



# REALity

REALISTIC | EQUAL | ACTIVE | for LIFE

REAL Women of Canada “Women Building a Better Society”

[www.realwomenofcanada.ca](http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca)

Volume XXXIX | Issue No. 12 | December 2020

## FACTS ON THE FAMILY IN CANADA

A window on Canadian families is provided by the national censuses which take place every five years. The last census taken was in 2016, and the next one will be in 2021. In between the censuses, Statistics Canada sorts through the data to measure the progress, stability and also the deterioration of our society. It is very revealing information as statistical analysis is a powerful lens for understanding our world.

### MARRIAGE IS THE BEST ENVIRONMENT

Statistics Canada tries to adopt a “neutral” or indifferent approach to the traditional family of a mother, father, and children, despite the fact that social sciences provide us with countless studies enforcing the long-held view that stable marriage is the best environment for the well-being and advancement of men, women, and children, physically, economically, socially, and mentally. In fact, according to American statistics [marripedia.org](http://marripedia.org), (which results would be similar in Canada), children from intact, married families have the highest high school graduation rate and are more likely to gain more education after graduating from high school than

those from other family structures.

This is because other family arrangements are significantly more prone to instability, violence, poverty, and crime. Also, sadly, children in non-marital environments are more likely to suffer emotional, physical, and educational neglect, although some of these families do manage to surmount these obstacles.

### OTHER REASONS WHY THE TRADITIONAL FAMILY MATTERS

Government and survey data overwhelmingly document that married-parent households work, earn, and save at significantly higher rates than other family households. They also pay most of all income taxes collected by the government.

Such households also contribute to charity and volunteer at significantly higher rates, regardless of income, than do single or divorced households.

Married households also have larger average net worth at retirement than other family structures.

Married individuals occupy hospitals and health institutions less often, are released from hospitals sooner, on average, and spend half as much time in hospitals as opposed to single individuals.



Cartoon: Brian Gable, Globe and Mail, December 2020.

Let bells ring out  
a song of peace for our country,  
and let us wish you joy  
in your hearts and homes.  
In this season of blessings,  
we are so grateful for all our readers.  
Have a merry Christmas and  
a happy New Year!

## CONTENTS

FACTS ON THE FAMILY IN CANADA.....	PAGE 1
JUDICIAL ARROGANCE.....	PAGE 3
THE CORRUPTION OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS.....	PAGE 5
PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE.....	PAGE 6

Unfortunately, the Canadian 2016 census results indicate that marriage and fertility are declining in Canada. This is not good news.

## **MARRIAGE IN DECLINE**

Despite the importance of the traditional, intact family of mother, father, and children, Statistics Canada reports a persistent decline in marriage in Canada. No effort, however, appears to be made to encourage and increase traditional marriages. In fact, some government documents even view this decline as “progressive” and as “enlightened diversity”.

Statistics Canada stopped collecting data on marriage and divorce rates in 2011, while other western countries have continued to provide this valuable information. Interestingly, previously, among the Commonwealth countries, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand had similar average marriage rates per 1000 from 2001 to 2011, at 4.6, 4.7, 5.2, and 4.7 respectively. The United States kept its average rate higher, at 7.3, which is 59% higher than in Canada. Marriage rates in the U.S., like Canada, however, are now also on the decline.

Another negative for Canada’s social health, uncovered by Statistics Canada, is the average age of first marriages, which has increased from 21.1 years of age in 1971 to 29.6 in 2008 for women, and from 24.4 in 1971 to 31.0 in 2008 for men. No data is available after 2008, except for Quebec, where the age of first marriage in 2016 was 31.9 for women and 33.4 for men.

Marriages taking place at a later date present problems because fertility decreases with age, and this results in a lower birth rate. The Canadian birth rate is now 1.6 children per woman of childbearing age. A birthrate of 2.1 is required to maintain a population, and only occurs, today, in Africa.

## **MARRIED COUPLES PREDOMINATE**

There is good news in that a majority of couples in Canada are legally married despite the decline in numbers. Census 2016 reports that 78.7% of couples in Canada are married (down from 79.8% in 2011) while 21.3% are living common-law.

Interestingly, there are four areas in Canada which have exceedingly high percentages of common-law couples: They are Quebec (39.9% of couples), the Yukon (31.9%), the Northwest Territory (36.6%), and Nunavut (50.3%). All other provinces combined have a much lower rate, at 16.8%, of couples that are living common-law. These latter relationships, however, differ both in expectation and commitment, which changes the behaviour of the couples.

The significant differences between a legal marriage and a common-law relationship are evidenced by data from Statistics Canada’s *General Social Survey*, published in 2017, based on the 2016 census. It shows that 74% of common-law relationships terminated within seven years, but only 28% of legal marriages are terminated during this same period. In fact, according to the data, only 15% of common-law relationships last for a period of ten years, compared to 57% of legally married couples. This lack of stability in common-law relationships is unfortunate for children. According to Statistics Canada, the majority (63.6%)

of children live with their legally married parents, whereas 16.3% live with parents in a common-law relationship with its inherent instability (last available data). Further, the incidence of domestic violence is multiple times higher among common-law couples than among married couples.

## **STATS CANADA AND “CENSUS FAMILIES”**

Statistics Canada introduced a new concept in defining families in 2001, which it calls “census families”. This grouping is not what Canadians usually understand as constituting a “family”. Instead, this new definition includes many relationships. It includes couples with children from previous relationships; couples living common-law; same-sex couples, grandparents with grandchildren living with them, and a lone parent of any marital status. That is, the “census family” consists of many domestic arrangements tied together only by the fact that these “families” live together in the same residence. The children counted in a “census family” may also include children of any age, including adult children. In short, a “census family” is just about any type of domestic arrangement. This really doesn’t tell us much, except that Canadians are one confused people!

There is a purpose in Statistics Canada using “census family”, however, in that it introduces a new cultural understanding of what constitutes a family.

Also, when the definition of family is broadened in this way, the number of “families” it adds lowers the percentage of legally “married couples” by 12.9 percentage points to 65.8% of census families, rather than 78.7% of couples. This explains different census results reported in the media. Common-law couples account for 17.8% of census families while lone parents account for 16.4%.

## **DECLINE OF BIRTHS IN THE LAST CENTURY**

In 1871, there were seven births per Canadian woman of child bearing age, in 1961 there were four births, and in 2019, the fertility count was a mere 1.5 births per woman. The U.K., Australia, New Zealand and the U.S. are all at 1.7 for 2019, 13% higher than Canada (World Bank numbers).

The percentage of one-person households has increased from 7.4% in 1951 to 28.2% in 2016, a troubling affirmation of Canada’s decreasing family formation, rising divorces and an aging population.

In 1851, the average number of people per household was 6.2, whereas it was 2.8 in 2016. One Statistics Canada report, ever politically correct, refers to this regression as “evolving living arrangements,” whereas it speaks volumes about the decline of our society to function efficiently.

## **SAME-SEX COUPLES**

Same-sex marriage was legalized in Canada in 2005 by the Liberal government, under PM Paul Martin. It argued this was required because of the need to provide “equality” for homosexuals. Homosexuals cannot be “equal” except in companionship because they do not provide the essential function of marriage, which is to give birth to children, necessary for society’s survival. Canada was one of the first countries in the

world to measure same-sex couples in its census.

Ever politically correct, Statistics Canada now includes same-sex couples in their statistics in order to “shed light on an aspect of inclusiveness in Canada.” Statistics Canada reports that there was an increase of 60.7% in same-sex couples from the 2006 census. However, the report doesn’t mention that the increase between Census 2006 and 2011 was 43%, when same-sex marriage was new, but that between Census 2011 and 2016 the increase was only by 13%. That is a very steep decline in same-sex marriages taking place in Canada. This indicates that the novelty of same-sex marriage has worn off. The LGBTQ community achieved its goal of “normalizing” their relationships by way of the so-called legal measure of marriage, but most homosexuals preferred to continue their lifestyle of promiscuous sex and are not interested in marriage. This is because their culture rarely includes committed relationships. Even those few who do have committed relationships almost always have open relationships at the same time, i.e. other sexual partners. This practice is widely accepted in the LGBTQ community. This should come as no surprise since they warned us before same-sex marriage was legalized that few among them actually desired legal marriages. The homosexual magazine, FAB, stated in an editorial (May 2005) “ the gay marriage movement in Canada has been spearheaded by a handful of lawyers and a few homo-activists, who most queers couldn’t name if their lives depended on it...there has been no mass gay marriage movement here in Canada.” Gareth Kirkby, editor of the homosexual newspaper Xtra, stated in a 2007 editorial “... some couples, a few lawyers and out of touch lobby groups decided that same-sex marriage was the only thing that really mattered...very few of us really want to get married.”

Same-sex couples account for 0.9% of Canada’s 8 million couples, and married same-sex couples account for an even lower 0.3% of all couples.

The majority of male/female couples choose marriage (78%) whereas among same-sex couples the majority (60%) choose a common-law relationship.

Census 2016 discovered a significant wage gap between couple types. In higher income brackets, male (gay) couples had the highest combined median income in 2015 at \$100,707, then female (lesbian) couples at \$92,857, and the traditional male/female couples had a median income of \$87,688. Lower income partners followed the same median income pattern: gay couples had an income of \$31,192, lesbian couples had an income of \$30,942 and male/female couples had an income of \$24,969. So much for so-called “discrimination” against homosexuals in the work place.

### **CHILDREN IN CANADA**

Census 2016 counted 5,839,565 children, aged 0 to 14, in Canada in a population of 35,151,728, with the majority, 69.6%, living in two parent married families, 16.3% living in common-law relationships, 19.2% living with one parent, 9.8% in stepfamilies, and 0.17% with same-sex couples (80% of which were female couples).

### **CONCLUSION**

Marriage and fertility are in decline in Canada, which negatively affects our well-being. It is causing a burden on our social benefit/welfare programs. There appears to be no interest among politicians to do anything about it. †

## **JUDICIAL ARROGANCE**

When U.S. Supreme Court Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg died in September 2020, the left wing fell into convulsions of grief and anxiety.

It grieved that it had lost the support of a woman who, without exception, handed down judgements that supported the feminist ideology as well as its left wing agenda. Many, however, were angered that she had failed to retire earlier from the court when Barak Obama was still President. This would have permitted Obama to appoint her replacement in order to preserve Ginsburg’s left wing legacy. Instead, her replacement to the court fell to President Donald Trump just two months prior to the 2020 presidential election. Trump appointed Justice Amy Coney Barrett to the court. She is the polar opposite of Ginsburg, both in values and in judicial behaviour.

Ginsburg had admitted that the opinion about Roe vs Wade (which legalized abortion on demand) was a mistake—not because it led to the deaths of 61 million unborn babies,

but, rather, because she believed the decision was written in a way that galvanized, rather than gutted, the pro-life movement. That is, she regretted that Roe vs Wade had inadvertently led to the growth, influence, and effectiveness of the pro-life movement. She also admitted many times that the origins of her decisions on both contraception and abortion were rooted in eugenic racism, telling the New York Times, in July, 2009, “Frankly I had thought that at the time Roe was decided, there was concern about population growth and particularly growth in populations that we don’t want too many of.” This statement displayed a callous, insensitive attitude regarding the humanity and value of human life.

Significantly, Ginsburg, in her early career, decades before her appointment to the Supreme Court in 1993, had authored a report urging Congress to abolish Mother’s Day and Father’s Day for the same reason she would later berate the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, in that they perpetuated (biblically grounded) sex-based distinctions.

## GINSBURG'S UNCHECKED JUDICIAL ACTIVISM

No one has publicly stated the truth about Ginsburg, that she was a social engineer, using her position as a judge to change the social order in ways that she personally believed were in the best interest of society. She did so despite her obligation as a judge to only interpret the law, as passed by the legislature, not to remake the law to her own liking. She remained, during her long tenure on the court, indifferent to the historic role of the judiciary, and to the division of responsibility that separated the executive and legislative branches of government. In short, she was an arrogant judge who used her position on the court to her personal advantage in order to promote her own beliefs.

## CANADIAN JUDGES ARE ALSO JUDICIAL ACTIVISTS

Judge Ginsburg's behaviour on the U.S. Supreme Court is similar to that of far too many Canadian judges—especially those on the Supreme Court of Canada. These nine judges have incorrectly assumed the role of Parliament, which is to determine public policy. These judges are contemptuous of their proper role and also of the Canadian public. Their elitism is based on nothing more than judicial arrogance—a mistaken belief that somehow judges are superior to the public, know what is best, and that this justifies their changing Canada's social, political, and cultural values as they see fit. This raises the question whether these nine appointed, unaccountable individuals should be permitted to continue to make decisions on public policy without the consent of the public. Although this may satisfy their own self-regard, it does nothing for democracy.

## THE ARROGANCE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA JUDGES

Canada certainly has not been spared the overbearing and egotistic behaviour exhibited by U.S. Justice Bader Ginsburg.

Consider the following:

### 1. Rosalie Abella

The egotism of Rosalie Abella is apparent in both her public speeches and judgements. She displayed her extraordinary misunderstanding of the role of a judge in a bizarre speech she gave in Toronto at Osgoode Hall in April 2000. She stated: "The judiciary has a different relationship with the public. It is accountable less to the public's opinion and more to the public interest."

Who is she to determine what is in the public's interest? That's not her job. It is the job of Parliament. She has the mistaken notion that her insight and understanding are superior to that of the public. This is unacceptable in a democracy.

### 2. Beverley McLachlin

In November 30, 2006, McLachlin gave a speech in Wellington, New Zealand, in which she asserted that judges may render their opinions based on "unwritten" constitutional norms, even in the face of **clearly enacted laws or hostile public opinion** (emphasis ours). She defined

unwritten norms as those "essential to a nation's history, identity, values and legal systems." McLachlin concluded such norms were properly understood and interpreted by appointed judges who had been given a legitimate role in determining "unwritten" law because judges have a "judicial conscience" which is founded on the judges' "sworn commitment to uphold the rule of law". At the time of making this arrogant speech, McLachlin had full knowledge that judges' consciences in many instances were based on their own personal preferences or choices, rather than on legal principle or established law.

**Judges are not seers or oracles acquiring special insight upon their appointment to the Bench, as McLachlin clearly believes.**

Justice Beverley McLachlin also freely publicly admitted that she was usurping the role of Parliament when she stated,

*My job is simply to listen to what the parties have to say ... to think about what's best for Canadian society on this particular problem that's before us, and give it my best judgement after listening to also, my eight other colleagues.* (National Post May 23, 2015)

Who is she to determine "what is best for Canadian society"? Why does she think she is superior? How does the legal merit of a case before her fit into her grandiose opinion of herself as judge? Not much, apparently.

### 3. Chief Justice Richard Wagner

The present Chief Justice of Canada, Richard Wagner, also appears to be of the same mindset as McLachlin and Abella when he stated that he was "proud" that the Supreme Court of Canada was the most "progressive" in the world. (Toronto Star, June 22, 2018)

Who is he to make the court a "progressive" one, instead of providing an objective analysis of law precedent and respect for the legislature's decisions? He too misunderstands his role of judge. He deliberately has chosen to ignore it in order to provide the court with political power. Under what authority do these imperious judges, McLachlin, Wagner, and Abella and their colleagues on the court, have the right to determine what is "best for society", and "public morals"?

None whatsoever. †

*A very happy Christmas and New Year to all. This past year has been difficult, and we pray that the coming year brings more certain times for your family. We wish you hope for better days ahead.*



# THE CORRUPTION OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

There was a time when those living in the European Union (EU) could turn to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), located in Strasbourg, France, if they believed the courts in their own country had dealt unfairly or unreasonably with them. The ECHR was the final court of appeal for 800 million people across Europe, including the United Kingdom. This is no longer the case in regard to the U.K., which separated from the EU in January 2020.

Nonetheless, a woman living in the U.K. is currently bringing a case to the ECHR, which will likely be the final case it will hear from that polity. In 2018, this woman brought a legal challenge against an abortion bubble zone law surrounding an abortion clinic in London. She had, at one time, been pregnant, homeless, jobless, and all alone with no support, when she was stopped at the abortion clinic by a pro-life counsellor who turned her life around. This led to the birth of her much-loved daughter. The woman was determined that other women should be able to receive the kind of help that she had from the pro-life counsellor. This was the reason she brought her legal challenge of the abortion bubble zone law. It is significant that the pro-life presence at the abortion clinic had resulted in more than 500 women accepting an offer of help and choosing to keep their babies, rather than having an abortion. The abortion clinic regarded this as lost money for its business and, as a result, had successfully obtained the abortion bubble zone law, even though there was no evidence that women were being harassed or intimidated outside the abortion facilities. The U.K. High Court upheld the law and the U.K. Court of Appeal further upheld the bubble zone law last year. The U.K. Supreme Court refused to hear the case and this woman's only option was to take it to the ECHR.

Even with the best of intentions and the best legal team, it is doubtful that her case will succeed before the ECHR. This is foreshadowed by the fate of two Swedish nurses, who were denied employment as midwives for their refusal to perform abortions. They appealed their case to the ECHR arguing that they had faced unjust discrimination on the basis of their religious beliefs. On March 12, 2020, the ECHR refused to take up their case.

## THE ECHR HAS BEEN CORRUPTED

A pattern has developed at the ECHR, which supports a growing campaign to eliminate conscientious objection to abortion. This places abortion, which is not an international human right, above all other rights, including religious freedom.

This pattern was disclosed in February 2020, when the European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ), an international organization dedicated to the promotion and protection of human rights and religious freedom throughout the world, exposed the fact that the ECHR had been corrupted by pro-

abortion agencies. The ECLJ's report included the names of the judges on the Court who had been involved and influenced by pro-abortion NGOs and especially those funded by billionaire George Soros.

In its investigation, the ECLJ disclosed that, between 2009 and 2019, from a total of 100 ECHR permanent judges, almost a quarter of them (22) had links to specific pro-abortion NGOs. In fact, before becoming judges on the Court, these individuals had been collaborators and sometimes even managers of the pro-abortion NGOs. Of 22 judges from such NGOs, 12 had direct relationships with George Soros's Open Society Foundations. Six other NGOs were financed by that organization.

The report also found that 18 of the 22 judges had heard cases on the Court presented to it by Soros's Open Society. The most controversial judge on the Court is a Bulgarian lawyer, Yonko Grozev. He has spent his entire career as a lawyer working with NGOs close to George Soros or financed by him. Grozev worked with Soros's Open Society Foundations specializing in using judicial institutions for political purposes. Grozev now heads one of the five sections of the ECHR with general management powers and he systematically sits in most court cases. He alone also has power to decide to invite, allow, or refuse the intervention of NGOs in the cases the Court will hear.

The ECLJ has alerted the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe about this conflict of interest held by the judges. Unless and until this situation at the European Court of Human Rights is corrected, there's no point in arguing cases before it, since the Court's objective has been exposed as promoting anti-life, anti-family policies. †

## CROWDFUNDING CAMPAIGN

FOR

 **REAL Women of Canada**

**OUR FUNDRAISING HAS GONE GLOBAL!**

Find us on the WonderWe platform.  
Check out the promotional video!

<https://www.wonderwe.com/real18>

SHARE ON YOUR SOCIAL MEDIA.



## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE



Dear supporter of REAL Women of Canada:

Welcome to the December 2020 issue of e-REALity and the November/December 2020 issue of our bimonthly hard copy edition.

On behalf of our National Board of Directors and our dedicated support staff, I extend to you and your families all the blessings of this joyous Christmas season. We hope that 2021 will be a year of much health and happiness for you. 2020 was full of challenges for us all, to be sure, but we can always look forward to a brighter future with great expectation.

It is entirely possible that another federal election may be on the horizon for 2021. If there is a good chance that there may be a pro-life/pro-family candidate running for party nomination in your riding, it is important that your membership in the EDA (Electoral District Association) of that party be up to date so that you can vote for that candidate. The social conservative voice is a voice that will not be silenced, as was evident in the recent Conservative Party leadership race. We must keep this momentum going.

Two important federal government bills are currently at the Standing Committee stage, which is the step in between the Second and Third Readings. These bills are Bill C-6 (formerly Bill C-8) to ban Conversion Therapy and Bill C-7 to further liberalize our current euthanasia law, which is already too vague. Bill C-7 would make the laws even more relaxed, with few, if any, safeguards to protect our vulnerable. It is important that you contact your MPs to ask them to vote against these bills in Third Reading. Once these bills pass the Third Reading, they basically are rubber-stamped by the Senate and then become law. A brief handwritten letter expressing your concern is always the most effective way to communicate with your MP.

We are almost at the new year, which means it is time to renew your annual membership in REAL Women of Canada. Memberships are always due January 1. The fees are still only \$30 for an individual or family, and \$50 for an organization. Memberships can be [renewed either online](#) or by mail. When you make a donation, the first \$30 of your donation automatically goes towards updating your membership if it is up for renewal. Your donation online is secure, whether you use the PayPal option, or pay by credit card. The credit card payment is administered by PayPal, but you do not need an account with PayPal for the credit card payment to go through.

Cathay Wagantall, MP for Yorkton-Melville, tabled Bill C-233 in the House of Commons, An Act to Amend the Criminal Code (Sex-Selective Abortion), on February 26, 2020. This is a Bill that would prohibit doctors from committing abortions based solely on the grounds of the child's genetic sex. This bill is at the First Reading stage. Please support this important bill by signing Campaign Life Coalition's petition online <https://www.campaignlifecoalition.com/petition/page/1/id/35> or by signing the hard copy and by contacting your MP to urge him/her to vote in favor of Bill C-233.

We will continue to be a strong voice for the pro-family movement. We will never wave the white flag. Good is always worth fighting for. Always!

Thank you for being women and men trying to build a better society for our families, the most important unit of society.

Best Regards for a Blessed Christmas Season,

*Pauline Guzik*

Pauline Guzik, National President †

*REAL Women wishes you a merry  
Christmas and a happy New Year.  
May the joy and warmth of the season  
be ever in your heart. May the new year  
bring you hope for tomorrow.*



### 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](http://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](http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca) | [info@realwomenofcanada.ca](mailto:info@realwomenofcanada.ca)