

Opposition to Bill C-22 – An Appeal to the Individual MP

- Right now, Canada is engaged in the largest human rights abuse of its history: state seizure of children from fathers and mothers designated “noncustodial.” Bill C-22 evades government commitments to ensure that children enjoy the full benefit of relationships with both parents. A hateful ideology controls the Minister of Justice.
- By introducing vague terminology, C-22 seeks to obscure the brutal reality of custody and access, and to deny the existence of fundamental parental rights and fundamental needs of the child. Only the divorce industry profits from this bill.
- Loss of a parent is among the worst abuse that can be done. Regardless of terminology, the state has no basis for its practice of granting exclusive possession of the children in divorce to one parent, usually the mother, and encouraging discord by favoring one side.
- It is well-established that children need both parents, with or without the trauma of divorce. Loss of the father is the best predictor of later incarceration, psychological and educational problems, and teenage pregnancy, as well as numerous other harms to children. There is no evidence that loss of a mother is any better.
- Recent studies, including some conducted by the Department of Justice, have shown that Canadians overwhelmingly favor a more even-handed approach to custody and access, and that they distrust the family court system. This trend appears more pronounced in younger people.
- The Department of Justice has systematically avoided studying or polling about fundamental issues: chiefly, equal parenting and the existence of systemic bias against men and boys and against fathers. There is an obvious bias in the way that the DoJ analyzes and creates evidence. Much of this is traceable to career bureaucrats.
- Superficially designed to promote the interests of women, feminism is the only political movement that is directly financed by the government, despite the fact that it is rejected by most Canadian women, and the fact that it does them great harm.
- The government systematically refuses efforts to participate in policy formation by non-feminist organizations such as REAL Women or by groups that favor equal parenting.
- In 1986, the federal government revised the Divorce Act to feature the option of joint custody. Parliamentary debate of the period clearly shows that the parliament intended fundamental practical changes in the conduct of the court, with more equality for parents and security for children, but the courts thwarted the intentions of parliament by granting joint custody less frequently and by defining terms of joint custody that were, in fact, tantamount to sole custody.
- In 1998, a special joint committee of the Commons and the Senate issued a report entitled “For the Sake of the Children,” which recommends shared parenting with the clear intent of moving toward parental equality. Without justification, previous and current Ministers of Justice have effectively repudiated that report. Mr. Cauchon needs to reverse course.
- Current activists have moved on to a demand for equal parenting as the just and effective solution for most of the abuses of the current system. Even “shared parenting” is no longer a suitable response for us. Our groups are growing in unity and political awareness.
- As a parliamentarian, we need you to support the efforts of Roger Gallaway and Senator Anne Cools to establish parental equality and protect children from conflict and the loss of a parent. We expect you to make a decision on these critical issues and take a stand. We will be very gratified if you meet with us, and get to know our perspective. Groups want you to see the benefit of adopting the majority position.

Equal Parenting Groups: To follow up on this information, contact: Eric Tarkington, 416-636-0772, or etarking@sympatico.ca.

Please feel free to use the one-page position document above. You do not need to mention EPOC or HEART when you use this document.