

## THE FRAUD OF THE CANADIAN JUDICIAL COUNCIL



**The complaints procedure of the CJC is clearly inadequate and even the Canadian Bar Association has recently jumped into the controversy.**

Although the Judges Act provides that complaints may be made to the Canadian Judicial Council (CJC) for alleged misconduct by judges, the reality is that this process of complaint is meaningless.

This is because, in practice, the Council operates as an insiders' club with a total lack of transparency. The Council consists of only judges, headed by the Chief Justice of Canada, Beverley McLachlin. The role of the Council appears to be to protect judges from legitimate complaints by the public, rather than to protect the public from the misconduct and bias of judges. In effect, the CJC protects arrogant and insolent judges who, figuratively speaking, thumb their noses at Parliament and its legislative intentions, secure in the knowledge that the CJC will protect them.

In its complaint procedures, the CJC has put in place barriers to anyone making a complaint. For example, section 2.2 of the procedure provides that the executive director shall not open a file for complaints if he is of a view that the complaint is "clearly irrational ... or an abuse of the complaint process". One may ask, who is the Executive Director, a paid employee, to decide whether a complaint is worthy of being brought forward? Further, even if the Executive Director does refer the complaint to the Chairperson of the Council's Conduct Committee, that Chairperson creates a further barrier as he may order the file be closed if, in his opinion, under section 3.5, it is "trivial, vexatious, made for an improper purpose, manifestly without substance, or does not warrant further consideration".

REAL Women of Canada has had extensive experience with the barriers in the complaint process of the CJC. Our complaints have been arbitrarily dismissed as "being without substance" and "not warranting further consideration". This has occurred even though our complaints have been based on a reasonable apprehension of bias by the judges.

For example:

1. In September 1988, REAL Women brought a complaint against Chief Justice Brian Dickson, objecting to his meeting privately with a feminist lobby group, including members of the legal arm of a feminist movement, the Women's Legal Education and Action Fund (LEAF), which, at that specific time, had four separate cases before the Supreme Court of Canada. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss "how the new equality rights [under the Charter] would be interpreted by the judiciary". REAL Women was advised, however, by the CJC that the fact that the Chief Justice of Canada "...was able to take the time in his onerous schedule" to meet with these individuals was, to be "commended, and not criticized".

It is unconscionable that the Chief Justice met privately with a special interest group to discuss the very issues that the group was bringing before his court.

2. In February 1990, Madame Justice Bertha Wilson gave a speech in which she referred to:

"... 'A distinctively male perspective' that exists in the law and has led to legal principles that 'are not fundamentally sound'." She went on to say: "Some aspects of the criminal law in particular cry out for change since they are based on presuppositions about the nature of women and women's sexuality that in this day and age are little short of ludicrous."

## CONTENTS

THE FRAUD OF THE CANADIAN JUDICIAL COUNCIL .....	PAGE 1
POPULATION CONTROLLERS HATE HUMANITY .....	PAGE 3
SEXUAL REVOLUTION AND DEMOGRAPHIC WINTERS .....	PAGE 4
THE LEFT PLANTS FALSEHOODS TO MISLEAD THE PUBLIC .....	PAGE 5

REAL Women laid a complaint against Judge Wilson on the grounds that her speech indicated a bias in her approach to her duties in that she endorsed the views of feminists in their interpretation of Canadian laws. In its response, the CJC stated that there was nothing to suggest a formal investigation as it found nothing in Judge Wilson's speech that was "deeply disturbing and indicative of her inability to properly carry out her duties to impartially and objectively interpret the law".

3. In April 1991, Madame Justice Beverley McLachlin delivered a speech in Calgary in which she criticized specific areas of the criminal law which, she asserted, were the result of a "male-dominated Parliament" which did not reflect the "female perspective". REAL Women's complaint asserted that Judge McLachlin's comments indicated that she had pre-judged the law and had inappropriately crossed the line from the judicial role to the political one, which undermined the integrity of the Supreme Court.

In its response, the CJC stated that Judge McLachlin had merely provided "informative and historical analysis ... of interest to all those who care to consider the important issues which she chose to address". Further, the CJC stated that Judge McLachlin's speech "has contributed to a greater understanding and sensitivity as to how the criminal law has impacted on women". This comment assumed that all women think the same way feminists do and that a feminist analysis of the law is the only acceptable one.

4. Madame Justice Claire L'Heureux-Dubé criticized, in one of her judgements, a decision by Alberta Court of Appeal Judge John McClung, claiming that he had promoted "myths and stereotypes" about sexual assault.

REAL Women submitted a complaint to the CJC asserting that her comments indicated she had a bias in support of feminism. We backed our complaint with evidence that Judge L'Heureux-Dubé was a founding member, as well as a board member, of a prominent feminist group in Canada (funded by The Status of Women) and that she was a member of a feminist international group: she served on its executive, even after she was appointed to the court.

The CJC responded, however, that the documentation we provided on Judge L'Heureux-Dubé was not relevant, and, to our astonishment, that Judge L'Heureux-Dubé was not personally aware of her own association with the international feminist group!

The off-handed dismissal of our complaints by the CJC indicates the lengths to which it went to protect judges.

*It is significant that, at the time of the REAL Women complaints to the CJC, the executive director of the CJC was Jeannie Thomas, who was well known as a committed feminist. Her position and personal views did not provide REAL Women with any confidence in her objectivity in regard to our complaints, but, rather, indicated that she used her position to protect her fellow feminists.*

5. Chief Justice Roy McMurtry of the Ontario Court of Appeal had a conflict of interest when he legalized same-sex marriage, when his daughter was living in a homosexual union and, as a result, was directly affected by his decision in that case.

The CJC's response to our complaint was that "the sexual orientation of a judge's children was not ... indicative of any bias on the part of a judge".

The issue before Judge McMurtry, however, was whether same-sex unions should be recognized as legal. That is, the case dealt specifically with the legal rights of same-sex unions – a matter which directly related to McMurtry's daughter's own personal relationship. In short, the case dealt with the acquisition of new, controversial rights and privileges, which directly applied to his daughter's situation and, therefore, he should have recused (withdrawn) himself from the case. It is significant that Mr. Justice Rosenblatt, a member of the New York Court of Appeal, was in the same position in that his daughter was a declared lesbian at the time a same-sex marriage case was brought before him. Because of this he recused himself.

In addition, REAL Women included in its complaint that Judge McMurtry, after handing down his decision, partied with the litigants in the case. The latter placed photographs on their website of the Chief Justice with his arms embracing the litigants. In response to this concern the Council stated:

*Attendance at such events is important to ensure ongoing exchanges between the judiciary and other members of the legal profession. If Chief Justice McMurtry was asked to have his photograph taken with Messrs. Bourassa and Varnell, it might indeed have been viewed as mean-spirited or worse to have declined. ...*

If a judge had refused to be photographed with any other successful litigant in a case he had recently presided over, it would most certainly have been regarded as a reasonable and judicious decision. In the case of these same-sex litigants, however, according to the Council, such a refusal would have been "mean spirited or worse". What a shallow, transparent double standard!

## **THE CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION JUMPS INTO THE CJC CONTROVERSY**

The complaints procedure of the CJC is clearly inadequate and even the Canadian Bar Association (CBA) has recently jumped into the controversy. The CBA, historically, has resolutely supported the judiciary—mainly, because, under the Liberal government, many of the CBA executive have been mysteriously appointed to the Bench. That is, the CBA never previously wanted to offend the judiciary, not only to protect its members' personal ambitions, but also because being respectful of the judges serves as their bread and butter, since it assists them in the successful outcomes of their cases.

It was surprising, therefore, that in August 2014, the CBA made recommendations to reform the CJC. One of its recommendations was that the CJC complaint process would be more credible if it ceased to consist only of judges, i.e., it should also include members of the public. According

to the CBA's submission the public should take part. The submission went on to say that "every self-governing profession is vulnerable to the suggestion that they protect members of their profession at the expense of the public interest". In this case, truer words were never spoken. †

## POPULATION CONTROLLERS HATE HUMANITY

**Once millions of people have been eliminated to the satisfaction of the population controllers, they believe they would then be left in a position to better manage the world.**

The fact that population controllers hate humanity has never been made more evident than in their reaction to the recent spread of the vicious Ebola virus. They view it as a welcome development to curtail the curse of population growth.

Dr. Charles Arntzen, from the Arizona State University, who developed an experimental treatment for Ebola, has joked about using Ebola to cull large portions of the population.

Dr. Eric Pianka from the University of Texas, who was named the 2006 Distinguished Texas Scientist by the Texas Academy of Science, speaking on the topic of reducing the world's population, made a statement on Ebola, in 2006, that makes one's hair stand on end. He stated:

*War and famine would not do. Instead, disease offered the most efficient and fastest way to kill the billions that must soon die if the population crisis is to be solved. AIDS is not an efficient killer because it is too slow. My favourite candidate for eliminating 90 percent of the world's population is airborne Ebola (Ebola Reston), because it is both highly lethal and it kills in days, instead of years. ...*

Thomas Ferguson, of the U.S. State Department Office of Population Affairs, stated, in 1982, in the Executive Intelligence Review, Special Report, The Global 2000 Report: *Once population is out of control, it requires authoritarian government, even fascism, to reduce it ...*

*The quickest way to reduce population is through famine, like in Africa, or through disease like the Black Death ...*

When Henry Kissinger was Secretary of State for President Richard Nixon, under his direction, a confidential document was prepared, in 1974, referred to as the National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM) 200. This document, declassified in 1990, revealed that the U.S. was determined to limit population growth in developing countries because rapid population growth could cause civil unrest, which would affect U.S. access to minerals and other natural resources. Thirteen countries were listed, whose rapid population growth was unacceptable to Washington.

It is significant that NSSM 200 recognized that population control was much cheaper than development. At page 53 the Memorandum raised the issue of: "... how much more efficient expenditures for population control might be, than raising production through direct investments in additional irrigation and power projects and factories."

Once millions of people have been eliminated to the satisfaction of the population controllers, they believe they would then be left in a position to better manage the world. †



**This is me! My ultra sound picture BEFORE BIRTH: LEGAL TO KILL**



**Still me! After I am born AFTER BIRTH: ILLEGAL TO KILL**



# THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION AND DEMOGRAPHIC WINTERS

A pro-family conference was held in Moscow, Russia on September 10 to 11, 2014.

The individuals attending the conference didn't necessarily agree on President Putin's behavior in the Ukrainian conflict. However, they did agree that we are in a global crisis that is attacking the nature and identity of the human person and we all shared the same determination to rise against it. The topic at the conference was not simply the family, but *large families* because they can reverse the demographic crisis that threatens the future of most nations.

One of the outstanding speakers at this conference was Don Feder, former columnist for the Boston Herald. He gave an excellent speech entitled: *The Sexual Revolution and Demographic Winters*, as follows:

## “THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION AND DEMOGRAPHIC WINTERS”

By: Don Feder

If current trends continue, we won't run out of energy or other natural resources in the foreseeable future. We will run out of people. This global catastrophe will be the result of rapidly declining fertility, known as Demographic Winter.

In 1960, worldwide, the average woman had 5 children. Now, that number is 2.6 and falling—in other words, a decline of almost 50% in a little more than 50 years. Today, 59 countries with 44% of the world's population have below-replacement fertility. Many developed nations have fertility rates of 1.5 or lower, with 2.1 needed just to replace current population.

This didn't happen spontaneously. Demographic Winter is the direct result of the Sexual Revolution—which first became noticeable in the late 1960s, not coincidentally, about the time birth rates began to fall.

The dogma of the Sexual Revolution—which has become ingrained social wisdom in the West—might be summarized as follows: 1. Sex is the most important aspect of existence. 2. When sex is consensual, it's always good. 3. The primary purpose of sex is pleasure, not procreation or the physical expression of love. 4. The primary purpose of life is pleasure. 5. Inhibitions lead to neuroses and must be overcome. 6. Sex has nothing to do with morality and 7. Sex should not only be guilt-free, but free of consequences—hence contraception, hence abortion, hence abandonment of marriage.

The prophets of the Sexual Revolution include Sigmund Freud, “researchers” like Alfred Kinsey and Masters and Johnson, pornographers like Playboy founder Hugh Hefner and feminists like Margaret Sanger, Betty Freidan and Simone de Beauvoir. In the United States, the Sexual Revolution is spearheaded by groups like Planned Parenthood, the National Organization for Women, the (homosexual) Human Rights

Campaign and the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS).

The impact of the Sexual Revolution on fertility can not be overstated.

For the first time in history, just under half the world's population of child-bearing age uses some form of birth control. By 2015, the global contraceptives market will generate an estimated \$17.2 billion annually.

Overwhelmingly, this is financed by governments, businesses or international aid agencies. Other species have become extinct. Ours may be the first to finance its own extinction.

Worldwide, there are approximately 42 million abortions a year. That's more than twice the number of military deaths in World War II.

From a demographic perspective, we're not just losing 42 million people annually, but also their children, grandchildren and other descendants down through the ages. We are, quite literally, aborting our future.

The flight from marriage has affected fertility even more profoundly than contraceptives. In France, in 2010, more people began living together than married.

In the United States, in 1960, 59% of 18-to-29-year olds (those in their prime childbearing years) were married, compared to only 20% today.

Once a central reality of existence, marriage is increasingly optional. In its place have come cohabitation, casual liaisons and out-of-wedlock births. Not surprisingly, fewer marriages—especially early marriages—result in fewer children.

Just as Demographic Winter is the result of the Sexual Revolution, the latter is the result of something called Cultural Marxism—a movement associated with Antonio Gramsci, the Frankfurt School and Herbert Marcuse.

Cultural Marxism was their answer to the failure of worldwide revolution after the First World War. Gramsci believed family and church gave workers what communists called a “false class consciousness” that made them immune to the appeals of Marxism.

The solution, then, was to destroy the family and religion—and what better way to do that than to foster sexual license and a society oriented toward mindless pleasure and away from hearth and home.

While there's no proof that dramatically declining fertility is what Cultural Marxists wanted, it's the natural consequence of creating a highly eroticized society where family is viewed as an obstacle to self-fulfillment and children as a burden.

We won't find our way out of the forest of Demographic Winter until the Sexual Revolution is overthrown—its prophets exposed and its dogma debunked.

Ultimately, the Sexual Revolution is about death—

abortion, contraception, sexually-transmitted disease, pornography and promiscuity, in place of marriage, fidelity, procreation, and responsibility.

To combat both the Sexual Revolution and Demographic

Winter, we must embrace a philosophy of life.

For does not the Bible tell us: 'I have set before you this day life and death, blessings and curses. Therefore, choose life so that you may live—you and your children.' " †

## THE LEFT PLANTS FALSEHOODS TO MISLEAD THE PUBLIC – PART II



**The media seems to relish misleading the public, deliberately (sometimes negligently) making wildly inaccurate statements which embellish the liberal slant to their articles.**

The media seem to relish misleading the public, deliberately (sometimes negligently) making wildly inaccurate statements which embellish the liberal slant to their articles.

Canadians are not supposed to notice what the media are doing—but are supposed to obediently acknowledge the “superior knowledge” of the media. Some may do so, but most of us are not such fools. We prefer a careful analysis of the facts rather than falsehoods.

Some of the media’s favourite, most repeated, falsehoods include the following:

### **1. Homosexuals make up 10% of the Canadian population.**

The claim that 10% of the population is homosexual has been central to the homosexual activists’ effort to legitimize their lifestyle. This 10% figure is unblushingly and routinely repeated by the secular media. The latter should be ashamed of themselves for such unprofessional misrepresentation of the facts.

The mythical 10% figure was derived from the 1948 and 1953 Kinsey Reports. Dr. Kinsey was an Indiana University zoologist who openly espoused unconventional, unorthodox and illegal sexual behaviour, including sex between adults and children, between humans and animals and sexual abuse of children in his experiments. He was a deeply disturbed man who, even his admiring biographers admit, was a sadistic bisexual/homosexual. His “research” has been entirely discredited—but the myth he created lives on, thanks, mainly, to the media. A very clever 2004 Fox Studios movie portrayed him as a hero who liberated a generation from sexual inhibitions.

The latest data from Statistics Canada’s Canadian Community Health Survey show that 1.3% of Canadians 18 to 59 who reported in 2012 consider themselves to be homosexual (gay or lesbian). 1.1% consider themselves to be bisexual.

### **2. Gay couples are now commonplace and accepted.**

Feature articles in daily newspapers would lead us to believe that same-sex couples are a common occurrence. In their report on 2011 census couples, Statistics Canada highlighted a “huge” 42.4% increase in same-sex couples from 2006 to 2011, with same-sex married couples tripling. The media enthusiastically repeated the news. But a closer look, beyond StatsCan release of selected data, shows that same-sex couples amounted to a mere 0.8% of all couples. And only 32.5% of these couples were married, an infinitesimal 0.26% of all couples. This is the final result of the Liberal and NDP shake-up of Parliament and society to redefine marriage in 2005 to make it available to same sex partners: 0.26% of Canadian couples! And there is hysterical media objection to income splitting for families with children because the left claims, falsely, that it only benefits some Canadians, whereas the media ignore the fact that immoral, unacceptable, same-sex “marriages” are only a speck, barely recognizable in the national statistics.

### **3. Gay Couples With Children Are Commonplace**

Full page feature articles trying to show that married male couples with toddlers are just part of the New Canada, also mislead the public. These couples, male same-sex couples with children under 25 at home (StatsCan designation), consistently represent 3.4% of all same-sex couples (the 0.8% of all couples), that is, 0.027% of all couples in Canada. But only 32.5% of same-sex couples are married, which would indicate, according to available data, that in fact, only 0.009% of Canadian couples are married same-sex men with children under 25 at home.

In Canada, lesbian same-sex couples with children outnumber male same-sex couples with children 5 to 1. However, half of the children in lesbian households are children generated from previous male-female unions. Only 16.5% of all lesbian couples had children in their household according to the 2011 census.

### **4. Women earn 72 cents for every dollar earned by a male worker**

Another falsehood used consistently by feminists and faithfully reported in the media is that women are victims who are discriminated against in the workplace since they

earn 72% of what men earn. This falsehood has been repeated by US President Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, the Ontario Pay Equity Commission, YWCA publications, and shamefully is still used by Status of Women Canada.

The feminist *Equal Voice*, an organization which promotes equal numbers of men and women in Parliaments also uses this falsehood to promote its mission. In a recent *Equal Voice Welcome back to Parliament* event, supportive speakers included Status Women Minister Kellie Leitch (CPC), MP's Elizabeth May (Green Party), Hedy Fry (Liberal) and Nicki Ashton (NDP) speaking in support of the outdated feminist propaganda. *Equal Voice* continues to receive funding from Status of Women.

The 72 cents for every dollar propaganda fails to incorporate the fact that women, even those classified as "full time, full year earners" work fewer hours than men. Quite simply, men work longer hours and as a result have higher earnings. No discrimination there. Also, many women choose part time work over full time because they consider the work they do at home caring for their families as an important contribution to the social, economic and cultural life of Canada. They are not victims of discrimination, but merely women making decisions according to their family's needs.

Even though Statistics Canada repeats this 72 cent figure, without qualification, the agency has previously admitted that

this wage gap is not due to discrimination but to the different working patterns of men and women.

In summary: in 2012, 72% of Canadian *part-time* workers were women, 157% more than men. Canadian women were more likely to work less than 30 hours a week – 23% versus 12% for men. Women are in and out of the workforce more often than men due to family responsibilities. Absentee rates were 50% higher for women than men in 2012. All data are derived from Statistics Canada surveys, available to anyone, including the media, who could look it up if they ever wanted the facts.

Further, women are not the helpless victims that the tax funded feminist elites would have us believe. The Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce heard the following evidence on February 2, 2011:

*"Statistics show that women control \$7 million worth of consumer and corporate spending. In households, women are responsible for 80% of all purchases, they are responsible for 95% of furniture purchases, 91% of house purchases, 60% of car purchases and 50% of business travel.... Nearly half of the individuals with assets of \$500,000 are women."* (Evidence given by the Quebec Business Women's Network).

If women are such helpless victims, why are they making so many of their family's financial decisions? †

## MAKING A GIFT UNDER YOUR WILL TO REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

Making a gift under your Will to REAL Women of Canada is a lasting gift, not just to REAL Women itself, but also to Canada as a whole.

Canada needs strong families, especially now, when the fabric of society is being torn apart by materialism, selfish individualism, and disrespect for human life.

REAL Women's efforts on behalf of the traditional family have never wavered. Through turmoil and adversity, we have put forward our voice on behalf of the family in a clear and uncompromising manner. We can only continue this vital work for many generations to come with your help.

When preparing your Will, please consider assisting REAL Women by making a bequest to our organization so that we can continue with our crucial work. †

## MESSAGE BOARD

- An important fundraising campaign is underway. Watch for our appeal letter in the mail. We hope that you will be as generous as possible. Your [financial support](#) is greatly needed in order for REAL Women of Canada to continue our important pro-life and pro-family work. We sincerely thank those of you who have generously supported us financially this year.
- We encourage those of you who are receiving REALity by Canada Post to switch to our e-newsletter if possible, as this will help reduce our mailing costs. Please contact our Ottawa office by phone or [e-mail](#) to make the change. Thank you.

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](http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca) • [info@realwomenofcanada.ca](mailto:info@realwomenofcanada.ca)

## SUPPORT REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

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

Membership \$30/year • Groups \$50/year • Donation \_\_\_\_\_

*Contributions, unfortunately, are not tax deductible.*

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

Province \_\_\_\_\_ Postal Code \_\_\_\_\_

Tel \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

Send online at [www.realwomenofcanada.ca](http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca) or by mail. Thank you.