twins of human control—the media and the education system—successfully turned the Quebec population, in a few short years, from a devout religious community to a secular, anti-religious society.

Homosexuals are only a very small minority in Canadian society. According to the 2009 Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS)—(the latter established jointly by Statistics Canada and Health Canada)—only 1.1% of Canadians between 18 to 59 years of age are homosexuals.

Despite the small numbers, homosexual activists have taken control of the media in Canada, putting only positive and selected information forward on the topic. As a result, we rarely read or view the truth about homosexuality, such as its deadly effect on health and life caused by abnormal sexual practices, the link between pedophilia and homosexuality where ratios for pedophilia are much higher among homosexuals than among heterosexuals, and the psychological damage caused by the promiscuous lifestyle, leading to loneliness, abandonment and despair as they age. This latter tragic reality about homosexuality is carefully kept from public view and we are supposed to regard homosexual behavior as perfectly normal.

Since the media have capitulated to homosexual activists' pressure, these activists have now turned their full attention to the education system to dismantle what they describe as the "homophobic and trans-phobic" culture which they claim has caused the unjustifiable curtailment of "queer people" and their equality rights.

The manifesto for this undertaking has been outlined in a book written by Donn Short, a homosexual Professor of Law at the University of Manitoba and published by UBC press in 2013. His book is called, "Don't Be So Gay! Queers, Bullying and Making Schools Safe."

Mr. Short argues that schools must start in the early grades to begin the cultural transformation, using the law to confront religious based claims. He describes this as taking on God. He asserts that transformational solutions must come from state issued laws to seek wide-spread cultural transformation.

He argues that the resistance to sexual orientation was earlier formed in terms that stressed an allegiance to "tradition" and "social norms". Now, however, he claims that arguments against homosexuality are "pretty much exclusively and overtly religious in nature".

Mr. Short argues that it is now necessary to successfully "queer" schools to make them safer by aiming at transforming the "heterosexual" culture so as to render queers and their privileges as normal, as reported daily in the media.

In this regard, Mr. Short believes that the provincial initiatives, such as Ontario's Bill 13 and Manitoba's Bill 18, the supposedly anti-bullying bills, that require the establishment of gay-straight alliance clubs in schools are not sufficient to transform the culture. He asserts that what is required is a more specific law and policy under the provincial Education Acts to be applied in the earliest grades (the Ontario and Manitoba bills only apply to high schools). He believes that the entire curriculum must change to include homosexual content and to recognize homosexual families. This requires a "wall-to-wall transformational approach that includes the playing fields, the stages, the artwork on display in hallways, media classes, sports, music, visual arts, friendships, libraries, music rooms, loyalties, clubs, the machine shops, the gyms and the classrooms" to be used in pursuit of providing sexual minority youths and their interests priority both on and off school property. This is required because schools are such a crucial part of the lives of homosexuals as well as all other children. In short, he believes that this day in, day out approach to homosexual propaganda will achieve the desired cultural transformation.

Such an approach, however, would clearly infringe on religious freedom and that of opinion and thought. It is aimed at specifically silencing those who disagree with homosexual activity and the deadly consequences of living the gay lifestyle. These changes are nothing short of political indoctrination using our children to transform the culture to accept the homosexual lifestyle.

Unless Canadians raise strong objections to this proposal, which amounts to no less than a culture of death for our children, it is inevitable that the transformation of our culture will occur at the insistence of these homosexual activists. We have been duly warned.

For those who think this is too far-fetched, just consider that same-sex marriage and gay/straight alliance groups in our schools were off the radar just a few short years ago. We must stop such a transformation of our culture. We must carefully elect governments who will not be manipulated by the media and pressured by left-wing activists to adapt our culture to accommodate the homosexual culture. It is up to us. †

HUMAN RIGHTS MUSEUM —A CENTRE FOR PROPAGANDA

[The Human Rights] Museum has become a tool to champion liberal causes: it uses a biased interpretation of “rights”, not those established in the UN’s Declaration of Human Rights to which all nations and individuals have agreed.

From the very beginning, REAL Women of Canada has been concerned about the Canadian Human Rights Museum in Winnipeg. Although its founder, the late Izzy Asper, stated that he did not want the museum to become a propaganda device for a particular political point of view (Ottawa Citizen—April 17, 2003), in fact, that is exactly what it has become.

REAL Women of Canada was alerted to the possibility that the Museum would become a propaganda centre for a left wing interpretation of human rights, such as feminism and homosexuality, when the first executive director of the museum just happened to be a homosexual activist. The Museum also established a homosexual committee to advise it. This Committee was headed by a Vancouver lesbian activist, Jennifer Breakspear. Also, the museum’s Content Advisory Council consisted almost entirely of feminists and homosexuals. When this Content Advisory Council travelled across Canada to supposedly obtain input from Canadians as to the exhibits they wished to have included in the museum, the Council dismissed all input from pro-life family individuals who had taken the

time and had an interest in contributing to the museum.

In April 2007, the Conservative government designated the museum as a “national museum” and agreed to provide the museum with both \$1 million to assist the start-up costs and approximately \$22 million annually to cover its operating costs.

It seems now that our concerns were well justified. The museum recently put out a call to same-sex couples in Canada to contribute to its same-sex marriage exhibit. Same-sex marriage is not a “human right” but, is, rather, a travesty of genuine marriage, brought about by pressure from the left wing mainstream media and liberal activists. It is not and will never be a human right and will always remain a pretense or charade of marriage—a standing joke—and a black mark against contemporary society.

This museum has become a tool to champion liberal causes: it uses a biased interpretation of “rights”, not those established in the UN’s Declaration of Human Rights to which all nations and individuals have agreed.

Some legitimate exhibits will be sprinkled here and there throughout the museum to give it a pretense of legitimacy. In actual fact, the museum is a eulogy to former Prime Minister Trudeau and his Charter of Rights (which has resulted in imperial courts imposing their undemocratic, ideological decisions on Canadians) and to liberal, humanist values—not universally accepted human rights.

What a waste of the taxpayers’ money and an insult to the integrity and real concerns of Canadians. †

MESSAGE BOARD

- **Annual General Meeting** at 7:00 p.m. on May 31, 2013 at Cartier Place Suite Hotel at 180 Cooper St in Ottawa.
- **Nominations for Board of Directors** may be sent in writing by two members with resume of nominee by May 17, 2013. Send to National Office address or email. [Click here.](#)
- **Resolutions** may be submitted by May 17, 2013 to National Office address or by email. [Click here.](#)

REALity is a publication of **REAL Women of Canada**

PO Box 8813 Station T Ottawa ON K1G 3J1 • Tel 613-236-4001 Fax 613-236-7203
www.realwomenofcanada.ca • info@realwomenofcanada.org

SUPPORT REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

PLEASE MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO JOIN OUR WORK
TO DEFEND & PROTECT LIFE & THE FAMILY

Membership: **\$25/year** • Group rate: **\$30/year** • Donation: _____
Being a political lobby group, contributions are not tax deductible.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Province _____ Postal Code _____

Tel _____ Email _____

Send online at www.realwomenofcanada.ca or by mail. Thank you.



Find Us on [Facebook](#).