

THE STATUS OF WOMEN MUST BE ABANDONED AN EGREGIOUS ABUSE OF TAXPAYER'S MONEY

The Royal Commission on the Status of Women (RCSW) tabled its report in 1970 and recommended that the federal government establish a special agency to further the advancement and equality of women.

As a result, the Status of Women was established in 1973. Since that time, it has handed out over one hundred million dollars to so-called women's groups. In fact, only feminist groups have been the major beneficiaries of this largesse. Acting as agents of change, the latter have used taxpayers' monies to further the feminist ideology in Canada. This is the reason feminists have been more influential in Canada than anywhere else in the world. With large amounts of government grants, they have infiltrated the schools, universities and government, as well as the courts.

In the last ten years, annual grants given directly to feminist groups from the Status of Women (Women's Program) have almost doubled, from \$8 million in 1998 to \$15 million for 2007-2008. Total funding for the Status of Women agency for 2007-2008 (last available data) was \$25 million, which covers administrative costs, salaries, grants, etc. The total allocation to the Status of Women for the last ten years (1998-2008) is \$225 million.

The RCSW took place over forty years ago. Much has changed since then. For example, today, women are perfectly capable of making their own decisions with regard to their lives and do not require a government agency to support them because of supposed discrimination by a mythical "patriarchal" society. Women today comprise 66% of university students, 59% of medical graduates and 55% of law graduates. It is significant that the current unemployment statistics indicate that men, rather than women, are experiencing the most unemployment difficulties.

It seems that it is now men who are lagging behind women. Yet, the Status of Women, with its entrenched feminist bureaucrats, is still pushing the feminist agenda, undeterred by the remarkable changes that have taken place in Canada in the past few generations. Why then is this absurd agency still allowed to exist?

The Conservative government did try to come to grips with the problems of Status of Women in September 2006, when it stopped the direct core funding of prominent feminist groups, such as the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC) and LEAF (Women's Legal Education Action Fund), the latter being the legal arm of the feminist movement. The Conservative government also stopped feminist "research." Instead, the government specified that only projects which would directly assist women were to be funded.

Feminist Research Projects

The "research" previously funded by the Status of Women was advocacy research, since its purpose was to advocate and promote the feminist ideology only.

For example, one of these so-called research projects, funded by the Status of Women, was carried out by a feminist professor, Pierette Bouchard, in the Faculty of Education at Laval University in Quebec, along with her two research assistants, Isabelle Boily and Marie-Claude Proulx. Their "study" was released in 2003, which, apparently, helped reveal a "reactionary ideology attacking the gains by women and to discredit feminism."

This report, posted on the Status of Women's website, reported that a "masculinist" lobby threatens to overturn policies that protect women's rights. The research included an analysis of Internet sites operated by these so-called "masculinist" groups. One of these groups has a website called B.C. Fathers, created by Ken Wiebe of Victoria. Mr. Wiebe brought an action of defamation in the B.C. Supreme Court against the researcher, her assistants and the Status of Women based on the researchers' claim that these men's groups were engaged in "hateful, violent and unrestrained discourse against feminism" and were a vehicle for "hate mongering."

The B.C. Supreme Court concluded, in January 2008, that Mr. Wiebe was indeed defamed by the researcher, her assistants and the Status of Women, but that the comments “however exaggerated, obstinate or prejudiced” were permitted under the law because of the legal defence of “fair comment”. The latter refers to matters of opinion which is not capable of proof, but is allowed to be expressed, although others disagree, provided the opinion is considered an honest belief.

That is, although the researchers and the Status of Women were found to have made defamatory remarks against Mr. Wiebe and his organization, since it was an “honestly held opinion”, the court claim by Mr. Wiebe was dismissed.

Nonetheless, this case does reveal the nonsense spilled out at the Status of Women by its funded researchers. What an obscene waste of the taxpayers’ money!

Notwithstanding the setbacks caused by government policy on funding and the detrimental court decision, the militant feminist bureaucrats in the Status of Women are still hard at it, spending the taxpayers’ money, circumventing government policy by generously funding some additional, newly organized feminist groups. These latter have received thousands of dollars in huge grants since 2006, when the new funding policies were supposedly put in place. The two most prominent groups now receiving funding are the Feminist Alliance For International Action (FAFIA) and Equal Voice.

Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA),

(FAFIA) has received huge sums from the Status of Women since it was formed in 2002. It received \$330,000 from the Status of Women in 2006-2007, and \$180,470 in 2007-2008 and in the fiscal year 2008 – 2009, it received the enormous grant of \$480,000, supposedly to organize a series of training events for 105 women across Canada to “become familiar with the tools related to the UN Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)”, i.e., how to agitate for feminist goals. This money will keep FAFIA operational to continue its feminist work for a year or so, at which time it will, undoubtedly, receive another large grant from the Status of Women – as regular as clockwork. This most recent grant is supposed to enable FAFIA to hold four regional workshops. However, no matter how lavish the workshops, they don’t cost \$480,000! These feminist applications for grants are “padded” in order to allow the feminist groups to receive funds to cover their operational expenses, such as offices, equipment and staff, while they carry out their “project”. For example, granting funds to FAFIA provided it with funding to carry out other feminist activities, such as researching and drafting a paper to attack MP Maurice Vellacott’s bill on shared parenting (see article “Family Under the Spotlight”, p. 4).

Another of FAFIA’s major activities is to appear before select UN monitoring committees, which are feminist dominated, to report on the Canadian government’s many alleged failures to support “women,” which failure contravenes UN treaties. For example, when the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women Monitoring Committee issued a report on Canada, which included FAFIA’s criticisms of the Conservative Government, the opposition parties used this report to attack the Conservative government, (Hansard, November 25, 2008, page 242, 249, and 250. Also, see Hansard November 28, 2008, page 278). The Conservative government, therefore, is allowing taxpayers’ funds to be used to facilitate attacks on itself and to undermine its policies. Sheer madness!

Equal Voice

Equal Voice is a feminist organization promoting policies to encourage more women to enter politics. It has regularly received \$70,000 annually from the Status of Women, but in 2009, it hit the jackpot receiving an additional \$1.2 million over 38 months from the Status of Women to develop a special mentor’s program to train young women to attain political office. Although Equal Voice is supposedly non-partisan, it is, in fact, a feminist organization with feminist supporters from all the political parties, such as former Prime Minister (for a brief few months) Kim Campbell, Judy Erola (former Liberal Minister for the Status of Women), Audrey McLaughlin, (former federal NDP leader) and Pat Carney, a feminist Progressive Conservative Senator, now retired.

Equal Voice claims that, with this generous funding from the Status of Women, it is “poised to become the most active voice for Canadian women” – what women? Since when do feminist organizations represent anyone but themselves?

It is significant that the grants to Equal Voice and FAFIA are both supposed to be used for the “training” of women. We know that the “training” will be in the feminist ideology and the trainees, young women, immigrant and aboriginal women, will be trained to serve as the next generation of feminist agitators – all at the taxpayers’ expense.

Professional Feminists

Mention should be made here about the efforts of the professional feminists who spend their entire lives living on comfortable salaries provided by the taxpayer, while spending their careers solely pushing feminism in Canada.

Feminist organizations have few members, and, therefore, rely on these well-educated professional feminists to promote their platform. These professional feminists have no other occupation than that of operating these organizations. They move sideways from one feminist organization to the other – never stopping in their quest to revolutionize society on the taxpayers’ dollar. Some of these women are:

Shelagh Day

A self-acknowledged lesbian, she was one of the founders of the legal arm of the feminist movement LEAF (Women’s Legal Education and Action Fund). She then became vice president of the feminist umbrella group the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC) in which capacity she attended the Charlottetown Constitutional Conferences in 1992, supposedly representing “women” at the taxpayers’ expense. Next, she chaired the equality panel of the Court Challenges Program, generously handing out funds to feminist and homosexual groups to support their legal challenges. Ms Day was also a member of the Canadian delegation at the UN Conference for Women held in Beijing in 1995. She represented the homosexual organization EGALE (Equality for Gays and Lesbians Everywhere) at that conference – of course, with all expenses paid by the taxpayers. Ms Day’s most recent reincarnation was in the recently formed (1999) umbrella feminist group Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA), referred to above, where she chairs its human rights committee.

Andrée Côté

She is former president of the government funded NAWL (National Association for Women and the Law), and is currently Director of Legislation and Law Reform for the public service union PSAC (Public Service Alliance of Canada). She has also been a spokesperson for the Pay Equity Network, comprised of Status of Women funded NAWL, the Court Challenges Program, and LEAF (Legal Education and Action Fund), NOIVMW (National Organization of Immigrant and Visible Minority Women in Canada) and FAFIA (Feminist Action for International Action), and various labour organizations. Côté was Human Rights Officer for PSAC during their Call to Action against Bill C-484, a bill to make violence against the unborn child a separate crime in cases of violence against the mother. She was Research Associate at the Centre for Feminist Research, York University and also represented the pro-abortion, same-sex marriage World March for Women (REALity, May/June 2000). Her feminist publications have been funded by Status of Women, NAWL, and the Quebec and Ontario governments through feminist organizations. She has also co-authored a brief for the Ontario Women’s Network on Custody and Access (2001).

Nancy Peckford

At present, she is executive director of Equal Voice, which, as stated above, recently received \$1,200,000 from the Status of Women. She has published “Women and electoral reform: Pursuing a feminist policy agenda in Canada”. She is former Director of Programs for FAFIA. Peckford has been a researcher with NAWL (2001), Lobby Coordinator for the 2000 March for Women (2000), Provincial Coordinator of the Ontario Women’s Network on Child Custody and Access (2002), and a program officer with the Canadian Labour Congress’ Women’s and Human Rights Department

(2003). In 2007-2008, while executive director of FAFIA, she served as one of the three experts for the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women's study on gender budgeting. Such a well-paid career – funded almost entirely by the taxpayer.

Where is the Conservative Minister Responsible for the Status of Women?

Where is the Conservative Minister responsible for the Status of Women in all this, since she must approve these questionable grants before they are finalized? The current Minister, the Hon. Helena Guergis (Simcoe Grey) must either be lacking in common sense to believe the nonsense plied her by the bureaucrats in her department, or she is sympathetic to the duplicity being carried out by her department and is delighted to push these funds into feminist hands. Either way, she is an ineffective, toothless representative of the Conservative government and should be removed.

Conclusion

The Status of Women organization and its vast empire, including its tentacles which are present in every federal government department, by way of the policy of so-called “gender mainstreaming,” should be abolished. Funds used for this anachronistic agency should be used to meet the real needs of men, women and children who genuinely require assistance: such funds should not be funneled off to the well-educated, professional feminists, whose power and influence over the years have stemmed solely from funding by this government agency.

Please write to the following to request the disbanding of 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. James Moore
Minister of Canadian Heritage
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Fax: (613) 992-9868

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

THE FAMILY HITS THE SPOTLIGHT

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

Western nations are looking at the shambles their countries have become. A great increase in family breakdown (divorce and separation) resulting in increased substance abuse, alienated youth dropping out of school with no skills, and an ever increasing number of children raised in single parent homes, are just a few of the problems facing nations today. This has led to government policy makers, churches and charities trying to make sense of both the causes and consequences of family break-up. Consequently, the future of the family has now been placed at the top of the political list of priorities.

For example, British Prime Minister Gordon Brown talked about family values at the annual Labour Party Conference in Brighton, September 27-October 1, 2009. The UK opposition leader David Cameron told his party members that the family lay at the heart of his beliefs. Other government leaders in Russia, France, Poland, Latvia and Romania are expressing similar concerns.

As a result of these concerns, conferences on the family are springing up in the western world. The Congress of the Families, held in Amsterdam in August, has been followed by a similar conference, held in October in Malta. The latter conference was jointly organized by the Qatar based Doha International Institute for Family Studies, the University of Malta's Centre for Family Studies and the Cana Movement, a lay Catholic organization. Another conference on the family was held in late October in Gdansk, Poland.

Speakers at these conferences make clear that marriage is the best institution for the raising of the next generation and the best way for adults to find fulfillment.

Incorrect Assumption About Single Mothers

The common assumption in the past has always been that the problem of single mothers has been due to poverty, and the remedy for this was for the state to give single mothers a home and enough money to live on. There is now irrefutable evidence, presented at these conferences, that this policy on single mothers has created a perverse incentive to adopt the negative behaviour that attracts the benefits. In effect, such government policy deliberately produces fatherless children, supported by the state, along with destruction of the father's role in the family.

The consensus is now emerging in social sciences that the biggest handicap that a child can face is the absence of a father figure while growing up. Unfortunately, the deliberate alienation of the father (and sometimes the mother) is one of the common side effects of separation and divorce (see article "Parental Alienation Syndrome", p. 9).

According to Statistics Canada, in 2004, custody was awarded in cases of divorce and separation to the mother in 45.0% of the cases, while fathers were awarded custody in only 8.1% of the cases. Custody was awarded to the mother and father jointly in 46.5% of the cases. However, in such joint custody arrangements, children do not usually spend equal amounts of time with each parent, but rather one parent retains physical custody, usually the mother, and the father is customarily awarded access rights only.

Special Joint Committee on Child Custody

The 1998 Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Child Custody and Access recommended that all child custody awards in divorce cases commence with the rebuttable presumption (a presumption that can be overturned on evidence to the contrary) that the father and mother have equal parenting rights with equal legal responsibility and joint physical custody of the child. A Nanos Research poll, conducted during March 2009, indicates that 80% of Canadians support equal, shared parenting after divorce. These results are nearly identical to a Nanos Research Poll, conducted in 2007, on the same question.

Private Members Bill C-422 – Shared Parenting

What then can be done to ensure that both the mother and father are closely involved during a child's growing years? One answer is to pass legislation to ensure shared parenting, as recommended by the

parliamentary committee in 1998. This policy was the basis of Private Members Bill C-422, sponsored by MP Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon-Wanuskewin). At REAL Women's annual meeting, held in Edmonton in June, a resolution was passed to support MP Maurice Vellacott's bill on shared parenting.

Evidence in support of this bill has been provided by Prof. Edward Kruk M.S.W., Ph.D. (edward.kruk@ubc.ca) of the University of British Columbia. In the Executive Summary to his report he stated: "Research is clear that children fare best in post-separation relationships in which they maintain meaningful routine parental relationships with both of their parents beyond the constraints of a 'visiting' or 'access' relationship, in which they are shielded from destructive parental conflict, and in which they are protected, to the highest degree possible, from a marked decline in their standard of living. Contrary to current practice and dominant socio-legal discourse in Canada, when parents disagree over the living arrangements of their children after separation, new evidence suggests that [the] conditions [for children] are best achieved by means of a legal shared parental responsibility presumption, defined as children spending at least 40 per cent of their time with each parent, rebuttable only when a child is in need of protection from a parent."

Minister of Justice Rejects Shared Parenting

Minister of Justice Rob Nicholson, however, in a statement to the Canadian Bar Association in August 2009, stated that joint custody presumptions should not usurp the "best interests of the child" standard, which he maintained should remain the paramount consideration in custody and access decisions under the Divorce Act.

REAL Women agrees that the best interests of the child should always be paramount, but in our view, the presumption of shared parenting would ensure that this occurs. It is to be noted that shared parenting would be a rebuttable presumption which can be overridden by evidence that shared custody would not be in that child's "best interests." The shared parenting presumption supports the critical concept that a child should have both a father and a mother as an integral part of the child's life unless, of course, such an arrangement is shown not to be in the child's "best interests".

Provide Legislative Support for Parallel Parenting

There are situations, however, where parents cannot always get along and work together, even though they both love and care deeply for their child. In such circumstances, parallel parenting regimes would permit both parents to have joint custody, yet split decision-making authority between them. For example, one parent could be given responsibility for all medical and extracurricular decision-making and the other, responsibility for all educational and religious/cultural decision-making. Each parent is therefore able to maintain an active role in a child's life, rather than becoming, as too often is the case, a "weekend" parent. This position has been upheld by Mr. Justice Paul Perell of the Ontario Superior Court in his well-reasoned decision in *Mayer v. Douglas*, (2008). In that case, he ordered a parallel parenting regime in a family situation fraught with communication and cooperation problems. The judge noted that in many cases, sole custody orders could be quite arbitrary, particularly when there is evidence to show that each parent exhibits good abilities to parent the child. In such circumstances, Mr. Justice Perell concluded that parallel parenting was the appropriate solution.

Obviously, the courts now recognize that it is in the children's "best interests" to have each parent play an active and meaningful role in their upbringing. This includes active decision-making, and this would be accomplished by way of shared parenting or parallel parenting described above.

Feminists Oppose Shared Parenting

Since shared or parallel parenting is obviously to the advantage of the children, then why has it not been implemented? In a word, this has been due to intense feminist pressure as the latter are resolutely opposed to shared parenting. For example, when the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons proposed joint parenting in its 1998 report, the then feminist Minister of Justice Anne McClellan, aided and abetted by the feminist lawyers in the Department of Justice, totally ignored this recommendation.

Status of Women funded feminist organizations, such as the organization National Association of Women and the Law (NAWL), recently made a submission to the Department of Justice on the issue, rejecting Mr. Vellacott's shared parenting bill. The Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA) (see article "Status of Women Must be Disbanded", p.1) has submitted its own objections to shared parenting. The reason that shared parenting raises feminist hackles is due to the fact that, if it were to be implemented, women would no longer be assured on divorce of having control, as well as physical custody of the children of the marriage, as is the current situation. Therefore, feminists regard Bill C-422 as a severe undermining of their "entitlement" to the children of the marriage upon separation and divorce.

Since most divorces in Canada are initiated by the wife, women might not be quite so quick to initiate divorce proceedings if there was a real possibility that they would not have custody of their children on divorce, as they do at the present time.

Please write to the following to indicate your support for joint parenting (Mr. Vellacott's Bill C-422).and parallel parenting

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

The Honourable Robert D. Nicholson
Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
284 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H8
Fax: 613-954-0811

Your MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

THE LIBERAL PARTY MIRED IN THE PAST

The federal Liberal party has recently been experiencing hard times. An Ipsos Reid Poll in October indicated that the party had only 25% support among Canadians – an Ekos poll taken in the last week of October showed Liberal support at 26%, down even from the 28% support received by the party under its former leader, Stéphane Dion.

There are a number of reasons for this lack of support, not the least of which is the fact that Canadians have not warmed to Liberal leader, Michael Ignatieff.

This may change with the appointment of Ignatieff's new Chief of Staff, Peter Donolo, who previously worked as communications director for Prime Minister Jean Chretien. At the present time, however, Canadians do not seem comfortable with Mr. Ignatieff.

Liberals Are In Past

Another reason for the Liberals' problems may be due to the fact that the Liberal party has not moved with the times in regard to social issues. Instead it has become mired in past policies, set in its heyday in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. This retrogression was demonstrated by the Liberal Party when it marched in the Ottawa gay pride parade this summer under the banner, "The 69 position". This referred to the 1969 omnibus bill, which decriminalized homosexual sex for those over 21 years of age. (See REALity September/October 2009, "The Way We Were, Trudeau's Stamp of Corruption", page 12). An editorial in the homosexual newspaper, Capital Xtra (September 30, 2009), urges the Liberal party to reflect a new generation of "gay-friendly" legislation following the precedent set in 1969, for example: by modernizing divorce and family laws to reflect the fact that marriage is no longer a life long commitment; allowing freedom to access explicit pornographic images on the Internet; and striking down so-called "antiquated" laws prohibiting restrictions on erotic mail, lewd performances and all sodomy. This gives rise to concern that the federal Liberals, well known for their unhesitating support of all homosexual demands in the past, will be doing so again, if the Liberals regain power.

Certainly, the federal Liberals have unquestioningly supported all feminist demands. The federal Liberal women's caucus has prepared three volumes of the Pink Book – volume III was released in late October: Michael Ignatieff has happily endorsed it. The Pink Book includes the usual feminist special demands for a national day care program, pay equity, preventing violence against women, establishing an office of Commissioner for Gender Equality, a gender based analysis of all federal legislation, etc., etc. The feminists' demands are endless, unimaginative, narrow, and based on debunked statistics.

The Liberal Party has also promised to restore the notorious Court Challenges Program – another nightmare. This boondoggle only serves the purposes of left-wing special interest groups, such as feminists and homosexual/lesbian organizations, to cover their legal costs in launching legal challenges to further their agenda.

Why don't the Liberals deal with today's problems, such as the breakdown of the family (see "Family Under the Spotlight", p. 4), policies to assist women in balancing paid employment with their family responsibilities, family taxation, fixing our health care system, unemployment, and the problems arising in regard to private pension funds, etc.?

Liberals Support Special Interest Funding

The reason that the Liberals are so keen on special interest funding may be because of their party's belief that the state can achieve utopia, where the imperfections of mankind cease to exist by endless government intervention on behalf of a parade of victims. Hence, the enormous special interest grants distributed during the Liberals' time in power. Mr. Trudeau began this special interest funding early in the affluent 1970s. Mr. Trudeau argued that the government funding of the "under dog" would amount to "participatory democracy". Significantly, this practice had the advantage of making special interest groups beholden to the government. Also, this policy greatly advanced the Liberal government's own agenda. For example, in 2003 the Liberal government moved toward decriminalizing prostitution. Under the Access to Information Act, REAL Women discovered that between 2004-2006, prostitute associations had received nearly \$700,000 in grants from the Liberals to promote decriminalization (see REALity, Sept/Oct. 2008 p. 5, "The Former Liberal Government and Prostitution").

Today, the Conservatives are still funding special interest groups, (See "Status of Women Must Be Disbanded", p. 1). Though the Conservatives have tried to cut back on these grants, they have not been very successful in doing so due to backlash from the groups insisting on their "entitlements". In fact, the Conservatives lost seats in Quebec in the last election due to their attempt to reduce arts funding.

On the other hand, in late October, Mr. Ignatieff (at a meeting with arts stakeholders in Montreal) agreed to double the budget for Canada Council for the Arts, provide stable funding for CBC, and re-establish the cultural funding that the Conservatives had managed to cut.

The Liberals remain incensed that ever-increasing buckets of cash are not being handed out to special interest groups as they have done on a regular basis. They apparently attribute this failure of the Conservatives to their alleged "hatred" of special interest groups. According to Liberal Whip Roger Cuzner (Cape Breton, Canso) Hansard, September 14, 2009, p. 4910:

He [Prime Minister Harper] needs absolute power so he can teach his enemies a lesson, and he makes it clear just who his enemies are: women, minorities, anyone who dares to fight to protect their charter rights.

When will political parties learn that special interest groups do not represent the public, but serve only their own interests? Grants to them are a waste of taxpayers' money – and a tax on our patience.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

REAL Women of Canada is one of several pro-family, pro-life organizations in Canada. The more groups there are, the more issues that can be addressed! Our groups sometimes join together to co-operate as a coalition, for example in a court case, or to promote a specific project. At other times, each organization takes its own approach to address issues. Always, however, all the pro-family groups operate on the same wavelength, holding the same objectives, i.e. promoting and protecting the traditional family.

All our groups play an important role in the broader pro-family, pro-life movement. From time to time, we ask our members to support a particular campaign sponsored by another group because there is no sense in duplicating specific projects. It would be appreciated, therefore, if you would support the following current campaigns:

UN Petition for the Unborn Child and the Family

The Catholic Family & Human Rights Institute (www.c-fam.org) is heading an international coalition of groups circulating a petition for the unborn child and family around the world. The goal is to get a total of one million names and present the petition to the United Nations in December.

The petition calls for Member States of the UN to interpret the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as protecting the unborn child from abortion. It also calls for special protection for the family. These are ideas, right out of the original Universal Declaration, that have been forgotten over time.

This petition is necessary because the UN is the font of a great deal of anti-life propaganda. UN agencies and UN-related groups are at the forefront of making abortion a universally recognized human right. That is, UN radicals want to make killing babies in the womb a human right. Can there be anything more evil than that???

The pro-life movement at the UN is fighting this hideous movement to kill babies. We are outspent ten million to one and out-manned one thousand to one, but this hasn't stopped our effectiveness!

To sign the petition, go to www.c-fam.org/campaigns/lid2/default.asp. REAL Women's web site also includes information on this petition. Look under the heading "Alert" on the web site: www.realwomenca.com

Select the language of your choice, and sign the petition. Would you please forward this note to all of your friends and family, to everyone in your address book? We must show the UN there is global support for the unborn child and the family!

Bill C-268 – Human Trafficking of Persons Under 18 Years of Age

This Bill amends the Criminal Code to include a mandatory minimum penalty of imprisonment for 5 years for offences involving trafficking of persons under the age of 18 years. Our law must send a clear message that the trafficking of children is a serious crime and severe penalties will be imposed on anyone committing this offence.

On September 30, 2009, Bill C-268 passed the House of Commons, and has now been passed by the Senate. Many thanks for Conservative MP Joy Smith (Kildonan-St. Paul, Manitoba) for her private members bill on this crucial issue.

Bill C-384 – Euthanasia Bill

This Private Members Bill, tabled by Bloc MP Francine Lalonde, would legalize euthanasia and assisted suicide in Canada. It is not about dying with dignity or palliative care. Bill C-384 is about giving the power to a physician to directly and intentionally cause the death of individuals. It is not limited to the terminally ill; it permits people with chronic physical or mental pain to die by lethal injection. The Bill does not provide any effective safeguards for vulnerable people.

A new website is dedicated to defeating Bill C-384 at: www.stopbillc-384.com. This site contains all the information you need to organize a response to Bill C-384, including a postcard and petition campaign. Please notify your MP of your opposition to the Bill.

The first hour of debate on Bill C-384 was held on October 2, 2009 in the House of Commons and went very well. The second hour of debate is tentatively scheduled for December 1, 2009 with a final vote on second reading of the bill to take place on December 2, 2009. If the vote is not carried on second reading, the bill will die on the Order Paper. If it passes second reading, then the bill goes to the Justice Committee for review. Hopefully it will not get that far. We must continue to contact our MP's to defeat Bill C-384. Please act now.

Financial Support

As we near the end of the year, we would like to encourage our members to renew their membership and to consider a year-end contribution to REAL Women of Canada. All of our work – the REALity news publication, intervention in the court cases, letters and presentations to Parliament, and the other lobbying and informational activities – are funded by memberships, donations and bequests.

We cannot do it without you! Your financial assistance is needed throughout the year for us to be able to effectively defend and speak out for the family. Please support us by donating whatever amount you can. All donations will be greatly appreciated and will go directly to finance our efforts to defend marriage and the family.

A Merry Christmas and Happy New Year to all!
Cecilia Forsyth

PARENTAL ALIENATION SYNDROME (PAS) How Legislation and the Courts Encourage PAS

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

The death of a marriage gives rise to intense stress comparable to the death of a family member. However, the grief and stress experienced by a parent when his/her beloved child becomes alienated and who, as a consequence, refuses to be a part of that parent's life, creates similar grief and stress. Until recently, this pain and desolation were seldom recognized and understood. The aching wound caused by a child's withdrawal physically, emotionally and spiritually from a caring parent is deepened when the alienation is deliberately instilled in that child by a custodial parent after the marriage has broken down. In many cases, it is used as a tool to acquire sole custody of the child.

Unfortunately, legislation, policies and judicial decisions, unintentionally, encourage one parent to alienate a child from the other parent. Usually this occurs in regard to the father, but this is not always the case. This alienation from a parent leads to permanent harm to that child and quite properly can be described as child abuse.

Examples of legislation contributing to PAS include the following:

1. Federal Legislation

No-fault Divorce

No-fault divorce, which became law in Canada in 1986, permits a spouse to walk away with ease from a marriage. (See REALity, March/April 2009, page 1, "The Tragedy of No-fault Divorce.") Unfortunately, this permissive law can also separate the child from the other parent. This is because the divorce industry has put machinery in place to "facilitate" the fall-out from these divorces and it is this machinery which facilitates parental alienation syndrome (PAS) by enabling one parent to use the child to harm the other parent. This divorce "machinery" includes the following:

(a) Criminal Code of Canada Allows PAS

PAS is allowed because it is the policy of most provincial Attorneys General that an accusation of domestic violence requires both police and Crown lawyers to prosecute, under the Criminal Code, with vigour any spouse alleged to have engaged in domestic violence, even though it is based only on the accusation of one of the partners. Thus, under this criminal process, the complainant can achieve, by court order, total custody of the matrimonial home and custody of the children, just by alleging violence on the part of the other partner. This criminal charge of violence, therefore, can wreak havoc on the family unit and, in particular, on the children, since the criminal justice system pays no attention to the best interests of the child. There is no remedy, short of a bail review for the accused. This places one party in a position of immediate superiority over the other party for as long as it takes (perhaps a year) for the criminal charges to be resolved. During this period, the child of the marriage usually has no contact with the accused parent. The period of incarceration also provides the uninterrupted opportunity for the custodial parent to encourage alienation of the child from the other parent. The stigma attached to the alleged domestic violence and the resulting charges also exacerbate the alienation of that child.

No Evidence Required

It is deeply troubling that an accused parent can be arrested for domestic violence and child abuse, even if no evidence is provided – a mere accusation by the complainant is sufficient. In fact, a custody order can be put in place, plus child support payments ordered, again, with no evidence required – just the accusation of a spouse. The latter, of course, often uses these accusations of domestic violence and child abuse for a tactical advantage in the struggle for custody and support. This tactical advantage, however, is not usually as available to men as to women, given the fact that, when domestic violence is instigated, it is presumed, often incorrectly, by police and the justice system, that the male is responsible and should be removed from the home. In fact, studies indicate that women instigate

domestic violence as frequently as men. (See REALity, March/April, 2008, "Violence Against Women: A Money Grabber," page 1.)

(b) Federal Child Support Guidelines Upon Marital Separation

The intent of the Federal Support Guidelines, which came into effect in 1996, was to promote objectivity and consistency in child support awards in order to lessen conflict and tension between the separated partners. Before the implementation of these Guidelines, however, courts were able to take into account the level of access by a parent who may have been alienated from his child by the other parent. This had an ameliorating effect on the custodial parent, and prevented him/her from denying access to the separated or divorced spouse. Under the present Support Guidelines, however, the support must continue to be paid, even in circumstances where court-ordered access is not being honoured by a parent. The reality is that court-ordered access is seldom enforced and the parent who has been alienated from his/her child has no practical remedy, except by way of costly litigation for a court order to enforce the access order. This option, however, is often out of reach for parents financially struggling to maintain two residences and child support as a result of the separation.

2. Provincial Legislation

(a) The Provincial Family Law Acts

Provincial family law legislation creates a double jeopardy scenario in regard to Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS), in that not only does the federal Criminal Code provide an opportunity to exclude a parent by PAS, but provincial legislation also provides this threat. For example, the Family Law Act of Ontario, which has been the flagship for family law in Canada, since most family law acts in Canada pattern themselves after it, includes provisions that easily provide the opportunity for PAS.

The preamble to such legislation usually provides for the "equitable sharing by parents of responsibility for their children", but the devil appears to be in the details, since these acts also include provisions that work against the preamble. For example, most provincial family law acts permit a spouse to have the other partner removed from the home if there is "evidence" of abuse. Again, it is not necessary to provide substantive evidence of such alleged abuse – only the complainant's statement of abuse.

(b) Abuse Allegations

False allegations of abuse have been described by Senator Anne Cools, an expert on family law, as the "heart of darkness." That is, falsely accusing the other party (usually the father) of sexual or physical abuse is a lethal weapon in the business of parental alienation and achieving sole custody of a child. Countless accusations of child sexual or physical abuse (over 50 cases in recent years) have been proven to be false.

The 1996 Manitoba Civil Justice Provincial Task Force reviewing false allegations for reasons of obtaining sole custody of a child, reported as follows:

The task force heard horror stories about the traumatic impact on the accused person, on the immediate family and children affected by malicious false allegations designed to achieve sole custody, prohibit or restrict visiting privileges, and to punish the other parent.

3. The Courts

The courts have recently become much more aware of the problems created by PAS, and are now making a genuine effort to remedy the situation. In January 2009 in the case A.L. and K.D., (Ontario Superior Court), the court found that a mother had deliberately turned the children against the father and, as a result, the children refused all contact with their father. The court ordered the children removed from the mother's custody and placed in the custody of

the father instead, denying the mother visitation rights until she had received counselling.

It doesn't always work out this way. In another recent case, the court found that the mother had deliberately alienated the child from her father and had taken the child out of the jurisdiction to Saudi Arabia, where she remarried. The court concluded that even though the mother was "a mischief maker, a liar and a manipulator, who had ignored the court and common decency", the child's "best interests" required she remain with her mother in Saudi Arabia. This decision indicates that PAS can still be a successful tactic.

Another example of insensitivity by the courts to the non-custodial parents was the Supreme Court of Canada decision in 1998 when Madame Justice Claire L'Heureux Dubé, who, from her many decisions, can be accurately described as a feminist judge, wrote a lengthy judgment in *Young v Young* [1993] 4 S.C.R. 3 in which she asserted (p.58) that a child's best interests were best served by protecting the position of the custodial parent. According to her, "the role of the access parent is that of a very interested observer, giving love and support to the child in the background." This is scarcely reassuring to a parent alienated from a child. For a parent to be defined as merely "an interested observer" is an insult and a denial of the important role both parents play in the raising of a child.

What Can Be Done to Protect a Parent from PAS

It seems apparent that the legislation relating to families should be amended to include a specific provision to the effect that, if it is shown that a parent has alienated a child from his/her other parent, then custody and access should be denied that parent, since PAS is not in the child's "best interest." That is, it is not sufficient that protection from PAS be left to the discretion of the judge: it must be a requirement written directly into the legislation and if PAS is present, the parent responsible for it should not be given custody of the child.

In addition, it is important that allegations of abuse under the Criminal Code or provincial legislation be supported by evidence before charges are laid. That is, statements by a spouse of abuse should no longer be regarded as sufficient to support the laying of a charge. It is realized that such evidence is not always easy to obtain since domestic disputes occur, frequently, when there are no other witnesses present.

Perhaps the answer may be to provide penalties for those proven to have made false allegations. This may serve as a deterrent for those who now so readily and easily make such allegations to serve their own ends.

Attempts to protect a child from alienation of a parent and to recognize the importance of both parents in a child's life have not been easy. However, for the sake of the children, we must never give up on this goal. We must persevere until children are safe from PAS.

INTOLERANCE

There is no question that we are living in difficult times. Our culture is undergoing great strain in a struggle between those who support a secular, materialistic society, where no restrictions are placed on sexual and other behaviour, and those who wish a society which respects the law, basic human rights and freedoms and the values which have proven to be worthy over years of experience.

The reasons for this difficult conflict of values are many. However, we can identify those agencies, organizations and individuals who are pressing the case for a more liberal society with unrestricted sexual liberties. At the same time, they demand that society adapt to their values exclusively, backed up by financial penalties and open public contempt and derision for those contradicting them - charging that it is "intolerant" to disagree with them.

We have outlined below the major institutions and individuals who are currently attempting to impose their questionable values on society.

Human Rights Commissions

The self-righteous determination by Human Rights Commissions to zealously impose their “politically correct” nonsense on Canadians is unbearable. Their victims are now legion: Macleans and Catholic Insight magazines, writer Mark Steyn, publisher Ezra Levant, religious leader Bishop Fred Henry of Calgary, and Pastor Stephen Boissoin of Red Deer are just a few of their more recent victims. Who are the arrogant individuals appointed to these Commissions and paid for by our tax dollars to torment us with their capricious agendas? We must at least de-claw them and send them off to hide in a dark corner – away from decent, law-abiding citizens who dare to think independently and to freely express their own thoughts. To accept the right of the free speech of others, regardless of whether one agrees with them, constitutes the high point of a civilized democracy. We are neither civilized nor a democracy with our Human Rights Commissions dehumanizing us. The attempt by the Commissions to intimidate us, and to herd us into mindless obedience is deeply offensive. We must not become subservient to these capricious dictators.

Intolerant Homosexuals

Homosexual activists have one worldview – namely, anyone who doesn’t agree with them, is intolerant and a bigot. They, themselves, are filled with intolerance. They object to those who express opposition to them, whether this opposition is faith-based or otherwise. The democratic process is not for them. Intimidation is their weapon of choice.

This mode of operation became most vivid in the aftermath of the referendum in November, 2008 in California, which overturned the 4-3 decision of the California Supreme Court, that May, to legalize same-sex marriages. The referendum on this court decision, called Proposition 8, overruled the court decision 52% to 48%. Homosexual activists went berserk. They began to trample on religious freedom, as well as on the democratic right to freely vote and to have independent beliefs. They did this by way of protests, marches, witch-hunts on individuals and businesses that supported Proposition 8 and vandalism of religious buildings and church services – all in the name of “tolerance”. The homosexual reaction to Proposition 8 was an out-of-control wildfire of hate.

Homosexual Intimidation

Although a broad based coalition of Jews, Muslims, Evangelicals, Catholics, Sikhs and Hindus supported Proposition 8 (the Episcopalian [Anglican] Church was one of the rare exceptions), homosexual activists turned their hatred especially on the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Mormons), which is a strong promoter of family and traditional marriage. The Church, acting on its beliefs, put its heart, soul and money (approximately \$25M) into promoting the passage of Proposition 8. Frustrated homosexual activists thus used the Mormon Church as the primary scapegoat for their crippling loss on the referendum. Protests were staged at Mormon temples in California and, in New York, Mormon churches were vandalized. The church is now being charged with election violations and its tax-exempt status is being challenged by homosexual activists. The depth of homosexual hatred was apparent in their ad to oppose Proposition 8, released just before voting day, which portrayed two Mormon missionaries invading and ransacking a lesbian couple’s home, rifling through their belongings, and destroying their marriage license. This ad was unabashed religious hatred. Letters containing a white powder (obviously mimicking anthrax) were sent to the Mormon Salt Lake City headquarters in Utah and to a temple in Los Angeles. Homosexual activists also called for a boycott of Utah State, which takes in \$6 million in tourism each year.

More Faith Bashing

It was not just the Mormon Church under attack, however, although the latter received more than its share of such attacks. The Catholic Knights of Columbus headquarters in New Haven, Connecticut, which also contributed to the support of Proposition 8, received an envelope containing white powder. A Christian Church in California, Calvary Chapel Chino Hills, was spray painted by vandals, after homosexuals learned that the church served as an official collection point for Proposition 8 petitions. A 69-year-old Christian woman carrying a cross was spat on and her cross stomped on in San Francisco. Also in San Francisco, a Christian group was swarmed by homosexual demonstrators, its

members were thrown to the ground, had hot coffee thrown at them, were urinated on, and sexually attacked. A Christian Church, Mount Hope Church in Lansing Michigan, was interrupted in the middle of its services by homosexuals who threw flyers and condoms at the congregants and placed an obscene banner over the pulpit.

Cities, such as Seattle, Chicago, Baltimore, Philadelphia and New York had homosexuals marching around city halls to demand same-sex marriage. In Washington, D.C., protestors held signs saying, "This means War," "Jesus had two daddies," and "If I can't have a husband, I'll steal yours."

Homosexual protestors boycotted business owners who supported Proposition 8. Names of individuals who contributed to the referendum were publicized and subjected to boycotting and other pressures. The artistic director at California's largest non-profit musical theatre company was forced to resign amid protests over his \$1,000 donation to the Proposition 8 campaign.

This latter strategy of publicizing the names of individuals and businesses which support traditional marriage was also used recently with same-sex marriage on the ballots in Maine and Washington in November. Marriage supporters there were faced with the possibility that their names will be released to the public. It is obvious that the purpose of this is to intimidate people. By the way, Maine voters in the referendum held in November rejected last spring's decision of the State Legislature to legalize same-sex marriage.

At the Miss USA Pageant, held in April 2009, the contestant, Carrie Prejean, a Christian, was asked by homosexual judge and celebrity gossip, Perez Hilton, for her views on same-sex marriage. She spoke in support of marriage between a man and a woman and thereby promptly lost the crown to the runner-up. Ms Prejean sued the Pageant in August. In early November, the Pageant and Ms. Prejean reached a confidential settlement of the lawsuit.

Homosexual Intolerance in Canada

Homosexuals in Canada have been quick to lay complaints with their favourite human rights tribunals against anyone contradicting their worldview, especially religious leaders. School boards (Surrey B.C. School Board) and universities (Trinity Western) have been brought to court, charged with "hate" and discrimination for expressing views contrary to those of homosexual activists. Why must those with a religious faith be silenced by homosexual activists in the name of tolerance?

Intolerance by the Media in Canada

It is difficult to feel regret for the diminishing power and influence of the mainstream media, especially newspapers (see REALity July/August 2008 "Newspapers Experiencing Sharp Decline in Circulation", p.1). The latter have consistently supported only the liberal or left wing approach to issues, no matter what the issue – abortion, same-sex marriage, drug injection sites, sexual swinging, etc. We can always count on a lack of balance in most newspapers and in other media reports.

A blatant example of media bias occurred in Canada in 2003, when the Globe and Mail gleefully gave its "Nation Builder" award – awarded to those who have made a special contribution to Canada – to Chief Justice Roy McMurtry of the Ontario Court of Appeal who "swept away the last obstacles to same-sex marriage in Canada". Same-sex marriage - a "nation builder"? Only a prejudiced newspaper could have come up with that idea. No mention was ever made in the media that McMurtry had a direct conflict of interest in the defining court case, since he had a daughter living in a lesbian relationship, which relationship was legalized by his decision. In addition, he also ordered that handsome payments of court costs be paid to the lawyers retained by the homosexual activists, who argued the legal challenge against traditional marriage. Judge McMurtry then topped off his homosexual support by partying with the homosexual litigants, along with Madame Justice L'Heureux Dubé, on June 26, 2003 – several weeks after the decision was handed down. Mr. McMurtry (now thankfully retired) was a judge who lacked honour and integrity, and was a political activist hiding inside a judge's gown.

Intolerance of Judges

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms, imposed by Prime Minister Trudeau in 1982, has given unlimited power to appointed, unaccountable judges. The latter relish their role as the decision makers rather than as interpreters of the law. No one appearing before Canadian courts can doubt the power of this exclusive club of political activists.

For example, a handful of appointed judges in the Canadian courts suddenly discovered a constitutional right to same-sex marriage – a right, never noticed before. Madame Justice Claire L'Heureux-Dubé of the Supreme Court of Canada made no secret of her bias and personal belief that she was ordained to set this country right by declaring same-sex marriage a fundamental right. She did this boldly in public speeches, made at a conference on same-sex marriage, held in London, England in July 1999, in a speech on Domestic Partnerships at Queen's University on October 21 and 23, 1999, and at a party celebrating the same-sex marriage victory in the Ontario Court of Appeal on June 26, 2003 when she stated:

... courts have been at the forefront of this [homosexual] evolution not to say revolution. It's fascinating that the courts played a unique role...the Ontario Court of Appeal handed out, I am told, as I have not read it yet, one of the most perfect decisions on an issue which was difficult. It took a lot of courage...Canadian law owes [the courts] a great deal.

Contrary to Judge L'Heureux-Dubé's silly, self-serving comments, the appointment of a lawyer to the Bench doesn't give him/her any special knowledge or insight – only the apparent right to impose his/her personal views on the public.

In the US, thirty-one (31) states have passed amendments to their constitutions to define marriage as the union between a man and a woman. These amendments were made necessary because of the danger presented by arrogant judges, as in Canada, who see themselves above the law – indeed, creators of the law.

The practice of using the courts and their obliging judges to rewrite laws and create "rights" must end. The courts have become the most dangerous branch of government because there is no control over them. They are a disgrace to democracy. Who can respect them? Who wants the present-day dysfunction? Only the left-wing activists who rely on them to achieve their objectives by doing an end-run around Parliament, which is the democratic foundation on which this country is built.

Conclusion

Although the current situation in Canada is dire, this does not mean that Canadians are helpless victims of it. The intolerance now on display in this country does not mean we can do nothing to put a stop to it.

In the next issue of REALity (Jan/Feb 2010) we will deal with what can be done about this deterioration of society.

THE OBSESSION OF FORMER JUDGE ROY MCMURTRY

The former Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Appeal, who brought down the leading case in support of same-sex marriage decision in June 2003, seems to be a man obsessed with the issue.

He owes his appointment to the bench to his relationship with former Liberal Prime Minister Jean Chrétien who "owed" McMurtry for his and former Ontario Premier Bill Davis's active support of the Trudeau Charter in 1981-1982. This could never be described as an appointment of merit.

As mentioned in REALity (September/October 2006), REAL Women laid a complaint against McMurtry with the Canadian Judicial Council because of his conflict of interest on the issue, since his lesbian daughter, at the time of the

decision, was living with her female lover. His decision legalized that relationship. In fact, according to the homosexual newspaper, Xtra (October 11, 2007), McMurtry has not one, but two, lesbian daughters. Jeanie, who was in a lesbian relationship at the time of the court decision, and Erin, an actress.

McMurtry, after his retirement, was appointed Chancellor of York University in Toronto. In that capacity, at the commencement ceremonies at 10:30 a.m. on October 17, 2009, involving the Faculty of Health, Osgoode Law School and the Schulich School of Business, he took the opportunity to further his own agenda on the issue.

At that ceremony, McMurtry and the Rev. Brent Hawkes (dressed like a priest), a pastor at the homosexual Metropolitan Community Church in Toronto, were the main speakers. Hawkes, in company of his same-sex "husband", was conferred with an honorary degree. His acceptance speech covered the customary homosexual propaganda and he also spoke about how the Order of Canada was awarded to him specifically because of his work with gay and lesbian people. McMurtry's speech was over the top in praise of Hawkes's "achievements" in advancing the gay agenda. McMurtry also pontificated that those who claim to be Christians, but reject this agenda, are bigoted, homophobic and fundamentalist. At the end, most people in the auditorium, following McMurtry's lead, gave Hawkes a standing ovation. Only about ten percent of the students, remained seated. Many of those who did stand looked uncomfortable, but apparently gave in to the pressure from the university elites to conform.

McMurtry's behaviour, both as a judge and as a university Chancellor, reflects not only his profound lack of judgement, but also his failure to understand appropriate behaviour in carrying out his responsibilities.

It seems clear that McMurtry is obsessed with the same-sex marriage issue and misused his position at the convocation to force affirmation from a captive audience for his misguided beliefs and actions. Such propaganda had no place in any convocation ceremonies.

McMurtry, by these actions, has exposed himself as a totally inadequate and flawed individual – more to be pitied than scorned. The tragedy, however, is that all of Canada has had to suffer because of his profound inadequacies, both as a judge and as a person.