

Peter Cornakovic
3341 Cardross Road
Mississauga, Ontario
L4X 2N4
(905) 625-3636

April 13, 2003

Attn: Ombudsman
The Toronto Star
One Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5E 1E6

Dear Sir or Madam:

Re: Complaint Against Michele Landsberg's Hate Literature on 'Divorce bill's flaws inadvertently aid abusers'

I am writing this letter of complaint against The Toronto Star and Michele Landsberg for her misinformation of facts and promotion of hate literature towards men in the above-mentioned article. This hate literature propaganda is in contravention of Section 319 of the Criminal Code.

Contrary to Ms. Landsberg's perspective on removing custody and access in favour of parental responsibility by the Minister of Justice's Bill C-22, this move was designed in fact to eliminate fathers access, not increase it. If the intention is to increase access, why would C-22 also remove the implication that maximum contact with both parents' is in the child's best interest? It was removed in order to make access more difficult for fathers and prevent them from having any say in raising their children.

There is no shared custody and never was tried in England or Australia. As a researcher who reviewed the Australia changes, the only changes, which occurred, were terms from custody and access to resident and non-resident parents. The changes were not successful because the legislative changes, while a promise to non-custodial parents of more access, in effect changed nothing in the actual time spent with the non-custodial parent. In other words, the non-resident parent thought that a form of shared parenting was the intention of the legislative changes, but no direction on this matter was given by the legislature. The judiciary, confused over the changes, only changed the words of their orders, without any changes to shared parenting. This enraged non-resident parents and did not change the situation from the previous words used. Therefore, it was a failure because there was no actual change in implementation, only in the terms. To quote Professor Mark Henaghan, Dean, Faculty of Law at University of Otago on this matter, "The Rhodes, Graycar and Harrison Report on the changes of wording in Australia shows that a change of language does not lead to changes of attitude by the parties, and may in fact create more conflict as expectations rise".ⁱ

Most parents do not separate with civility. Most parents separate in motion court with fathers believing they will receive non-gender biased decisions. They mostly lose in motion courts and learn that it is always a winning game for women and a loss for fathers and their children. This is gender profiling and a crime against humanity. This 95% statistic is not a settlement, but more often motion judgments by the courts. Trials only proceed when bankrupt fathers can muster up further resources to argue the errors of the motion court judges. Her facts are wrong.

When fathers recognize that they cannot win in a family court, many fathers wisely give up or cannot afford to continue fighting for the **RIGHT** to love and develop their children's potential. The few stubborn fathers, such as myself, adhere to a higher standard of non-gender biased family justice and continue to fight for the just opportunity to share in loving and developing their children's potential. This is the primary purpose in life for any wise and loving parent. Men have no hope in the gender-biased family courts. In the 5% who take it to trial, fathers do not receive custody 'slightly more than 50 per cent' of the time in trial. This is a false fact and misinformation.

Contrary to her statements, allegations of abuse by men against their former spouse are proven without merit in 90% of the cases. Yet making false allegations by women against men is the most successful weapon of choice of separating women. This is not only a criminal act, but also child abuse by mothers that is never punished. Yet, this fact is not presented.

As well, studies of spouse abuse throughout the western world and even by Statistics Canada have shown that women are just as physically abusing as men in their relationships. Ms. Landsberg does not present this and in fact insinuates that men are more abusive. The emotional abuse is just as prevalent by women towards men, especially when using the Duluth Wheel of Violence and Control. In my case, my divorced spouse used the "I am leaving you and I am taking the kids" threat throughout 17 years of marriage. This is emotional blackmail, which the family courts provide positive reinforcement by awarding mothers sole custody in 92% of the cases!

Her request to remove gender neutrality would be in contravention of not only the Charter of Rights, Canada, 1982, but more importantly the supremacy of natural moral law. This advocacy of gender-biased legislation by Ms. Landsberg is propagandizing hate literature based on false facts and myopic myths and stereotyping against men. This is a criminal offense. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Canada, 1982 does not demand that laws enhance women's equality per her statement. Any attempt to make it more favourable for women in family law would in effect make it even more biased against the natural rights of fathers, who along with their children, loose in the family court of law. If you understand this logic, you will understand why men have marital commitment problems and are more unwilling to have children: If the relationship does not work out, decided by women in 80% of separations, then it is only the father and children who loose, not women. It is society, including men, women and children who all loose in this pathological cultural environment.

I consider Ms. Landsberg a criminal nazi-like propagator of gender biased misinformation against men, which is not only in contravention of the Criminal Code, The Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Media Counsel guidelines, but also demeaning and dehumanizing to any father or man of virtue, integrity and character. Please have her fired, print a front-page retraction story of this hate literature or else I will be seeking a ruling by the Media Counsel.

Yours very truly



Peter Cornakovic

Encl.

¹ Henaghan, Professor Mark, "Above and Beyond the Best Interest of the Child", Dean, Faculty of Law, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand