

**George J. Atis, Barrister & Solicitor**  
**December 23, 2010 - Statement re Kayla Watkins Story**  
**For Immediate Release**

---

Although it will take some time for this story to run its course, I just want everyone to know that the insults, the threats and the attacks on me by Internet trolls and hackers *will never dissuade me from speaking out about any situation that is wrong.*

I came from very humble beginnings and have faced great adversity – including ignorance, prejudice, and pre-judgment – to get where I am today by speaking out and taking action in difficult or unpopular situations.

For those who know all the facts of the situation involving Vanessa, Sheree and Kayla Watkins, they know that I had to act for the sake of the 15 other team members (who were boys) and who, regrettably, have been lost in the media frenzy of "Kayla's story."

And, for those who know me as a person and as a lawyer, they know that I am a direct, fair and principled person - and no "spinning" of my character in the media will ever change that.

Although I am savvy enough to understand that *most* people form quick-opinions based on what they read on the Internet, I was, nevertheless, surprised by the extent of the ignorance out there. *Whatever happened to not judging a person until you walk a mile in their shoes?*

In any event, as a lawyer, it is second nature to me to question what I read or see and investigate to get to the facts before passing judgment. I can assure you, based on what has been written to me and about me, that this is not the case with most people, even pseudo-professionals – like the talk show hosts on Toronto morning radio programs.

And, even though the "judgments" and commentary about me have been disproportionately harsh and unfounded, I accept both as a by-product of today's media and the Internet community - *in a free and democratic society.*

I consider this a great lesson in human nature that I can discuss in the years to come with those who are closest to me.

In any event, I would like to make sure to have my side of the story "on the record" (so to speak) now - so that I can look back at this incident in my life in the years to come, judge my actions in the situation and revisit the reactions of various critics, the responses of which I have saved as a teaching tool.

***Preliminary Points Before Addressing "The Agenda"***

First of all, the issue with Kayla Watkins was one of several agenda items to be discussed at a November 14, 2010 parents meeting regarding the state of our hockey team as of that date. (I bet no one really picked up on this point from the story in the Star or the related stories on the Internet.)

Second, the events leading up to the November 14, 2010 meeting had everything to do with a disgraceful and dishonest team manager in Vanessa Watkins, who, by that time, had managed to alienate most of the parents on the team with her negative attitude towards *everything*. That attitude was also evident in Kayla towards her teammates - *a fact that was never explored by the media, because it does not make for a good story.* And, despite Kayla's portrayal in the media, I think that her former teammates have a different perspective, based on their first-hand experience with her. The net-net is this: the environment of this minor hockey team as of November 14, 2010 was so bad that most of the other players on it did not want to play-out the rest of the season with Kayla - *another fact ignored by the media.* (In my interview with Robert Cribb, the Toronto Star reporter who first reported this story, I advised him of this fact but, he chose to ignore it because, in my view, he had already decided the *slant* of the story he wanted to write.)

Third, several parents on the team, including me, had approach the coach, Paul Macchia, with our concerns about the team, including the fact that several did not want to play on it anymore. We practically begged the coach to address these issues - as coaching matters - but, he did nothing. Unfortunately, Paul's nature is to "do nothing" and this was (and is) a major part of the problem. And, many think that this should have been the end of the issue –

**George J. Atis, Barrister & Solicitor**  
**December 23, 2010 - Statement re Kayla Watkins Story**  
**For Immediate Release**

---

except that "do nothing" in the circumstances was not acceptable. (All Paul had to do was listen to the parents and then say, politely but firmly, that he would make any decisions about Kayla as the coach. The problem is that we got mixed signals: he agreed to shorten the bench on PPs and PKs but, he didn't – which confused the heck out of us.)

As an aside, during several media call-in shows on December 22 & 23, I heard people debate whether parents are entitled to request a meeting in the context of a Canadian "rep hockey" team. My view is that it all depends on the situation. In the situation of this team as of November 14, 2010, we most certainly did – because the manager and the coach, to whom we raised concerns and issues about the team prior to the meeting, did nothing and the team was splintering apart.

At the time we (the parents) requested a meeting with the coach and manager about Kayla, there were about 20 games left in the season, which was plenty of time to salvage it. (By the way, the meeting had nothing to do our wins / losses record - but, rather, just playing out the season in an environment where the team members actually want to come to the rink, have fun and be together. Unfortunately, because of the preferential treatment given to Kayla - *who never actually earned her spot on the team* – the boys were not having fun anymore.)

*After Kayla's departure* (she and her manager mother quit) – the boys started having fun again. The team, while still struggling in the wins and losses department, is having fun again. (I know that people don't want to hear this but, I am going to say it anyway: the reason the team is having fun now is because the negative elements on the team (Kayla, her white-trash mother and grandmother) have left. It's that simple. It's unfortunate that it had to be that way but, yes, it's that simple.)

As another aside, why didn't Robert Cribb "investigate" the other side of the story - Kayla's teammates – before publishing "Kayla's Story"? In my view, it is because it would not have made for an interesting or controversial story! In fact, Cribb implied to me, in my interview with him on December 20, 2010, that he would do a follow-up on both sides of the story and that he was only rushing to interview me because he had a 5 PM deadline on that day. Cribb had ample time to investigate the complete story but chose not to. Cribb claims that he intends to do a follow-up but, who, in their right mind, would trust his integrity now. In any event, I will leave it to the reader and Cribb's peers to ask "why" he chose to publish half a story!

Fourth, the issue with Kayla had nothing to do with my son - or any other boy on this team - complaining about ice time to the coach or my "delusions" about whether my son would make the NHL. (The latter point was particularly funny to me because for those who know me, they know what a realist I am about everything. So, for the more ignorant people out there, let's be clear that the issue with Kayla has nothing to do with *"little Johnny not getting enough ice time or getting to the NHL."*) I am not sure how people drew this conclusion but, it may have been from the coach's cryptic quotes in the Toronto Star article regarding which Paul told me: *"I feel that what Cribb wrote does not reflect the way I said it to him."* (Hey Paul, welcome to media interviews and the dissembling that occurs after them! This is why I tape these interviews.)

Fifth, up to November 14, 2010, the team manager, Vanessa Watkins, had organized two parents' meetings during which there was no agenda, nothing was accomplished and no follow-up actions were identified or taken. Many parents, including myself, were upset at the time wasted during these meetings and I suggested that a meeting agenda be drafted for the next meeting.

By this time, it was clear to most parents that the only reason that Vanessa had taken on the role of "Team Manager" was so that Kayla could get a spot on this team – because she was not doing anything that resembled "managing".

And, contrary to what people have read, Kayla never "made" the team through a try-out; she came to the Toronto Ice Dogs from the Downsview Beavers in a deal arranged by certain parents of a player on the team (who shall remain nameless). (These parents, who were the big money supporters of the team, arranged for Paul Macchia to be the coach because he was easy on their son and, apparently, the deal included Vanessa and Kayla, which was not disclosed to me or the other parents on the team, whose children had tried out and made the team based on their skill.)

**George J. Atis, Barrister & Solicitor**  
**December 23, 2010 - Statement re Kayla Watkins Story**  
**For Immediate Release**

---

After I learned how Kayla had “made” the team, I advised these parents and the coach that this was a mistake and I considered moving my son but, the Ice Dogs would not release him, which would have allowed him to move. I accept the blame for trusting the big-money parents (because we were friends at the time). Ironically, Paul (the coach) did not choose their son as the Captain or even as an Alternate Captain (because his play and his presence in the dressing room did not merit it) and their relationship with him soured immediately thereafter on and, coincidentally, the behind-ones-back gossip about the coach and about the kids who were elected to those positions began. Go figure!

***The Agenda***

Now, let's turn to my actual agenda that people are "appalled" about.

Before exploring the specific points on it, there are two things that people should know. First and foremost, it is quite "normal" to draft an agenda to set out the discussion topics for a prospective meeting and second, to actually distribute it to participants prior to the meeting.

It is absolutely bizarre that the media and the masses took issue with this normal-course action - and it made me realize that the vast majority of people who commented about me and wrote to me about this point are truly, ignorant vulgarians. (I will discuss the content of the agenda below but, I still can't believe that people were appalled that I actually took the time to draft an agenda for the November 14, 2010 parents' meeting. So, I have to ask the painfully obvious and rhetorical question: *Why wouldn't I draft and circulate an agenda of the items that I intended to discuss at a meeting?* That's what lawyer do, among other things.

OK, now let's look at the content.

The first agenda item was "**Interim Budget Report**".

This was a budget report request for the period from the beginning of the season to November 2010, which Vanessa Watkins, as team manager, was required to provide. (As parents, we pay a lot of money for our kids to play rep hockey and we are entitled to know where it is being spent.) I had personally requested this from Vanessa at least twice before the November 14 meeting and she had ignored my requests. She finally delivered a "report" at the November 14 meeting. (And, by "report", I mean a piece of paper with numbers written but devoid of any organization, making it useless. It was, by no means, a typical budget report.)

Many parents, including myself, asked questions about this "report". In particular, I asked about certain discrepancies between budget revenue and expenditures which Vanessa could not explain at the time of the meeting. (The major discrepancy is that her report indicated that one player had not paid the team fee as of November 14, 2010. To this day, this discrepancy has not been explained, so please draw your own inferences.) (Note: After I wrote this article, I discovered that Kayla had not paid her fees – so she was getting a free ride, which was not disclosed to us!)

We moved on to the second agenda item after Vanessa agreed to follow up. (By the way, she never did follow up.)

As an aside, Vanessa Watkins, as team manager, had fiduciary responsibilities for the budget and remains responsible to explain any discrepancies in it. I followed up with Vanessa after the November 14 meeting but, she left the team shortly thereafter and has not, to date, followed-up with me. If there is a real investigative reporter out there, then, why don't you ask parents about Vanessa Watkins' "management" of the Downsview Beavers minor PeeWee team in 2009-2010 and some budget issues experienced in that year with this same manager? Then again, the budget discrepancies involving Vanessa Watkins last year and this year are probably just a coincidence, right?

The second agenda item was "**Hockey Canada Policy Regarding Separate Dressing Rooms for Mixed-Gender Teams Starting at "PeeWee" Level.**"

**George J. Atis, Barrister & Solicitor**  
**December 23, 2010 - Statement re Kayla Watkins Story**  
**For Immediate Release**

---

Many of the boys had complained to their parents about several "near misses" in the dressing room where, during the process of taking off their hockey equipment, their boxer shorts had almost come off. This was embarrassing to many of them and they were very uncomfortable about undressing in front of Kayla.

As more parents discussed the matter, a few of us did some quick research and I wrote to the Manager of Hockey Operations of the GTHL about our situation and he advised me about a rule for this exact situation - starting at the PeeWee level.

The rule is as follows:

**HOCKEY CANADA CO-ED DRESSING ROOM POLICY**

The following is the policy of Hockey Canada with respect to coed dressing in which the OHF will adhere to: Hockey Canada firmly believes in accommodating both genders in our great game. We further believe in balancing this goal with the safety, privacy, modesty and wishes of ALL our members without compromising the aspects of camaraderie, social integration and bonding inherent in a team sport. This policy attempts to meet all these goals while providing a safe and respectful environment for our participants.

Hockey Canada stresses the importance of coaches in ensuring both male and female players have equal access to pre and post team sessions and to all team related activities.

Hockey Canada recognizes the physical limitations of some facilities and encourages our members to work with local facility management to ensure that appropriate changing facilities are available to both genders.

Hockey Canada allows co-ed dressing room situations to exist at the Initiation Program, Novice and Atom levels, 5-10 years of age provided participants in a co-ed situation either arrive in full equipment or wear at a minimum gym shorts or long underwear as well as a full t-shirt (no tank tops) all of which must be in good condition and without holes/tears.

At the PeeWee (11 years old) level and above the following conditions will apply in all co-ed team environments:

- *Females and males will change in separate rooms*
- Both genders shall congregate in one dressing room fully prepared to participate in the game/practice not more than 15 minutes prior to the scheduled ice time unless otherwise indicated (to be there earlier) by the coaching staff.
- The lesser represented gender shall depart the dressing room not more than 15 minutes after the game/practice unless otherwise indicated (to stay longer) by the coaching staff.
- The gender in the majority shall not begin changing, helmets, gloves and skates excepted, prior to the departure of the lesser represented gender.
- When necessary, due to facility limitations, dressing and showering shall be done in shifts with the gender in the majority dressing and showering first. Once the room with shower facilities has been fully vacated the lesser represented gender may use the shower facilities.
- It is the belief of Hockey Canada that these provisions adequately address issues of team unity/camaraderie and provide for the modesty/privacy of all participants.

As a courtesy, I approached Vanessa about this rule before the meeting and she told me that she was aware of the rule but that she chose not to enforce it because of Kayla. I was surprised and put-off that she already knew about the rule - *but consciously chose her daughter's interest over the interests of the 15 other team members.*

**George J. Atis, Barrister & Solicitor**  
**December 23, 2010 - Statement re Kayla Watkins Story**  
**For Immediate Release**

---

I advised her that her decision to hide this rule from the team was wrong and that I would be raising it as a formal agenda item at the next meeting.

As an aside, you may be starting to understand that Vanessa Watkins is not the person that the media has made her out to be. Of course, if you do not believe me, then, hire her as your manager and see for yourself. I am pretty-sure that you'll be calling me about it after your experience is over.

The bottom line for me was that Vanessa Watkins was playing fast and loose with the budget and ignoring the OHF and Hockey Canada rule regarding co-ed dressing rooms - because it suited her daughter's interests.

As a parent on this team, this did not sit well with me because there were 15 others on the team who were being ignored. In addition, as a lawyer trained to spot unfair and suspicious actions, Vanessa was a giant red flag to me - in so many ways - and I was not going to ignore her dishonest actions for the rest of the season.

The third agenda item was "**Kayla Watkins - Player Ability Limitations & Suggested Options**".

This is the "media darling" of issues that people have seized upon to hurl their insults at and pass judgment on me.

Again, I am OK taking the bullets for the team because that's what I have been trained to do, as a lawyer, representing others but, for those of you who are interested in why this item was on the agenda, please keep reading.

As a lawyer, drafting of agendas is second nature to me, as is clear, concise and to-the-point drafting. Obviously, the media has "spun" my agenda to suit its needs but, the agenda was drafted to the minimum length needed to raise the issues slated for discussion - period. There was no other intent - period.

Any spinning of the words on that Agenda by anyone has been done consciously and in retrospect, *in order to sensationalize the content*. (That's a risk that all authors take but, that's why you have to question what you read - especially by some reporters in certain publications. I believe that rational people do question what they read but, many don't and they render "snap-judgments" about the author.)

The net-net is that the media articles that I saw and the clips on the talk shows that I heard only included the "juicy tidbits" of the agenda that make for a controversial story. What most media articles and the reports left out were the following parts of the agenda:

"I recognize that this item is a very difficult topic to list on this agenda and to discuss as a team; however, I also recognize that team morale (kids and parents) is suffering because this situation has not been addressed to date.

It is now 14 games into the season and we have noticed that Kayla's play has not improved. It is at the point where many of the team members do not want to play on this team if this situation is not addressed. I believe that this situation must be addressed immediately - *in the best interests of team as a whole* - so that we can preserve the balance of the season (about 20 or so games)."

The agenda then goes on to suggest two options regarding Kayla that the coach could implement so that the team could accommodate her playing abilities:

**Option 1:** Move Kayla to forward and play her on a regular shift but, not on any special teams (i.e. on power plays or penalty kills) - until her skating and shooting improves; or

**Option 2:** Keep Kayla on defense but, play her every other shift but, not on any special teams (i.e. on power plays or penalty kills) - until her skating and shooting improves.

**George J. Atis, Barrister & Solicitor**  
**December 23, 2010 - Statement re Kayla Watkins Story**  
**For Immediate Release**

---

Both of these options were suggested because, in my discussions of the issue with several parents and outsiders (some of whom had coached competitive hockey), they were acceptable ways to manage a weaker player's abilities.

Obviously, it was up to the coach to consider these options and decide whether to reject them or implement them but, nevertheless, the above options reflected a consensus view of the then-current situation.

The agenda then went on to say that if Kayla was not amenable to these options, "the coach should find Kayla a new team to play on - commensurate to her skill level - for the balance of the season and the manager should be refunded the *pro rata* portion of the fees she paid for the entire season." (Note: This part of the agenda was included before we found out that she had not paid her fees.)

Unfortunately, at the November 14 meeting, instead of discussing all of the issues at bar in a rational and delicate manner so that the coach could arrive at an action plan, Vanessa Watkins, the team manager, allowed her mother Sheree to attend the meeting and to turn it into a "circus".

Sheree ranted and raved and called the "boys on the team" (i.e. all of them) "useless".

Sheree threatened us that she would "spin" this issue into a gender discrimination issue - which she has done - with the help of the media.

As an aside, has anyone bothered checking with the parents of this team regarding Sheree's comments about the kids on the team (whom she called "useless") and how they felt about Sheree's and Vanessa's behaviour at this meeting?

Therefore, instead of having an adult discussion with the manager and the coach about a difficult and sensitive issue, both allowed the meeting to degenerate into another fiasco.

To top things off, *nothing was done or said by the coach after the meeting.*

Neither the manager nor the coach issued any communication about the meeting; they simply ignored it. I discussed this with many parents and informed them that "I was done" trying to help the situation. (As the saying goes, the rest is history.)

***Kayla's "Public Humiliation"***

Now let's turn to the "public humiliation" that Kayla says that she suffered.

First, this was very much a private team matter.

The only people that publicized this situation were Kayla's family - and you really have to ask yourself: *Why? Why would a mother or a grandmother parade Kayla out to the media?*

To me, the reason is clear: because Vanessa and her mother wanted to try to embarrass me, primarily, and the team, secondarily. (I address the former below.) There was no benefit to Kayla from the media exposure.

For anyone who knows Vanessa Watkins, it should be clear that she wanted a final soapbox on which to stand. I exposed her as a very poor manager of this team and she did not like this - and particularly me - so she used Kayla as a pawn in a public chess match. This was a choice that Vanessa made, not me.

Second, (and this is really disturbing to me), the media articles that I read suggested that Kayla had "come across" my agenda when going through her mother's e-mail. Come on, people, even the ignoramuses out there can't be buying that BS. What kind of a mother allows her 12-year old daughter to read her e-mail and, particularly, this particular e-mail? As parents, we have to shield our children from adult discussions.

**George J. Atis, Barrister & Solicitor**  
**December 23, 2010 - Statement re Kayla Watkins Story**  
**For Immediate Release**

---

Apart from the fact that I am a lawyer and my e-mail communications are highly confidential (and I protect them as such), I also communicate with my wife and teachers (and other professionals) via e-mail (and by other means) *on a confidential basis* about sensitive topics involving our kids. I may discuss the issue of the e-mail with my children in an appropriate way if it concerns them but, I don't let my children read the e-mails.

For example, a teacher may call with an issue at school and express concern about a child's behaviour and strategies for dealing with it. *Would you play the voice mail for your child? Or, would you address the issue of that voice mail with your child in an appropriate way?*

The fact that Vanessa or Sheree Watkins showed Kayla my e-mails and agenda should speak volumes about whether either was looking out for the best interests of the child.

As an aside, I think one person who wrote to me commented that I was "blaming the mother" for Kayla reading the agenda. He is absolutely right: *I am blaming the mother for showing her daughter the agenda.*

The agenda was an adult agenda and if Vanessa Watkins did not understand that fact, then, she has bigger problems as a mother beyond this issue - and I truly feel sorry for her.

Obviously, the point of the agenda item involving Kayla was for Vanessa Watkins, as team manager, and Paul Macchia, as coach, to address the issue directly with Kayla - in an appropriate manner, in private - *but only if their intent was to take action.*

On the other hand, if they had decided to say to the parents *"Thanks very much for your views but, the decision regarding Kayla's play is a coaching issue and we have decided to keep Kayla on the team as is"*, that would have been fine too (and they would NOT have had to discuss the situation with Kayla).

This course of action by Paul and Vanessa would have been OK because it would have allowed us (i.e. the parents) to make decisions about the rest of the season with respect to our children. That is: *Do we play it out? Do we try to move? Do we leave?* etc.

The fact is that nothing was done and nothing was said following the November 14, 2010 meeting.

Vanessa and Kayla just didn't show up for the next game and even after that, Paul never addressed the situation in a communication to the team.

We, as parents, learned, indirectly, that Vanessa and Kayla had quit and that Kayla was playing on another team better suited to her skill level. (By the way, all of the parents that I discussed this with are happy for Kayla (as am I) - because we know it was the right decision.)

### ***Lessons Learned***

Look, based on what I have read in the media, I understand that it is easy for others to judge me or the agenda itself in isolation to make me the "bad guy" but, the fact is that team morale was at a very low point and many of Kayla's team members did not want to play with her any longer.

Kayla was negative towards her team members when they tried to help her - because she had an attitude of entitlement as the "manager's daughter".

In addition, team members and their parents were speaking about Kayla's play behind her back.

For those who know me, they know that I don't like to hide from situations; I confront issues and deal with them directly and openly.

**George J. Atis, Barrister & Solicitor**  
**December 23, 2010 - Statement re Kayla Watkins Story**  
**For Immediate Release**

---

In the context of all of the gossiping that was destroying the team, I did not think it was fair to Kayla - or to the rest of the team - to continue to play out the balance of the season in a dysfunctional environment, which is what this team was as at November 14, 2010.

And so, I was tasked with drafting an agenda of the topics to be discussed at a meeting to discuss how to go forward, including proposals for keeping Kayla on the team.

The issue with Kayla *has never been about gender or about winning or losing* and it is regrettable that Vanessa and Sheree Watkins have used this situation – with the help of the media – as a platform to mask the real issue.

The mother's and grandmother's behaviours were not something anyone could control – least of all me – and they have to live with their actions.

I am genuinely sorry if Kayla actually read the agenda or felt "humiliated". No child deserves that, which is why we shelter kids from adult discussions.

As a child, she could have been spared all of this if Vanessa and Sheree Watkins had made certain decisions and took off their blinders about her qualifications to play for this team.

To be very direct, they are ultimately responsible for Kayla's feelings *because they chose to share my agenda with Kayla*, without my permission.

As an aside, stop for a moment and think about this.

If your child was the topic of this Agenda, would you share the agenda with him or her or would you manage the situation and explain the situation in a way that would least hurt your child?

I know what I would do but, then again, the visceral reaction of the masses is to blame me as the drafter and messenger. That's OK; I understand them; but I don't agree with them - period.

At the end of the day, as I said above, the people who know me will ask me about this incident and I will answer them directly - as I always do.

For all the people that wrote vile and disgusting things to me, about me and about my kids, I stand by your right to say these things to me because we live in a free and democratic society.

I would ask you, however, to respect the fact that I may disagree with you and debate you regarding the content of your opinions.

And, I just want the media and the Internet trolls to know that you will dissuade me from speaking out against things that I know are wrong.

Despite the fact that some people live their lives without ever taking a stand between right and wrong, truth and lies, that's not how I live my life or operate my law practice.

It was wrong of Vanessa to sneak her daughter onto this team in a backroom deal. It was wrong of her not to pay her fees. It was wrong of her to use her managerial position to give her daughter preferential treatment on a team of 16 players. I discovered these things and tried to discuss it in a rational way. If you think that I was wrong, that's your problem – not mine – and just because I was pilloried in the press, I am not dissuaded from doing it again if I have to.

This incident showed me the characters of certain parents on the team, who talked tough behind the coach's and manager's back, but who have run for cover – like common cowards – during the media frenzy about this story.

**George J. Atis, Barrister & Solicitor**  
**December 23, 2010 - Statement re Kayla Watkins Story**  
**For Immediate Release**

---

Most people don't have the mental fortitude to withstand the character-assault that I faced over the past week *but, I do.*

Already, people who have bothered to look behind the media and internet stories have written back to me and apologized for their initial reactions. I will publish both the ugly, nasty stuff and the apologies - at the appropriate time. Right now, I will let Vanessa, Sheree and Kayla have their 15 minutes of notoriety; I truly hope it turns out good for all of them but, I think we all know where they will end up in life in the long run.

I know that "Kayla's story" was motivated by retaliation against me by Vanessa and Sheree Watkins but, they can rest assured that my Christmas holidays have not been ruined.

As a Christian during this time, it is important to me and for me to be Christian-like in my actions towards and comments about Vanessa and Kayla and all of her family – and I will.

I have dealt with a lot of adversity in life and every instance is a character builder - with this one being in the "top 10". (I mean, really, did the media need to publish my picture and at the very least, could they not have airbrushed a few pounds off it. I can only think of four words that I thought of when I saw the picture: "... *the horror, the horror*".)

In these situations, time is the great equalizer and you can bet that I will be there to speak out at the appropriate time.

It probably won't be a sexy-story for the media but, I have never lived my life seeking external, public validation - and I am not about to start now.

Any follow-up that I publish about this incident will be about the value of patience and perseverance and standing your ground.

The only thing that concerns me is that Vanessa Watkins' brother is a Metro Toronto Police officer and I know that cops (and cops' families) tend to stick together.

And, while I cannot prove anything right now (and I am not alleging anything), the threats of violence against me and my family that I have received on my home number have come from the same voice.

I will be issuing a report to my local police department, the York Regional Police, about such threats and I have also taken action to commence my own private investigation but, in the meantime, I would ask people who choose to disagree with me, my agenda, or this whole situation to do so in a respectful manner befitting of this great country.

George J. Atis,  
Toronto, Thursday, December 23, 2010