Ontario's Radical Sex-Ed Curriculum

By: Campaign Life Coalition

Now that the Ontario Liberal Party has a majority in government and no election is in sight, Premier Kathleen Wynne has “coincidentally” announced that in the Fall of 2015, she will reintroduce the same graphic Sex Ed Curriculum that had outraged parents in 2010.

Back then, parents and religious leaders came out angrily against Liberal plans to teach early grades about explicit, age-inappropriate topics like masturbation, anal sex, oral sex, vaginal lubrication, homosexuality, and the idea that being male or female is merely a “social construct”.

So strong was the backlash that McGuinty “shelved” the curriculum after only 3 days of public outcry.

At the time, CLC warned that the curriculum was only “temporarily” shelved and would return. Kathleen Wynne proved us right by putting this at the top of her agenda at a time when this cannot hurt her at the voting booth.

Below are some excerpts from the 2015 curriculum that Kathleen Wynne is planning to foist on our children in both Public and Catholic schools. This curriculum gives too much, too young, and in some instances undermines the moral/religious beliefs of traditionally-principled families. The curriculum leans towards sexualising children and many parents fear it will launch them into premature sexual experimentation.

Parental concerns about age-inappropriate lessons sexualizing their kids were only heightened after the man who developed the sex-ed curriculum, the former Deputy Education Minister, Benjamin Levin, pleaded guilty to three child pornography related charges. They included one count of possessing child pornography, one count of making child pornography, and one count of counselling a sexual assault on a child.

Graphic testimony from the trial revealed how Levin, the curriculum’s architect, counselled an undercover cop posing as a sexually deviant mother, “on how to groom the child to get her used to sex”. The Court transcript revealed his advice to the mother on how to go about lowering her daughter’s sexual inhibitions: “Mr. Levin instructed (the officer) to expose her daughter to pornography, to be nude and to masturbate in front of the child”.

The fact that the material is age-inappropriate and overly explicit was reason enough for parents to reject Kathleen Wynne’s sex-ed curriculum. The involvement of Ben Levin in its development, and the possibility that the reason explicit content was introduced at such young ages may have been for the purpose of “grooming”, further taints the curriculum such that the majority of Ontario parents do not want it anywhere near their children. Protests have been organized at Queen’s Park. Over 100,000 Ontarians have signed petitions demanding it’s retraction.

Below, we have provided some excerpts of the controversial elements from the actual government document so that you can decide for yourself whether to join in the growing opposition. For the safety and wellbeing of vulnerable children, we hope you do.
Grade 1 - excerpt (age 6)

- Graphic lesson on sexual body parts including "penis", "testicles", "vagina", "vulva" and more

Grade 3 - excerpt (age 8)

- Will teach the flawed theory of "gender identity". This is the notion that whether you’re a boy or a girl does not necessarily relate to your physical anatomy. It is merely a “social construct”. Gender is "fluid" according to this theory, and any little boy can decide that he is actually a girl, if that's the way he feels in his mind, or vice-versa. Note: The potential for causing serious sexual confusion in the minds of children is very real with this teaching.
Grade 3 - excerpt (age 8)

- Will normalize homosexual family structures, without regard for the religious/moral beliefs of families

Human Development and Sexual Health

C3.3 describe how visible differences (e.g., skin, hair, and eye colour, facial features, body size and shape, physical aids or different physical abilities, clothing, possessions) and invisible differences (e.g., learning abilities, skills and talents, personal or cultural values and beliefs, gender identity, sexual orientation, family background, personal preferences, allergies and sensitivities) make each person unique, and identify ways of showing respect for differences in others [PS, IS]

Teacher prompt: “Sometimes we are different in ways you can see. Sometimes we are different in ways you cannot see – such as how we learn, what we think, and what we are able to do. Give me some examples of things that make each person unique.”

Student: “We all come from different families. Some students live with two parents. Some live with one parent. Some have two mothers or two fathers. Some live with grandparents or with caregivers. We may come from different cultures. We also have different talents and abilities and different things that we find difficult to do.”


Grade 4 - excerpt (age 9)

- Will introduce children to the idea of being “more than just friends” and “going out” with classmates whom they may “like”. See excerpt below from the actual 2010 curriculum

Teacher prompt: “What can change socially as you start to develop physically?”

Student: “Relationships with friends can change, because sometimes people start being interested in different things at different times. Some people start ‘liking’ others. They want to be more than ‘just friends’ and become interested in going out. Sometimes people treat you as if you are older than you actually are because of how you look. Sometimes classmates, friends, or family make comments or tease you about the changes.”

Will teach children the disputed theory of "gender expression" as if it were scientific fact.

Again, the potential to produce sexual confusion in the minds of 10 year olds is a present danger.

gender expression. The manner in which individuals express their gender identity to others. A person’s gender expression is often based on a social construct of gender, which is either stereotypically male or female. However, some individuals who do not see themselves as being either male or female but as some combination of the two genders, or as without gender, choose to express their identity in terms of a multiple model of gender, mixing both male and female expressions.
**Grade 6 - excerpt (age 12)**

- Teaches about “vaginal lubrication”
- Encourages masturbation as a "pleasurable" way for children to learn about their bodies

---

**Teacher prompt:** “Things like wet dreams or vaginal lubrication are normal and happen as a result of physical changes with puberty. Exploring one’s body by touching or masturbating is something that many people do and find pleasurable. It is common and is not harmful and is one way of learning about your body.”

p.175, The Ontario Curriculum Grades 1-8: Health & Physical Education, 2015 - revised

---

**Grade 7 – excerpt (age 13)**

- Encourages children to carry condoms on their person

---

**Student:** “They should go to a health clinic or see a nurse or doctor who can provide important information about protection. People who think they will be having sex some time soon should keep a condom with them so they will have it when they need it. They should also talk with their partner about using a condom before they have sex, so both partners will know a condom will be used. If a partner says they do not want to use a condom, a person should say, ‘I will not have sex without a condom.’ If you do have sex it is important that you use a condom every time, because condoms help to protect you against STIs, including HIV, and pregnancy.”

Grade 7 - excerpt (age 13)

Under the pretext of encouraging abstinence from behaviours associated with high risk for STDs, the curriculum uses a sleight of hand to sneakily introduce to children the concepts of "anal intercourse" and "oral-genital contact". Those are ideas that many of these 12-13 year old kids might not be aware of, or at least, have never seriously considered as an act they could be taking part in right now.

In another sleight of hand, "anal intercourse" is lumped in as a sexual act of the same kind as vaginal intercourse, with no differentiation between the two types of sexual acts, either morally or with respect to risk for sexually transmitted disease, for which the former carries dramatically higher risk. For example, anal sex carries a 300% higher risk for contracting HIV than vaginal intercourse.

Was the goal in this sneaky introduction of graphic sex acts to avoid the accusation that the government was promoting a gay agenda, seeking to normalize gay sex in the minds of kids? By claiming that this curriculum is about encouraging kids to "delay" these high risk sexual activities, many casual readers won't notice that what has actually occurred is that the teacher has planted ideas in the minds of children that might not otherwise be present, regarding "anal intercourse", "oral-genital contact", etc.

Anal intercourse is not an activity to which the government should be giving any semblance of approval whatsoever. It is the most efficient method of transmitting the AIDS virus, so much so, that despite all the "safe sex" and condom education over the past 20 years, epidemiologists still predict that 50% of men-who-have-sex-with-men (MSM) will eventually contract HIV.

In fact, the Ontario government's chief epidemiologist publishes a report on the spread of HIV every 4 years. In the study which collected data between 2005 to 2008, it found that almost 1 in 4 MSM who live in Toronto (21.9%), are currently infected with HIV. See chart at the bottom of this section.

Extrapolating the current growth rate for infection tells us that by the time 2012 public health data becomes available, almost 1 out of every 3 actively gay men in Toronto will be infected with HIV. So, why would Premier Kathleen Wynne want to get 12 and 13 year olds thinking about 'anal intercourse'?

If the government's going to talk about anal sex at all, it should be at older grades and the message should be "That's a risky, potentially fatal activity. Don't do it". The curriculum makes no mention that anal intercourse, in the context of male-on-male sex, leads directly to the death of a large percentage of those who practice it, and is generally unhealthy for all practitioners.
People have a right to know about serious health risks before they choose to engage in it. Withholding such vital information is an inexcusable moral failure. In fact, Kathleen Wynne’s Sex Ed curriculum leaves 12 and 13 year olds with a distinct impression that "communicating clearly with each other when making decisions" is all that's required for this activity to be "responsible and safe".

Above: table from latest government study of HIV infection in Ontario, showing staggering prevalence rates amongst men who have sex with men.

**Grade 8 - excerpt (age 14)**

- Teaches children to make a personal, “sexual plan” for themselves

>`Teacher prompt: “How would thinking about your personal limits and making a personal plan influence decisions you may choose to make about sexual activity?”

>`Student: “Thinking in advance about what I value and what my personal limits are would help me to respond and make decisions that I felt comfortable with in different situations. I would be able to approach a situation with more confidence and stick to what I had planned. I would be less likely to be caught off guard and have to react without having thought through the options and possible consequences.”`

Benjamin Levin: Pedophilic influence?

It’s important to consider the fact that this curriculum was written under the direction of an alleged child pornographer, Mr. Benjamin Levin. He was the Deputy Education Minister at the time, serving under then Education Minister Kathleen Wynne.

Levin was charged by police with 7 counts of child porn, including making and distributing child pornography. Many people are questioning whether “grooming” could have been a reason for introducing these explicit subjects at such delicate ages. If the allegations are true, could it be that the curriculum was designed to “prime” children, so as to make them sexually available?

When it is found that a child pornographer was in charge of writing what many parents perceive to be graphic, age-inappropriate Sex Ed curriculum, parents cannot be blamed for wanting no part of the curriculum. Should warning bells be going off when we learn that a sexual predator oversaw the writing of curriculum which gets 6 year olds talking about their genitals, encourages kids to masturbate, and wants to get 13 year olds thinking about oral sex and anal sex?

The safety of children is too important to ignore Levin’s hand in this curriculum. In fact, Kathleen Wynne’s late addition to the curriculum of teaching “sexual consent” beginning in Grade 1, only served to poured gasoline on existing parental concerns about the sexualisation of children.

Can we know a curriculum by the company that it keeps?

It is not average moms and dads who are asking for this curriculum to return. In fact 100,000 Ontario parents have signed a petitions against it to-date. So who is really pressuring the Liberals to bring back the controversial curriculum?

Several radical organizations, or those with ties to radical groups have been lobbying the Liberals to bring back the 2010 curriculum. These include:
- OPHEA (The Ontario Physical & Health Education Association)
- Planned Parenthood Toronto
- Queer Ontario
- The Communist Party of Canada (Ontario)
The main lobbyist spearheading the campaign to re-introduce the 2010 sex ed curriculum is OPHEA. This group has really served as a stalking horse for the Liberals to soften public opposition to the explicit Sex Ed program.

OPHEA’s website lists a coalition of “partners” who had joined its lobbying effort to bring back the 2010 sex ed program. Some of these partners ought to raise red flags in the minds of parents and grandparents.

One is Planned Parenthood Toronto, an abortion-advocacy group.

On its Resources web page, Planned Parenthood Toronto offers explicit sex instructional tools for 13 year olds, such as “Making Sex Feel Good” which many people would interpret as encouraging kids to view pornography: “Looking at sexy magazines or movies and using fantasy is another way to explore what you like and don’t like sexually”, says the resource.

Another Planned Parenthood Toronto resource is called “Anal Play 101”. This fact sheet states that “Anal play is healthy and normal” and encourages youth to practice such perverse activities as “fisting”. See an excerpt from that resource:
A second Sex Ed lobby “partner” is called Queer Ontario, a group whose Mission & Vision Statement web page includes the “celebration” of “sex acts, such as bondage“, “sadism/masochism”, and “polyamorous sex” (ie. group sex).

From Queer Ontario’s website:

> **Sex Positivity**
> - Individuals of all ages should have access to age-appropriate, accurate, and comprehensive knowledge about sexuality to make informed decisions about their bodies, behaviours, and relationships
> - Celebration of sexual and gender diversities, including but not limited to sexual preferences, identities, orientations, as well as consensual relationships and/or sex acts, such as bondage/discipline, dominance/submission, sadism/masochism, and open and/or polyamorous (many-to-many) relationships or sex.

When groups who advocate for the normalization of sadism, group sex, anal play and watching pornography are demanding the return of the 2010 Sex Ed curriculum, parents cannot be blamed for believing that this curriculum will have the effect of sexualizing young children.

Tack on the fact that the curriculum may have been influenced by an alleged pedophile and there’s cause here for full-scale, parental revolt against this curriculum.

To get involved, please help spread the word using Campaign Life Coalition’s petition. Check out our website for more ways you can protect our vulnerable children from being sexualised: [www.campaignlifecoalition.com](http://www.campaignlifecoalition.com).