

NEW BILL PROTECTING MOTHERS AND PRE-BORN CHILDREN: CASSIE & MOLLY'S LAW

Advocates for abortion persistently argue that rights should be denied the child in the womb, and demand a cone of silence on the issue. Fortunately, they have repeatedly been rebuffed on this, as the issue of the child's humanity just keeps bubbling up to the surface, time and time again, refusing to be denied.

What makes this issue so difficult for the pro-abortionists is that their argument is based on the fiction that the pre-born child doesn't really exist. It is obvious that this is absurd. The fact of a human life growing within a pregnant woman was acknowledged, even in the middle ages, when the law prevented the hanging of a convicted woman who was pregnant because she was carrying an innocent human life within her. What has changed today is not the biological fact of the child's presence, but only the propaganda pretending the child isn't really there.

Bill C-225, was tabled in the House of Commons on February 23, 2016 by a newly elected Saskatchewan Conservative female MP, Cathay Wagantall, (Melville—Yorkton). She presented a bill aimed at protecting unborn children in the womb when a crime of violence has occurred against their mothers. This bill was seconded by another newly elected Conservative female MP, Rachael Harder, Lethbridge, Alberta.

The bill is called "*Cassie and Molly's Law*" after Cassandra Kaake (Cassie), a seven month pregnant woman, murdered in her home in Windsor in December, 2014 along with her unborn daughter, whom she had already named Molly. At the time of her murder, Cassie had prepared the nursery for Molly, and was looking forward to Molly's birth with great excitement.

Women under Canada's abortion law supposedly have a "choice" whether to give birth or not. But the decision not to give birth, (i.e. the choice for abortion) is protected, but there is no legal protection for the life of the unborn child to whom the mother wishes to give birth. That is, currently, when a pregnant woman is killed, along with her unborn child, the only charge is for the murder of the mother, not her child. As stated by Molly's father, Jeff Durham,

"Two hearts stopped beating as a result of this atrocity, but only one was being accounted for—regardless of Cassie's choice".

Bill C-225 is aimed at correcting this gap in the law. Bill C-225 does the following:

- Creates a new offence in the Criminal Code for injuring or causing the death of a pre-born child during the commission of a criminal offence against a pregnant woman.
- Adds pregnancy to the list of aggravating factors for the purposes of sentencing. This means that killing the unborn child, with intent in the course of assaulting or killing its mother, must be considered by a judge when sentencing the offender. Even if the pre-born child is not injured or killed, the courts can still come down hard on anyone who is convicted of violence against a pregnant woman.
- Adds to women's rights by protecting a pregnant woman when she chooses to carry her baby to term.

This bill does not apply to abortion or acts or omissions by the pregnant woman herself. The bill is exclusively and only directed to those who knowingly commit a criminal offence against a pregnant woman which harms the unborn child. The bill serves as a strong deterrent to committing violence against pregnant women.

Because of his unspeakable grief, Mr. Durham, the father of Molly, has personally mounted a campaign to obtain justice for his daughter. He launched the website: www.mollymatters.org.

Also, the political action group, Association for Reformed Political Action (ARPA), has created [three sample letters](#) relating to this bill which can be sent to your MP.

There is a new online government petition, launched by the Clerk of Petitions in December 2015. You can sign a written peti-

CONTENTS

NEW BILL PROTECTING PRE-BORN CHILDREN: CASSIE AND MOLLY'S LAW.....	PAGE 1
TRUDEAU LOVES THE DISGRACED UN.....	PAGE 2
SHOULD CATHOLIC HOSPITALS BE FORCED TO KILL.....	PAGE 3
CRASHING DRUG INJECTION SITES PROPAGANDA.....	PAGE 4
THE MISERY OF CANADIAN NEWSPAPERS...	PAGE 5

tion and an online petition and both signatures will count. To sign the online petition go to this link <https://petitions.parl.gc.ca/en/Petition/Sign/e-183>. The petition calls upon the House of Commons to pass legislation which would recognize pre-born children as separate victims when they are injured or killed during the commission of an offence against their mothers, allowing two charges to be laid against the offender instead of just one.

For those who do not have access to a computer, please telephone our National Office at: 1-613-236-4001, to obtain copies of this information.

Bill C-225 is not a perfect law since it won't stop abortions. However, it will protect the human rights of mothers and their unborn children when they have chosen to carry their child to term, and is a recognition of the existence and humanity of that child. ‡

TRUDEAU LOVES THE DISGRACED UN

Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau, with his typical boyish enthusiasm, appears to worship the corrupt and discredited United Nations (UN).

Like others in love, he can't see the obvious flaws of his beloved. Rather, he views the institution only with rosy glasses. He has promised that Canada would "engage robustly" with the organization in order to further Canada's "warm" relations with it. He has already promised the UN \$2.65 billion to assist it in helping developing countries with climate change.

In addition, Trudeau is considering the following initiatives for the UN:

- A plan to provide \$15 billion to the Palestinian relief agency, United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) which the Conservative government stopped funding because of its alleged ties to the Hamas which has been designated as a terrorist group by the US and Canada.
- A seat on the UN Security Council. The Security Council has fifteen members in total — five permanent members which include the US, the UK, Russia, China and France. These countries were the world powers at the time that the UN was established in 1945. They each have a veto over all decisions made by the Security Council. There are also ten non-permanent members elected to the Security Council for two-year terms by the General Assembly. These non-permanent members serve more as a pretence that the Security Council is

democratic, which clearly, it is not, since all the power is held by the five countries with the veto power.

- Increased Canadian involvement in peace-keeping. The reputation of UN peace-keeping missions has been severely marred in recent years by numerous accusations of sexual assault by the "Blue Helmets" (the colour of the helmets worn by the peace-keeping soldiers).

Trudeau has suggested that Canada could send more female troops on UN peace-keeping missions believing that involving more women in the process would mitigate the sexual abuse. This is an odd suggestion in view of the fact that the Canadian military is presently grappling with a serious problem of sexual harassment and assault within its ranks. Sending female military to third world countries would provide female soldiers with even less protection than they have in Canada. Trudeau's female peace-keepers' idea isn't very smart.

Trudeau is also apparently unaware that the UN's peacekeeping operations are in shambles. Not only are there rampant allegations of rape and corruption, but these troops are ill-equipped and woefully led and often regarded as an invasion force rather than as a welcomed force. However, to Trudeau, Canada's participation in UN peacekeeping is an opening shot at securing a seat on the Security Council in 2021.

- Resurrecting Canada's Junior Professional Officer Program at the UN which the Conservative government ceased funding in 2010. The purpose of this program is for young professionals in the Department of Foreign Affairs, (now called Global Affairs by the Liberals) to learn and gain experience on the job at the UN. This program costs around \$120,000 per delegate, per year.

UN SECRETARY-GENERAL BAN KI-MOON VISITS OTTAWA

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon visited Ottawa in February, 2016 to meet with Trudeau. Viewing him, obviously, as a "soft touch" he requested increased funding by Canada for the UN. The UN's target for aid spending by rich countries is 0.7% of gross national income. Only five countries, have ever reached this target. Mr. Ban Ki-moon stated during his visit to Ottawa that "I'm sure that Prime Minister Trudeau and his government will pay more focus on this matter [funding]. I count on his leadership". That's very likely.



Michael De Adder / For the Toronto Star. Published on Fri Feb 12 2016

Encouraged by Mr. Trudeau's love affair with the UN, the UN's High Commissioner for Human Rights, Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein, arrived a week later in Ottawa. He met with Foreign Affairs Minister, Stéphane Dion to discuss Canada's human-rights record. Mr. Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein is not the best choice to do so, since he is on record as urging Catholic countries to legalize abortion over the Zika virus. Laying on the flattery, however, the High Commissioner praised the Liberals' approach to First Nations' grievances and poverty, as well as Canada's acceptance of 25,000 Syrian refugees. The High Commissioner contrasted Canada's position on refugees with the more fearful and cautious attitudes elsewhere.

In response, Mr. Dion announced that the Liberal government would provide \$15 million over three years to support the core work of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. A most worth-while visit to Ottawa by Mr. Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein and Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon.

THE CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT'S APPROACH TO THE UN

In contrast to Justin Trudeau's warm re-engagement with the UN, the Conservative government had a more realistic view of the tainted and unethical UN. It was not impressed by the anti-Israel resolution of the UN General Assembly. Canada, under the Conservatives also had no intention of applying again for a Security Council seat after Canada was rejected for the seat in 2010.

The Conservative government saw the ineffective UN for what it was, and had no intention of pretending that it serves much purpose other than to promote unacceptable ideologically driven policies, unsupported by Member States, and to provide sinecure (plum jobs) for its over-paid bloated bureaucracy.

We can be certain, however, that over the next few years, gullible Mr. Trudeau and his government, will be funnelling billions of Canadian taxpayers' money to the UN. †

SHOULD CATHOLIC HOSPITALS BE FORCED TO KILL PEOPLE

By: Margaret Wentz

The Globe and Mail Columnist

Republished from *Globe and Mail* dated March 26, 2016

Of all the bold new initiatives on the Trudeau government's to-do list, there's one it really doesn't want to talk about: the new law that will legalize doctor-assisted dying. The Supreme Court has given the government a deadline of June 6—just two and a half months away.

So what's the problem? After all, an overwhelming number of Canadians want the right to physician-assisted death. The problem is the details. Should we have a narrow law or a broad one? Who is eligible and who is not? What about people with mental illness? What about kids? What about the seriously demented, who can no longer decide for themselves? If your gaga granny made an advance consent directive, then who, exactly, will determine whether she's too gaga to go on living?

No jurisdiction in the world has sorted all these issues out. There is no political capital in this. There is only grief. On top of that, the federal government is risking a major run-in with the Catholic church, which flatly opposes physician-assisted dying on religious grounds. The Catholic health networks include a huge range of faith-based facilities across the country. St. Paul's Hospital in Vancouver, one of the city's oldest, has said it won't permit physician-assisted dying. Ottawa's biggest palliative care hospital, Bruyère Continuing Care, says it won't, either. Privately, the CEO of one major Catholic institution in Ontario says it will never happen on his watch—not because he himself opposes the law, but because it would violate the principles the place was built on.

The Dying With Dignity folks and civil liberties associations strongly disagree. Assisted death, they argue, is a human

right and should be provided everywhere. If a hospital doesn't comply, then it should lose public funding. The government's own parliamentary committee report on assisted death agrees that no institution should be exempt on religious grounds.

In every community across the Western world, the church (or the synagogue) was there before the state was. It was the church that cared for the sick, the orphaned and the homeless. In Canada, Catholic hospitals have pioneered health services for the homeless, for people with drug addictions, and for those in need of palliative care. They are valued partners of provincial governments.

But now, a great many people believe they are an anachronism. They think there's no place for religious values in the public sphere.

I disagree. Many religious institutions provide an ethic of care that secular outfits can't match.

"The Catholic sisters knew that their essential job was to provide love and compassion and caring," says Daniel Lussier, chair of the Catholic Health Alliance of Canada. "They never forgot the human element."

I once got to know a hospital run by the Salvation Army. Most of its patients were immigrants, and many were non-Christian. The CEO, a Salvation Army officer, was a brilliant administrator who worked for a pittance. The senior staff, who were of all faiths and none, shared a sense of higher purpose. Their patients weren't yet "customers" or "clients." After the hospital was forced into a merger, it lost what made it special. Many of the staff moved on, and that was the end of that.

Salvation Army hospitals never did perform abortions. So what? Other hospitals did. Across Canada, not all hospitals are obliged to provide all services. Some don't do abortions. Some don't do dialysis. Why should every hospital be

required to provide assisted death?

I'm a nonbeliever. I do not admire the Catholic Church. I believe that assisted dying should be legal, and that it should be available to everyone without a lot of hassle, just as abortion is. But the scorn and contempt that many people heap on religious belief astonishes me. The ostracization of Trinity Western University, for example, is one of the more shameful examples of intolerance in our time. Sanctimonious provincial law societies decided that because Trinity Western asks its students to respect traditional Christian values, in a way that is perfectly legal, anyone who graduates from its law school isn't fit to practice.

Our tolerance for religious belief should extend quite far. That's why we've decided that Sikhs can wear kirpans, and Mounties can wear turbans, and Muslim women can wear the niqab in citizenship court. All these decisions have been robustly supported by the finest liberal minds. But when it

comes to Christians — forget it.

Our tolerance extends only as far as those religions we think it's fashionable to tolerate. In British Columbia, a native community is battling a company that wants to build a ski resort on land the community believes is inhabited by the Grizzly Bear Spirit. The case is going to the Supreme Court. We're all for that. But if a bakery won't sell wedding cakes to same-sex couples, we want it shut down. If Christian hospitals want to observe their foundational beliefs about the sanctity of life, we want to cut them off. Where's the tolerance in that?

Note:

Angus Reid conducted an online survey in March on whether Catholic Institutions should be required to provide assisted suicide. According to this Poll 69% agree (three in five Canadians) that institutions with moral objections to assisted suicide should be able to refuse to do so. †

CRASHING DRUG INJECTION SITES PROPAGANDA

The well-orchestrated public relations campaign touting supervised drug injection sites (SIS) never includes a discouraging word. This makes one reluctant to crash the party with some unpleasant truths, which indicate that a supervised drug injection site (SIS) is not all it is cracked up to be.

The stories about the advantages of SIS don't mention their major flaw. SIS ignore the fundamental need of a drug addict, which is to obtain treatment. This failure is based on the belief that addicts are incurable and hopeless, and cannot change, so it is important to provide them, instead, with clean facilities and medical supervision while injecting their drugs. This defeatist assumption about drug addicts is contradicted by the thousands of former drug addicts, who sought treatment, and who were able to return to their families and communities to lead healthy, productive lives.

The problem with the SIS's approach is that it only leads to an increase in addicts' addiction. Well off individuals can afford to obtain treatment for their addictions, but, it is the addicts without money or support who are shuffled off to an SIS, where they inject themselves continuously with street drugs. This results in the addict's further degradation and, eventually, often terrifying death. The problem with drug abuse is not solved by enabling drug addicts to use more drugs.

Advocates of SIS claim that they provide opportunities for the addict to seek treatment. The Vancouver Injection Site called InSite, does have some treatment beds, but very few addicts take advantage of them. This is because InSite is not in the treatment business. It doesn't exert pressure on the addict, as it is believed they must make their own independent health decisions. As if a drug addict is in a position to do so! Sweden, a very liberal country, has strong law enforcement and mandatory treatment for addicts. Treatment facilities are widely available. As a result, Sweden has the lowest rate of drug use in Europe. It is noteworthy that the effectiveness of

treatment is the same whether it was voluntary or mandatory.

Referrals for treatment are also not a central part of SIS, because it must rely on a continuous supply of addicts to maintain its funding from federal and provincial governments. Life-long addiction insures a continued source of income for the SIS.

Advocates of SIS further argue that it decreases drug deaths by overdose and reduces harm caused to addicts. This proposition is based on the fictional world created by the three lobbyists for the Vancouver SIS. These lobbyists are also researchers, and they have produced over 30 studies, all finding, without exception, that the Vancouver SIS is astoundingly successful.

All these studies were peer reviewed only by supporters of drug injection facilities, and, contrary to standard scientific procedure, these researchers have refused to share their data with other researchers so that their studies can be replicated. As a result of their dual role as advocates and researchers, they have an obvious conflict of interest in ensuring the continued operation of the SIS.

One of their studies in 2011, claimed that since the SIS facility, InSite, commenced operation on September 2003, there has been a 35% decrease in overdose deaths in InSite's immediate area, compared with the rest of Vancouver, which had decreases of only 9%. This study was discredited by an international team of medical researchers from Australia, the United States and Canada, in the respected British Medical Journal Lancet in January, 2012.

This discredited study, however, was pivotal: the Supreme Court of Canada relied on it for its decision to support the establishment of SIS.

The Government's Expert Advisory Committee on Supervised Drug Injection Sites (March 31, 2008) found that there is no proof that drug injection sites decrease the spread of HIV and other blood borne diseases. Nor is there any

proof that SIS decrease crime in the area. In Vancouver, between 50 to 66 extra police are assigned to the 12 city blocks surrounding the drug injection site in order to limit criminal activity in that area. Police officers are prohibited from charging the addict with possession and, instead, are obliged to escort the addict into the injection site. The drug addict obtains illicit drugs, usually heroine or cocaine, of questionable purity, from a drug trafficker, which he/she brings into the site for injection purposes. The drug injection site becomes a “honey pot” or meeting point for drug traffickers. According to the Expert Advisory Committee’s report, it is estimated that each addict causes \$350,000 worth of crime each year in order to purchase drugs from a trafficker.

It is also fiction that drug addicts using SIS cease casually disposing their used injection needles. The Government Advisory Committee report found that only 5% of drug addicts use SIS for injections, and, of these, only 10% used the facility exclusively for their injections. 90% of them continued to inject their drugs on back streets, alleyways, etc., leaving their contaminated needles behind.

A compassionate society must not kill addicts by enabling their addiction, but should instead, reach out to them by both providing generous treatment facilities and encouraging them to break their dangerous addiction. This doesn’t happen when money is being funnelled into self-serving Supervised Drug Injection Sites (SIS). †

THE MISERY OF CANADA’S NEWSPAPERS

Canada’s newspapers have had a miserable year. They have had to make cost-saving changes which have resulted in the loss of jobs for hundreds of their employees. For example,

Montreal’s La Presse - For over one hundred years, this newspaper was the largest French-language daily in North America. It is no longer available in print form except on Saturday. The paper’s owners have moved the paper to digital format, leaving many of its journalists, graphic artists, photographers, etc., without employment;

Postmedia news has cut 90 jobs across the country. Postmedia purchased the Sun News in 2015, and has now merged the news rooms of its major newspapers with the Sun newsrooms in Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton and Ottawa. For example, the Ottawa Citizen, Edmonton Journal, Calgary Herald and the Vancouver Sun now share a newsroom with Sun newspapers operating in these cities, although separate papers are still being published. The news is re-written according to the style of each outlet, so Postmedia claims that nothing has changed.

Postmedia, which has 200 plus media outlets across the country, was purchased by way of funding by the New York based Golden Tree Asset Management, a hedge fund, which now controls 35% of Postmedia. Postmedia owes the hedge fund \$672 million for financing Postmedia’s creation five years ago from the bankrupt Canwest empire owned by the Asper family, and for its purchase last year of its Sun Media expansion. This debt must be paid or refinanced by July, 2018. Another major investor in Postmedia is *Canso Investment Canada*, a private investment fund located in Richmond Hill, Ontario. The latter would be first in line to take control of Postmedia in the event that restructuring becomes necessary down the road.

It is significant, however, that Postmedia, which includes some of the biggest dailies in the country, is still making money. That is, although, the large city dailies are taking the biggest hit from the transformation to the information age, Postmedia’s many small mid-size and community newspapers continue to make a profit. It is the enormous debt plus the approximate \$60 million annual interest paid on the debt to the New York hedge fund that is hurting Postmedia so badly.

TORSTAR (TORONTO STAR AND METROLAND MEDIA)

Torstar is a Canadian media and publishing company based in Toronto. The company is primarily a publisher of daily and community papers, including its flagship and namesake, the Toronto Star. It recently announced that it was closing down its printing plant in Vaughan, Ontario, and will lay off about 300 employees as a result. It also recently laid off 13 people from its digital team.

At the end of January, 2016, Torstar closed down the community newspaper, The Guelph Mercury, because it wasn’t making money. This resulted in 26 full-time and three part-time employees losing their jobs. The Guelph Mercury had been in existence for 150 years.

THE REASON FOR THE PROBLEMS OF THE CANADIAN NEWSPAPERS

Surprisingly, these problems are not being caused by people spending less time reading newspapers. In fact, the average time Canadians spend reading newspapers has stayed almost the same since 2000. This amounts to around three hours per week. About 70% of Canadians read newspapers on a regular basis. However, the public is also reading news on their laptops, cellphones and tablets.

The problem for newspapers is that the advertisers are abandoning the print media and moving their advertisements over to Google and Facebook, which does not generate as much revenue. This is because readers and advertisers do not want to pay as much for news on screen as they do for news on paper. Analysts expect print advertising revenue in Canada will continue to decline from \$2.7 billion in 2008 to \$1.7 billion by 2017 — a \$1 billion dollar loss. This is the real cause of the problems experienced by Canada’s newspapers.

TORONTO STAR’S VICIOUS ATTACK ON POSTMEDIA

The Toronto Star published several articles in the past few months, in which it has viciously attacked Postmedia, calling it a “cancer” on journalism, a “malignancy” and an “abomination”. One might think that the Toronto Star doesn’t like Postmedia!

It is not just the financial competition that the Toronto Star abhors, it is also the fact that Postmedia has about 21 million Canadian readers across the country, which the Toronto Star can't influence with its left-leaning slant on the news. For example, the Toronto Star attacked Postmedia for its alleged endorsement of Conservative policies and Stephen Harper's bid for re-election last October. This was hypocrisy on the part of the Toronto Star as it had slavishly supported Justin Trudeau for Prime Minister during the election campaign, and has, since the election, reported Trudeau and his government's policies only in uncritical, rosy, positive terms. Another major reason for the Toronto Star's attack on Postmedia is that the Toronto Star is in dire financial difficulties itself and is on the brink of a financial meltdown. Torstar is controlled by a voting trust held by seven families (descendants of the original owners). Their shares have fallen since 2004 from \$240 million to \$20 million today. It is a question as to which newspaper chain will hit the wall first.

IS THERE A SOLUTION TO THE CURRENT MISERY OF CANADA'S NEWSPAPERS?

Several solutions have been put forward to solve the problems of Canada's newspapers. One solution is to have federal and provincial governments play a role in funding

newspapers. This recommendation should be marked as "dead on arrival". We certainly don't need the government to interfere in the important undertaking of providing news to Canadians. We already know the outcome of such a scenario. It is far too likely that a newspaper funding scheme by governments would be influenced by the newspapers' perspective. That is, although claiming to be completely in support of press freedom, governments would be sure to target those newspapers that do not support their policies. It would be difficult for a government to resist doing so. All too often, we have witnessed governments' financial favouritism towards projects with which they agree.

Another recommendation is that newspapers become charitable or non-profit trusts. Two of the world's most respected newspapers, namely, London's Guardian and the Observer, are owned by non-profit trusts. The Tampa Bay Times, owned by a non-profit journalism school, the Poynter Institute, tops its rival, the Tampa Tribune, in readership, and has won many Pulitzer prizes.

The issue of freedom of the press is a serious one since it is a cornerstone of democracy. A solution to the problem facing Canadian newspapers must be found before they all hit the wall. †

MESSAGE BOARD

- Please let our National Office know if you move or change your phone number. Even if you receive REALity by e-mail every month, we still do mail-outs and phone campaigns from time to time, so your updated contact information would be greatly appreciated.
- Action Item: In this month's article on Cassie and Molly's Law, Bill C-225, there are two suggestions for you to support this Bill. Sign the on-line petition and/or write to your MP, using the sample letters from ARPA as your guide.
- Action Item: Continue to bombard your MP, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, the Health Minister Jane Philpott and the Justice Minister Jody Wilson-Raybould with your letters, e-mails, postcard campaigns, phone messages, regarding Bill C-14, the Euthanasia and Physician Assisted-Suicide Bill. This Bill must be stopped!



"The Liberal 2016 Budget," Gable. Editorial, Globe & Mail, March 26, 2016

REMINDER

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Friday, June 17th, 2016 @ 7:00 p.m.
at the North York Central Library
5120 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario M2N 5N9
Hall #1.

FEATURING GUEST SPEAKER

CHARLES LEWIS

Anti-euthanasia activist and former religion reporter of
The National Post.

Our speaker's topic will be: *Euthanasia: What Now?*

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