



REALity

REALISTIC | EQUAL | ACTIVE | for LIFE

THE CHARTER IS USELESS

A perceptive article in the *Financial Post* (November 3, 2021) by Bruce Pardy, Professor of Law at Queen’s University, entitled “During COVID, the Charter has been useless”, raises serious questions about the Charter.

In these days of increasing restrictions on our basic rights and freedoms (well attested to by Professor Pardy), creeping group think, government tyranny, and apparent judicial acquiescence, it is fair to ask: what happened to the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*? Wasn’t the *Charter* supposed to protect our individual liberties from government overreach?

THE EXPERIENCE OF CANADA’S CHARTER

Signed into law in 1982, the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* has been around now for some 40 years, so it is appropriate to reappraise it to determine whether it has been effective.

Unfortunately, it has not been a resounding success in limiting the state’s power, or protecting individual rights. There were, a few *Charter* cases that showed promise in protecting individual rights in the criminal law, such as protection from mandatory imprisonment (liberty); wire-taps (privacy); reverse onus (presumption of innocence); disclosure of evidence (fair trial); and a prohibition of mandatory minimum sentences (guarantees against cruel and unusual punishment). Other *Charter* cases, however, have done nothing to protect individuals and society from the consequences of anti-social behaviour by others or protect individuals in the exercise of their supposedly constitutionally guaranteed fundamental rights and freedoms.

When social issues, such as freedom of religion, traditional marriage, drug injection sites, physician assisted suicide, abortion, pornography, and prostitution have been litigated before the courts, the courts invariably have used the *Charter* to further a progressive, anti-Judeo-Christian world view. One is hard pressed to find any provincial appellate court, let alone a Supreme Court of Canada decision under the *Charter*, that has upheld Judeo-Christian values in legislation duly enacted by the legislature.

The sad reality is that after 40 years, the *Charter* has

increasingly become nothing more than a tool in the hands of the judiciary to impose, and support, the progressive agenda that is destroying the social and legal fabric of this country. The changes brought by the court would never have been passed by Parliament. Indeed, as Professor Pardy noted, “[t]he Supreme Court has read the charter [sic] over its 40-year life largely through a progressive lens, slowly transforming what was intended to be a roster of autonomy rights into a mandate for collective values, group rights and the priorities of the administrative state.”

UNDERSTANDING THE CHARTER’S FAILURE

Simply put, the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* has not guaranteed our rights and freedoms. This is because the Supreme Court is quite in love with the idea that the Charter should be interpreted as a “living tree”, capable of growth and adaptation to changing times. The problem with this analogy is two-fold: first, it ignores the fact that rights and freedoms are OBJECTIVE and FUNDAMENTAL, and do not alter with changing social circumstances. Secondly, the court, in “growing” this living constitution, has totally ignored the soil in which that “living tree” is planted, which is the soil of the Judeo-Christian principles that makes both the limitation of government power conceivable and the subsequent respect for rights and freedoms possible. By repeatedly ignoring this, is it any wonder that the judges are using the Charter as a tool to further the progressive agenda?

After forty years of the Charter’s existence, it has shown itself to be useless in protecting the rights and freedoms of Canadians. †

CONTENTS

THE CHARTER IS USELESS.....	PAGE 1
FAMILIES ARE THE FOUNDATION OF THE NATION....	PAGE 2
PRO-LIFE PERSISTENCE IN IRELAND.....	PAGE 3
HARD TRUTHS ABOUT EUTHANASIA	PAGE 4
PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE.....	PAGE 6

FAMILIES ARE THE FOUNDATION OF A NATION

Totalitarian leaders both hate and fear the family. This is because totalitarians want to vest all power in themselves and the family is a threat to this objective. This is made apparent, for example, by the fact that one of the major policies of Marxism was to destroy the family. Its policy is based on the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who partnered the book, The Origin of the Family in 1884. This book outlined how the family could be abolished. Some of their key points included:

1. Eliminate all religion, which they described as “the opiate of the masses”.
2. Dissolve monogamy in marriage.
3. Encourage pre and extra marital sex and other unconstrained sexual activity, including homosexuality.
4. Separate children from their natural parents by sending women to work in the factories.
5. Establish daycares and nurseries so that children will be influenced and trained by the state from their earliest years.
6. Provide free education for every child in public schools, since children are the property of the state and the state must, therefore, assume total responsibility for education.
7. Require equal obligation for all persons to work. Ironically, Karl Marx, himself, refused to be employed during his lifetime and was supported by his well-off family, friends, and donors. He spent his days reading and writing in the British Museum.
8. The state must control and centralize all means of communication.

Do these provisions sound familiar? Nearly one hundred and fifty years later, these once radical proposals have become part of our mainstream culture. What Marx and Engels proposed in 1884, has become normal and acceptable.

TOTALITARIAN GOVERNMENTS DESTROY FAMILIES

Simply put, the family is built on the foundation of marriage between a man and a woman. This reality is regarded as dangerous by totalitarian states because the family, while raising its children, also passes on tradition, culture, and faith—all of which confront the state when it wishes to impose its own will on the populace.

The family is important because it teaches the hard truths of moral values. It forms character and gives the young the ability to grow up to become independent, stable, functioning, and compassionate individuals. Such individuals are much more difficult to control. As a result, such individuals and their families are regarded as a threat to totalitarian governments.

It is not surprising, therefore, that every totalitarian government has tried to destroy the family unit, including Marx, Engels, Adolph Hitler, and Joseph Stalin. They all wanted to destroy the family by taking away the rights,

responsibilities, and authority of the family.

A DAYCARE SYSTEM IS NECESSARY FOR A TOTALITARIAN GOVERNMENT

Consequently, once a totalitarian government gains power, one of its first decisions is to establish a universal daycare program. This is because totalitarians believe that children are the property of the state. Therefore, the state has the right to compel parents to turn over their offspring to the daycare system so that children will be trained to adopt the state’s values and perspectives so as to become future tools of the state.

However, realists know that babies and toddlers are better cared for at home with their mothers. We also know that the one-size-fits-all institutional daycare programs are detrimental to children, parents, and society. Parents, not the state, should decide how children are raised. Most parents prefer their children to be cared for in family settings, with a relative, friend, or neighbour. Under a national daycare system, families must pay the costs of private care, themselves, while also paying for the government daycare system, by way of their taxes. A national daycare program, therefore, is discriminatory policy.

QUEBEC DAYCARE SYSTEM

The daycare system in Quebec, established in 1997, is the basis on which the federal Liberal government has modelled its national daycare plan. The Quebec model has, however, provided evidence of the failure of the daycare system. According to a study, published by the National Bureau of Economic Research in 2015, which was based on their prior analysis in 2005, researchers Baker, Gruber, and Milligan, found that the Quebec model falls short of quality day care. Specifically, the researchers found more hyperactivity, inattention, aggressiveness, issues with motor and social skills, plus a reduction of the child/parent relationship. That is, alarmingly, the study indicates that placing children in the daycare system may lead to a breakdown between the child and his/her parents. When the children are cared for by others, some cease to have confidence in their own parenting skills.

This also has occurred in Sweden, which provides only one choice—a government subsidized daycare system. A full 92% of children in Sweden, aged 18 months to five years, are in institutional daycare, which costs the government \$20,000 annually per child. Swedish taxes are among the highest in the world and the tax system is designed to encourage both parents to seek employment in the paid workforce. Studies indicate that not only have academic performances plummeted in Sweden, but parents there do not have the necessary confidence to raise their children because their parental instincts have decreased. Parents began to lose the ability to set limits

for their children and they failed to sense their children's needs, since the children did not develop a strong psychological attachment to their parents. Instead, because they are being raised in large groups of their peers, they look to their peers for approval.

This Marxist experiment, to eliminate the traditional family, ended in disaster for the Soviet Union, which collapsed in 1991. The collapse was due to a number of reasons, but one of the major causes was the breakdown of Russian society under Communism. Mikhail Gorbachev stated in his book, Perestroika; New Thinking for our Country and the World (1988):

Perhaps the breakdown in Russian society with its prevalence of alcoholism, divorce, abortion, etc., may be due to the separation of young children from their mothers in day care at too early an age.

However, some women are required to be the family breadwinner or must contribute to the family income. If there is no family or place available to assist them, then they are obliged to place their children in government licensed daycare. It is not the best situation for either the child or the parents. However, at least, we now know the problems that arise with such government operated, licensed daycare and the parents can do the best they can to offset those problems.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU'S NATIONAL DAYCARE PLAN

Prime Minister Trudeau and his Minister of Finance, Chrystia Freeland, have aggressively pushed a national daycare plan in Canada.

Although they insist that the daycare policy is to assist families and children, in reality, its actual objective is quite different. It assists the Trudeau government by encouraging women to return to the paid workforce re-

sulting in the government receiving increased tax money to distribute, as is its custom, to acquire more political leverage with the voters.

The Trudeau government based its policy on a national daycare program on the argument that women experienced greater job losses during the pandemic. It relied on a study, developed by a feminist economist, Armine Yalnizyan, who invented the notion of what she called, "she-session". Yalnizyan, however, has been associated, since 1993, with the leftist organization, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. Her proposition was a fabrication, not supported by competent economists. According to www.countryeconomy.com, from January 2019 to October 2021, Canada's monthly male unemployment was consistently higher than female's, except for eight pandemic months out of these thirty-four months. However, female unemployment was higher by less than one percentage point in seven out of these eight pandemic months. The highest unemployment rate was in May 2020 at 13.5% for males and 13.9% for females, a 0.4 point gender differential.

In October 2021, female unemployment in Canada was 6.2% and male unemployment was higher at 7.0%, a 0.8 percentage point advantage for women. Women are already "back at work". Senior women and men, have the highest rates of unemployment in October, at 7.8% and 8.5% respectively. They do not require daycare to return to work!

Withdrawing children from the control of their parents ensures the children are receptive to the progressive, left-wing ideology, which Trudeau and Freeland ardently promote.

The family, consisting of mother, father, and children is a fortress against the pressures being imposed on today's parents. It is our only defence to safeguard society. †

PRO-LIFE PERSISTENCE IN IRELAND

Ireland was once a Catholic country which included in its Constitution the *Eighth Amendment*, guaranteed protection for the unborn child. Because of its strong law prohibiting abortion, Ireland had a remarkably low maternal death rate, since all funding for maternal care was directed to the mother's and the baby's safety.

Because Ireland was Catholic and pro-life, it became a target for pro-abortionists. These attacking outsiders included International Planned Parenthood, U.S. billionaire George Soros' Open Society and the U.S. Ford Foundation, together with the mainstream media and social media such as Google and Facebook. These forces organized a ruthless campaign to successfully remove the *Eighth Amendment* from the Irish Constitution. They spewed

out pro-abortion propaganda defying any attempt at balancing pro-life information. Consequently, a referendum, held on May 25, 2018, resulted in the *Eighth Amendment* being removed from the Constitution.

On December 20, 2018, the *Regulation of Termination of Pregnancy Act (RTP)*, became law in Ireland, which permitted abortion up to twelve weeks of pregnancy, or later where there is a serious risk to the pregnant woman. The law also permitted abortion when there is a condition likely to lead to the death of the unborn child before or shortly after birth.

Although the pro-abortion propaganda at the time of the referendum claimed that the removal of the *Eighth Amendment* would not cause a large number of abortions, the removal has, in fact, resulted in 13,709 abortions on

women residing in Ireland in just two years. This number includes abortions that were performed not only in Ireland, but also on Irish residents in England and Wales.

IRISH PHYSICIANS RELUCTANT TO PERFORM ABORTIONS

The Irish College of General Practitioners has a registration totalling 3,496 General Practitioners (GPs). However, only 373 of these physicians have signed contracts with the Health Service Executive (HSE) to provide abortions. In addition, approximately only half of the maternity hospitals in Ireland provide abortion services to patients.

PRO-ABORTIONISTS FURIOUS

The Abortion Support Network (ASN), as well as feminist groups, were furious with the failure to cooperate and promote the abortion law. They demanded an immediate widening of the law.

GOVERNMENT TO REVIEW THE ABORTION LAW

Under the *Termination of Pregnancy Act*, the Health Minister is required to carry out a review of the abortion services no later than three years after the law's commencement. The Health Department confirmed that a review would take place in 2021. The Department of Health extended an invitation to all interested groups, organizations, and members of the public to provide their views for the review of the operation of the abortion legislation.

The pro-abortionists, including the feminist National Women's Council (NWC), claim that women in Ireland are deprived of the "benefits" of the abortion law. They are demanding that abortion access be expanded in Ireland so that all abortions be decriminalized, and demanded that "Do it yourself", at-home abortion services, that were

established during the COVID pandemic, be made permanent. Further, they want the gestation limits on abortion in the current legislation to be eliminated.

NOT THE END OF THE IRISH ABORTION STORY

This is not the end of the story. Although the Irish pro-life movement experienced a heart-breaking setback by the new law, it did not lose its determination for Ireland to become again a pro-life country.

On June 29, 2021, the pro-life movement organized 55 pro-life rallies across Ireland urging the public to re-think abortion. These individual rallies were organized in lieu of a nation-wide rally due to COVID-19 restrictions.

THE EUTHANASIA STORY IN IRELAND

After the abortion debacle, anti-life forces in Ireland expected further victories. This did not happen in the Irish Parliament. The most recent attempt occurred in the Justice Committee however, which dealt with a 2018 bill on assisted dying. The Committee concluded "it was not in a position to recommend legislative changes at this time".

This conclusion occurred because the pressure to bring euthanasia into Ireland was not promoted, advocated or pushed by outside organizations (mainly U.S.), which had successfully brought about the abortion law. The Irish culture of faith and life prevailed, supported by nearly all medical stakeholders in Ireland. Over 2,500 health care professionals signed a letter rejecting the euthanasia bill, and the disability rights advocates also pushed against it.

Although the pro-life movement in Ireland was battered and abused by the outside forces on abortion, it is still alive and fighting for the dignity of all human life, both on abortion and euthanasia. The pro-life forces are ready and waiting to protect all human life there. †

HARD TRUTHS ABOUT EUTHANASIA

"Euthanasia advocates' reckless desire for death has also had another tragic side effect—marginalizing palliative care."

The anti-life organization, Dying with Dignity, was the driving force behind the Supreme Court of Canada decision to allow physician-assisted suicide. The procedure is now euphemistically called, 'Medical Assistance in Dying' (MAID), which attempts to whitewash the horrifying fact that physicians in Canada may now legally kill their patients. This is a grievous departure from the Hippocratic Oath, which has guided physicians for centuries to "do no harm". Dying with Dignity, aided by sympathetic, woke

media, achieved this legislative goal by distorting the truth about what happens during the deadly procedure.

The first myth put forward by the advocates for euthanasia was that euthanasia would be rarely used, and only as a last resort. A review of Canadian statistics quickly refutes this claim.

In June 2021, Health Canada reported that there were 7,595 deaths by MAID in 2020, accounting for 2.5% of the deaths in Canada. This represented a growth rate of 34.2%, compared to 2019. The total number of medically assisted deaths since the enactment of the federal legislation in 2016 is 21,589.

In the province of Quebec alone, according to Quebec's Commission 'End-of-Life-Care', between April 1,

2020 and March 31, 2021, there were 2,426 euthanasia deaths, up by 37% over the previous year, representing 3.3% of all deaths in Quebec.

MAID IS A MASQUERADE

MAID masquerades as medical treatment, supposedly provided by trusted doctors acting ethically in the best interests of their patients. This pretense has resulted in the normalizing of euthanasia, whereby some physicians do not even bother to consider alternative options for the patients.

SLIPPERY SLOPE

Advocates for euthanasia have consistently denied that there is a slippery slope inherent in all euthanasia legislation. In every country that has brought in such legislation, there has been a rapid increase, in a very short time, of deaths by euthanasia. This is because once the line is crossed that allows the right to kill another human being and is an accessible right, this results in a rapid abandonment of safeguards that were initially put in place to protect the public.

For example, in March 2021, Canada removed the safeguard that restricted euthanasia to only those whose death was “reasonably foreseeable”. This has resulted in euthanasia being available to anyone who is experiencing “intolerable suffering” (which can mean anything). The amendment also further expanded the legislation to allow anyone experiencing mental illness to be euthanized, including those with schizophrenia, dementia, or deep depression, who cannot provide consent.

In addition, the Canadian Parliament is currently considering legislation to further amend the law to allow people with early dementia to provide an “advance directive” to obtain euthanasia should they later become mentally incompetent. The government is also considering whether children should have access to euthanasia.

FALSE ARGUMENTS

The arguments from advocates of euthanasia are a façade to pretend it is for the patient’s autonomy (self-determination) and empowerment. However, it is the physician who has the “autonomy” and controls the death. He ultimately decides whether to provide or deny the procedure. Further, the patient’s so-called autonomous decision is often based on his/her feelings of hopelessness, despair and alienation. It may also be based on factors such as pressure from the family, who may stand to gain practically or emotionally by a patient’s death. Further, a request for death may be, in truth, a request for reassurance that the physician, or others around, still value his/her dignity and life. In short, the patient may not always view death by euthanasia rationally.

EUTHANASIA IS FREQUENTLY NOT AN EASY DEATH

Advocates present euthanasia as quick, dignified and easy. However, although assisted suicide death may be

speedy, this does not always occur, nor is it always painless and/or dignified.

Because of problems achieving an efficient death, experiments have been carried out with lethal drugs, without success, to try to make deaths quicker, less painful and less risky. Inadequacy in achieving death easily has also led advocates to push for other methods of causing death, such as allowing the patient to die of starvation and dehydration (lack of water). This process leads to a horrific death, painful and difficult, which should not occur in a humane society.

Further efforts to facilitate death have led to the development of a suicide pod developed by Australian doctor Phillip Nitschke, known as “Dr. Death”. This pod, called “sarco”, is a chamber that is a glorified transportable gas chamber. According to Dr. Nitschke, “The benefit for the person who uses it is that they don’t have to get any permission, they don’t need some special doctor to try and get a needle in, and they don’t need to get drugs difficult to obtain.” The patient just steps inside and presses the button. The pod doubles as a bio-degradable coffin. This product is to be introduced in Switzerland in 2022.

Euthanasia advocates’ reckless desire for death has also had another tragic side effect—marginalizing palliative care.

PALLIATIVE CARE

Palliative Care provides positive, holistic care for patients, including emotional, physical, and spiritual support during the last stages of life. It allows the patient to die naturally, with dignity and compassion, which gives meaning to the patient’s life and death.

The presence of MAID has complicated the efforts of palliative care physicians, since physicians supporting MAID insist that the patient remain lucid to provide a valid consent so as to not jeopardize the legitimacy of MAID. This requires withholding sedation which causes the patient much distress.

MAID and palliative care also compete for funding and resources. Good palliative care takes time and interdisciplinary resources, whereas MAID kills the patient, frees a bed, and is a cost effective solution to the overwhelmed health care system. Consequently, it is prioritized in the health care system.

PALLIATIVE CARE’S DISADVANTAGE

Palliative care has also been put at a huge disadvantage in comparison to MAID. MAID has been positioned as a “right” under the *Canada Health Act*, so that it must be publicly funded and accessible to all Canadians. Palliative care is not provided with the same status as there is no legal requirement that it be funded and accessible as a “right”. Consequently, many dying patients (98% of whom die natural deaths) do not receive a genuine option of end of life care.

Canada is failing its citizens at this sensitive time in their life’s journey.†

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE



Dear supporter of REAL Women of Canada:

Welcome to the January 2022 issue of e-REALity. Our staff and Board of Directors would like to wish all our readers a very Happy New Year. May 2022 be a year of joy and peace for you and your families.

Our REALity news magazine is one of Canada's top pro-family publications. It contains information and analysis of political and social issues not reported elsewhere. This month, we report on our Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, attempts to disrupt the family, euthanasia, and the status of the pro-life culture in Ireland. You will not find this information in the mainstream media, such as CBC, or the Toronto Star. We are not funded by the government, as is mainstream media. Therefore, since we are not beholden to the government, we can comment on issues as we uncover the facts, and not to appease government ideologies.

On December 6, 2021, we issued a Media Release on the passage of Bill C-4, the so-called Conversion Therapy Bill. The Bill has now been given Royal Assent. It passed through Parliament and the Senate without the usual scrutiny of Three Readings, debate and Standing Committees. The Conservatives are the ones who introduced the motion to dispense with normal parliamentary procedures. They unanimously sided with the Liberals and NDP to pass this troubling legislation as quickly as possible. This was very upsetting to social conservatives and the pro-family movement.

Your annual membership fee for REAL Women is due every January 1. It is \$30 for individual and family memberships and \$50 for group memberships. If you have not renewed yet for 2022, we kindly ask that you do so at your earliest convenience. You can renew on-line, or by mail. If you are not a member of REAL Women, then there is no time like the present to join. You will be joining the only Canadian women's movement that provides an alternative voice to the radical feminist ideology movement which believes all Canadian women should think alike. REAL Women will be YOUR voice, standing up for pro-life values and for the values of the natural, traditional family. JOIN NOW! There is strength in numbers. Men are also welcome to join as associate (non-voting) members.

We have added two new features to our website. One is an FAQ page, Frequently Asked Questions. We invite you to send us your suggestions to add to our list of questions. The second new feature is our Commentary page. This section is for quick replies to events that can be posted immediately, before the particular issue is off the front pages and opinion columns. If you would like to contribute to the commentary section, please forward your article to realwcto@realwomenofcanada.ca. Commentaries will be accepted with the approval of REAL Women and subject to editing and length considerations.

Thank you for all your past support and we look forward to your continuing support, in all of its many forms, throughout the coming new year.

Warm regards,

Pauline Guzik

Pauline Guzik, National President †



Cartoon from *The National Post* on October 20, 2021 by Gary Clement.

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