



REALity

REALISTIC • EQUAL • ACTIVE • FOR LIFE

WINS AND LOSSES FOR THE FAMILY AT THE UN

At the UN, in recent years, a bitter struggle has been taking place over the definition of family and the issues of abortion and homosexual (LGBT) rights.

The anti-family member states from the western world are determined to use the UN as a tool to require all nations regardless of their culture, tradition and faith to conform to western beliefs and demands on these issues. They do this by repeatedly presenting resolutions, or by slyly inserting new wording in long established UN treaties under review which, if accepted by member states in the developing world (who are generally not aware of the interpretation of these expressions in the English language) end up trapping them like fish caught in a net.

It is amazing, under these circumstances, that the UN bureaucracy, many anti-family/life organizations at the UN, and the western member states, especially the US and the European Union, have repeatedly failed to make headway at the UN in achieving their goals.

In the two months of July and August, 2015, however, the pro-family/life cause experienced some successes and losses at the UN.

You will never hear of the successes from the west's mainstream media, because these achievements are directly contrary to the agenda that the media relentlessly push. The media can't abide successful pro-family/life achievements. When they do occur, they steadfastly pretend that they didn't happen and refuse to report them. This is one reason that no one today trusts the media. They play their own game by unabashedly pushing their own liberal agenda, at the expense of truth.

THE 2015 OUTSTANDING SUCCESS AT THE UN

During the first week of July 2015, the Human Rights Council in Geneva passed a resolution, by a vote of 27 to 14, to protect the natural family as the fundamental unit of society, recognizing the prior rights of parents to educate their children and calling on all nations to create family sensitive policies and to recognize their binding obligations under treaties to protect the family. This was a shattering development for LGBT advocates as member states insisted on using the singular "family" rather than "various forms of family", which would then have included homosexual relationships.

The US, UK, Ireland and other European countries, supported by feminist and pro LGBT NGO's, pulled out all the stops during these negotiations. They exerted tremendous pressure on member states to prevent the resolution from passing. Opposition to the resolution was led by the US, which, under President Obama, has placed the LGBT agenda as one of its primary foreign policy objectives. The US and other developed countries threatened to withhold foreign aid from Brazil, Mexico, Argentina and Macedonia if they voted



CONTENTS

WINS AND LOSSES FOR THE FAMILY AT THE UN.....	PAGE 1
THE MYSTERIES OF MARRIAGE	PAGE 3
PORNOGRAPHY—THE COLLAPSE OF RESPECT FOR WOMEN.....	PAGE 4
HEARTBREAK FOR THE CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION.....	PAGE 5
WOMEN ARE NOT SHRINKING VIOLETS.....	PAGE 6

for the resolution. As a result, these countries abstained from voting. However, the sponsors of the bill, Russia, China, Belarus, and more than a dozen Muslim and African countries handily won the vote. Canada is not a member of the Human Rights Council and was not involved in these negotiations.

The passage of this resolution was predictably condemned by feminists and sexual advocacy groups who were apoplectic as a result of their loss. These activists claimed that this resolution was “a set back to the advancement of the human rights of individuals ... without acknowledging the harms and human rights abuses that are known to occur within families ...” and that “families perpetuate patriarchal oppression, traditions and harmful practices...”

THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS 2015 - 2030

Member states at the UN have been negotiating an overhaul of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) to be enacted between 2015 and 2030. These SDG's have been the basis of multiple negotiations at the UN for the past three years.

Over 70 organizations, including REAL Women of Canada, signed a letter to the negotiators requesting they uphold the goals of the UN including the definition of traditional family and marriage.

On August 2, 2015, an historic, unprecedented agreement was reached which did not include abortion as a human right, or gay rights,—the twin goals of the anti-life/family forces at the UN.

There is concern, however, that the SDG do refer to “universal access to sexual and reproductive rights”. This is language that has been interpreted in the past to mean providing women “with modern contraception” and with abortions in countries where they are legal. This language has also been used as a vehicle to fund abortion groups world-wide to provide and promote abortions. Inevitably, therefore, this expression is going to cause problems for third world countries.

The SDGs are massive in scale with total cost expected to be in the trillions of dollars per year from all funding sources, including national budgets controlled by legislators. NGO health care providers, including those that perform abortion, are preparing for the unprecedented influx of funding as sexual and reproductive health and health-care services are integrated into national health strategies and programs while a target to provide “universal health coverage” is also pursued.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVES SDG

The General Assembly of the UN met in New York on September 25th, 2015 and approved these negotiated SDG goals including the expression “sexual and reproductive rights”. This SDG remains a cloud on the horizon for the pro-life cause.

Also at the General Assembly, the US, EU and their allies, despite every effort, did not succeed in having included abortion and homosexual rights in these new global development goals.

In the absence of making headway on these issues,

however, the Obama administration with its homosexual (LGBT) supporters, moved to erode the pro-life and pro-family principles that underpin the UN by having “the family” removed from the sustainable goals document.

While this is not a gain for LGBT rights, it is a loss for the pro-life and pro-family cause. The exclusion of the family does not re-define the family, nor does it imply any recognition for same-sex couples. But the exclusion creates a space for mischief to re-define the family, despite the Universal Declaration of Human Rights not contemplating any recognition of same-sex relationships as capable of constituting a family.

At the heart of the UN is the recognition of the family as the “natural and fundamental group unit of society.” First stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, every major UN agreement, and just about every UN resolution, touching on social policy has included a reference to the family. As a result of the omission of the word “family” in the SDG, several countries gave strong statements that the new goals should not be interpreted to include LGBT rights.

THE STORY BEHIND THE PUSH FOR LGBT RIGHTS AT THE UN

The push for LGBT rights at the UN comes from the Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights, which has been funded, since 2011, by the Nordic countries in order to campaign specifically for LGBT rights. This is taking place even though that UN agency is pleading for funds to carry out its basic work. At the same time, the office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights is caught up in a scandal. It is accused of corruption by deliberately mishandling an investigation of French soldiers sexually abusing African boys. Children as young as nine were induced to trade oral sex and sodomy with the French soldiers for food. This UN agency should deal with its own problems before creating problems for the rest of the world.

African and other delegates have repeatedly expressed their frustration with the obsession of the UN bureaucracy and some governments with pushing controversial LGBT issues, when there obviously is no consensus on it.

DEEPLY GRATEFUL FOR WORK OF PRO-FAMILY NGO'S AT THE UN

We can only be grateful for the stalwart work of the pro-life/family NGO's at the UN, who are there to encourage and assist pro-life countries to stand firm for their beliefs. It is a tough, never-ending job. As long as they are there, however, the small but persistent group of sexual rights NGO's and their powerful supporting countries and UN bureaucracy and agencies, will continue to face an uphill battle in pushing their agenda.

Hopefully a pro-life president will be elected in the US in 2016. This will undermine the efforts of those promoting abortion and homosexual rights at the UN. †

THE MYSTERIES OF MARRIAGE

Living out our lives responsibly, and raising our children with both a mother and father are necessary for a child's well-being.

Most people would like to have a happy marriage. For example, the Vanier Institute of the Family found that, among others, the vast majority of teens say they want to be married and stay married for a lifetime.

Yet, the marriage rate has reached the lowest level in generations at 4.4 per 1000 in 2008, a drop from 7.7 in 1981. (No statistics are available later than 2008 according to Statistics Canada). There are three major reasons for this tragic phenomenon. They are:

1. The Sexual Revolution

During the sexual revolution of the 1960's, all social norms were challenged, especially sexual behaviour. The new attitude was that we are sexual beings and our sexual needs should not be denied. This paved the way for sex outside marriage. The latter is now regarded as "normal" – even expected of young people. The birth control pill and the availability of abortion made sexual activity much easier, which resulted in ever increasing sexual experimentation.

2. No Fault Divorce

This divorce revolution occurred in Canada in 1986, when federal legislation permitted divorces after a one year separation, without having to prove any "fault". That is, one spouse could dissolve the marriage for any reason – or for no reason. This undermined the concepts of the permanency and commitment in marriage and made every marriage vulnerable. In 1961, the number of divorces in Canada was 6,563. In 1986 there were 78,304 divorces. In 2008 (Statistic Canada's most recent statistics available) there were 70,226 divorces in Canada.

3. The Co-habitation Revolution

Co-habitation has become increasingly accepted as a valid alternative to marriage or as a way to "test-drive" the relationship before committing to marriage. Research data show, however, that co-habiting before marriage is harmful to the permanence and commitment of a later marriage. According to Statistics Canada, by the time the children of co-habiting parents are ten years old, 63% of them will have seen their parents separate, compared with only 14% of children whose parents were married. 25% of children whose parents lived common law, but then married, will experience family breakdown, compared to 13.6% for children of married parents who

did not cohabit prior to marriage.

Who will suffer the most from this? The children of these unions pay the price. These children will experience higher rates of poverty, mental illness, suicide, juvenile delinquency and criminality. This is very unfair to children and to society.

In addition, the break-up of couples with children costs the taxpayers millions of dollars because the government must pick up the pieces of these broken relationships through the welfare and judicial systems.

THE COLLATERAL DAMAGE - MALE RELUCTANCE TO MARRY

These three major reasons for the decline of marriage have given rise to yet another disturbing phenomenon. This is the reluctance of men to commit to marriage today. Women want marriage because most want children. Many men, however, see no reason to marry. The sexual liberation has given them the sex they want without having to commit to marriage. This differs from previous generations, when men usually had to marry to have sex and a family. However, when women make themselves sexually available, men are not required to settle down with one woman only.

Also, men often don't gain much from marriage. In fact, many lose by it. They not only lose their freedom and easy lifestyle, but they also, frighteningly, lose most of their money if the marriage goes wrong. Thanks to the feminist domination of our judicial system, under the Provincial Family Law Acts, men lose half their savings, pensions and property. Further, under the 1997 Supplementary Guidelines to the Divorce Act, child support (again influenced by feminists) is based, unreasonably, only on the income of the non-custodial parent, (usually the father) even though the Divorce Act itself provides that support be based on the income of both parents. Therefore, men are forced to pay support payments, regardless of the income of the custodial spouse, with serious ramifications for any failure to comply.

Men know all too well that it is women who initiate most of the divorces in Canada, taking the children and most of their income with them. Why don't men marry today? They're too smart.

THE EFFECT ON SOCIETY OF MODERN CHANGES

There is little doubt that these so-called "progressive" societal changes and legislation have left in their wake a tangle of disturbing problems. Instead of providing freedom and liberty and "free-love", we have the fragmentation of families, sorrow and grief, not to mention financial losses to both individuals and society.

It seems, in retrospect, that the previous ways of respect for the power of sexuality, the family and traditional moral values,

established by our various religious faiths, bequeathed to us the advantage to live our lives as happier, more fulfilled individuals with purpose and meaning. How to restore stability to society is our challenge today. Grievous damage has occurred, and changes are necessary. This will not be easy, but we have to start somewhere. Some useful changes would include:

CHANGING THE DIVORCE LAWS

There is no question that our no-fault divorce law is not working, as the crucial values of commitment and permanence are undermined by it. Moreover, no-fault divorce was supposed to resolve marital difficulties. It has not done so. Acrimony, suffering, and trauma still follow divorce as the no-fault aspect does not solve the main practical problems of divorce, namely, the custody of the children, division of property and financial support. It is only accountants and lawyers who have benefitted from our present, no-fault divorce law.

PROMOTION OF MARRIAGE BY PROVIDING SUPPORT SYSTEMS FOR COUPLES

The tragedy is not that so many marriages end in divorce today, but rather, that so little is done to assist troubled, but still viable marriages. Instead, society is emphasising personal happiness as the priority over responsibilities to spouse and children.

There is nothing new, however, about unhappy marriages.

What is prevalent is the unwillingness to work through the stresses that are inevitable in every marriage.

A network of support systems for ailing marriages should be set up, including easily available and low-cost counselling. These services should be tax-deductible and government subsidized.

SEX EDUCATION CURRICULUMS

Research indicates that teen relationships are the training ground for future intimacy. Sex education should help students identify the skills that will help produce stable marriage relationships. Instead, current sex education programs, such as the appalling one introduced in Ontario in September, 2015, does not relate sexuality to love and marriage in any way. The curriculum relates only to safe sex and personal pleasure, which gives a deeply distorted and dangerous view of sexuality. It is extremely harmful.

Living out our lives responsibly, and raising our children with both a mother and father are necessary for a child's well-being. Marriages should be permanent, made possible by the will to put others before oneself and to restrain our sexual impulses. Having stable, married parents is a template for teens in the formation of their later stable partnerships. Parental example plays a huge role in a child's attitude towards the permanency of marriage. Such an example should be our major goal. †

PORNOGRAPHY

—THE COLLAPSE OF RESPECT FOR WOMEN

Mainstream pornography is unbelievably dehumanizing, degrading and violent. Pornography changes the brain chemistry of viewers so that sex has no inherent link with real life.

Women, as wives and mothers, are no longer respected and protected as they have been in the recent past. Today, they are all too frequently regarded as sex objects, whose existence is to fulfill a man's pleasures and fantasies. At universities, a woman's value often depends on her willingness to perform oral sex, even on men whom she scarcely knows. Her humanity and dignity as a person are not a consideration.

Why is this happening? It is because our society is overwhelmed by the widespread use of pornography. Studies show that 79% of men 18-30 years old view pornography at least once a month, followed by 67% of 31-49 year olds, and 49% of 50-60 year olds. Also, 88% of pornography contains physical violence against women. In effect, pornography has become nothing more than virtual rape and sexual assault. The profit motive is what has led to these unsavoury depictions of violence and the humiliation of women. That

is, pornography is purely a business enterprise where women and girls are gratuitously violated and degraded as entertainment, for huge profits in order to fulfill the sexual fantasies of men. This has had a profoundly detrimental effect on gender relations as it has created a culture where sexual assault is trivialized and women are perceived as valuable only for the sexual services they provide men. Pornography has also made promiscuity seem normal and marriage to be regarded as too sexually confining for males.

In short, pornography today is not like the pin-ups of yesteryear. Rather, mainstream pornography is unbelievably dehumanizing, degrading and violent. Pornography changes the brain chemistry of viewers so that sex has no inherent link with real life.

YOUTH AND PORNOGRAPHY

Pornography is readily accessible to youths. Almost every teen has a cell phone or an iPod today with access to the internet.

It is no surprise, therefore, that a survey of more than 5000 young Canadians (Mediasmarts, 2014) showed that 10% of boys in grade seven, 33% in grade eight, 50% in grade

nine, and almost 66% in grades ten and eleven look at porn sites, and 40% of these did so daily. Pornography has become their sex education. The consequences to young males is catastrophic. Pornography is ruining their lives and future relationships with women. It is destructive of marriage and family life as indicated by the fact that over 50% of divorce cases now involve one partner being addicted to pornography.

This is one of the major reasons sex-education curriculums in the schools are so harmful. It plays into the pornography mentality that there is an entitlement or right to sex and that sex has no connection with the other person, other than to fulfill sexual fantasies. School sex-education curriculums also never depict sex as being connected to

long lasting meaningful relationships and to marriage. It is portrayed only as an isolated event of self-satisfaction and sexual fulfillment.

It is argued that pornography should be protected under the freedom of speech provision of the Charter of Rights, but this notion gives little consideration to the rights of those who are harmed by it. Pornography causes harm not only in its production and consumption, but to all women since it contributes to their degradation and to the damage done to the institution of marriage.

Men's widespread abuse and disregard for women today would have been unthinkable a few generations ago. Pornography has greatly contributed to this disaster. †

HEARTBREAK FOR THE CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

In 2015, the courts declared the Commission did not have the authority to review federal laws to determine discrimination. It was restricted to deciding only a private dispute. Oh, the heartbreak!

The Canadian Human Rights Commission (the "Commission") was established in 1977 to protect individuals in federal jurisdictions from discrimination. Its jurisdiction covered the public service, the armed forces, the RCMP and the national banks.

The appointed employees of the Commission were not required to apply standard legal procedures and protections, such as the presumption of innocence and the impartial weighing and interpreting of evidence, which serve as safeguards for all parties involved. It also was not a neutral agency since it was staffed by human rights activists who promoted their own favourite causes. The Commission not only investigated the complaint and determined the evidence, but also assisted the complainant in drafting the complaint and collaborated with him to argue his case before the Commission's Tribunal.

Altogether, the Commission operated like a kangaroo court of deceit and partisan activity. It was a zealous enforcer of political correctness and played the role of conducting witch hunts against anyone who raised objections to the politically correct agenda—especially on the homosexual issue.

In 1998, the Auditor General, Denis Desautels, issued a scathing report on the Commission confirming that the Commission was a highly biased agency which failed to be neutral in dealing with complainants because of the special interest advocates sitting on the Commission pushing their own agenda.

If that were not enough to undermine its credibility, the

Commission was also seething with internal problems.

In 2001, questions were raised about the exodus of workers—especially managers and investigators who were quitting the Commission in frustration. The fact that 63% of the then 200 strong staff quit, with 37% of those who remained looking for another job, made the working environment a disaster. The Chief Commissioner at that time, Ms. Michelle Falardeau-Ramsay, was absent a great deal of the time, on expensive travel abroad advising foreign officials how to implement their own human rights. Ms. Falardeau-Ramsay finally resigned in December 2002.

However, the Commission remained knee deep in controversy. Another Chief Commissioner, Jennifer Lynch, Q. C. also spent large sums of money on travel and other "necessities" and experienced revolt among her staff accompanied by low morale, back biting and huge staff turnovers.

This bizarre Commission then began to face even more problems. These included budget cutbacks; the repeal by the Conservatives in 2013 of section 13 of the Human Rights Act, which had given the Commission powerful jurisdiction over the determination of hate speech; the courts also gave to other tribunals human rights jurisdiction where the Commission had previously enjoyed it exclusively. Further, the courts removed the power of the Commission to order costs against the "guilty" party. Finally, in 2015, the courts declared that the Commission did not have the authority to review federal laws to determine discrimination. It was restricted to deciding only a private dispute. Oh, the heartbreak.

Once a glorious colossus which strode across all those who worked within federal jurisdiction, looking for signs of loathsome discrimination (as they so defined), the Commission has now been reduced to a mere shadow of its former self. On the bright side, however, many Canadians are now outside the Commission's reach and its bizarre behaviour. †

WOMEN ARE NOT SHRINKING VIOLETS



Women's views differ according to their social, economic, religious and cultural backgrounds, the same as men. As no men's group can claim that it represents the views of all males in Canada, similarly, these feminist groups cannot claim that their ideological views represent the voice of all Canadian women.

A number of women's groups tried to drum up a debate during the election on so-called "women's" issues. Such a debate does not and will never represent "women" in Canada.

All women are important, and that's the difficulty with the proposed debate.

The groups requesting the debate have their own agenda, which certainly does not represent the views and aspirations of most women. Rather, they represent the special interest group of feminists only.

Women's views differ according to their social, economic, religious and cultural backgrounds, the same as men. As no men's group can claim that it represents the views of all males in Canada, similarly, these feminist groups cannot claim that their ideological views represent the voice of all Canadian women.

The activist women proposing the debate have, of course, every right to their own views, but to suggest they represent "women" is to insult our intelligence.

The agenda of these women's groups suggests that women are supposedly "victims" and that a special debate is required to provide them with protection. On the contrary, most women are perfectly capable of standing up for themselves, and do so. We are not shrinking violets.

For example, women in Canada are now poised to become dominant in medicine, since more than half the physicians in Canada under age 35 are female, and most retiring doctors are male. This has occurred owing to the fact that medical schools have emphasized the need for women in the profession—highlighting female physicians as role models, offering scholarships, and celebrating parity when it arrived in the 1990's. Even now, when men are a minority of medical students in Canada—there are at least nine scholarships exclusively for women to become medical students in Canada—and none for men.

A problem does arise however, with the dominance of women in medicine, as research shows female doctors are more inclined to work part-time than their male colleagues, and avoid certain specialties, such as surgery, as they balance demands of raising a family. This creates problems for patients' access to physicians, especially specialists.

There is a similar problem with women in law as nearly half the women eventually leave the profession entirely, or work for the government or corporations because of a need for regular hours to accommodate their family requirements.

The concerns of these professional women to balance their lives are laudatory and reasonable, but they do indicate the difference in women's work force availability. The latter, it is noted, is not in any way due to discrimination but rather to women's own personal preferences.

It is significant that even as far back as 2009, according to The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Canada ranked fifth highest among the member countries of OECD in that 60% of graduates and post-graduates in Canada were female in all fields, but notably high in the areas of science (50%) and health and welfare (80%). Women don't seem to be doing badly at all in Canada!

It is significant that grants to feminist organizations by the Status of Women Canada have increased by 73% over the last ten years. In fact, the taxpayer has paid over \$500 million to the Status of Women Canada since the 1980's. However, this large financial contribution, according to the feminist groups, has failed to improve women's equality in Canada. Obviously a new strategy is required. Perhaps cutting the \$30 million annual funding to Status of Women Canada would give women's groups a head start on learning to be financially independent, as REAL Women of Canada has managed to be for the last 32 years, without government funding.

It may surprise the activist groups, too, that many women share the same broad interests as men on such issues as the economy, foreign affairs, national security, crime, pipeline systems, etc. These issues affect us as deeply as they do men. Why wouldn't we be interested in them?

Their assertion that women were left out of the election campaign, and required a separate debate is truly bizarre. These activist women should move away from the past, and into the present. They are looking through a rear view mirror, focusing on the past, instead of looking to the present and the future. ♯

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE



Warm greetings to all our REAL Women of Canada supporters!

In this Thanksgiving season, it is important to focus on the many positives in our lives, including family, faith, freedom, health (hopefully, for most of you!), and friends. It is so easy to get discouraged in the pro-life, pro-family work we do, when we read of yet another setback to our battle to promote a better society. Let us not be discouraged, but rather, focus on our efforts to do the right thing, even though we may not always succeed in this world. We will be judged by our efforts, not by our successes. There needs to be a record in history that there were movements to counter the secularism, relativism, and culture of death that is so prevalent today. Did you know that all of REAL Women of Canada's work, our publications, pamphlets, briefs, factums, speeches, are in the National Archives? We continue to regularly submit our materials to them. Yes, REAL Women of Canada is part of history!!

Please vote in the federal election, Monday, October 19. Consult our 2015 Federal Election pamphlet which was inserted in the July/August 2015 REALity and was attached to the August e-REALity. Extra copies are available from our Ottawa office. The pamphlet is also on our website. It should be all right to distribute this pamphlet through your church. It is non-partisan, as it does not promote any particular party, but rather, compares pro-life, pro-family policy for the three major parties, which have candidates in almost every riding in the country. Inform your pastor that the pamphlet assists the voter to vote with a Christian conscience. REAL Women of Canada did all the original research and wrote this pamphlet. It represents hours of work, and much expense.

In order to increase the coverage of our Press Releases and Alerts, it would be most helpful if you could please send the following information to our Ottawa office, Attention Suzanne: the name of your local weekly or daily newspaper, the city, and the newspaper's e-mail address. Your assistance would be greatly appreciated.

The Ninth World Congress of Families will be held in the United States for the first time, in Salt Lake City, Utah, October 27 to 30. Our National Vice-President, Gwen Landolt, will be one of the presenters. We will also have an exhibit booth at the Trade Show, to promote REAL Women.

Thank you so much for being "Women Building a Better Society".

Pauline Guzik

Pauline Guzik
National President

MESSAGE BOARD

- REAL Women of Canada has an Air Miles Small Business Account which allows card holders to accumulate Travel Reward Points for REAL Women. If you would like to help us with this fundraising endeavour, which costs nothing for the card holders, please contact our Ottawa office and they will send you a card.
- Check out the improvements to our website. REALity articles are now posted individually which allows you to share them on social media, e-mail, or print. Our Resolutions are now posted. You can also sign up to receive Alerts and Media Releases on a timely basis.

SUPPORT REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

PLEASE MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO JOIN OUR WORK
TO DEFEND & PROTECT LIFE & THE FAMILY

Membership **\$30/year** • Groups **\$50/year** • Donation _____

Contributions, unfortunately, are not tax deductible.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Province _____ Postal Code _____

Tel _____ Email _____

Send online at www.realwomenofcanada.ca or by mail. Thank you.

REALity is a publication of **REAL Women of Canada**

PO Box 8813 Station T Ottawa ON K1G 3J1 • Tel 613-236-4001 Fax 613-236-7203
www.realwomenofcanada.ca • info@realwomenofcanada.ca