

PROSTITUTION LAW OVERTURNED

REAL Women of Canada together with the Christian Legal Fellowship and the Catholic Civil Rights League intervened in a challenge of Canada's prostitution law before one of the most liberal courts in Canada, the Ontario lower court, called the Ontario Superior Court of Justice. The case was heard by a single judge, Madam Justice Susan Himel in October 2009.

On September 28, 2010, Madam Justice Himel handed down her decision in which she struck down three major provisions on prostitution in the Criminal Code. These provisions included the prohibition against operating a common bawdy house, living off the avails of prostitution, and communicating for the purposes of prostitution.

She did so, on the basis that these laws increased the risk of harm to street prostitutes and the risk was too high a price to pay to eliminate what she described as a "social nuisance". This was a dismissive way of decriminalizing the law which was aimed at preventing the victimization, degradation and exploitation of women and children and a few men.

The effect of her ruling is that she has decided that prostitution and its accompanying activities, is a legal right which must be protected by S.7 of the Charter of Rights, which provides for the "liberty and security of persons". In short, Madam Justice Himel has declared that the prostitution laws prevented prostitutes from conducting their lawful business in a safe environment which could be provided by in indoor setting, i.e. a brothel, rather than on the streets, and that such activity must be protected by the Charter of Rights.

Her conclusions, however, are based on two false premises: first of all, that there is a constitutional right to engage in prostitution (there is no such thing) and that prostitution conducted from a legal brothel is "safer" for prostitutes. This is not the case, as experience in other countries has shown.

Prostitution entails a high level of risk for individuals who engage in it, and significant harms to society at large, wherever it takes place. Social science evidence in Canada and internationally demonstrates that the risks and harms flowing from prostitution are inherent to the nature of the activity itself. Thus, the risks and harms exist, regardless of the many ways in which prostitution is practiced, whether "street" or "off-street", and regardless of the legal regime in place. Moreover, prostitution is associated with other harmful activities that include physical violence, drug addiction and trafficking, the involvement of organized crime, and the globalization of the sex industry and trafficking in persons.

Removing the preventive laws on prostitution, as Madam Justice Himel has done, has made even more prostitutes vulnerable to harm, because one of the effects of decriminalizing prostitution is to increase the number of prostitutes who operate in both legal (brothels) and illegal situations (on the streets). It also allows especially vulnerable women, such as aboriginal women and others, to be used and exploited in human trafficking.

Another effect of her decision is that overturning the offence of keeping a common bawdy-house, will now prevent police from raiding homosexual bath houses, where unprotected, promiscuous sex acts are rampant. In the past, police have raided such premises, based on the provision of the Criminal Code.

Judicial Activism

A single, appointed judge, non-answerable to the public, has handed down a decision on a national, social policy that would never be passed by an elected Parliament.

As stated in an editorial in the Toronto Globe and Mail (September 29, 2010):

...who is she [Judge Himel] to weigh all the potential harms at stake and decide matters, on either side? Who says she can do a better job than Parliament? ... that is a job for elected legislators, not a judge....Parliament is in a far better position to listen to all the evidence, including how Canadians think and feel about the issue, than a judge.

Government to Appeal Decision

The federal Attorney General, Rob Nicholson, has announced that the federal government will appeal the decision of Madam Justice Himel. REAL Women will seek leave to intervene in this case on appeal and will continue to do so until the matter has been finally settled by the Supreme Court of Canada.

TAXPAYERS FORCED TO FUND POLITICAL PARTIES

In 2002-2003 two tumultuous events occurred within the Liberal party, which led to Prime Minister Jean Chrétien making, perhaps, the most disastrous decision of his political career.

The first event was the Adscam scandal in Montreal, whereby the federal Department of Public Works made overpayments for advertising contracts to a Quebec based advertising company. These overpayments found their way back to the Liberal Party of Canada's Quebec Wing. In Auditor-General Sheila Fraser's report in 2002, she stated that "senior public servants broke just about every rule in the book" in awarding these mysterious contracts to a Quebec advertising firm.

The second event was that Minister of Finance, Paul Martin, quietly and efficiently gained control of the levers of power within the Liberal Party. The purpose of this was to have himself replace Mr. Chrétien as Liberal leader. In pursuing this objective, corporations showered Martin with \$12 million to ensure that he, in fact, would become the next Liberal leader.

Mr. Chrétien shrewdly assessed these two disasters coming down the road. To head them off, in 2003 he introduced legislation for what he thought would be his finest legacy for democracy, and at the same time, well-known for his vindictive streak, would punish Mr. Martin, by prohibiting all corporate and union funding of political parties. This legislation would also limit individual contributions to political parties to \$5,200.

To make up for these restrictions, taxpayers would involuntarily be required to foot the bill for funding federal parties by paying \$1.75 (later increased to \$1.95 with inflation) per vote earned in the most recent election for each party. Consequently, as a result of this legislation, taxpayers shelled out over \$30 million to the four main parties after the 2008 election. The individual payments were as follows:

| | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Conservatives | - | \$10,410,324 |
| Liberals | - | \$ 7,260,920 |
| NDP | - | \$ 5,026,804 |
| Bloc Québécois | - | \$ 2,757,912 |
| Green Party | - | \$ 1,873,820 |

Mr. Chrétien's plan was initially met with anger and dismay from his party officials and his own caucus. The President of the Liberal Party, Stephen LeDrew called the plan as "dumb as a bag of hammers" and his caucus threatened open rebellion. Mr. Chrétien thwarted this opposition by threatening to call a snap election. He then pushed this legislation through the House of Commons. This legislation has forever changed the scope and shape of elections in Canada – for the worse.

In 2006, the Conservatives did not help matters, by bringing in even more restrictions by reducing individual contributions to a \$1,100. limit.

The Law of Unintended Consequences:

1. Bloc Québécois (BQ) Rolls in Cash.

The BQ has the sole objective of working towards the separation of the province of Quebec from the rest of Canada, yet it receives 86% of its expenses from the Canadian taxpayers. Since it is a regional party, its share of the taxpayers' money has been largely responsible for much of the BQ's campaign success at the polls, with 49 BQ MPs elected in the 2008 federal election out of a total of 75 seats in Quebec. In short, the Canadian taxpayer is being forced to finance Quebec's separatist movement. Also, the BQ, which is even further left than the NDP, has changed the dynamics of the House of Commons with its strong support of euthanasia, abortion, national day care, etc. Its presence in Parliament skewers the position of the majority of Canadians living in the rest of Canada.

2. Changes in the Political Parties

The public funds for the political parties go directly to the national party headquarters, which helps make the parties even more centralized machines to manipulate power and public opinion. That is, this generous funding pays for much of the stealthy spin doctoring, the attack ads, and other similar campaign tactics now so prevalent in Canada.

3. The Undermining of Democracy

Political parties have become wards of the state with these federal entitlements. Political parties are supposed to be, instead, voluntary associations of people sharing views on public policy. That is, members and associates should be funding a political party, not the state. This legislation, then, has cut the crucial link between citizens' participation and the fate of the political parties which now operate more or less independently with centralized control. This allows parties to ignore the views of its members, without concern about any financial backlash for the party.

Mr. Harper's Dramatic Solution

In November 2008, the Conservative government announced it would bring in legislation to eliminate the \$1.95 per vote taxpayers pay to subsidize political parties. The opposition parties went apoplectic. They threatened an election by defeating the proposed legislation on which their political future depended. They also threatened to form a coalition to take control of the government, i.e. to oust the Conservatives. This created a constitutional crisis, which led to Mr. Harper making the controversial walk across the street to the Governor-General, Michaëlle Jean, in December 2008. This resulted in her agreement that Parliament be prorogued. With prorogation, the legislation died.

Not the End of the Matter

In March 2010, the Conservative Party announced that it will campaign in the next election (probably in 2011) on killing the \$30 million subsidy to the political parties. No doubt, the proposal will also include an increase in the limits of individual contributions to political parties and allow some corporate and union support. To fail to do so, would deliberately bankrupt the opposition parties who have not yet mastered the efficiency of the Conservative party in raising funds. The political parties raised the following funds on their own in 2009:

| | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Conservatives | - | \$17,770,477 |
| Liberals | - | \$10,120,312 |
| NDP | - | \$ 4,039,104 |
| Green Party | - | \$ 1,166,874 |
| Bloc Québécois | - | \$ 834,762 |

The media will jump on this proposed legislation, alleging the Conservatives are destroying democracy by preventing the opposition parties from flourishing. This will create a feverish backlash against the Conservatives. Consequently, there will probably be some practical way found to replace the loss of this government entitlement.

Be prepared for a Battle Royal over this proposal in the next election.

STATUS OF WOMEN FUNDS A NEW FEMINIST MOVEMENT

The near collapse of the feminist movement in Canada, and the failure of the feminist movement to become an international political force, has been an ongoing concern for the federal Status of Women (SOW). Consequently, it has decided to take decisive action (using the taxpayer's dollar) to organize what they hope will become a new, powerful feminist movement both in Canada and internationally.

In fiscal year 2008-2009, the SOW gave a grant totaling \$1,016,400.00 to fund a large feminist conference, called the Women's Worlds 2011 (WW 2011). Its objective is to draw feminist women together from across Canada and abroad to form a new feminist movement. The conference is to be held in the Ottawa-Gatineau area in July 2011. The planning and co-ordination of the conference are being carried out by the Women's Studies Programs at Carleton University and the University of Ottawa, in concert with l'Université du Québec en Outaouais and Saint Paul University in Ottawa.

The steering committee and sub committees are comprised of "volunteers" – many of whom appear to be students from the Women's Studies Programs at the various universities. There are, however, several experienced feminist activists who are in charge of the operation, to keep a firm hand on the project.

They include:

Jill Vickers, a feminist political science professor at Carleton University. She is a self-described socialist and supporter of the NDP, who ran for that party unsuccessfully in the 1979 federal election.

Ms Vickers spent her career researching and writing about feminism and gender. She is the former president of the feminist Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAOW), which averaged SOW funding of \$383,000, yearly, for over 24 years. The federal funding of CRIAOW was cancelled in 2007. Grants from SOW to CRIAOW between 1984 and 2007, total \$2,270,950.

Bonnie Diamond is a former executive director of the Elizabeth Fry Society; former executive director of the National Association of Women and the Law (NAWL) and of MATCH International, which recently lost its federal funding from CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency). This latter event may curtail her career trajectory.

Nancy Peckford is just like Bonnie Diamond above, in that Ms. Peckford is like a bee, constantly chasing honey, flitting from one feminist organization to another. She is currently the executive director of the feminist group Equal Voice, (see REALITY, November-December, 2009, and REALity, September-October, 2010). She served in 2007-2008 as executive director of Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA); was a researcher for National Association of Women and the Law (NAWL) and was a co-ordinator for the 2000 March for Women, among other feminist organizations in which she has participated.

Pauline Rankin is a lesbian feminist who is a professor at Carleton University in the departments of Canadian Studies, Political Science and Women's Studies. She served as a gender "consultant" with CIDA. Ms. Rankin is on the Board of Governors as a University Senate representative at Carleton University. She has spent her career writing on the feminist movement and gender issues.

Caroline Andrew has had a long career in the feminist movement. In 1984 she moderated the televised "women's debate" during the federal election, in which all the party leaders participated. The televised debate was organized by the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC). In 2007, Ms. Andrew was appointed by the homosexual Ontario Minister of Health, George Smitherman, chair of his department's Women's Health Agency. Ms. Andrew participated as moderator in a National Film Board documentary on women who kill their partners and argued such actions were in self defense.

The keynote speakers for this planned 2011 conference to date include feminists from India, the U.S.A. and Switzerland. The conference is open to those who are committed to women's rights and equality and includes the Lesbian/Gay/Bi-sexual and Transgendered (LGBT), the two-spirited, as well as those who are "beautifully uncatagorizable" (providing of course they are in support of the feminist ideology).

According to its website, this conference is to connect and reconnect around strategies and political agendas so that "women's equality and human rights may truly advance".

The conference states that it will be dealing with injustices experienced by women because of globalization, colonialism, capitalism, imperialism and inequality, all of which lead to "women's subjugation". In truth, the conference is to organize a new feminist movement, both in Canada and internationally.

Please write to the Prime Minister Stephen Harper, to Stockwell Day, President of the Treasury Board, Rona Ambrose, Minister Responsible for the Status of Women, and your own MP to request an end to this intolerable abuse of the taxpayers' money by permanently closing down the Status of Women.

The Right Hon. Stephen Harper
Office of the Prime Minister
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A2
Fax: 613-941-6900

The Hon. Stockwell Day
President of Treasury Board
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Fax: 613-995-1154

The Hon. Rona Ambrose
Minister for the Status of Women
House of Common
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Fax: 613-996-0785

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

THE RISKS TO SOCIETY CAUSED BY FATHERLESS CHILDREN

Feminists have always insisted that children can be raised well without a father's presence or his playing any significant role in the child's life. In short, they argue that fathers are basically unnecessary or superfluous.

This is the propagandized feminist perspective that has taken hold in our society, ably encouraged by some feminist

judges on the Supreme Court of Canada, such as Madam Justice Claire L'Heureux Dubé who, thankfully retired in 2003. In her 1992 judgement in the case of *Young v Young*, she referred to a father, separated from his wife, as being merely an "interested observer" in his child's life after a separation.

There is now a wealth of research, however, showing that children do need their fathers, not just two parents. As they grow up, children need to see complementary roles, the relationship between the sexes, which is a microcosm of society.

The Costs of the Father's Absence

There are direct and indirect costs to absent fathers.

Financial Costs

According to a 2009 study published by the Ottawa-based Institute of Marriage and Family Canada, by researchers Rebecca Walberg and Andrea Mrozek, the cost of family breakdown to taxpayers is approximately \$7 billion annually. This money effectively provides incentives for choice, ie. for either remaining married, or to not marry, or if married, whether to divorce or separate. This government financial support includes child support, welfare benefits, and single parent tax breaks, all of which slip into place with the absence of the father. Government becomes a substitute husband for the mother and surrogate father to the children. The punitive child support payments, set out in the federal Child Support Guidelines, further create the destruction of families since the generous provisions can serve as the incentive for some women to divorce.

Loss of a Father's Input in Raising Children

The absence of a father in a child's life is not just the loss of his physical presence, but also frequently means the loss of the bond that he has with his child.

A Father's Role

A father's role is to protect, nurture and sponsor his child. As stated by David Blankenhorn in his book "Fatherless America", (Basic Books, A Division of HarperCollins, 2002):

As protector, he [the father] seeks to help his children learn how to navigate their way amid the dangers of social life... he seeks to pass on to his children a valued way of life, showing them what sort of persons they are to be and how they are to live.

Mothers also provide sponsorship, but they do it differently from fathers. A father's sponsorship, according to Mr. Blankenhorn, is generally more expectant and demanding, focused especially on "preparation for the future and on the child's success in the larger society". It is a love that is more conditional than a mother's love, and is dependent on having expectations met. A mother's unconditional love is much easier and less complicated for a child. The father's expectations make a child's life more challenging, but also teaches the child to strive and seek out objectives to meet his/her father's expectations. The child's requirement to earn the father's love – that is, earn his respect, which is a form of love – is a crucial component to helping a child reach the maturity to manage successfully in the adult world.

Daughters have a need for a good relationship with their fathers. It develops their self-esteem, with the result that they are less likely to become sexually active at an early age and less likely to experience depression, alcohol or drug abuse, or eating disorders. Daughters need their fathers to show them admiration and to give them affection and attention. A father is the daughter's first experience with male love. The experience she has with her father is filtered through her future experiences with males. If she trusts her father, she is more likely to trust men, if she has been hurt by her father, she will shy away from men.

Studies have shown therefore, that understandably, children thrive so much better within an opposite sex, parental home, where both kinds of love are present. In contrast, the fall-out from a single parent, mother-led family, no matter how courageous and determined the mother, is well documented.

Fall-out From Fatherless Homes

Overall, children of fatherless families use mental health services at a higher rate than children of two-parent families, have more behavior problems at school, and are more likely to enter the juvenile justice system. They do less well at school, and schools may have to make additional efforts to educate them. Their higher use of drugs, alcohol, and tobacco, and poorer physical and mental health, causes such children to use medical services more than children of two-parent families.

Empirical research on family and crime also strongly suggests that crime is closely linked to family structure, which is the strongest predictor of urban violence. Adult children of single-mother families are more likely to be incarcerated, even when a wide range of other factors and social status are statistically controlled.

Men and Suicide

The suicide rate of men is four times higher than that of women. Suicide for men in Canada had peaked during the depression years, but that rate has been surpassed today and is higher than at any time in Canadian history. In contrast, over the past five decades, the suicide rate for Canadian women has shown only very slight variations. According to the World Health Organization, the suicide rate for men per 100,000 in Canada in 2009 was 17.3 (in contrast to 5.4 for Canadian women).

The reasons for men's suicide are vast and complex and individual to each man. However, according to sociologist Augustine Kposowa of the University of California at Riverside, divorce and the loss of children are often determining factors in men's suicides. The pain and anguish associated with divorce, child custody or child support battles in an unsympathetic family court system are not easily accepted by some men. According to Professor Kposowa, a marriage confers health and many other advantages, which divorced persons lack. In addition, women form greater supportive networks, such as meaningful friendships at a higher level than men. That is, although divorce is a crisis and a profoundly stressful life event, men and women react to the crisis and stress differently. Men more often kill themselves, while usually women do not.

A Constructive Change to Solve Family Disputes

The present adversarial system in divorce and separation that systematically occurs in the courts, makes the gulf between the marital partners wider, with the children used as pawns. In an issue of the Lawyers Weekly (September 3, 2010), however, Chief Justice Warren Winkler of Ontario Superior Court, stated that there must be a "cultural shift" to make judicial mediation more routinely available. He said that the court system "...must provide a means by which lengthy, expensive trials can be avoided through the provision of an early, meaningful investment in a one- or two-day mediation."

Chief Justice Winkler points out that judges are often in the best position to mediate cases because their views are taken seriously by the parties.

Other Sources of Mediation

The purpose of mediation is not to restore the marriage, but rather to work out the highly controversial and painful problems that arise in the breakdown of a marriage, namely custody of the children, access to the children by the non-custodial parent, and, of course, financial support for the children and spouse.

Unfortunately, a mediation conducted by a judge or otherwise can be an expensive undertaking for the separating

couple. There are less expensive private mediation services available, but these too can also strain the budget of a couple already experiencing the financial problems due to the necessity of establishing two separate homes. Alberta, however, provides this service free for those with an income less than \$40,000. The proposed changes to the BC Family Act also include mediation services but they would only be optional.

Concerns about Mediation

A drawback to mediation is that it is poorly regulated so that untrained mediators are often employed.

Other concerns about the mediation process include those of feminists who complain that in circumstances of a power imbalance between the spouses or family violence, mediation runs the risk of potentially dangerous or unfair outcomes. Others, such as father's groups, believe that mediation only works if both sides want it to work and that it doesn't solve the problem of the adversarial system of justice in family matters. They believe that we must design a better system in dealing with family disputes to eliminate the emotional pain, acrimony and adversary system that pits spouse against spouse, aided by expensive lawyers. What that new system will be, is still a matter of conjecture.

Next year, the U.K., however, may have pointed the way by requiring that mediation become compulsory and the role of lawyers reduced to a minimum. Parents will also be required to attend parenting classes.

U.S. ORGANIZATION INTERFERES IN CANADIAN POLITICS

Hungarian born, U.S. citizen George Soros is a very rich man. In 2010, Forbes listed Soros as the 14th richest U.S. citizen (35th in the world), with a net worth estimated at US \$14 billion. Mr. Soros has given away \$7 billion to many liberal causes dear to his heart. These give-aways, unfortunately, also include money to influence Canadian politics.

For this, to date, Mr. Soros and his many front organizations have not been called to task in Canada. No doubt this is due to the fact he is protected from public scrutiny by way of Canada's liberal media which prefer to protect their own.

Soros' Causes

Although Mr. Soros' money has been used to fund some worthy projects, such as the defeat of communism, and providing aid to help eliminate poverty in Africa, the bulk of his philanthropy, has been directed to extreme liberal causes. For example, in the US between 2000-2004, Mr. Soros donated \$23,581,000 to defeat the election of President George W. Bush. Mr. Soros stated this "was the central focus of his life" and a "matter of life and death". He has also donated billions of dollars world wide (including Canada) to promote the liberalization of drug laws. Most recently, he donated 1 million US dollars to a controversial referendum in California to legalize marijuana. He has funded euthanasia initiatives, such as the Oregon Death With Dignity Act. His mother was a member of the pro-euthanasia Hemlock Society and Mr. Soros stated in a speech in 1994, that he had offered to help his mother commit suicide.

George Soros' Interference in Canadian Politics

One of Mr. Soros' many front organizations, Avaaz, is based in New York. It is a liberal activist group incorporated in 2006. Its name means "voice" in a number of languages. It has no Canadian website, but apparently its executive director, who resides in New York, was Canadian born, but there are no other Canadian employees, and no office in Canada. Yet, this organization has brazenly attempted to manipulate public opinion in Canada as follows:

Interfering in 2008 Federal Election

Avaaz went to work fighting the election of a Conservative government in the 2008 federal election by purchasing political ads targeting Conservative candidates in three separate ridings.

The Election Act allows third parties to spend a maximum of \$3,666 in any single riding. It seems, however, that Avaaz spent far more than this limit to target those ridings. For example, the ad for the Ottawa Citizen targeting Ottawa MP John Baird cost \$13,566.26; the ad targeting Defence Minister Peter MacKay in the Halifax Chronicle-Herald cost \$10,083.34, and the ad to defeat BC MP Randy Camp cost \$9,729 in the Vancouver Sun. The telephone number included in the ads was an Ottawa cell phone number that didn't connect to any group and has since been reassigned by Bell to another individual not connected in any way to Avaaz. A footnote in the ads asked voters in other ridings to vote for whichever candidate would defeat the local Tory candidate.

The Conservatives put a complaint in to Elections Canada. In its response, Elections Canada stated:

...since the ads also attacked the Prime Minister, and the government as a whole, it was 'premature' to suggest that riding-specific limits were about to be violated. It was also 'premature' to assume donations might come from non-Canadians.

What an extraordinary response. Avaaz's public Elections Canada report lists only \$9,931 from Canadian sources.

Attempting to Stop the Conservative Cable Sun TV

A conservative cable company, Sun TV, has applied to the CRTC for a license. It is called "Fox News North" by its liberal critics (see REALity Sept/Oct. 2010). Avaaz has distributed a petition to pressure Prime Minister Harper and the CRTC to prevent Sun TV from being launched. By so doing, it is lobbying public office holders, although it is not an official, registered lobbyist. It has, perhaps, got around this difficulty by having no Canadian staff lobbying the federal government. If so, then, why is a foreign organization attempting to influence Canadian policies?

The petition claims that Sun TV will bring American style "hate" to the Canadian airwaves and will broadcast "hate-filled propaganda". There is absolutely no factual support for these allegations. Apparently, the fact that Sun TV will have a conservative perspective, automatically makes it "hateful" to the liberals at Avaaz.

An interesting turn on the Avaaz's anti-Sun TV petition is that the eccentric Canadian feminist writer, Margaret Atwood, who, judging from several of her novels, has a visceral hatred for Christians, has signed the petition. This so-called "liberal" writer appears to draw the line on a conservative voice being licensed to speak. She based her signature on the supposition that PM Harper has influenced the CRTC on the Sun TV application. There is not a scintilla of evidence to support this. It's her own liberal view that she is trying to ensure controls the Canadian media. This is not the first time that the flaky Ms. Atwood has put her personal views ahead of common sense. In the 2008 federal election, when asked if she would vote for the separatist Bloc Quebecois if she lived in Quebec, she replied "Yes, absolutely.... What is the alternative?" Perhaps Ms. Atwood, in the name of patriotism, could cast a vote for a federalist party, who at least would not support the breaking up of the country. For a bigoted liberal, however, this is apparently too much to ask.

In essence, therefore, a well-funded group of left-wing Americans, led by billionaire George Soros, don't want an alternative, conservative voice to be heard in Canada.

We neither need nor want this American influence. Canadians can competently manage their own affairs.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Ideas for a President's Message can come from current events, political issues or personal experiences. The topic of this message comes courtesy of the Prime Minister's Office. It began on October 5th when our Toronto office received a telephone call from the Prime Minister's Office to inquire if a representative from REAL Women of Canada would like to join the government delegation in Rome (at her own expense) to attend the canonization of Brother Andre Bessette of the famed St Joseph's Oratory in Montreal. The call was referred to me as National President, and

as they say, the rest is history.

I was pleased to accept the invitation. The President of Campaign Life Coalition Canada, Jim Hughes of Toronto, received the same invitation. The two of us were the official “stakeholders” on the government delegation to attend the canonization service and related receptions in Rome.

On October 17, 2010 six Blessed candidates from Poland, Spain, Italy, Australia, and Canada were canonized at a special Mass for that purpose held in St Peter’s Square in Rome. Thousands and thousands of people filled St Peter’s Square for as far as the eye could see. It was an honour to represent REAL Women of Canada within the Canadian government delegation, which was headed by the Honourable Lawrence Cannon. It was also an honour to be seated on the altar platform with the other 22 members of the government delegation with a close-up view of Pope Benedict XVI.

I deeply appreciate the government’s invitation to join the Canadian delegation in Rome at the canonization Mass. As a Catholic, the canonization service held a profound religious significance for me. It was a thrilling experience - an experience of a lifetime.

As we near the end of 2010, I encourage our members to renew their membership and, if possible, to consider a financial contribution to REAL Women of Canada. All of our work, be it in the courts, in Parliament or our REALity newsletter, is funded by memberships, donations, and bequests. We simply cannot do it without you! All donations are greatly appreciated and go directly to finance our efforts to promote and defend marriage and the family.

This will be my last President’s Message as the new REALity newsletter format in 2011 will no longer include a President’s Message. The current newsletter production has become too expensive. As a result, the Board of Directors decided to produce a simpler version beginning in 2011. A printed copy will be mailed to members who prefer that manner of delivery and an e-newsletter will be sent to members who will accept email delivery. The informative news content will remain the same. We appreciate your understanding and support in this effort.

May the blessings of Christmas and the New Year be with you and your loved ones!

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL’S FINAL FLING

Feminist Conference at Rideau Hall

Governor General Michaëlle Jean gave her last hurrah in office, by hosting a feminist only conference with 120 invited women in Rideau Hall on September 9 and 10, 2010, just two weeks before her term of office ended.

The conference, “Together for Women’s Security”, claimed it represented inclusion and diversity, but it was markedly a feminist affair, with no room for family advocates like REAL Women. Status of Women Minister Rona Ambrose made an appearance to close the conference, but the closest she dared come to supporting a conservative perspective was mentioning John Diefenbaker’s Canadian Bill of Rights which included the family in its first paragraph, contrary to Pierre Trudeau’s Charter which excluded the family as an entity.

Governor General’s Feminist Colours

The Governor General’s introduction displayed her feminist colours, as she addressed Canada’s feminists: “I like the energy in the room, it’s full of power, stubbornness, determination, warmth.” The conference “is what I have passionately worked toward in the past five years as Governor General of Canada.”

She said she was among those who “proudly marked” International Women’s Day. She focused on women as victims. “In Canada, behind closed doors, women and girls are mentally and physically bruised and beaten”, “today all over the

world, women and girls are living in fear.”

Feminists Mourn Their Past Glory

The entire conference revolved around the feminists' great sorrow over their previous hey day when they arrogantly served as the sole spokespersons for Canadian “women”, while wallowing in their self-importance with unlimited taxpayer money to carry out their lobbying. For example, Constance Backhouse, feminist law professor, recalled the glory days of feminism when “radical feminist consciousness raising groups sprouted from Victoria, to Yellowknife to St John’s.” She praised efforts to “re-conceptualize women's health”, and denounced the all-male boardrooms and old boys' clubs that had caused boardrooms across Canada to be dominated by men. Backhouse praised the leadership of the Governor General, who in turn, avowed that she has had many meetings with Canada's feminist elite and has taken them with her on official trips. Backhouse repeated the discredited claim that “women still earn just seventy one cents for every dollar paid to men.”

Feminism Crosses Party Lines

Red Tories were very much present at the conference - Maureen McTeer, wife of former Prime Minister Joe Clark was there, former Liberal MP Belinda Stronach spoke, and former Conservative MP Kim Campbell addressed the group via satellite. Liberal Senator Lucy Pepin was in the audience. The usual litany of complaints were heard – violence, rape, funding cuts, discrimination, residential schools, colonization of aboriginals, more men than women in positions of leadership, and the wage gap. Along with the mutual admiration for one another, the message was clear that they missed the momentum that feminism had in the 1960's. Jean Augustine lamented that “women's organizations falter, get into almost reverse gear.” There were calls to: get angry, unite and fight, run for office, win our space back. A male feminist speaker, Michael Kaufman of the White Ribbon Campaign, stated “our job is transforming masculinity”, overcoming the “impossible standards of masculinity” and “changing the ideals of manhood”, “standing up against tradition and domination, and domination in the name of tradition.”

Frances Wright, former CEO of the Foundation of the Famous Five (whose names no one can remember), which had a statue of them placed on Parliament Hill, and their faces on the Canadian \$50 bills, praised the feminists present, especially University of Calgary law professor Kathleen Mahoney, whose advocacy she claimed, caused the world court to adopt rape as a war crime. In keeping with the Famous Five Foundation efforts to change the words of the Canadian national anthem, Ms Wright announced, “I call upon all of you to break the law and sing 'in all of us command’” whenever the national anthem is sung, instead of using the official words “in all thy sons command.” But, there is no law to break!

Feminist Nostalgia

Professional feminists who have been well funded over the years by the Canadian taxpayers, via the Status of Women spoke at this conference. Such individuals and groups are: Bonnie Diamond (Feminist Alliance For International Action (FAFIA), National Association of Women and the Law (NAWL), Elizabeth Fry Societies, Match International; Maureen O'Neill (Canadian International Development Agency: CIDA), International Development Research Centre (IDRC), the left wing North South Institute; and the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation. Mary Lou McPhedran of LEAF, the Women's Legal Education Action Fund, the legal arm of the feminist movement also spoke, as did the representative of the Canadian Muslim Women's Association. Aboriginal women's representatives were in abundance and claimed there had been perfect matriarchal control over a peaceful aboriginal nation until colonialization by the whites. Now, they claim they have poverty, violence against women and girls, lack of education and a need for further funding of aboriginal women's groups.

Bonnie Diamond was nostalgic for the old days when the federal government “funded civil society to hold their own government accountable” and complained that the Status of Women mandate no longer supports feminist advocacy and research. She confirmed that “In the legendary taking of the equality clauses of the constitution, the women's movement was fully supported and in large part resourced by women parliamentarians from all parties”.

Another professional feminist, Shelagh Day (National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC), LEAF, Court Challenges Program, FAFIA, Poverty and Human Rights Centre, (see REALity Jan/Feb 2009) gave the most ideological recap of the day. She saw the “erosion of the foundations of women's equality” which she claims is “antithetical to the value of egalitarianism.” “I did not think we could move so far backward so fast”, she lamented. While many Canadian women today welcome cuts to state feminism, she sees “hostility to women's concerns and hostility to rights on the part of the present administration.” She announced that “Women need governments, we need governments that intervene in the family and in the market to create conditions of equality.” “Social programs have been fundamental creators of equality”, she believes. “Income security programs have shifted our economic dependence on men, and health care, home care, child care shifts some of the burden of caregiving from the shoulders of the individual to the shoulders of the state.” As a feminist and human rights activist, she says, less government intervention is unacceptable. Almost in tears, she emoted, “I feel that the pieces of Canada that women need are falling away.” She pleaded, “It's time for us to pull ourselves together and to take the risk of solidarity before it's too late”, to which the audience responded with a standing ovation.

But Canadian tax dollars are still propping up a failing feminism. The conference was organized over a period of five months by a Status of Women employee who took leave to plan the conference, and then she returned to Status of Women. The considerable costs of this feminist shindig in the Governor General's residence were paid out of the Governor General's budget, which is provided by the taxpayer.

The conference closed with a feminist manifesto, listing 13 resolutions in a Declaration for urgent action on the part of government for women's human rights and equality and calling for the usual feminist demands - more power for women, a social safety net, a public, not for profit, health system, the re-establishment of the Court Challenges Program, fully adequate government funding, etc. As with the United Nations monitoring system, they want monitoring of the demands of the above Declaration to be reported to the new House of Commons Status of Women Committee, dominated, luckily for them, by opposition party, feminist MP's. The Canadian Declaration on Women and Security can be found at:

<http://ourfuturehasnoviolenceagainstwomen.blogspot.com/2010/09/canadian-declaration-governor-generals.html>

Governor General Michaëlle Jean thoroughly enjoyed the feminist conference with a call to make Canada “a country that we dream of”. She called for “equity, equality, justice, security and respect for the expression of our liberty”.

A feminist woman clearly out of touch with today's world.

CONCERNS ABOUT DONATING OUR ORGANS

We are constantly reminded that the donation of organs is a compassionate way to assist another person to live.

Behind this generous statement, however, lies an eerie, dark world, of which we should be aware before we agree to donate our, or a family member's organs.

The awful reality is that the organs of some patients are being harvested in hospitals before the patient has died. According to Dr. Lawrence Huntoon, editor-in-Chief of the Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons, in an internet report, “in hospitals with aggressive transplant programs they regard making sure a patient is actually dead before removing the organs can, and is, viewed as a minor technicality or impediment.” Hospitals make a huge amount of money on transplant cases: it's a billion dollar business, which explains one of the reasons for the eagerness to obtain organs.

The Problem

The problem with organ transplants is that, for organs to be suitable for transplanting, they must be taken from a living person. In pursuit of a ready supply of organs, physicians can and do declare a person dead whether they

actually are or not.

The appropriate criteria for transplants were succinctly summed up by Pope Benedict XVI, when he addressed a conference on “brain death” in Rome in February 2009. He stated that “respect for the life of a donor allows the removal of organs only in the presence of his actual death”. So when does death actually occur?

Criteria Used for Defining the Death of a Donor

Brain Death Donor (BDD)

There is no medical or scientific consensus about the definition or diagnostic criteria for brain death – yet so-called “brain death” is viewed as the supposed time to remove an organ.

In 1968, a definition of brain death was authored by an ad hoc committee of department heads from Harvard Medical School. The premise of the Harvard standard was that the lack of brain function implies absence of blood circulation to the brain, which causes brain necrosis or the irreversible death of the brain cells. When this occurs, heart and lung function is maintained by life support until the physician removes the organs.

However, medical scientists have now discovered that the absence of brain function is not the same as “brain necrosis” or true brain death. In many cases, when there has been no discernable brain activity, the patient has recovered with appropriate treatment. In truth, brain death is not necessarily death, that is, a patient’s permanent demise. Many examples of this are available, such as pregnant women deemed “brain dead” but who are capable of delivering a healthy child several months after their supposed “death”.

In short, brain death was and never will be true death. Yet, about 10% of organ transplants in Canada are taken from patients declared brain dead.

Cardiac Death Criteria

The demand for human organs is relentless, and physicians are attempting to apply another, simpler criterion, which is just as ethically questionable. The newer criterion is called Cardiac Death Criteria (CDC).

This procedure was revived in Canada in 2006 at a “consensus” conference of 120 medical, ethical and legal experts who determined that it was appropriate to remove organs after cardiac death. As a result, organs have been removed after CDC from more than 120 patients in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, Alberta and B.C.

CDC nevertheless raises grave ethical problems. This is because organs are obtained for transplanting by first obtaining a “Do Not Resuscitate” order (DNR). The patient’s respirator is then removed, while the heart is still beating. If the heart stops beating within an hour, the surgeon waits from 2-5 minutes before removing the organs. If the heart does not stop beating within the hour, the patient is returned to a hospital bed to die without any further treatment.

The difficulty is that medical research has demonstrated that a person can survive cardiac arrest, i.e. be resuscitated, for an average of 72 minutes if given appropriate treatment. Turning off the respirator to determine whether or not the patient can breathe on his own, and then finding out that he cannot, is the same as suffocating the patient. It is clear, therefore, that the use of cardiac arrest, as a criterion of death, is not tenable.

In a paper written by Dr. Christopher Doig from the Office of Medical Bioethics, University of Calgary, a word of caution about CDC was raised. He stated that:

... to proceed with this is premature and...casts doubt on the intentions and practices of [medical professionals]...and of organ donation practices as a whole.

Further, a letter signed by Dr. Ari Joffe, an intensive-care specialist at Stollery Children's Hospital in Edmonton, co-signed by seven U.S. pediatric intensivists, published in the journal, *Pediatric Critical Care Medicine* in September 2010, has urged a moratorium on donation after cardiac death in children. The Alberta physician said that the arguments for children apply equally to adult patients.

According to Dr. Joffe, the problem is that loss of blood circulation due to a non-beating heart is generally considered irreversible. But this is the case only if CPR is not applied to try to restart the heart. With CDC, the decision is made not to try to revive the heart.

Misguided Belief In the Physician's Opinion

Canadian research has demonstrated that families and patients consider trust in their physicians as paramount in making end-of-life decisions.

Unfortunately, when physicians make the arbitrary decision that the patient's prognosis is "hopeless" because, in their opinion, the patient will not survive, or will not have acceptable quality of life, this is not necessarily the case. It is impossible, in the early stages, to predict whether a given patient will die or at what level his recovery may be. There are too many instances of unexpected recovery.

Nevertheless, physicians tell the patient and his family that the patient's future is hopeless, and that support is futile. Then, the DNR (do not resuscitate order) is written, with the removal of the organs being the actual cause of death, not the cardiac arrest.

Conflict of Interest

The attending physician, in these cases, has a conflict of interest in that he has the duty, supposedly, to preserve the patient's life, not hasten his death. Only after death should the physician consider the patient a potential donor and approach the family about organ donation. However, if a death has definitively occurred, then the organs are no longer usable and therein lies the cause of the deception on the part of the medical profession.

What Is the Solution?

According to Alex Schadenberg of the Euthanasia Prevention Coalition (www.euthanasiaprevention.on.ca/), the issue of organ donation has become an even greater concern since there now appears to be a connection between legalized euthanasia and organ donations, according to the *Journal of Transplantation Proceedings* (2009). Euthanasia was legalized in Belgium in 2002. In this paper it was stated that between 2005 and 2007 four patients expressed their desire to permit organ donation once they had died by way of euthanasia. This raises the concern that intense pressure will be placed on individuals to seek euthanasia, so that their organs can be harvested. According to Alex Schadenberg, since all organ donations actually cause the death of a person, whether they are actually dying or not, all organ donation should be opposed. The alternative is that adult stem cell research should be promoted to provide the vital organs that need to be replaced. That is, using adult stem cells that regenerate the organ, is the only morally acceptable way to obtain organs. Thus, adult stem cell research should be promoted and its research intensified.