

Deadbeat Writes

The revolution against decency continues unabated

By David Warren - February 26, 2007

Since Ontario court judges no longer feel the need to recuse themselves from cases in which they are personally interested, I will not recuse myself from writing this column.

I refer, in the first instance, to Roy McMurtry, the Ontario Chief Justice who, sitting himself on an appeals court decision, recently helped create a third "parent" for the child of two lesbian activists and a male "sperm donor." McMurtry has a daughter, also of the sapphic persuasion, who had a very arguable interest in the outcome of that case. But the idea that this would disqualify him from assessing the merits of a judicial try-on that ought to have been a lot more controversial was so much water off that duck's back.

Mr. Justice Rosenblatt, who found himself in precisely the same position when the New York Court of Appeal made a ruling on same-sex marriage last year, recused himself. But then the United States is a country in which due process is not yet under attack.

Our entire society has an interest in reckless, ideologically motivated judges laying the "rights" groundwork for the court legislation of polygamy. Which is precisely what the Ontario Court of Appeal's "three parent" decision provided. Yet the justices, in their reasoning, could not be bothered to consider the consequences of what they were doing. The destruction of a society's entire moral order being not the sort of thing they feel the need to concern themselves with.

McMurtry is the same chief justice who presided over the creation of "same-sex marriage" through a court decision in June 2003--and was photographed partying with the plaintiffs afterward. A complaint

about this behaviour from REAL Women of Canada was dismissed only last month by the Canadian Judicial Council. This review panel did not challenge the fact; they only failed to find anything wrong with it. And given mainstream media who are utterly unprepared to make an issue of that sort of thing, why should they worry?

The revolutionary cliques in our law schools and on our judicial benches are a close-knit compact. They look after their own.

We must assume a chief justice sets an example to all the judges below him, and that McMurtry's innovations in family law are now paralleled by his innovations in judicial partiality. He will soon retire, "rich in years and honours"--but the carnage he has wreaked on a society that entrusted him to defend its laws spreads in his wake.

I have myself an interest--quite personal--in another aspect of what I would call this "revolution against decency." I am one of tens of thousands of publicly labelled "deadbeat dads," created by a vicious Ontario bureaucracy with the Orwellian name "Family Responsibility Office." For several years, I, who had already voluntarily parted with almost everything I owned, and have been consistently garnished for half of my after-tax income, have been pursued for the rest in additional spousal-support "arrears," and child support for kids past voting age. And in amounts that the same bureaucracy knows to be beyond my ability to pay--having driven me into bankruptcy and default of taxes. And I have, like all the other men in my position--all pauperized, all stripped of the traditional protections of the common law; many driven to suicide--continued to be hounded, by this faceless, Kafkaesque bureaucracy, its process-serving outriders, and threats of jail.