

HOMOSEXUALS CLIMB TO POWER AND INFLUENCE IN CANADA BY VIRTUE OF THE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Over the past ten years, Canadians have experienced a revolution in regard to the homosexual issue. This revolution, whereby homosexuals, who, according to the 2003 census, consist of approximately one per cent of the population, have acquired enormous power and influence in this country. These new-found rights of homosexuals have priority over other basic rights, such as freedom of religion, speech, belief etc. This has not been accomplished by the will of the public, but rather by a number of other factors, such as the one-sided promotion of the homosexual issue in the secular media, judicial activism, and the decisions of human rights tribunals. However, even these significant institutions could not have brought about the homosexual revolution by themselves. The real engine behind the success of the movement was the federal Liberal government, which undertook a cunning and calculated campaign to achieve recognition and rights for homosexuals during the past ten years. It was a long, insidious but successful campaign, achieved step by step, largely accomplished out of view of the Canadian public.

The Liberal Government's Step by Step Campaign to Legitimize Homosexuality in Canada

Prime Minister Trudeau

The first step in the calculated campaign by the Liberal government actually began long ago, in 1969, by Liberal Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, when he amended the *Criminal Code* to decriminalize homosexual acts for those 21 years of age and over. In 1987, the *Criminal Code* was again amended, this time, to lower the age of consent for homosexual acts to 18 years of age. Mr. Trudeau was famous (infamous) for his statement that "there's no place for the state in the bedrooms of the nation". He went on to state that "What's done in private between adults doesn't concern the *Criminal Code*". However, the decriminalizing of homosexual acts for those over 21 years of age had the opposite effect of what he claimed he intended. However, the decriminalizing of homosexual acts for those 21 years and older, provided state approval, for the first time, for homosexual acts to take place, whether in the bedrooms, bathhouses, or even the parks of this nation.

Since then, a succession of Liberal Ministers of Justice have pulled the strings, privately and publicly, as well as financially, to further the homosexual cause. These actions commenced with Justice Minister Allan Rock (1993 – 1997); followed by Anne McLellan (1997 – 2002); Martin Cauchon (2002 – 2003); and Irwin Cotler (2003 – 2006). The support for the homosexual agenda by this succession of Liberal Justice Ministers was carried out with the full approval of both Prime Minister Jean Chretien and Prime Minister Paul Martin.

Allan Rock (1993 – 1997)

Allan Rock started the ball rolling, pushing for homosexual rights in 1996, when he put through an amendment to the federal *Human Rights Act* to provide protection on the basis of sexual orientation. In order to accomplish this, Mr. Rock met first with representatives of the homosexual organization EGALE to strategize and map out how the *Human Rights Act* could be successfully amended. (See REALity, March/April 1996) Mr. Rock managed to push this amendment through Parliament by deliberate misrepresentation and the use of the parliamentary guillotine of closure, in order to cut off debate. This resulted in this controversial legislation being passed in an astounding 10 days: that is, between April 30 to May 9, 1996. The bill was hurried through, apparently because Mr. Rock did not want to give any time for resistance to gain momentum. The Justice Committee reviewed the proposed amendment in a remarkable one day hearing, which allowed very little input from the public.

Throughout this brief and tumultuous debate, the Liberal government steadfastly maintained that the amendment would not lead to the legal recognition of same-sex marriage or special rights for homosexuals, knowing full well that was, in fact, the intention.

Effect of Federal Human Rights Act Amendment

This amendment to the federal *Human Rights Act* had the effect of legalizing and protecting homosexual sex acts, notwithstanding their detrimental medical, psychological, and social ramifications. This legislation protected homosexuals in jobs -- especially in sensitive positions such as in the schools, as well as regarding adoption and foster parenting, when similar amendments were made to provincial *Human Rights Acts*. Also, the military, which requires a united fighting unit to protect morale and the effectiveness and cohesion of the unit, was obliged to accept homosexuals. In other words, the amendment protected homosexuals in their jobs, despite the fact their orientation may be detrimental to the institution in which they are employed or to individuals, such as children. All that was considered in these decisions was the protected "rights" or entitlement of homosexual/lesbian adults – to carry out their sexual practices without legal interference.

This amendment to the federal *Human Rights Act* also had another far reaching implication, since it placed sexual orientation in the same category in the human rights legislation as those protected on grounds such as race, sex, place of birth etc. The latter however, are unchangeable, morally-neutral characteristics: this is not the case with sexual orientation, which is a changeable behaviour (just ask all the former homosexuals who are now happily living in heterosexual marriages). Nor is homosexuality morally neutral, which is quite different from race, sex, and place of birth. Moreover, for the first time, "behaviour," rather than unchangeable or immutable characteristics, was given special protection under the federal *Human Rights Act*. Finally, there is a public consensus that race, sex etc. should be protected under human rights legislation, but there is clearly no public consensus that homosexual behaviour should be a protected right. Rather, in Canada, such protection has caused enormous turmoil socially, politically and legally.

Justice Minister Anne McLellan (1997 – 2002)

Justice Minister McLellan's contribution to the homosexual agenda was to provide family benefits to same-sex partners on an equal basis to those given to heterosexual couples.

In March 1998, the Ontario Court of Appeal Judge Rosalie Abella handed down a decision in the Rosenberg case, in which she stated that homosexual couples must be considered "spouses" under the *Income Tax Act*. According to a confidential briefing note prepared for Ms McLellan, written the day that decision was handed down, Ms. McLellan agreed with the homosexual lobby group, EGALE, to consult with them before deciding whether to appeal this case. Ms McLellan subsequently decided against appealing the case to the Supreme Court of Canada, obviously on the advice of her EGALE advisors.

Ms McLellan was determined to provide more family benefits for homosexuals. Before doing so, however, at tax payers' expense, she retained advice from a consulting research firm, Sage Research Corporation, located in Mississauga, Ontario for advice as to strategies she would use to "promote public understanding and support...for benefits beyond the traditional scope of marriage and spouse" i.e. homosexuals. (See REALity, March April 1999, "Justice Department Hires Market Research Company to Sell Same-sex Benefits," page 6).

Ms McLellan also again met privately with representatives of EGALE to discuss the further expansion of family benefits to homosexual partners. This subsequently resulted in her introducing the *Modernizing of Benefits Act*, in March 2000, which amended over 80 federal statutes, giving benefits to same-sex marriage couples. Interestingly, however, this Act was at pains to point out that none of these beneficial changes should be interpreted as affecting the definition of marriage which was expressly set out to be the recognition of a relationship between one man and one woman.

The day this same-sex benefits bill was tabled in the House of Commons, it was learned that EGALE had received a copy of the bill prior to it being made available to the MPs in the House of Commons. It is not difficult to understand how they obtained a copy of it (see REALity March/April 2000, The Justice Department's Private Consultations with Homosexuals, page 9.)

Questionable Ethics of Justice Ministers

These private meetings, held by the Ministers of Justice with the special interest lobby group of homosexuals, did not go unnoticed. In an editorial in the National Post (March 1, 2000) the behaviour of Ms. McLellan and her predecessor, Allan Rock, holding private meetings with EGALE "raises more than just political questions; it raises questions of ministerial ethics as well." The actions of these ministers speak far louder than words and indicate their determination to force homosexuality on Canadians, regardless of any ethical consideration, the views of the public or implications to Canadian society.

Minister of Justice Cauchon (2002 - 2003)

Justice Minister Cauchon's contribution to the homosexual cause was to implement the strategy to legislate same-sex marriage in Canada. In this particular undertaking, Mr. Cauchon was assisted by the chief policy advisor to Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, Paul Genest, Alex Himelfarb, Clerk of the Privy Council (administrative arm of the government) and Deputy Minister of Justice Morris Rosenberg (See REALity July/August 2004, page 12). It is a concern, by the way, that Morris Rosenberg is now the Deputy Minister of Health under the Conservative government. One wonders what further damage he is causing by way of this influential position.

Mr. Cauchon began implementing his strategy to legislate same-sex marriage in November 2002 when he sent a personal letter to the House of Commons Justice Committee requesting an examination of the issue. What was significant about this initiative was that the Justice Committee was requested to review the issue at the personal request of the Justice Minister, rather than through Parliament, which is the usual and accepted process by which Parliamentary Committees act. The objective of Mr. Cauchon's approach was to prevent any parliamentary debate on the issue at that time: as such a debate could possibly have led to the defeat of any proposed same-sex marriage bill. In effect, the Liberal government wanted to delay the debate and vote until such time as the public's attitude and resistance to it had moderated or softened. In short, the country had to be brought around to accept same-sex marriage by several diverse strategies, such as intense propaganda in the media, political pressure on the MPs, and court decisions.

In this regard, the legal challenges on same-sex marriage funded by the Court Challenges Program were key. That is, the favourable decision in support of same-sex marriage by the Ontario Court of Appeal, as well as other provincial courts who followed the lead of the Ontario court, were all funded by the Court Challenges Program. This was made clear in an article in Capital Xtra (October 19, 2006), which stated:

Money from the Court Challenges Program helped EGALE win equal marriage rights through the courts in BC, Ontario, and Quebec. When government sent questions to the Supreme Court in 2004, EGALE was there to help make the legal case that gay and lesbian marriage was a Charter issue – with the help of the Court Challenges Program money.

Mr. Cauchon did not appeal the Ontario Court of Appeal decision in support of same-sex marriage as it was a strong decision favourable to his objective – to make same-sex marriage legal in Canada. He did not state this publicly, but instead claimed that he was unable to appeal the Ontario decision because the Justice Committee had passed a motion rejecting such an appeal. What Mr. Cauchon did not disclose, however, was that he had manipulated the committee vote by removing two Liberal Justice Committee members opposed to same-sex marriage and replacing them with two MPs who were in support of it. This allowed the motion by homosexual NDP MP Svend Robinson to reject an appeal of the Ontario decision to pass. Moreover, in June 2003, before the Justice Committee was able to write its findings on

the same-sex marriage issue, the House of Commons was unexpectedly adjourned for a three-month summer recess. This early adjournment was accomplished by Liberal House Leader, Don Boudria (Glengarry – Prescott - Russell) quietly slipping into the House of Commons on Friday afternoon, June 13, and, using an obscure Parliamentary rule, adjourning the House of Commons for the three-month summer break. (This was made easy by the fact there were fewer than 25 MPs present in the House at that time.) The abrupt adjourning of the House of Commons made it impossible for the Committee, which was expected to oppose same-sex marriage, to complete writing its report, until Parliament resumed sitting in the fall. However, the committee on same-sex marriage was never allowed to resume sitting.

With Parliament safely away for the summer recess, on July 17, 2003, Mr. Cauchon announced legislation (Bill C-38) to legalize same-sex marriage. At that same time, he cunningly announced that a reference would be made to the Supreme Court of Canada on the issue. In other words, Mr. Cauchon jumped the gun and put forward his legislation legalizing same-sex marriage without waiting for the report from the Committee. The Committee had visited 12 cities, heard almost 500 witnesses on the issue and dealt with over 250,000 pieces of correspondence and was expected to reject same-sex marriage as a reflection of the public's view on the issue. Mr. Cauchon did not want this opposing view to be known, which would have "muddied the waters" in his efforts to legalize same-sex marriage in Canada.

Further, the purpose of the reference to the Supreme Court of Canada of Bill C-38 was to do another end run – this time around Parliament. Using the approval of the Supreme Court of Canada on the constitutionality of same-sex marriages, (even though the court never stated that opposite-sex marriage was unconstitutional), together with the legal opinions of the provincial courts on same-sex marriage, the Liberals were ready to begin the debate on the issue in Parliament. Liberals piously argued that they had no choice but to bring in same-sex marriage on the basis of the court decisions.

The final chapter on same-sex marriage was carried out by yet another Minister of Justice, Irwin Cotler, who replaced Mr. Cauchon after the June 2003 federal election.

Justice Minister Irwin Cotler (2003 – 2006)

The responsibility of pushing the same-sex marriage Bill (C-38) through Parliament fell to Justice Minister Irwin Cotler. Mr. Cotler accomplished this by applying the usual Liberal devices of manipulation, deceit and misrepresentation. For example, when Mr. Cotler appeared before the Justice Committee, which was reviewing Bill C-38 (same-sex marriage) on May 12, 2005, he stated flatly that same-sex marriage would not lead to polygamy. This was a straightforward lie, as Mr. Cotler knew that this result was, in fact, a real possibility.

He knew this because, under the *Access to Information Act*, the Canadian Press had learned that Mr. Cotler had requested a legal opinion on the impact of same-sex marriage on polygamy and had been advised that polygamy could possibly result from the same-sex marriage legislation. During the debate on Bill C-38, Mr. Cotler further argued that religious bodies would be protected from having to perform same-sex marriages if it was against their conscience or religious beliefs to do so. However, Mr. Cotler knew, as a lawyer, that this affirmation was utterly meaningless because freedom of religion is a matter of provincial jurisdiction not federal legislation. To insert such a supposed "protection" in federal legislation was legally pointless and only served to mislead the public further on the issue of religious freedoms under the same-sex marriage bill.

During the final debate on same-sex marriage, held in June 2005, the Liberals, true to form, applied the guillotine of closure, refused to allow any amendments to the bill, and forced the 39 members of the Liberal cabinet to vote for it. Only one cabinet minister, Joe Comuzzi, representing the riding of Thunder Bay – Superior North, had the moral courage to resign from his position in the cabinet on the most profound moral issue of this generation.

Mr. Cotler also acted unconscionably when he instructed his department to publish a paper in May 2004, claiming that same-sex marriage would have no effect on children. Mr. Cotler was hypocritical in doing so. This position by his Justice department directly contradicted the position taken the year previously in the Ontario Court of Appeal on same-sex marriage. It was highly significant that many of the studies listed by the federal Justice Department in its summary of cases supporting same-sex parenting were published in either homosexual, lesbian or feminist journals. At best, these studies could be considered as advocacy studies, not objective data. Very few studies raising concerns about same-sex parenting were included in the Justice Department's list and, when they were included, they were either criticized or completely dismissed, out of hand.

In contrast, the National Assembly in France, in its report in January 2006, rejected same-sex marriage, mainly because of its detrimental effects on children. The French report also seriously criticized the studies on same-sex parenting that claimed that such parenting carried no ill effects for children. The report noted the lack of scientific rigor, inadequate samplings and the flagrant lack of objectivity in these studies.

Yet, Mr. Cotler was prepared to throw Canadian children to the wolves in order to legalize same-sex marriage in Canada.

Ironically, Liberal leader Stéphane Dion has appointed Mr. Cotler as his expert on "human rights" in his shadow cabinet. It is likely only the politically correct human rights will concern Mr. Cotler.

The Liberals' Journey to Promote Homosexuality

The above facts outline the long journey taken by the Liberal government to provide homosexual relationships with special recognition and protection in Canada. Some might describe the Liberals' methods in accomplishing this to be clever political manoeuvring. Others might characterize the Liberal government's actions on the homosexual issue as being devious and dishonest manipulation, which has betrayed the trust of Canadians. You decide.

February 20, 2007

Re-published courtesy LifeSiteNews.com