

an opening for exploitation. See the example on stereotyping (P.177). The second prompt on the topic is more corrupting because it makes a parody of true marriage. The child is forced to make suggestions likely contrary to their faith and to their parents' values. Substituting "partner" for husband and wife is quite offensive to most cultures. This suggestion also contravenes the government's own expectations regarding equity and inclusivity. The connection between HIV-AIDS and homosexual conduct is downplayed. The kids are told that being concerned about AIDS and talking about it makes life more challenging for those who have it and makes it easier for the AIDS virus to spread (P. 197). Expectation C1.5 (P.216) normalizes anal sex and as such is immoral, irresponsible (because unhealthy) and very offensive to many cultures and religions.

10. Calls for self-censorship of teachers

Teachers are repeatedly reminded to be aware of their own biases and values and the need to be respectful and tolerant of diversity based on race, culture, religion, sexual orientation, and gender identity, etc.(P. 15). In effect, teachers are counselled to exercise self-censorship for the sake of fairness, and even accept a false view of human nature for the sake of compassion. Section 264 (1) (c) of the *Education Act* clearly states the teacher's duty is "to inculcate by precept and example, respect for religion and the principles of Judeo-Christian morality and the highest regard for truth, justice, loyalty, love of country, humanity, benevolence, sobriety, industry, frugality, purity, temperance and all other virtues" rather than promoting a baseless social agenda of a social engineering cabal.

11. The curriculum document contains internal contradictions

The document acknowledges that kids should not be treated with the same approach as if they are all at the same age of development, with the same level of curiosity concerning sexual matters; yet the document really practices the opposite (P.9). On the one hand the document calls for more information, more frank discussion, but

when it comes to AIDS, for example, one must shut up and remain silent for fear of spreading it (P.197). According to the HPE there are multiple "genders", but "gender-based violence" refers only to violence by males against women and girls. Instead of condemning all violence, the curriculum document is saying that one type of violence is more important than other types, just like some victims of discrimination, violence, bullying etc. are more important than others. (P. 220)

12. Library and community resources should reflect all students

Libraries encourage students to read, help improve their research skills; and teach them to make effective use of information. HPE teachers can suggest to librarians suitable digital, print, and visual resources for projects dealing with health and physical education (P.75). Who will do the selecting and based on what criteria? Will the publications and videos of Planned Parenthood Toronto be prime resources? They offer for 13 year olds a supplementary document called ANAL PLAY 101 that encourages fisting, inserting dildos in the "butt" and numerous other unhealthy practices. Would you want this filth available to your child?

Let us be clear, this is an assault on the mind and innocence of your child. We have in Ontario a regime intent on destroying any expression of so called homophobia. It will seek to suppress any form of dissent. Traditional teaching on sex, marriage, and family will become taboo. The mainstream media has shown itself to be shameless enablers and cheerleaders. The spiritual leaders have adopted a passive stance, hiding behind processes, enveloped in studied silence. It is a culture war. Whose vision of public morality will win out? What are you prepared to do in defence of your child?

For more information on this important issue, simply go to www.campaignlifecoalition.com/SexEd, The actual full Ontario curriculum document is available there, along with some practical steps you may wish to consider in protecting your child's innocence and the upholding of your rights as a parent.



To order more copies of this pamphlet and help spread the urgent message to others, please call 416-204-9749.

Donation for this purpose is also most welcome, and may be sent to:
Campaign Life Coalition
 104 Bond Street
 Toronto, ON, M5B 1X9



2015

REVISED

The Ontario Curriculum
 Grades 1-8

Health and Physical Education



Ontario's Health and Physical Education (HPE) Curriculum 2015

Social Engineering Goes to School: The Rape of Childhood and Why Parents Should be Incensed

The not-so-hidden education agenda of the current provincial government is to change the way people think about some fundamental issues. We cannot abandon our precious children to the whims of social engineers, hell-bent on sexualizing them at the earliest age possible.

The gay movement has made impressive legal and social gains in the past twenty years. But, in the minds of its radical advocates, those strides have to be consolidated, and according to them what better way than entrenching their radical ideas in the youngest generation via the school system. Under the pretext of combatting discrimination and bullying the government inaugurated a grand experiment in social engineering:

- The provincial government in 2008-2010, under then Education Minister Kathleen Wynne, put out Policy/Program Memorandum (PPM)119, *Developing and implementing equity and inclusive education policies in Ontario schools* and (PPM) 145 *Progressive Discipline and Promoting Positive Student Behaviour*.

- Wynne tried bringing in a new sex education curriculum in 2010, but Premier McGuinty, head of a minority government at the time, withdrew it when irate parents demonstrated opposition to the proposed changes.
- Unhappy with the pace of implementation, the Liberal government amended the Education Act, through Bill 13 (*Accepting Schools Act*), to legislate social change in the province.
- Gay activist groups like *Queer Ontario* and *Trans Lobby Group* made presentations to the Standing Committee on Social Policy Bill 13 -May 14, 2012 .
- The present Education Minister, Liz Sandals, as a member of that standing committee was most accommodating to their recommendations, many of which were included in Bill 13 and found their way into the new curriculum document.
- Buoyed by majority government status, now Premier, Wynne took up her old agenda with a vengeance, reintroducing the rejected curriculum accompanied by a sham consultation process.
- The discredited former Deputy Minister of Education, Benjamin Levin, played a key role in the development of the new sexual education curriculum.
- Planned Parenthood Toronto (notorious for its radical sexual agenda, calling for the sexualisation of children at an ever younger age, on the basis of human rights) was one of the “expert” groups that lobbied the government to reintroduce the 2010 sexual education curriculum.

The sexual health component of the HPE document presents serious problems. Like all curriculum, implementation will depend on the preparedness and attitude of individual teachers and the parameters set by the school boards. But, given the seeming convictions expressed in the curriculum, parents have cause to be concerned about what their children are to be taught starting in September 2015.

Some of the Major Problems of the New HPE Curriculum Document

1. Parent wishes were ignored in the consultation process

The process and content of the curriculum “updating” has been dishonest and disrespectful

toward parents. Only a very select number of parents (one per school) were allowed to participate, and those were asked to complete a meaningless online survey which made no mention of specific items included in the curriculum.

2. Usurps parental rights as primary educators of their children

The document pays lip service to parent rights: *Parents are the primary educators of their children with respect to learning about values,they are their children’s first role models.* (P. 13) But the government is deciding what to teach, when to teach it and how to teach it, especially on matters that belong foremost to parents.

3. Attacks and undermines childhood as a time of growth and innocent development

Children’s innocence is assaulted through a well-orchestrated seduction of their minds. Many of the expectations are worded in a way that invites and permits the clearly underage children to start engaging in sexual activities. The normal development of children is disrupted by the introduction of inappropriate terms and notions. This government seems determined to indoctrinate children about issues of sexuality at a younger and younger age, without any real consideration of the social and emotional effects on the individual child.

4. Much of the sexual health material is age-inappropriate

A grade 3 student is asked to understand and appreciate “visible and invisible differences” by accepting and celebrating different forms of family composition, sexual identity, etc. (P.124). A grade 4 student learns about dating, a silly and dangerous concept offensive to many cultures (P 141). The concept of consent to sexual activity is introduced in grade 6 (P. 175). The 12-13 year old child is introduced to “oral-genital contact” and “anal intercourse” (p.195) an activity illegal for the students being addressed in the curriculum document.

5. Many of the glossary terms are false, inadequate and biased

Those pushing the new curriculum have coined new terms and have manipulated language to force our children to accept their version of reality. A term like *homophobia* has built-in prejudices and is intended to be pejorative. It is a recently constructed word loaded with intellectual baggage, intended to disarm any challengers and critics and pre-empt any negative analysis of the homosexual lifestyle. *Gender expression* is meant to be assertively liberating. Both terms have a basis in a subjective pseudo-reality and appear in the compulsory expectations and the “optional” teacher-student prompts. It is assumed, for example, without any trace of evidence, that *gender* per se is a social construct, and can be changed at the whim of the individual. It is a dangerous assertion. Confusing children at a delicate stage of development constitutes abuse. (P. 216)

6. Advocates a mechanical view of sex, without any moral context for sexual activity

Something as intimate as sexual health and relationships should not be reduced to naming body parts, explaining processes like menstruation and spermatogenesis, approving masturbation, or how to prevent sexually transmitted diseases and pregnancy. It is assumed that sexual activity among 12-13 year-olds is either rampant or soon will be and so they should make sure they use condoms to protect themselves against sexually transmitted diseases. With respect to masturbation, the document is very manipulative by inviting students to understand what gives them personal pleasure. It’s luring them to experiment. The document withholds information regarding the rate of STI and negative stats on HIV-AIDS. No mention is made of sexual activity being primarily or exclusively an expression of love within marriage, meant to create a family.

7. Introduces concept of consent at too early an age

The concept of consent to sexual activity is an important matter, but totally misplaced in elementary grades. Teachers can traumatize children by planting ideas and asking leading questions. Children are not mature enough to understand what may be involved, nor can the majority of them legally give consent (P. 175). At that age they lack the moral responsibility required. The proposed teacher-student prompts are preposterous. A teacher should not be counseling a student regarding consent to sexual activity. The Criminal Code of Canada in Sections 152 and 153 takes the matter seriously, plainly stating that no one can invite a child under the age of 16 to touch himself or them for a sexual purpose. According to the Criminal Code every person who commits an offence under subsection (1) of Section 153 “is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years and to a minimum punishment of imprisonment for a term of forty-five days”.

8. Creates family conflict, alienates children from their families

Children would be taught at school ideas and convictions which may be regarded as perverse and in opposition to the values of their own parents. The confusion of a minority of people in society is portrayed as the new norm. All sexual preferences, all sexual activities, all family arrangements seem to be equally acceptable. They are just different ways for people to live their lives. Parents have the right to give their interpretation of the right and wrong of a particular activity or belief. Freedom of conscience is not respected in the expectations found on Pages 163 and 173.

9. Scripts of teacher-student prompts are gay propaganda

Are the teacher-student prompts mere suggestions? The examples chosen for the sexual health portion reveal the true intent of the scripts. Highly manipulative and liberally laced with gay propaganda, the scripts can give the teacher